

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 12 March, 1987.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

### OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I wish to table four reports: the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation for the year ending March 1986; the Manitoba Credit Corporation for the 1985-86 year; the Manitoba Beef Commission, the 1985-86 Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1986; and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Farm Lands Ownership Board for the year ending March 31, 1986.

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It's my pleasure to table the Report on the Administration of the Rent Regulation Program for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1986.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Culture and Heritage Resources.

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have the privilege of tabling the Annual Report, 1985-86, for the Film Classification Board, Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Before moving to Oral Questions, I'd like to draw the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 73 students from Grades 11 and 12 from the Neepawa Area Collegiate. The students are under the direction of Mr. Wayne Hollier, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

On behalf of all the members, we welcome you to the Legislature this morning.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Bill No. 8 - misleading of House

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs, relative to the request of the government to ask this side of the House to grant leave to deal with Bill No. 8 yesterday.

As a result of that request, our caucus spent some four hours, Madam Speaker, in discussing that matter in order to arrive at a position to satisfy ourselves there would be public hearings, that the issue of relief for farmers from educational taxes would be dealt with in the Budget, and to obtain a day for the Opposition to discuss matters which we felt were of much higher priority.

The Minister of Urban Affairs represented to the MLA for Charleswood, the Urban Affairs critic, and through the Government House Leader to myself, that Bill No. 8 had to be passed by this Monday, Madam Speaker. I ask the Minister of Urban Affairs: in view of his responses outside of the House after yesterday's proceedings to the effect that the bill did not have to be passed till April 15, why did he mislead members of this side of the House in asking for leave?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, I have never said that it had to be passed by Monday.

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, if I could please answer the question.

The proposal on phasing in was made by the city a week ago. We moved very quickly on it and put it on the Order Paper for Monday and proposed, by leave, that it be passed or forwarded for Second Reading on Wednesday.

Madam Speaker, the reason and rationale all along for the expedient treatment of this bill was: (a) that we had just received the advice from the City of Winnipeg; and (b) that the City of Winnipeg was in the middle of formulating their final budget decisions, and phasing-in legislation directly affected those decisions.

The earlier the bill is passed, the more predictable it is for the budget process. Madam Speaker, prior to that, the city had publicly stated that they had requested a delay in the budget, delay that's been made before, I think in 1978 when members opposite were in government that the period of time was delayed. We passed by Order-in-Council yesterday a delay till April 15, again a point that I've made publicly before. The earlier that this proposal is passed, subject to public hearings, etc., the more predictable it is for the city to deal with the matters.

I believe the city is dealing with their budget date. In fact, yesterday afternoon the Mayor informed me

that the final budget date was April 8. Before that date, they had set a date of March 24. They had changed the dates. I don't have the control of that matter. But the predictability of phasing in is a very key component for their budget-making and decision-making power.

So the earlier the city had given it to us would be helpful, and the earlier that this House can consider it is helpful.

### Bill No. 8 - passing of

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Government House Leader.

Will the Government House Leader inform the House that, in a telephone conversation held yesterday morning between myself, himself and the Minister for Urban Affairs, the Government House Leader confirmed that Bill No. 8 had to be passed by Monday. Will he, as a man of integrity, confirm that?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, I was on the conference call, as the Honourable House Leader stated, and I know that you used the - I can't remember the exact language - but you stated, we believe that this bill has to be passed, or the city has to know by Monday. I think that was the terminology used.

Well, Madam Speaker, the city has changed the date of their budget, and there is absolutely no question that the earlier that this bill is passed in this House, because of the Budget Debate, the more predictable it is for the city and their budget-making authority.

Madam Speaker, I brought the bill to my - (Interjection)- no, Madam Speaker . . .

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

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert asked a question, and I presume he wants to hear the answer. Could we please have order?

The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. G. DOER:** Well, Madam Speaker, the date of the budget has been changed by the city. The proposal for the phasing-in legislation, we just received last week. If there was some confusion between the dates of what the budget was going to be and where it was set by the city, I will recognize that. But, Madam Speaker, we always stated that we wanted to proceed: (a) with the city's advice in this matter; and, (b) in the most expedient way so that they would have the most predictable budget-making process.

The leave would have been very helpful to get this bill through, but . . .

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

Answers to questions should be brief.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Government House Leader, who is not seeking the leadership of the N.D. Party.

Madam Speaker, will the Government House Leader confirm that in our telephone conversation yesterday,

I was left with the clear impression, not in any way contradicted by either the Minister of Urban Affairs or himself, that Bill No. 8 had to be passed by Monday?

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, I can't confirm, nor should I be asked to confirm, what the clear impression in the mind of the Opposition House Leader was or might be.

What I can say . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** What I can say, Madam Speaker, is that we were working together to attempt to expedite the business of the House so as to allow an adequate time of debate and discussion for this bill. The Opposition House Leader and I had entered into discussions as to how that might happen, not only privately but in this Chamber during the question period, so that we would be able to have full public hearings through the standing committee mechanism on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, so that we could bring this bill back for Third Reading on Monday, which in my understanding was in the best interest not only of the Legislature itself but in the best interest of the people who are concerned about their assessments and their tax bills, and the city who needs some finality and needs to be able to act upon the basis of the legislation being passed in this House.

I still believe there may be problems in respect to being able to pass that legislation in this House in time to allow for the city to set its budget even at a later date. I am still quite concerned that we may have a problem there, and will be entering into discussions with the Opposition House Leader in regard to how this might be done. Members opposite know full well, as members on this side that, because of the Budget Debate taking precedent, and because of the week off for the spring break that we have, we have some very difficult time constraints on a number of bills. I appreciate the fact that all Opposition members have been, I believe, quite cooperative in attempting to expedite the business of the House.

I also understand and appreciate the fact that the members opposite, as do members on this side, believe that this is not the only priority of this Legislature. There are other priorities. There are the agricultural issues; there are job issues; there are the maintenance and protection of social services. Those are all important issues which the Opposition House Leader indicated to me they would like an opportunity to debate, and we indicated we would provide them with that opportunity to debate.

Madam Speaker, I just answered the question directly in respect to the impression left . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. J. COWAN:** If the members opposite don't want to hear the answer, then I wish they wouldn't ask the questions.

Thursday, 12 March, 1987

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order. I remind honourable members that answers to questions should be as brief as possible.

### Winnipeg - loss in interest charges

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert, with a final supplementary.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** To the Minister of Urban Affairs, Madam Speaker, will he confirm or inform the House that he represented to the MLA for Charleswood, our Urban Affairs critic, that the city would suffer a \$3 million loss in extra interest charges to the city if Bill No. 8 were not passed by Monday?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, I want to confirm the day, Monday, was used in the telephone conversation by the member opposite. I recall that, and I thought that date was coincidental to the fact that our Budget was being presented that evening, because it does present 8 days.

Madam Speaker, the City of Winnipeg did change their budget date. They did say so publicly. They did acknowledge publicly that they had changed their date because they hadn't dealt with all their numbers. The city proposed the phasing-in legislation a week ago. We immediately moved on it, and members of all sides of the House have always stated that phasing-in legislation could prevent the major shifts of taxation being phased in over three years.

The Deputy Mayor today is quoted as saying - and I've talked to the Mayor about it - the sooner that this bill is passed, the sooner the city can get on with dealing with their budget in the most predictable way. I have always said, Madam Speaker, that as soon as we have the information from the City of Winnipeg, the sooner we deal with it the better in terms of the city establishing their budget. I've always said that in my conversations with the Member for Charleswood, and I stand by that statement, Madam Speaker. The issue of the \$3 million, as all members know, comes in if there is a delay so long as the tax notices don't go out and the revenue doesn't come in.

The city has got to establish its budget, traditionally by March 31. They have asked for an extension, something which the members opposite have done. In fact, in 1978, the members opposite also extended the Budget date. We were asked to extend the Budget date to April 15; we did so.

The earlier that this bill can be passed by this House, a bill that we have had a proposal for only one week, the earlier phasing-in legislation can take place so that massive increases in taxation in some areas of this city can be phased in over three years. I've said that consistently, Madam Speaker, consistently throughout this issue. In fact, the Minister of Municipal Affairs stated so last August, that phasing-in legislation would be necessary, in answer to a question from the Member for Charleswood.

### MTX - amount of loss

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Can the Minister indicate what the current loss figure for MTX within the Telephone System is?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, there are negotiations going on with three very sensitive projects, the major three projects announced by Coopers and Lybrand on November 21. Those negotiations are at a very critical stage, I should tell the House.

The figure that was released to the public was a figure of \$27.4 million. It was a figure that was arrived at on the basis of advice from both Coopers and Lybrand and Arthur Andersen, both the internal audit company and the external audit group that we have been using. We will know more definitively, Madam Speaker, because there is a projected amount of money, for purposes of the wind down of three of those projects, that is still a subject of final negotiations. Madam Speaker, at this point, we have publicly announced the \$27.4 million, but we will know the final figure when all those negotiations are complete.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question on this subject to the Minister is: will the total, with finalization of these three sensitive areas of negotiation, be higher than the \$27.4 million?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, as the member opposite knows, the bargaining position of the government with MTX was very public and transparent with the release of the Coopers and Lybrand's Report on November 21. Mr. Curtis, who is the acting CEO of MTX, and Mr. Robertson, who is the acting CEO of MTS, are both working very diligently to negotiate the best possible deal for Manitobans given the fact that, as members of this House all know, some of the liability areas are very concerning to the government.

We are, as I say, very close in one or two areas, but close is not a settlement, and settlement means that we can divulge the final figures to the House.

### MTS - cost of investigation

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, I'm sure the taxpayers of Manitoba await that ominous news. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs indicate what will be the total cost paid to Coopers and Lybrand by the Telephone System for their investigation of the past eight months?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, I'll take the specific figure as notice. They are still working on our behalf on all the three major projects, plus some other projects we've asked them to evaluate, given what was obvious to us to be very proactive advice from the Telephone System that didn't meet the tests of markets and financial stability was outlined in the Coopers and Lybrand Report. It certainly will be higher than the figure of the \$360,000 that was released to this House, quite a bit higher, but I am prepared to take that question as notice and give that figure to the House.

## MTX - RCMP Report

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, has he received any report, interim or otherwise, from the RCMP investigation into alleged wrongdoings in the MTX affair?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, I did receive a verbal report through the Attorney-General approximately two weeks ago. I have discussed the issue with Mr. Curtis in terms of the requests that have been made to Mr. Curtis in terms of completing the investigation. It has not been completed. As I understand it, it is in the almost final stages of completion, but of course the RCMP make those decisions on their own. I haven't received advice from Mr. Curtis in the last two weeks in terms of the RCMP investigation.

Mr. Curtis, as the House may know, is presently in Saudi Arabia, dealing with many of the outstanding items from the SADL-Datacom and Telecom arrangements.

## Careerstart - cutback in grants

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Careerstart Program.

In response to my questioning on March 4, the Minister stated, and I quote: "I think that it's wrong to say that there has been a cutback in terms of the monies available for the universities." But in 1985, according to the Minister's own figures, the universities received \$210,205 in Careerstart grants at \$4.30 per grant, and this year they will receive \$2.50 for each hour of work. This represents a cut of 42 percent, Madam Speaker.

I ask the Minister: how can the Minister say this is not a cutback?

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

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, what we are talking about is a change in the terms of the program, and whether X amount of dollars are spent or Y amount of dollars are spent and are made available to any one group or group of institutions or an individual company depends on the implementation of the program. It depends on what actually happens. My reference surely was to the terms in the program and that's available for anyone who wishes to read the pamphlet.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Madam Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister.

Students would like to know, the universities would like to know and this House would like to know where the universities will draw the extra money in order that major reductions in the number of students employed will not occur?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

That question is not within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Employment Services.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Then I will rephrase the question, Madam Speaker.

Will the Minister increase monies to Careerstart at the universities this year instead of decreasing it?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I was distracted for a moment. I wonder if the honourable member would repeat the question.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Madam Speaker, the question is very simple.

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

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

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Will the Minister responsible for the Careerstart Program increase the grants to universities, rather than decrease the grants to universities?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, first of all, they are not grants to the universities. These are monies available in the form of a wage subsidy to employers in the Province of Manitoba to enable those employers to hire more people than they might otherwise.

Our challenge, Madam Speaker, is to have the program run in such a way that we can distribute the monies that we have available to us as broadly as possible to encourage employers in Manitoba to hire more rather than fewer students and young people, and that's exactly what it's all about.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** When it is so rewarding and so easy for the government to create employment through the universities and, in his own statistics . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Question.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** . . . Madam Speaker, they are listed as grants to the universities, why does this government neglect this opportunity?

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, we have many excellent applications received under the Careerstart Program for many organizations. The university gives us various applications with interesting jobs. But I would remind the honourable member that we get applications from the business sector, particularly the small business component, with a lot of good job challenges that we should address and we should try to help those people hire young people if we can.

The non-profit area - child care is one very major area, I would add, that is very deserving as well, and we get a lot of applications from child-care organizations. We have non-profit organizations trying to help the mentally handicapped. We'd like to have some money left for them as well, Madam Speaker.

I could go on and on and point out to the honourable members that indeed we are blessed with many excellent applications from very well-meaning organizations across this province. We have a

responsibility to ensure that we make it available as widely, as equitably and as fairly as possible to all the organizations who are asking us for some help to provide jobs for the young people of this province.

### Universities - profit making

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River Heights, with a final supplementary.

**MRS. S. CARSTAIRS:** Yes, and I thank you for your indulgence, Madam Speaker.

Can the Minister of Education name one university in this province which is a profit-making body?

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** No, Madam Speaker, but I can tell the Honourable Member for River Heights that there are many other institutions who are going to have to meet exactly the same guidelines that have been produced under the Careerstart Program. I want to emphasize that the money that was forwarded to the universities through this program is not part of the university's funding. It is a response to the university's interest in employing young people, as the program responds to employers and non-profit groups from across this province who have an interest in employing young people.

### Anstett, Andy - expenses - re work activities

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question to the Minister responsible for the former New Democratic Cabinet Minister that my colleague from Springfield soundly trounced in the last election. The question, Madam Speaker, is . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The question, Madam Speaker, is: is the Minister responsible for the contractual agreement between that individual and the taxpayers through the government prepared to table the report of last year's work activities and the expenses incurred in those work activities?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, but to whom was the honourable member addressing that question?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, the question is to the Minister responsible for hiring the former Member for Springfield, Andy Anstett, under a contractual agreement . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The honourable member well knows that he is to address honourable members by their proper titles.

Would the honourable member please indicate to whom he is addressing the question?

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I'll let the Minister of Municipal Affairs go for it. Would the Minister of Municipal Affairs table in this Assembly a report that is prepared by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the report of his work activity of last year and the expenses incurred in doing so?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Chairperson of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, I certainly want to indicate to my honourable friend that when the final reports that will be tabled to us are reviewed, it certainly will be made public for everyone's consumption as well as the details of the expenditures incurred in that work.

I want to indicate to my honourable friend that the preliminary work and discussions that I have had with the gentleman indicate that there is extensive work, and he has done extensive work in the area of water management, in the area of rural infrastructure. There are some very interesting observations and recommendations that he is coming up with, Madam Speaker.

### Jobs Fund - hiring practices

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Agriculture.

I would ask the obvious question: are the terms of reference now under the Jobs Fund to hire former New Democratic Cabinet Ministers to give them employment after they've been defeated in elections in this province?

The further question, Madam Speaker: will he be entering into a new contract with Mr. Andy Anstett?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, obviously any decisions about future employment will be announced when and if they are concluded. Madam Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues certainly would consider Mr. Anstett for future employment. I want to tell my honourable friends that the work that he is doing in terms of rural infrastructure, in terms of water policies certainly will be reflecting some of the thrusts that this administration wishes to make in terms of keeping rural Manitoba as vibrant as possible, Madam Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, is one of the job descriptions that the former Cabinet Minister under the New Democratic Party has to be a political commentator on behalf of the New Democratic Party following certain activities that are carried on by this government?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, what any Manitoban does on their own free time in terms of being requested by whatever media is his own doing. We are not in fact saying that other members, who happen to be members of the Conservative Party, should not be used as commentators, or the likes of Mr. McCallum from the University of Manitoba who was giving advice to honourable members opposite in the

past, who played and wrote articles in the Winnipeg Free Press. Can they say that those people were in fact unbiased because of their political views and their advice to the former government in this province?

### **Anstett, Andy - Jobs Fund**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Is that individual, Andy Anstett, being paid out of the Jobs Fund?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I will take that particular question as notice to make sure of whatever terms have been agreed to and under what appropriation specifically it is being paid from and I will bring that advice to this House.

### **Farm land - operating credit and loans**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Virden.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is the Minister of Agriculture.

Manitoba farmers are desperately in need of some lower operating costs for 1987. Given the fact that Manitoba farmers are paying more education tax on bare farm land than farmers in any other province of this country, has he initiated any action to relieve this inequity that exists for the Manitoba farmers?

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, I want to indicate to my honourable friend, the question of operating credit and low operating loans was on the mind of this government four years ago and we've done something about it, unlike a recommendation that was made by 10 provincial Ministers of Agriculture to our federal colleagues to have a national operating loan guarantee program to complement what provincial programs there is. It was rejected, Madam Speaker.

We are hoping that later this month we will be making that proposition to the Minister of Agriculture and the Federal Government for probably the fifth time, and we are hoping that, after five times, the Federal Government will in fact produce some complementary programming. We have already, Madam Speaker, announced several months ago the continuation of our Operating Loan Guarantee Program for the next two years, and we're hopeful that the Federal Government will do likewise in this country.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Very specifically, Mr. Minister, have you initiated any action to remove education taxes from Manitoba farm land?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, the honourable members opposite should await the initiatives that will be coming from the Budget on Monday. I know they are impatient but, Madam Speaker, let me be very clear.

The moves that have been made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of Urban Affairs and members on this side to review the whole assessment process has implications on whatever moves will be made in any other area of taxation, and school taxation is one of those.

Those moves have been made consistently over the last number of years and decisions will be flowing from those moves, Madam Speaker.

### **Manitoba Sugar Beet Growers - tripartite program**

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** A different question to the same Minister, this Minister has received several requests from the Manitoba Sugar Beet Growers, from their association and from the United Food and Commercial Workers' International Union, Local 111. They have requested him very specifically to be involved in a tripartite program in 1987 for the Manitoba Sugar Beet Growers. What action has he taken upon their request?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, this government became involved in the whole question of income support as a result of offloading by the Federal Government. From 1958-1982, the Federal Government paid whenever it was deemed necessary under The Agricultural Stabilization Act, an act passed by the former Prime Minister of this country, the Honourable John Diefenbaker. A Conservative Prime Minister, I might add, passed that act in this country, and it was another Conservative Government in Ottawa that said that no longer will we use The Agricultural Stabilization Act to support farmers in this country. We will now move to offload those costs onto producers and onto Provincial Governments, Madam Speaker.

We negotiated an agreement with the Federal Government in 1985 that, in the clearest terms, Madam Speaker, stated that the Province of Manitoba will no longer be liable for any future funding to support the sugar beet industry in Manitoba. That was as black and white. We also negotiated an agreement, Madam Speaker, with the Federal Government that states that there will be, this year in 1985, a national sugar sweetener policy. Madam Speaker, they have reneged on both counts.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** This province needs diversification in agriculture and value-added industries. This sugar beet industry supplies both those. Is this Minister prepared to stand aside with his government and allow the industry to collapse in this province, like it has collapsed in Quebec already?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, this government is standing with the farmers of this province. This government will not allow the Federal Government of this country, in fact, for two reasons, one, will not allow them to offload their costs. They saved almost \$20 million by not paying stabilization payments in 1983 and 1984, and that was part of our negotiating agreement with them. The farmers, the sugar beet growers of this province said, Mr. Minister, please, we will negotiate that amount. The Federal Government saved almost \$20 million on that very issue by not paying the two previous years of stabilization.

By tripartite, they will continue to save in excess of \$1 million a year if we decide to go into tripartite.

Thirdly, Madam Speaker, the Federal Government in fact was asked by myself to carry on the existing program that they've put in for 1986 for one more year, because the Federal Tribunal Reporting on Tariff and Trade will be tabling their report at the end of March, which may recommend once and for all a national sugar sweetener policy on this issue, which everyone wants - the sugar beet growers and the Province of Manitoba - which can be accomplished without massive provincial taxation and input into that policy.

**MR. G. FINDLAY:** Madam Speaker, there are 400 growers and at least 350 jobs in this city involved in this industry. Is the Minister prepared to let that sit idle in 1987?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Madam Speaker, we have an agreement with the Federal Government. If the honourable members are saying now that we in fact should say, well forget the agreement, forget what the Federal Government said. Madam Speaker, that is one of the reasons why this Federal Government is now the lowest on the opinion polls of all Canadians, because they are not living up to their agreements.

They write a letter, they sign an agreement, and they say, we will do one thing and then they do another. They have their friends in this House defending them and saying, forget about that agreement. That's the kind of politics we're playing in this House, Madam Speaker - shoddy.

### Rapid Exchange of Driver Information

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways.

Last year it was brought to the attention of this Legislature that a suspended driver from the Province of Manitoba could go to another jurisdiction and obtain a valid driver's licence, and the opposite as well was apparently happening. I would like to know if the Department of Highways, through Motor Vehicle Registration, has taken any action to stop this breach of our laws.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, I had discussed this with the Member for St. Norbert informally a couple of days ago in the House. This issue is being dealt with across the country.

There is an automated system that is being put in place that will eliminate this abuse. However, it does take time to develop. A pilot project was put in place in Alberta and British Columbia, and that has been evaluated and will be extended across the country over the next couple of years. It's called the Rapid Exchange of Driver Information.

At the present time, there is an exchange of information through the mail. However, if a driver in

fact lies and does not give information to the other jurisdiction, says that he does not have a driver's licence, he then could in fact obtain a licence in another jurisdiction. This would be eliminated by the computerized automated system that would be put in place in the future, and that's what we're working towards as quickly as possible.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, due to the fact that a very large number of fatal accidents in this province are as a result of drivers driving without valid drivers' licences, will the Minister stop spending money on unnecessary bridges and make the correction of this problem a priority?

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, I have made clear that the many municipalities and the Selkirk and District Planning Board, the Chambers' of Commerce have all asked for the bridge to be located where it is, so it is not an unnecessary bridge. That misinformation has been the kind of thing that the Member for Ste. Rose has brought to this House and I had hoped that, when he has constituents sitting in the gallery, he would not continue to bring misinformation into this House. We expect more from him, Madam Speaker.

Let me just say that this is a priority. It is something that does take time to develop, an automated system to deal with this rapid exchange of information, and we are moving as quickly as possible on implementation, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, with a final supplementary.

**MR. G. CUMMINGS:** Madam Speaker, the Minister has stated that, if someone wants to mislead the person applying for the licence that they can get away with it. How difficult is it to increase the penalty for lying when applying for a licence?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, the automated system will ensure that all of this information can be picked up immediately by pressing the correct information into computers. This is not possible at this time. There is no reciprocal information on the other side. All provinces have to have an interconnected system for this to work, and that is what we're putting in place, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, will you please call the Debate on Second Readings as they appear on the Order Paper, starting on page 1 and going through to page 2, Bill No. 6, please.



## HOUSE BUSINESS

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, with respect to the government business that is being called by the House Leader, I simply want to inform him and members of the government that as a result of the representations received by members on this side of the House, we were prepared to debate Bill No. 8 yesterday and today in full. That is what we prepared for, and we're not prepared to debate any of the bills that are on the Order Paper.

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** I thank the Honourable Opposition House Leader for his advice. I think it's normal practice when a bill is standing in the name of a member in the House who does not want to speak to that bill, that any other individual who wishes to speak to that bill can in fact speak to that bill. The name would remain standing in the name of the individual whose name appears on the Order Paper, and that's the practice which I think will be followed today. I think it clearly indicates that members on this side of the House are interested in the matters, not only Bill No. 8 which was an important matter, that show up on the Order Paper as part of the normal business of government. We intend to proceed with debate on those issues.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 2, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Stand, Madam Speaker.

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

#### BILL NO. 3 - THE MANITOBA ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women, Bill No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Stand, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. M. DOLIN:** I would like to speak on this bill, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

The bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MR. M. DOLIN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This bill does not really require a great deal of statement, but I think it's important the principles of this bill should be discussed.

The Minister has already made some statements about the progress of the women's movement, its successes, its failures and the needs that it still has to go along the road to full equality. One of the things that I think is very important about this bill - I remember when we first came to government in 1981, there was an advisory person by the name of Eveline Holtmann, through the Minister of Labour at that time, Ken MacMaster, who also as a sideline was the Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

When we came to government in 1981, there was going to be more progress on the part of this government. We felt the single person advisor to the Minister, who at that time had been replaced by the new government, and there was now a female Minister, who happened to be my wife, appointed an Advisory Committee on the Status of Women. This committee still was more representative, was more relevant to the needs and was to provide advice rather than just a single individual.

What this bill today does is moves that one step further. I think it is a very positive step. What happened initially, if you go back to the previous government, is you had a single person, female, advising a male Minister on what she as an individual thought was good for women. We did not find that satisfactory. We then appointed an Advisory Committee, made up of women representing various people, individuals, groups in the women's community, to advise a Minister on what kind of issues are relevant to women.

What this bill does is moves it a step further. No longer is this body entirely an advisory body to a particular Minister, but it is now . . . One of the key points in the bill is the self-initiating body and an advisory body. So no longer does this body only deal with the issues referred to it by a particular Minister, but can now initiate its own studies. One of the other important factors in the bill, allowing further independence for this group, is the fact that this new Advisory Council on the Status of Women can actually go out and raise its own funds from the public, from the private sector, to do studies, research and other things that are necessary to advance the status of women in Canadian society.

I think this is a very important step forward; I do not think it is the final step forward, Madam Speaker. I think one of the things, if you look at the progression of events from a single person advising the Minister on what the Minister says he wants to be advised on to a committee representative, which still advises the Minister, she, on the issues relevant to the Minister, but more representative; and now you have a body which can not only take those issues as defined by government but initiate on its own, studies, research, public statements on issues important to women of the day. This is a very progressive step.

I also think the final result of this, and inevitably, will be an independent committee which will no longer be an advisory council but what will result will be - there will be a Manitoba Council on the Status of Women. I look forward to that day.

I think one of the things in her eloquent address, the Minister responsible pointed out a number of the



successes of the women's movement over the years since women became persons, and since women had the right in law to fight for the equality which they deserve.

I think one of the things I should remind both men and women of this House is it is not that long ago that women were considered, under the law of Canada, as property. The fact is until 1983, four years ago, when the sexual assault laws of this country were changed, the rape laws, when it was still considered rape and the criminal offence was rape, rape was based on the damage of somebody else's property. What had to be proved in court at the time was penetration, which meant a woman was not a person whose own space was violated, whose own person was violated. A woman was either the property of her father or the property of her husband in the laws of Canada, until 1983 when those laws were changed.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

That's a long, long time to realize that women have their own right as referred by the Law Reform Commission, which led up to that change, and saying a woman is a person, an individual who has a right to be sacrosanct from violence to her own person, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It's about time that change came. I think that is sort of a final change in some of the thinking that has happened in this country, but I don't think that would have happened without the constant pressures from the public sector, the advisory committees in this province, the sexual assault centres, the women's movement, the women's groups, politicians of the female sex, who are, as the Minister pointed out, very much unrepresented, and poorly represented in the parliaments of this nation and many other nations.

I look forward to the day when we have a Golda Meir or an Indira Gandhi leading this country. I think that some of the best governments we have seen in the world have been led by women. There is some, Mr. Deputy Speaker, misconception that women somehow cannot govern because they are not quite as tough as men; they are not as hard-nosed. I need to do no more than reflect and ask members to reflect on Attila the Hun, who now rules the United Kingdom. I think if anybody is looking for tough, hard-nosed - and I think she's a man in drag . . .

**A MEMBER:** Golda Meir wasn't tough?

**MR. M. DOLIN:** Golda Meir was absolutely tough, but Golda Meir was fair. Golda Meir ran a good government. One of the member's suggests Golda Meir - Indira Gandhi was certainly tough. Madam Badar Anaike from Sri Lanka was certainly tough. And all these women, in their own ways, whether I agree with their political outlooks or not, including Margaret Thatcher, were confident governors of their states. I think the fact is, I look forward to this someday in this country and certainly someday in the country south of here.

One of the things that I think is important to consider is what will be the work of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. The Minister mentioned a number of subject areas. I don't want to go into extensive detail on these areas, but I think some of the issues are issues of freedom of choice. I

think it's a major issue that this council should be advising the Minister, the government, all members of the House and the public on the real issues involved here.

One of the things, as I mentioned earlier, about the problem of changing rape, which defines a woman as property, to sexual assault, which defines a woman as an individual who can have her space violated - the same issues that revolve around the freedom of choice. Those are issues that will have to be discussed because they are in constant debate by competing groups, competing interests of both sexes, men and women, who take both sides of the issue for moral grounds, for personal grounds, for whatever grounds.

Is the freedom of choice issue being relevant to the right of a woman to make a decision about what happens to her own body in the case of an unwanted pregnancy? What responsibilities does the state have? What responsibilities does the medical profession have? What responsibilities does the woman have? What rights does she have and what obligations?

These are some of the areas that I think will be discussed by the council. It is certainly an area of some concern to the members. I think I have no qualms about putting on the record the fact that I believe a woman has a right to choice; that I believe a woman is a free, independent individual who has the right to make a decision about things that affect her own body and her own person.

I do not believe that three doctors have a right to make a choice for a woman. In the matter of a vasectomy, I do not think any man in this House would want to have a panel of three doctors to tell him whether or not he should do that. I think I, as an individual, have a right to make my choice. I think a woman has a right to make her choice.

I think the laws of Canada are sitting so hard on the fence that there is metal coming out of the top of Parliament's head on this issue. The fact is, what they did was give the women the right to make the decision to have an abortion in the case of an unwanted pregnancy, but also did not give them the complete right, but had three doctors, usually male, form a committee who can tell the woman whether or not this is okay by them.

I think the state has a responsibility to provide complete and accurate information on the options available to a woman when she has to make this difficult choice, but I think there is no question that it is her choice as a free, independent individual and a free citizen in this society to make that decision herself. I think we have been ducking that issue for a long time, but I think this is one of the issues that certainly this group will be able to deal with.

I have given my opinion. I do not know what the opinion of us, collectively as legislators, will be or what Parliament will be. I will certainly have my say. I'm certain, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that members on this side of the House will have their say, I'm certain that members on the other side of the House will have their say, and I am reasonably certain that there will not be unanimity.

But my concern is that organizations such as the Advisory Council on the Status of Women give informed advice and give accurate information so we, as legislators, can make accurate decisions based on real

information and not some of the misleading kind of statements you will read from the various lobby groups.

I also think the issue of older women in this society who are being punished for being two things, for being women and being old, and have been punished for much too long, I think these issues must be dealt with.

I think the fact part-time women - and the Minister of Labour, my colleague, certainly is aware of some of the issues around part-time. I live in a constituency which is mainly suburban. I have looked at house prices in my constituency, and I wonder how some of my neighbours who are working people, who are tradesmen, small businesspeople, how they can afford a mortgage on a \$120,000 house. Well, the response is very simple, as two or more people in that household must work. It is no longer the case where the wife works, as has been suggested by a former Liberal member of the Federal Cabinet, to make a little vacation money or to make a few pennies. Women are now working for the same reason men are: to support their families, to pay the mortgages, to pay the food bills.

This is no longer an issue where a woman makes a choice whether or not she can stay at home. It is no longer for most people. And if members of this House would look at the participation rates and the labour statistics in this country, they will see over the last 10 years how the participation rates have grown from the 40 percentile to the 60 percentile range and over 60 percentile. The reason for that is women entering the labour force, and the reason women are entering the labour force, I suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is not for pin money. They are doing it to pay to keep roofs over their heads and meals on the table.

When you get into the issue of part-time work, what we have are employers who do not wish to pay overtime. They do not wish to allow women into pension plans. They do not wish to allow women to participate in the work force to the full extent that men have traditionally participated in the work force.

I find this unconscionable. I also find it an issue that is no longer a game of whether or not you can rotate part-timers to allow lower income because this is something that women, as has been suggested by some of my friends in the Chamber of Commerce, don't need to work; they want to work. Well, I don't know about you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I don't know a lot of people who want to work. Most people work because they need to meet certain basic needs.

I think the reality is that people who want to work -(Interjection)- The honourable members are making a little noise in the Opposition bench. People who have choices in this world will usually make choices to take jobs they wish to do because people want to make a contribution to society. People who do not have choices take the jobs that are available to them.

The situation in this society, here and now, is that women entering the work force, being exploited, being discriminated against in part-time jobs, do not have the nice option of saying, well, I don't want to take this job. I would rather work in this climate, in that kind of office building. I do not see the women who work in the garment plants in the Inkster Industrial Park, or the women who work in the checkouts in supermarkets, or the women who work in other factories saying, I do this because I love this work. They do it because they need the money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to support their

families, to pay those mortgages, to feed their families as well as husbands.

We see also more and more in another issue that will be dealt with by the Manitoba committee is the fact of single parents, of women without the second income, attempting to support their families. This is becoming an increasing problem in this society where you have the breakdown, to a great extent, of the extended family where people do not have the kind of familial supports that we had in the more traditional society. No longer do you have the wise old uncle next door or mom and pop down the road. You are usually here, and when marriage breaks down, your relatives may be in Edmonton. They may be in Halifax; they may be in Rio. You do not have those supports, and this society must take into account that a single parent, primarily women, the statistics show that they are the poorest people in this country, particularly as they get older and the demands on them become greater.

These are problems that are not going to be solved by me here and now, but these are certainly problems that the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women will have the responsibility, the obligation and the right to deal with to give informed advice, to take some initiatives to ensure that these problems are dealt with so women have an equal place in this society.

I don't think that's a great deal to ask. I also don't think it's a great deal to ask when you have competing groups such as Real Women and the various other groups on the status of women - you have MACSW, the Manitoba Action Committee, you have the National Committee on Women - when you have competing information, both of them telling us, as legislators, that this is the reality of the interests of women today.

It's nice to have an organization such as the advisory committee to give us the facts, to give us the numbers on participation rates, on salaries, on pension plans, on actuarial tables, on real actuarial tables, on the conditions of women in part-time work, the conditions of women in various industries, the condition of single women, the condition of older women, the condition of women supporting children; the relevance of the Income Tax Act of this country on women. It's nice to have the facts before you make the decision.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Exactly.

**MR. M. DOLIN:** Oh, thank you. The Honourable House Leader agrees with that.

I think one of the important things that this bill creates is it is the third step towards, what I consider, the fourth and final step. This creates a semi-autonomous body. It goes back to originally a totally parasitical dependent person, to a quasi-dependent body, to now a semi-autonomous body, and hopefully someday the advisory word will come out of this bill and you will have a Manitoba Council on the Status of Women, which will be able to do all these things on an independent basis.

In summary and finally, I support this bill as a very, very important step on the road to equality. I also look forward to the day when we will not need such a bill, when we live in a society where we don't need special advice or special opinions on what are the roles in society and what are the problems of men and women - when we have advisory committees to deal with the

problems of the people of this society and when women are recognized - which has been a long and difficult battle as I point out with the rape laws. It was only four years ago that women were recognized as independent entities who had the capability of being injured as independent entities and not as damaged property of somebody else. That was only four years ago.

As the cigarette ads say: "You've come a long way baby," but the reality is we've still got a long way to go. I think this is a very important step in getting us on that road. I look forward to the day where this will be a self-obsolescing body where there'll be no further need for any advisory committees on any minorities or any particular groups in this society, but where we treat each other as brothers and sisters and treat each other as equals.

I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I, too, would like to make a couple of remarks in regard to this bill, both in terms of addressing the need for this particular act, the need for continuing to work for greater equality for women in our society, and some of the directions I think that both the Advisory Council and we, as legislators, should be looking at in the next few years.

First of all, I want to address the question as to what progress, if any, has been made in terms of the Status of Women Society here in Manitoba in the last number of years. I would like to indicate that there definitely has been some progress but, as has been pointed out by the previous speaker and by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women yesterday, there is still a great deal of work, a great distance that needs to be travelled before we can have anything approaching true equality here in Manitoba.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

I'll give you just one example of that situation, and that's in the question as to the difference in women's wages and men's wages here in Manitoba and there has been some progress. In 1970, the average wage of women was 61 percent of the average wage of men. By 1980, that had moved to 66 percent, so there has been some progress, but I think anyone who was to look at those figures and to look at the work that is being done by women in society would have to admit that is far from satisfactory. Sixty-six percent, in terms of average earnings, is not equality.

I think other statistics bear out the fact that we still have a great deal of distance to go before we do have true equality in Manitoba. If one looks at the economic circumstances, the social circumstances facing women, I think one finds that while in some areas there's been progress, in other areas, if anything, there has been a growing need for attention to the needs of women.

For example, women are amongst the highest consumers of health and social services and public assistance, particularly elderly women are in need. Two out of three elderly women live below the poverty line. There's a growing need, rather than a lessening need, for attention to these particular concerns, the concerns of women.

I think the act contributes in a substantive way to that. We have had an Advisory Council since, I believe, 1981. It was reactivated by this government in 1982. What this act does is go beyond the previous format and structure of the Advisory Council and gives it the autonomy that it requires, to be able to truly fight for the concerns of women in this province.

To the Leader of the Opposition, who yesterday took exception to some of the comments made by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, particular comments related to the Manitoba Conservative Club, a male-only club, and talked about the need for assistance to battered women and other assistance. I'd like to address both those points today.

First of all, I'd like to say to the Leader of the Opposition that the existence of a male-only political organization in the 1980's, in my view, is totally - it's an anachronism. I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition and his party, if he truly believes in equality for women, would take action to assure that that club, that organization with whatever influence it has does open up its membership to women.

It's not a question, as the Leader of the Opposition attempted to suggest, of raising this and ignoring other issues. Those other issues have been addressed and will be addressed. But when we're talking about equality for women, probably the area where the greatest evidence of inequality is evident is in the political process.

You know, Madam Speaker, in Canada at the present time, there are approximately 8 percent of legislators in the federal House of Commons and a similar percentage of legislators in this House who are women, 8 percent. That is not the lowest figure in the Western World. Some countries have as low as 4 percent. Britain, for example, despite the fact that it has a woman Prime Minister, has 4 percent of its legislators who are women. But can our 8 percent be considered in any way progressive at all when such countries as Norway and Finland and Sweden have anywhere from 35 percent up to 43 percent participation of women in their Legislatures? In Norway, where you have a woman Prime Minister, you also have 50 percent of the Cabinet being women - (Interjection) - and Iceland, as the Minister of Labour points out.

When we have 8 percent involvement, it's clear to me that we have serious problems, and we have a long way to go before we can have true equality. But the key role for achieving that equality, in the political sense, is through the political parties. I, for the life of me, cannot see how a male-only Manitoba Conservative Club can contribute to that. I notice the fact that a federal Tory Minister decided to cancel out on a speaking engagement because of the male-only fact of that club, that organization. I think that shows some acknowledgement of that at the federal level. But let's realize that when we're talking about equality for women, we're talking about equality, Madam Speaker, for anybody in our society. We have to start by getting our own house in order, and that certainly has to address the question of participation of women in political parties and in the Legislature of Manitoba.

So, if anything, there has been progress in society. Unfortunately, I would suggest that we, in the political process, probably would be lagging behind that because 8 percent participation, while it may be better than it

was a number of years ago prior to 1981, I suppose, when there was the first real breakthrough in terms of representation of women in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, we have a long way to go. And for the Minister responsible for the Status of Women not to address the fact of the Manitoba Conservative clubs and other types of clubs, which clearly do not encourage the full participation of women, I think it would have shown complete negligence on her part if she had chosen to ignore that fact and I'm very glad that she did raise that in the House yesterday.

But let's address the other side of the Leader of the Opposition's comments. Well what about initiatives for Women? - and let's deal with it, Madam Speaker, in the context of the Advisory Council. You know the Advisory Council, Madam Speaker, has taken significant initiatives on behalf of women in this province and this act will only strengthen its ability to do so. Consider, Madam Speaker, the outreach that it's organized in terms of reaching out to many women in this province and especially rural and northern women. Coming from a northern constituency, Madam Speaker, I can testify to the fact that they've made a serious effort to involve northern women in their activities and speak up on behalf of northern women as they have with rural women.

Let's consider some of the issues they've addressed, Madam Speaker - human rights legislation. I think this is an important one to consider given the fact that this government has made a commitment in the Throne Speech to bring in a new Human Rights Act, changes to the human rights legislation that we presently have in place. I would note that the Action Committee, for example, has supported the Human Rights Commission itself in recommending that sexual harassment, sexual orientation, discrimination on the basis of pregnancy be included as prohibited grounds of discrimination in human rights legislation.

I hope, Madam Speaker, that all members in this House, if they are truly committed to equality for women, will listen to the recommendations of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. I hope that they will listen, Madam Speaker, and act upon that when that legislation comes before us, and not just the Member for Kirkfield Park who is the critic for the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. I'm sure that she will be supporting the inclusion of all those items in human rights legislation, because she's stated her view that there should be, Madam Speaker, fair equality for women in this province. But I hope other members, if they are truly committed to equality for women, will back all of those items in the legislation.

They've also spoken up, Madam Speaker, about employment. In terms of Limestone, they pushed for more job opportunities for women, in terms of the Single Parent Job Access Program, in regard to a number of issues, and particularly in regard to pay equity.

The Advisory Council stated quite clearly that if we were to achieve true equality in Manitoba one of the key ways of doing that has to be by bringing in pay equity here in Manitoba. That's pay equity, Madam Speaker, not just in the public sector but in the private sector as well. I would note that this government has taken action to bring in pay equity in the public sector and that it has made a commitment to deal with the business community, Madam Speaker, to consult with

the business community, to bring in pay equity in the private sector as well. I hope that members opposite who do sometimes, I think, seem to have some difficulty in accepting the concept of pay equity will see it for what it is, an idea whose time has come, an idea that is based on the basic principle of equality between men and women that is aimed specifically at raising the earnings of women from the present 66 percent, which is a totally unfair level, of earnings of men to a level which reflects the true contribution of women in the work force to our society. I hope they will listen to the Advisory Council on that very important matter.

The Advisory Council has also spoken up, Madam Speaker, on health issues, whether it be in regard to the need for midwifery in Manitoba. They have spoken up on the issue of reproductive choice. They have spoken up, Madam Speaker, on the depo-provera issue and the treatment of it by the Federal Government. They have spoken up on issues in regard to education, family-life education, Madam Speaker, which they feel is important to women, particularly young women in our society. I hope all members of the House will take note of their very important contributions on this. They've spoken up on the need for education in regard to sexual abuse; and education generally, Madam Speaker, showing that women receive equal opportunities in education and training in this province. They have been very strong in lobbying on government expenditures specifically related to the needs of women, whether it be in regard to women's resource centres, whether it be in regard to funding for the Women's Studies Program at the University of Manitoba. On a whole series of issues, they've made their voice heard.

They pushed for increased representation of women on government boards and commissions. I might say, Madam Speaker, that there has been significant progress under this government in the representation of women on boards and commissions. There are far more women today who are involved in the setting of policy and making of recommendations through these boards and commissions as compared to a number of years ago when the Tories were in power, but there is still a long way to go, Madam Speaker, in making sure that women do have the fullest opportunity to participate on government boards and commissions.

Madam Speaker, I had a focus on research and publications on specific issues which I think has been very, very credible. The most notable one I would refer to is the Women in the Labour Force Study, which was a case study of the Manitoba Jobs Fund, which I think pointed out quite clearly that, while the Jobs Fund may have been successful in terms of overall employment - and they did not dispute that, Madam Speaker, as has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. They did not question the Jobs Fund itself. But while it may have been successful in terms of achieving those goals, it is clear that it has not been successful in terms of promoting job opportunities for women, particularly, Madam Speaker, when you consider that 43 percent of the labour force does consist of women. I believe the percentage of jobs created by the Jobs Fund was something in the neighbourhood of 24 percent. It's obvious to me that specific action has to be taken in similar programs in the future to make sure that women receive their fullest opportunities.

I would note, Madam Speaker, that the Advisory Council is currently preparing a number of studies which

include a number of items of particular concern to myself, concerns of northern women, and I look forward to seeing the results of that study, a report on Single Parent Women in Poverty. As I mentioned previously, Madam Speaker, there is a definite correlation between single-parent women and poverty in our society, something that really has to be dealt with.

There is also a paper being prepared on the status of women issues in post-secondary education, and I can indicate once again, certainly from my own experience in Thompson, that there is a significant need in my own area for more educational opportunities for women in our society.

The Advisory Council does address very significant concerns, and for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that it doesn't or that the Minister responsible for the Status of Women was somehow not addressing those issues is totally incorrect, Madam Speaker.

But it is not just the Advisory Council that is making recommendations, it is this government that has been acting on many of those recommendations. I think one only has to look at the record of the last five years to see that Manitoba has been a leader in terms of women's issues in Canada, a leader, Madam Speaker. That's something that I am personally quite proud of, the fact that we have moved ahead in a number of significant areas.

We've moved ahead in the area of child care. We've pioneered in the child-care system in terms of setting regulations and in terms of providing funding and providing the starts of a successful universal non-profit day care and child-care system in this province.

We've led the way in terms of wife abuse and family violence and providing support to women and dealing with it at the legal level. I can only point in the case of my own area to the pioneering work that was done by the Thompson Crisis Centre in this area, once again, which led the nation in many ways, the pioneering work that was done by the North Wind Shelter for battered women and we pioneered in other areas too.

I mentioned pay equity. We were the first province to bring in pay equity legislation and I hope we will continue to pioneer in that area.

We pioneered in terms of pension reform and, despite the weaknesses of the Jobs Fund, Madam Speaker, the fact that the Jobs Fund could be improved, I think overall the record is still a fairly good one in terms of job opportunities for women.

So a lot has been suggested by the Advisory Council; a lot has been reacted to by the government. I think the key feature of this legislation is the fact that it establishes clearly the autonomy of the Advisory Council. I think that's going to be important, Madam Speaker, important no matter what government is in office at the particular point in time.

I think women in this province need an autonomous body, a body that can speak for their interests, first and foremost, not the interests of whatever government is in power - and that includes this government - because as much as we have led the way in this country on women's issues, there is obviously so much more that can and should be done. I think the Advisory Council would be remiss in its objectives, Madam Speaker, if it did not point that out to us at every opportunity, and I indicated some of the areas where they have clearly pointed to the problems and needs of women in our society.

I hope we will all support the need for this autonomy, Madam Speaker. I don't think there should be any problem in this House, in all members of the Legislature supporting this act, but I hope in doing so that they go beyond merely establishing a statute that will establish autonomy for the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. I hope, by voting for this legislation, they will indicate their own personal commitment to equality for women in our society. I hope they will take that personal commitment and, when they are dealing with questions, whether it be human rights legislation or pay equity or services to women, in terms of resource centres or shelters or in terms of education, that they will apply that same principle to their votes in this Assembly on those particular questions.

We've gone beyond the point, Madam Speaker, where we need talk of equality for women in our society. We've had that for some time; we've had talk. The unfortunate part is, while we have had some progress, the progress has not matched the talk. The last thing we need today as we head into the late 1980's, when the equality between men and women is clearly accepted in our society, is more talk. What we need is action.

This is one small action, Madam Speaker, in that aspect but, if it were accepted for the principle it represents of true equality between men and women, if that principle was then to be applied to The Human Rights Act and pay equity and the other major issues of the day, many of which will be debated in this Session, this small step would be a major step, not just for women, Madam Speaker, although certainly it would be for women as well, but for all of us. Because when we can finally say that we live in a society where men and women are equal, when all are equal regardless of whatever characteristics that any individual has, that is when I think we will have truly fulfilled our potential as a society. Let's recognize that when we deal with matters like this.

A small step, yes, Madam Speaker, but it could be a much more important one if the . . . principle was adopted.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 4, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Stand, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 5, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**HON. G. MERCIER:** Stand.

## **BILL NO. 6 - THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Bill No. 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.



The bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Madam Speaker, I would like to speak on this motion and, of course, would be prepared to continue to let the motion stand in the Opposition member's name.

Madam Speaker, I think that the proposals that have been put forward for Bill No. 6, An Act to Amend The Emergency Measures Act, are certainly long in coming and very important to the Province of Manitoba and long overdue.

They have been in the preparation stage for years in the Province of Manitoba. I think that probably the need for changes to The Emergency Measures Act was recognized yet in the time of the former government, before 1981, and the Emergency Measures staff personnel have been working actively on reviewing the old act and making recommendations for change. Of course, that culminated this year with the discussion paper that was prepared, and I had the opportunity as Minister of Government Services at that time to send that out for a broadly-based consultation, particularly with municipalities and local governments, Northern Affairs councils and so on across the province, to gain input from them as to what they felt about the new directions that this act would take; and particularly to get some insight from them as to whether they felt that we were indeed reflecting a current thought in this particular area.

I believe that we have accomplished that, after the consultation did take place, and that we do have a relatively good consensus in the province that there is a need to update Emergency Measures provisions under statute, and that we are indeed moving in the right direction with regard to the provisions that have been put forward. We did not receive a great deal of controversial suggestions or concerns from those municipalities that were consulted, all of those groups that were consulted.

The fact is the old act was actually put in place in the 1950's and was patterned after the federal Civil Defence Act that was in place and, as the Minister of Government Services said yesterday, dealt primarily with war emergencies. Of course, since that time we have come to develop and recognize in this province that there are many other kinds of emergencies that occur, and that the provisions in the old act did not adequately address the current needs with regard to dealing with, in an expeditious way, emergencies as they developed in the province, mostly natural emergencies.

At the same time that we are undertaking this review and focusing on peacetime emergencies, as opposed to wartime, we are not putting our head in the sand, in that we recognize that if there ever were to be a major war, that there would need to be procedures in place. Of course the peacetime evacuation procedures would certainly be an excellent basis for dealing with wartime emergencies in any event. But the Federal Government has undertaken to review The War Measures Act that they have in place, which was an act that has tremendous powers, gives tremendous powers to the police, to the state, to the military during times of what could be relatively minor emergencies, if you put it in context.

The FLQ crisis in 1970 was a serious crisis for Canada, but at the same time it probably didn't warrant the kinds of powers that had to be given to the state at that time, because of the nature of the opposition. It wasn't like we had an invasion.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Ministers were being killed, John.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Certainly the Member for Lakeside has a point in that it was a serious crisis, and I did say that. What I did say though, in putting it in context, that relatively when you compare it to what could be an emergency as envisaged under The War Measures Act, it was relatively minor in that context. It's easy to say that in retrospect, much more difficult at the time.

But what they did recognize, what they have recognized, not only this present Conservative Government but the former government, is that there were problems with that act, that it was perhaps something like killing a mosquito with a sledgehammer, and that there was too much power there and it did infringe.- (Interjection)- Well, we'll deal with larviciding later. They're going to have sledgehammers issued to the Opposition, but I don't want them using them in this House. As the former Minister of Government Services, we have to protect this building.

But all kidding aside, this is a very serious topic, and the fact is there were enormous powers given to the state under The War Measures Act, and they have indeed recognized that must be revamped to reflect current needs, particularly with regard to peacetime emergencies.

So the Federal Government has undertaken to conduct a review which they believe that they will have to put in place a new act dealing with war emergencies, as unlikely as that event may be with the present kinds of weapons that exist, but that eventually would have to be dealt with. They would put in place a revision of The War Measures Act, but they would separate the issue of peacetime emergencies and have a separate act.

There is almost complete unanimity amongst the provinces in ministerial meetings that have been held on this that there should be a separate act for peacetime emergencies. That is exactly what the province is doing, as a matter of fact, with this legislation. In fact, we are somewhat leading what the Federal Government is doing in this area, but certainly it is compatible with what they are planning as a result of the discussions we've had.

Insofar as who initiated this - the question has been asked from the seat by the Member for Emerson - the fact is, as I said at the very beginning of my remarks, that the process began perhaps as early as 1980. I know that in 1982, when I first became Minister of Government Services, that this already was being considered and the Emergency Measures staff were working on this. We have progressed it along. It did take somewhat longer than I had thought it would at that time but, during that time, I think that they looked very carefully at the acts that were in place in other provinces, in other jurisdictions, and that's why we have an act now that we were so readily able to gain a consensus in the province amongst local governments.

There has become, I think, a greater awareness by local governments as to the need to be able to deal

with peacetime natural emergencies that might occur in their municipalities. There has been a recognition that you have to plan for those and that you cannot just wait until the disaster occurs and then have everyone running around in chaos trying to figure out who is responsible for what.

So over the last number of years the province, through the Department of Government Services and the Emergency Measures Branch, has been working, with limited staff, with municipalities and local governments across this province, working with them, developing and putting in place local emergency plans for these municipalities.

The numbers have grown over the years and, as I said, there is a greater appreciation by the municipalities. They now have over 100 emergency plans that have been put in place on this optional basis. There has been no actual legislative base for these emergency plans. Of course, we will now have those, and we will also have a compulsory requirement that emergency plans be put in place, that it no longer will be left to the relative priorities of a particular council that, oh yes, maybe we should do something in this area or, perhaps when a disaster strikes, they realize how important it is to have a plan. They say, oh, we'd better plan for the next one. So it's a very chaotic and haphazard way of dealing with this major concern.

Now it will become necessary over a period of years for municipalities to indeed have a plan in place. I think that is a progressive step. I actually was quite impressed with the response of municipalities in this regard and that they did not object to the fact that there would be something imposed on themselves. They felt that it was good to have this compulsory nature. I think that is a recognition of the importance of this issue to those municipalities.

I've had comments from councillors and from reeves and mayors that they felt very pleased with the kind of support they've been getting from Emergency Measures staff in the past in developing these plans; that when they had exercised these plans in mock disasters, they always found little areas that could be improved upon but they realized how important they were. So they have been very encouraging in the development of this legislation over the past year or so. So I'm very pleased to see it coming into effect in the Province of Manitoba over the next year, and I think it's going to play a major role in ensuring that people's lives and properties are protected during emergencies at the local level.

What the emergency plans in effect to do, Madam Speaker, is ensure that the local governments are clearly of the understanding as to who is responsible for what particular aspect of a disaster in dealing with that, when and if it should occur. It also gives them clearly the kinds of resources that they have available to them - the phone numbers and so on, the people that they can draw on, whether it be the hospitals and the schools for evacuations, and the fire departments and so on - so that they are all clearly in one document and the responsibilities are outlined absolutely during that period of time.

The other important aspect of this bill, of course, is that it does give local governments the power to declare a local emergency and therefore deal with it without having to go forward to the province to do it.

Now, the Member for Lakeside said therein lies the danger. The fact is these are elected people at the local level. They are responsible for the welfare of the people in their jurisdiction. There is a local responsibility in dealing with emergencies, and I think the Member for Lakeside knows well that the first response must come from the local government, that they are initially the front-line response - not the province, not the Federal Government, but the local government. Therefore, they should have the powers to deal with it and naturally exercise them with responsibility. We believe and trust that they will indeed do that, that they will indeed exercise those powers with responsibility.

However, there are some safeguards. In the legislation, originally, it was proposed that the expiry date of a declared emergency at a local level would be seven days after it occurred. However it is now, after response actually from the mayor of the Town of Dauphin in bringing forward his critique of this particular legislation, suggested that it should 14 days and that it then could be renewed after the 14-day period. So I think that is a safeguard that is in place.

In addition to that, it does provide for the Minister of Government Services, through Cabinet and through Order-in-Council, to terminate a local emergency if indeed it was found that was necessary, that there wasn't a responsible position being taken insofar as exercising these powers at the local level. So I think there are safeguards to balance the particular powers that are being given to local municipalities under this legislation.

I think the important point to remember, of course, is that even though emergencies now will be dealt with in an organized way and every municipality will have the power to declare an emergency and will have to have a plan in place, the disaster assistance regulations and policies that have been in place will not be affected by this legislation.

If, indeed, there is a rather significant disaster in a particular area of the province affecting those municipalities, there is financial aid to cover those disasters in a formal way through the disaster assistance policy that was developed in 1982 and 1983 in this province and has assisted many municipalities throughout the province over the last number of years.

As a matter of fact, it is an outgrowth of the original plan that was put in place without any formality to it when the Red River floods occurred where the Red River Valley received benefits from the province and the Federal Government under a cost-sharing arrangement but it really didn't apply generally to disasters throughout the province. That's not blaming anyone. That's kind of an orderly development of the program, but I am very pleased that we undertook that initiative in the first term of our government to ensure that there was a formal plan in place so that if flooding occurred, if other natural disasters such as tornadoes occurred, fires, emergency spills, chemical spills or whatever. If there was a tremendous cost involved, the municipalities would indeed have some recourse, some assistance that they could call on during that period of time to assist them through that emergency. There is a formula in place that is cost-shared and, of course, there is the formula with the Federal Government that is in place when it goes over \$1 million or \$1 per capita for the province as a whole. So that is a good system



that is in place, and that will not be impacted upon by the legislation that is being proposed.

So I would like to ask the members of the Opposition, the Opposition Critic for Government Services, the Opposition Deputy Critic for Government Services, to consider in an expeditious way, this legislation. I think they've had access to the White Paper or the discussion paper, and they are aware of the provisions in this act, to consider it carefully and as expeditiously as possible and get it onto the next stage. Because I think they will find that there is broad support for this legislation, and that it will be in the best interests of the public and the constituents that they serve if they would give support to this legislation as quickly as possible so that it can be moved forward. I would ask them to do that as quickly as possible.

Madam Speaker, I would therefore recommend that this legislation be approved by the House and supported by the Opposition. I think it is long in coming and will serve Manitoba well.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The bill will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

### PROPOSED MOTION - THE PATENT ACT

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

**HON. J. STORIE:** Madam Speaker, would you call the motion standing in the name of the Premier - (Interjection)- pardon me, standing in the name of the Member for Riel.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Stand. He's not here.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** (Stand)

On the motion of the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Member for Ellice.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I want to speak on the generic drug motion.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ellice on the . . .

**MR. H. SMITH:** Can I speak now?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Ellice.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Thank you.

Madam Speaker, I'm entering this debate on generic drugs, because the fact is the current legislation being proposed by the Federal Government, in effect, will mean increased prices for drugs for all Canadians. You know, in 1983 alone, the saving was \$211 million.

Now it's very strange to me to see the Conservatives, who usually espouse competition - they usually say competition is good. In this case they say, no, we don't want any competition. We want to allow a monopoly for 10 years. I mean, that is incredible. That's saying your whole philosophy goes out the window. The fact is that competition is useful.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Have you read the bill?

**MR. H. SMITH:** I've read a lot of information about the bill, to the Member for Sturgeon Creek. The fact is there is a tremendous saving.

Now in opposition to this point of view, you may talk about the fact that someone has invented the drug. The pharmaceutical company has gone ahead and done extensive research and development work and have developed the drug, and should get the benefits of the rewards of that effort. But they will, just like they have been since 1969. They'll be getting a 4 percent royalty. Why not allow that to take place? It makes sense.

All that your people are doing on the opposite side of the House is supporting your federal rogues - your federal colleagues, I should say.

**A MEMBER:** Federal what? I think he said rogues.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Brothers or rogues.

The fact is, because they are Conservative and they are doing something, you automatically support them unless it's so badly pictured in the public's eye that it loses points for you. But as the public realizes in Manitoba and across Canada that this proposed legislation will hurt us all, you will go down further in the polls. You'll drop below the 22 percent point, that's for sure.

I don't know why you'd want to do this. We've heard no reasons that make any sense. The only thing I heard yesterday from one of the speakers on our side of the House is the fact that the lobbying being done by Frank Moores and others, who formed a firm to lobby and who are closely connected with the Prime Minister, have lobbied for this sort of legislation.

But you know, really isn't it about time you did what you thought was right, rather than just following the footsteps of your Federal Government? Isn't it important to do things, not to think of political reasons but to go ahead and just do what is right for a change? I don't understand why you just sort of - I mean why don't you go ahead and carve an identity for yourselves, fighting for the people of Manitoba and bring about better legislation, putting pressure on your federal colleagues, instead of just going ahead and just sitting down like mice and just relaxing and accepting that Manitobans should get taken? You know, you should remember your name - progressive - part of your name. You should be doing some things that, in effect, help the ordinary Canadians, instead of taking them dollar by dollar whenever you can.

Now you can build a case. You can build a case for your position. It can sound good to some people, but the ultimate answer is it's going to increase by millions and millions of dollars the costs for drugs in Canada. Why have you thrown away the idea of competition? Why do you like a monopoly? I can support a monopoly when we all need the service and we all are going to require a certain percentage like electricity or telephones, but I can't support the idea of monopoly when competition can take place and reduce the price of drugs.

There are examples that we can cite. Valium, which some of you could use from time to time, under a brand name is \$15.95 per hundred; under generic price, it

could be 42 cents. There is a tremendous saving. You know, you may all say, being the young people you are, you will not require drugs, but the average Canadian does spend a considerable amount of money. An average family can spend a lot of money on drugs every year.

**A MEMBER:** How much?

**MR. H. SMITH:** \$230.00 a year. Now that's a fair amount of money.

But aside from the money question, aside from that, just think of your integrity. Think of the fact that you should think about doing what is right, rather than just going along. I bet you, if the Liberals were in power federally, you'd be attacking this legislation. You'd be attacking it as the ruin of the country. The fact is it's . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** He ran as a Conservative once, and he's lecturing us on integrity? Oh man.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Let me tell you this. I am lecturing you on integrity, because you're willing to see the people of Canada get hurt just to side with your colleagues in the federal House, and that questions your integrity.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Where's the integrity of telling us about it, Harvey? You keep denying it, Harvey.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Denying what?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That you ran as a Conservative nomination, and you keep denying it. Why?

**MR. H. SMITH:** Let me tell you this. I was never a member of the Conservative Party, ever.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You mean you ran without being a member? Where's your integrity Harvey?

**MR. H. SMITH:** I can't help it if your party accepts people to run for office who are NDPers. I can't help that. Look it, you're sidetracking the issue. I have never been a member of the Conservative Party, and I wouldn't belong to your group. I've always been an NDPer. I was on the Provincial Executive in British Columbia, the Provincial Executive here, the Federal Council. I was never a Conservative. I was never of your stripe that would hurt the average Canadian by going ahead and pushing a bill of this type.

I have done many things of a colourful nature in my past, . . . Lower Fort Garry and captured it; done a number of things like that to prove a point. But I was never a Conservative. I was never a person who would say ordinary Canadians can go to hell. We're going to go ahead and support legislation that charges them in excess. The fact is you have not given a reasonable explanation for supporting your federal rogues. You have never done that. You are saying that the former Premier of Newfoundland and other friends of the Prime Minister can lobby, and you're going to sit by and just allow that to happen.

I respect some of you on the other side, not many of you but some of you. I really do think that I would

expect some of you to rise and say, look, we're going to support this resolution for the good of all Canadians.

I have talked to many people in my constituency on this very issue. I've had the Conservatives who come across, they will always say, well look, shouldn't the person, the company that develops the drug, does the research work, they should really get a return. But they do get a return. Why don't you want competition? What is wrong with competition? -(Interjection)- I know you don't know. You don't know much, the Member for Pembina. I'm glad you admitted it for a change and you don't know anything about this bill. Study the legislation, look at it, and you will vote against it, too.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Will the honourable member please address his remarks to the Chair.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Yes, Madam Speaker.

I find it a pleasure to address my remarks through you, and I must admit - you weren't here the other day when I praised your contribution in the last Session.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Brandon West on a point of order.

**MR. J. McCRAE:** Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would like to call the member to order. It's well known that you're not supposed to refer to the presence or absence of members, and he referred to your absence, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** So the Honourable Member for Ellice will take note of that?

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

**MR. H. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I'm glad the Member for Pembina wants to become informed.

The fact is there's no group of people other than Conservatives who are, in effect, supporting this federal legislation. I mean the senior citizens organizations, any group at all - there's no group other than the lobbyists and people who are hardrock, rigid Conservatives, through thick or thin. My party, right or wrong, I'm a Conservative; those are the only people who are supporting this legislation.

Now, farm organizations are not supporting it. Senior citizens groups are not supporting it. There is not a group in Canada supporting it other than the groups that I've mentioned. Now even, by the way, let me tell you this: in other provincial Houses, for example, in Saskatchewan, they had hesitations about this bill. They have changed their mind with a few changes, but you people have never supported the ordinary Canadians in their opposition to this patent legislation. You're even worse than your colleagues in Saskatchewan. At least they had reservations that they actually worked out when pressure was put onto them by their federal colleagues.

By the way, in a Commons debate on April 11, 1983, the Progressive Conservative member for Hamilton-Wentworth said: "I'm worried about a real danger facing Canadian consumers. They may soon be paying tens of millions of dollars more than they do now for the price of good health." Health is something that we should all - I don't know if any of you have ever been

- well, I know some of you are sick. But, you know, to really have a physical sickness, to be suffering pain, to me that is inexcusable when we can provide prescription drugs, patent drugs at reasonable prices. It just is incredible that you people are not willing to support this.

The critical question facing the Minister - this is from the House of Commons - of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Ouelette, who must take his recommendation to Cabinet by this spring. This is by Mr. Scott. He says: "Will the government allow Canadians to continue to be protected under Section 41 of The Patent Act so that consumers may still buy generic copies of brand-name drugs?" There is no argument on your side except an emotional one. You may say there could be a cure; there could be a cure found for some terrible disease. You also will say probably something like more employment will be created in Canada. The fact is employment has been created by people making generic drugs, and this is where the increase in employment in industry has occurred.

I believe you don't have one sensible argument; you do not have one argument that will stand the test of time, and the people of Canada will accept. If you are interested in increasing your support in this country, think of ordinary Canadians, and think of, in effect, going ahead and supporting this drug. Take an independent stand for a change, and a strong stand. Don't just get taken in by your federal colleagues.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Acting Government House Leader - the Honourable Minister of Education.

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

I would also like to make a few comments on this particular resolution. Madam Speaker, I guess it's somewhat disquieting to have, I guess, a resolution that's this important before the House, and have no one on that side of the House who has considered the implications of this piece of legislation that is being proposed. They have not given it enough thought to formulate a position as a caucus or apparently as individuals.

Madam Speaker, thousands and thousands of Canadians have expressed their concern about the implications of the bill that is proceeding in the federal Parliament and thousands and thousands of Canadians have a legitimate right to be concerned about the implications of that bill. I think it should be on the record, the public record, that the Conservative Party in Manitoba, the Conservative caucus, individual members of the Conservative Party, have not obviously thought through the implications of this bill, when it has been a matter of public debate for many months now.

I think that is surprising. I think it's unfortunate, and I think it reflects, Madam Speaker, as my colleague, the Member for Ellice suggests, an unwillingness on the part of members in this Chamber of the Conservative persuasion to be objective, to be critical at all of the legislation, the plan, the ideological rigidness of their cousins in Ottawa. I think that there is a message

in that for members of the public, who at one time perhaps were supporters of the provincial Conservative Party.

The fact is while they meekly from time to time, Madam Speaker, proclaim their differences and say that they're a separate party and not tied to the wings of the federal Conservative Party, when it comes right down to it they don't have the guts to stand up and say, no, never mind the ideology in this; this does not make sense for Canada or for Canadians.

Madam Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Labour, Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I think put the case rather eloquently yesterday when he talked about the fact that since 1969, when The Patent Act was amended, that there have been no significant drugs introduced as a result of research and development in Canada, and that there is no hope, or little hope, that the legislation that's before the federal Parliament is going to encourage the kind of research and development that perhaps we all, at one level, would like to see happen.

The question, Madam Speaker, I think for all of us is, if that in fact is the sole principle, to create research and development, to create an atmosphere in which investment is going to occur, then we have to ask ourselves in all honesty how likely is that to happen? Who are the pharmaceutical manufacturers today? Where are they based? Where is the research and development that is occurring, occurring, and is that likely to change as a result of the introduction of this bill?

Let's be clear about the question we need to ask ourselves. I don't think we have to ask ourselves why should the Manitoba Government, why should we be introducing a resolution to deal with this matter because I think the WHEREASES and the background to this resolution clearly indicate why we should be concerned.

Perhaps, some would say that's a particularly selfish concern, but it is a legitimate concern because it deals with the question of health care costs, the question of cost to individual consumers of drug products in the province, and what's in our best interests.

Madam Speaker, I think that I will leave it to others to talk about why we should be concerned and why this resolution makes sense from a provincial point of view, and I think we'll argue strongly that all members of this Chamber should be supporting this resolution, that there is every good reason to support this resolution from a provincial perspective.

I would certainly hope that, perhaps as we hear from members opposite, we will hear some musings about the intent of this legislation and I guess whether the stated intent by Mr. Andre or other spokespersons for the Federal Government really do hold any water, whether their arguments are simply smoke and mirrors, whether they are simply based on some philosophical whim or whether there is any legitimate hope that the arguments they choose to use, publicly, have any hope of seeing any kind of result.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Ellice, I think, also pointed out that in terms of employment, the employment that is being created with respect to pharmaceuticals, comes now from generic drug producers, that as far as Canada is concerned, it is not the research and development into new, potential drugs and pharmaceuticals that's creating employment.

That's a sad fact and I think one that is reflected in many other sectors of the economy as well. We have known for many years that Canada is not blessed with the kind of research and development activity that occurs in many other countries and we need to do something about it.

Madam Speaker, I think if there was any sense that this legislation was likely to create the incentives necessary, or in fact was going to outline in any succinct way the requirements for drug companies, the multinational drug companies, to do research in Canada, to create employment in Canada, then perhaps there would be some satisfaction that at least the intent was soundly based.

But, Madam Speaker, the bill doesn't provide for any guarantees, the bill does not, I think, lever in any significant way those companies that are producing pharmaceuticals and will be doing research and development of new drug products to actually do the work in Canada.

What it does, Madam Speaker, is: (a) undermine the generic drug industry which creates significant employment in Canada; and (b) undermine the health needs of the average Canadian. It undermines further, Madam Speaker, the programs that individual provincial governments have introduced, to support low income Canadians in their purchase of needed drug products.

So, Madam Speaker, it fails on many accounts and it isn't good enough, I think, for the members opposite to sit idly by and not commit themselves because they are afraid of attacking the ideological principle behind the bill.

Madam Speaker, we should be concerned with the implications and the results. And the results, as everyone knows, are going to be disastrous for provincial health care systems, they are going to be disastrous for individual families, those with fixed incomes. So those are the points, Madam Speaker, I think that should be the telling points in the argument about whether this bill should in fact proceed.

Madam Speaker, we could talk about the costs of this bill and I think it has been estimated that it is going to cost the Provincial Government, through its hospital and its pharmacare system, some \$14 million in 1986. And obviously, if the intent of the bill is to become reality, then every year after that, the cost to Manitobans, the cost to the pharmacare system, the cost to individuals, is going to escalate as we move farther and farther away from the principle of the introduction of generic drugs.

Madam Speaker, there are many countries in the world that do not rely on any kind of indigenous research for prescription drugs. We are not alone in the world in having legislation which allows for the production of generic products. So, I think it would be a mistake, Madam Speaker, to suggest that because we are adjacent to Canada, we have some obligation to the multinational drug companies. Madam Speaker, we, in Canada should be setting our own drug policy. In 1969 we did set that policy and it has been supported by successive governments, by Canadians since that time. There is no need, I feel, Madam Speaker, for us to be apologetic about that.

Madam Speaker, there are only a handful of countries that represent 90 percent of the research and development of new prescription drugs. There are

hundreds of countries, Madam Speaker, who have been able to distribute drug products to their citizens because of the generic alternative, to support health care, to maintain health, to avoid illness and death, and I don't see any reason for the Canadian Government to rush in any headlong way to change that over the objections of the vast majority of Canadians and many who have a great deal more expertise in this area and knowledge in this area than myself.

So, Madam Speaker, the Federal Government is not listening to the experts. It is not listening to Canadians and it is sad to say that members opposite appear to be willing to sit idly by while the Federal Government does something which is going to jeopardize, I believe, the health care system in our provinces and individuals, for a wish and a hope which, for who knows what reason, they have chosen not to address in this legislation.

And they could address it, Madam Speaker, and I think we see the same kind of illness in this bill that we've seen in many other federal initiatives. And that is a refusal on the part of the government to identify the real concerns of Canadians and address them in legislation. They are reluctant to be proscriptive.

They are reluctant, Madam Speaker, to deal with the issue of the abuse of tax exemptions. Madam Speaker, the capital gains exemption is an example. It parallels very much what's happening in this legislation. They simply refuse to say if there is going to be a benefit, then there should be some concomitant requirement that, if there is going to be a tax exemption for this purpose or that purpose, it may be legitimate, but let's make sure that we have identified the public benefit that's going to flow from that, whether it be employment creation, or investment, or whatever. But they fail to do that. And they fail to that again in this legislation.

And so it should be opposed. It should be opposed until either there is time given for the Canadian public to express their opinions, their thoughts and their concerns or until we can see some concrete evidence that the hope that is expressed by federal Ministers, that this somehow will create a new and vigorous research and development industry in Canada with respect to drug products, can be tied into some kind of concrete action on the part of the benefactors of this legislation.

And who are the benefactors? The benefactors stand to be a handful of very large companies involved in research and development, and not involved in research and development to any great extent in Canada. So, Madam Speaker, there are so many reasons to oppose this, from a Manitoba perspective, from a consumer perspective, from a practical, economic perspective. It's surprising that we have not heard from members opposite in terms of their position.

Madam Speaker, in all honesty, it's one of those difficult positions that they find themselves in from time to time, perhaps too often in the past couple of years, because it is the Conservative Party that is mismanaging the Canadian economy and mismanaging the issues that Canadians have a great deal of concern about.

So, Madam Speaker, I think we would love to, on this side, hear from someone, be they a spokesperson or simply an individual from that side to express their point of view on this resolution.

There is no doubt that, unless there are substantial changes to this particular bill, unless there is a

willingness on the part of the government to allow full and thorough discussion, until the Federal Government commits itself to public hearings across Canada to allow for individual provinces, individual Canadians to make their views known, I think this should be opposed. And a unanimous resolution coming from the Manitoba Provincial Legislature, I think would be a good signal to Canadians, certainly to Manitobans, that there is one government who wants to work in the best interests of Canadians and our health care system, and who isn't afraid to stand up and say to large international companies that, yes, we're prepared to offer incentives and benefits, but there have to be obligations and responsibilities if there are to be benefits.

I certainly support this resolution, and I urge members opposite to do likewise, because I can tell them as this issue heats up that their constituents are going to want to know where they stand, and I think it's only fair that they tell us.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30?

The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Madam Speaker, just a suggestion, and then the members can do what they want. This could complicate things; there's 10 minutes. It's sitting; it'll be allowed to sit in the name of the Member for Riel, and if somebody starts it, that could complicate things.

If the member is satisfied with that, fine, but if not, maybe we should call it 12:30.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30? Is the Member for Inkster in agreement?

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