



**First Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(HANSARD)**

---

37 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXVII No. 100 - 10 a.m., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1988.**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY  
Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, December 16, 1988.

The House met at 10 a.m.

## PRAYERS

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report on the Committee of Agriculture.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Your committee met on Wednesday, December 14, 1988, at 8 p.m. and Thursday, December 15, 1988, at 10 a.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building. Your committee elected Mr. Helwer (Gimli) as chairman.

Your committee heard representations on Bills as follows:

Bill No. 28 The Agricultural Producer's Organization Funding Act; Loi sur le financement d'organismes de producteurs agricoles

Mr. Keith Proven, National Farmers Union  
Mr. Ed Guest, Western Grain Elevator Association  
Mr. Tom Dooley, Keystone Agricultural Producers  
Mr. Earl Geddes, Keystone Agricultural Producers  
Mr. Ken Sigurdson, National Farmers Union  
Mr. Allan Dickson, Farmers Union, Local 514  
Mr. Goldwyn Jones, Private Citizen  
Mr. Ian Jones, Private Citizen  
Mr. Robert Ages, Manitoba Coalition Against Free Trade  
Mr. Lyle Ross, Private Citizen  
Mr. John Whitaker, Private Citizen  
Mr. Greg Arason, Manitoba Pool Elevators  
Mr. Fred Tait, Private Citizen

#### Written Submissions:

Mr. Edward Hiebert, Private Citizen

Bill No. 29 The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail

Mr. Bob Munroe, Manitoba Cattle Producers  
Mr. Tom Dooley, Manitoba Cattle Producers  
Mr. Ken Sigurdson, National Farmers Union  
Mr. Goldwyn Jones, Private Citizen  
Mr. Doug McLaren, Private Citizen  
Mr. David Fulton, Private Citizen

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 28 The Agricultural Producers' Organization Funding Act; Loi sur le financement d'organismes de producteurs agricoles

Bill No. 29 The Cattle Producers Association Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur l'Association des éleveurs de bétail

and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**Mr. Helwer:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Free Trade Agreement Analysis

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Deputy First Minister. On November 25, 1988, Clayton Yeutter filed a document with the United States Congress outlining the requirements incumbent upon Canada to meet its obligations under the Free Trade Agreement. There are many items in this list which impact on Manitoba as, for example, the liquor pricing changes which were referenced by the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) yesterday. However, the document is very detailed and impacts upon grain transportation, exporter certificates, import prohibitions, technical standards, electricity pricing.

Can the Deputy First Minister inform the House if his Government has established a committee to report on the implications to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) of Mr. Yeutter's recommendations vis-a-vis Manitoba?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** I can advise the Leader of the Opposition that my department is reviewing that matter at the present time. Once I have their report we will be dealing with it in due course.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Because the implications are very far-ranging and affect almost every department of Government, can the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst) tell the House today if a broader look than just a particular department will be given to this documentation?

**Mr. Ernst:** Mr. Speaker, the initial analysis is done by my department responsible for Trade. Once we have that initial report back from my department, we will be dealing with it on an as-required basis in the broader context of the entire Government and how it affects all departments of the Government.

\* (1005)

## Reporting Process

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a final supplementary to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, Mr. Yeutter was required by law in the United States to report to Congress within 60 days after the enactment of the Free Trade Agreement. Will this Minister undertake to report to this House 60 days after the FTA becomes law in Canada on the implications to Manitoba of this required legislation?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, as she can appreciate, Mr. Yeutter is an employee of the federal Government of the United States of America. The Canadian Government entered into the Free Trade Agreement with the American Government. We will be dealing with the questions at hand and how they impact on Manitoba. We will be dealing with it in the context of how it affects the entire Government and all of the citizens of Manitoba, and then we will consider making that information available to all Members of the House.

## Rafferty-Alameda Project Senate Public Hearings

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner). It has been reported that President-elect George Bush is under some pressure by Senators in the United States to push forward on the Rafferty-Alameda Dam project. As the Minister is well aware, the Senate of our country has again called for public hearings on the particular proposal. Will the Manitoba Government be making representations to the Senate hearing on the Rafferty-Alameda project?

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** The Senator in the United States has indicated very clearly that he wants to get on with the negotiations that have been ongoing for a long time. So do we want to get on with the negotiations. We do have the concerns I have expressed on numerous occasions in this Chamber, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) knows full well that the arrangements that we have with both North Dakota and Saskatchewan on apportionment of water affects this province rather severely. Any agreement that we make in the future or at this time are in negotiations with North Dakota and Saskatchewan and the federal Government in regard to apportionment of water, will have an affect on how we do business in this province in the future, might affect many other jurisdictions that we are talking about now, and whether we will be making representation to the Senate hearings or not are rather questionable at this time.

It is somewhat questionable as to what jurisdiction our Senate in this country has on this matter, seeing that there is no federal land involved in the construction of the Rafferty and Alameda dams. Seeing that there is no federal money involved in the projects, it leads one to wonder what concerns the Senate has other than to protect the portion of water that we receive out of North Dakota and the quality of water.

Those negotiations, I should say to you, are going very well and have gone on continually—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Penner:** We have reached a part—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** With all due respect to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner), the Senate does have a very significant role to play here, the federal licence which makes this all possible.

## Manitoba's Interests

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My supplementary question to the Minister of Natural Resources is will he assure this House today that it will monitor the Senate hearings and keep an open mind with regard to the conclusions of those Senate hearings, in that George Hill, the Head of the Souris Basin Development Authority, has said it does not matter what the Senate said, it does not matter what is reported to the Senate, we are going to go ahead and do this thing anyway. Will Manitoba at least keep an open mind?

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** Our minds are always open to suggestions that will lead to a better solution than what we have today. We think that because of the construction of more storage facilities on the Souris River there is every reason to believe that Manitoba can gain, through negotiations, a better share of the water coming down, not a larger portion of the water but more equally distributed. We believe that if we continue those negotiations responsibly we will finally end up there. However, it appears that the Senate and the involvement in these negotiations are far more political than anything else and that concerns me.

\* (1010)

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner), the project cannot continue unless \$41 million is made available by the United States. That is part of the original agreement. The Environmental Protection Agency in the United States is saying no.

Has this Minister been in touch with American authorities and with those who are now on the transition team for President elect, George Bush, to explain to them our very real concerns with regard to this project, one which may well fly in the face of sustainable development?

**Mr. Penner:** On numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, have we been in touch with American authorities and voiced our concerns on this issue, and voiced our desire to gain a more regulated flow of water as well as maintaining qualities that we can live with, through the people who are involved in the negotiations as part of our team.

## Environmental Protection

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, it appears that everyone is concerned about the Rafferty-Alameda except the Manitoba Government. In a letter dated November 28 to President Elect, George Bush, a copy of which I will table, the North Dakota Senator, Quentin Burdick, states that he is concerned because, and I quote, "The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is obstructing and delaying an agreement with Canada on the Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project."

Can the Minister of Natural Resources tell this House why the U.S. administration would have concerns to the environmental impact of the project when the Manitoba Government claims there are no environmental concerns?

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** There are, Mr. Speaker, a number of wildlife refuges that have been created by the construction of dams in North Dakota, on the Souris River, and the concern that I have heard expressed by these wildlife federations are simply will the added storage capacity in Saskatchewan deteriorate the quality of wildlife in North Dakota, and that is a fair question.

It appears to me that the concerns that have been expressed by the Wildlife Federation in Canada are directed in this similar manner. It might interest you that part of the cost of the construction of the dams were directed toward the re-establishment of wildlife areas in Saskatchewan that might be taken away by the flooding of lands in Saskatchewan. I would suspect that after everything is said and done, and all the concerns have been heard in North Dakota that if the waters are released regularly it might in fact enhance the ability of wildlife to be sustained than be deteriorated.

## Manitoba's Interests

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister, the Minister has repeatedly rejected the idea of an environmental impact study on the Rafferty-Alameda Dam. I have, therefore, written to majority leader, George Mitchell, with Manitoba's concerns on the record since the Minister seems reluctant to do so.

I am wondering if the Minister would also write to Senator Burdick to put Manitoba's concerns on the record and what concerns Manitobans have. Would he at least phone that Senator?

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I have said before in this House that we have written to the Government of Canada to voice our concerns and ask them to express those concerns to Washington directly. I think our course of action as a Province is through our federal Government to the American Government, and we have done that. We have asked Washington to ask the Army Corps of Engineers to extend their environmental impact study from Minot all the way to Manitoba so that we would know what the effects of the construction of those dams

would be to water flowing into Manitoba. I think that is a very responsible position to take. I am not sure whether we have any right as a province to intervene directly with Washington at this time on this matter.

\* (1015)

**Mr. Harapiak:** It is surprising that the people who are directly involved with environmental studies did not receive that direction. Mr. Speaker, the Senator says that the Rafferty-Alameda Dam Project is of paramount importance to him. He also wants an international agreement to be signed, sealed and delivered before the administrator of the EPA is selected.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Senator who is willing to stand up and represent the interests of Minot, North Dakota. When will this Government open its eyes and stand up for the concerns of Manitobans?

**Mr. Penner:** I am getting a bit tired of the line of questioning that has been going on. The Honourable Member knows full well that we have arrangements with Saskatchewan which are 50-50 water-sharing agreements with Saskatchewan. We have those same kinds of arrangements with North Dakota. We have some rivers flowing into Manitoba where we have no arrangements whatsoever. It is by a gentleman's agreement and the consideration made by North Dakota and Minnesota that we are now getting a fairly substantial flow of water down the Red River. We also have arrangements with Ontario. We are the recipients of waters from all those jurisdictions into Manitoba, into the Churchill basin system.

I am as concerned as this Government, as is anybody in this province, about our quality and quantity of water that we have coming into this province and I am not about to stand here and put in jeopardy all those kinds of agreements—

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

## Manitoba's Interests

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings). It is clear that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner) is not prepared to take the matter seriously and every indication is that he has never taken it seriously. Will the Deputy Premier urge the First Minister to write to President-elect Bush and put Manitoba's concerns on the record as to why we are concerned?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Deputy Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources has been working extremely hard to make sure that the best interests of Manitoba are well taken care of. The Members opposite and the people of Manitoba need have no concerns about whether or not he is taking care of those interests and making sure that all of us can be satisfied with the procedures.

## Crime Prevention Programs The Pas

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** My question is for the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). The Speech from the Throne states that, and I quote, "Programs of crime prevention will be given priority treatment."

I informed the Attorney-General weeks ago that the Citizens Crime Prevention Committee in The Pas had threatened to disband for lack of support because of the withdrawal of police services from The Pas and because of a lack of commitment to crime prevention by his department. I have been informed that the Attorney-General has not even contacted this committee since that time. Is this his form of priority treatment for crime prevention?

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** As I have reminded the Honourable Member a number of times, crime prevention is indeed a priority of this Government. The matter of crime prevention in The Pas certainly has been discussed between myself and the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) might tell us whether we are talking about that part of the RCMP services which come under provincial responsibility or whether it is the town detachment at The Pas, which is a responsibility of the Town of The Pas.

The matter of crime prevention was a matter of public statements by me a few weeks ago near the end of November and the thrust of the Government has been made known with respect to crime prevention in this province. It is a thrust that allows for community input and those who are actually involved in helping prevent crime in our communities and that is the thrust of this Government.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

\* (1020)

### Mandate

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** The Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) and the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) have a nice discussion, but the Members of the Crime Prevention Committee in The Pas do not get a phone call. They have threatened to disband for lack of commitment to this program and, frankly, they have a point.

Mr. Speaker, my first supplementary is to the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae). He has made clear that he is not going ahead with The Crime Prevention Foundation Act. Instead, he will be setting up an advisory committee.

Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) indicate what the mandate of that committee will be, and in particular will the committee have sole discretion over funds targeted towards crime prevention as was the proposal under The Crime Prevention Foundation Act?

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, after the passage of The Crime Prevention Foundation Act, the previous Government commissioned a study of how to carry through with the intention of The Crime Prevention Foundation Act. To my way of thinking, before legislation is passed in the House and before a thrust is put into place, perhaps the study should have been done before instead of after because we found out the budget for crime prevention and the program did not work well together. This is something that unfortunately we had discovered on coming into office.

We propose as quickly as we can to engage in the consultation process to see that those involved with crime prevention in Manitoba are consulted as to the new thrust which will ultimately, we hope, result in the same kinds of crime prevention activities, the same kinds of crime prevention thrusts that the previous Government had in mind, but we unfortunately have found that it was not as workable as it should be. So I invite the Honourable Member to get involved in that consultation.

**Mr. Edwards:** I hope that one of the groups consulted, if it continues to exist, will be The Pas Citizens Crime Prevention Committee.

### Liquor Control Board Right of Appeal

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux)—and if you will permit me a second, the Minister for Inkster (sic) raised with the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) two weeks ago an issue of an inequity in The Liquor Control Act and a particular problem in his neighbourhood with respect to the Neighbourhood Residents Association and their inability to appeal while the applicant had that right to appeal. That has now been two weeks ago. Presumably the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) has had a chance to review the statute. Will he commit today to rectifying that inequity in The Liquor Control Act which seems fairly clear, given that one party has the right of appeal and one party does not.

**Hon. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** As the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) knows, there is legislation before the Standing Committee on Law Amendments. The Honourable Member has been active in that committee and I look forward to further discussion of this matter with the Honourable Member in that committee. I certainly understand the concern that the Honourable Members opposite feel and I think that we will have a very productive discussion with regard to that matter.

### Social Assistance Housing

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** My question is for the Minister of Employment and Economic Security (Mrs. Oleson). During Estimates, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) and myself asked this Minister some questions on housing for persons on

social assistance and whether a study had ever been made with a view to upgrading the general quality of housing available to these individuals. The Minister indicated that MHRC figures show a mere 19 percent of rental units are available to these recipients. What she did not say is that most of the housing is substandard and surveys indicate that indeed a very high percentage have unfilled work orders.

What plans, if any, does the Government have to upgrade housing where social assistance pays the bill and yet the recipients are forced to live in decrepit and unsanitary, unsafe conditions?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Employment Services and Economic Development):** Mr. Speaker, as I had indicated to the Member and his colleague when I was answering the questions posed during Estimates, and to just correct the Member's information, the welfare recipients have access to 30 percent of the rental market. A short time ago there was a 3 percent vacancy rate. I believe it has increased by now.

This department does not enter into capital improvements on rental facilities; I mean it would not make sense. As I indicated to the Members when we were discussing it in Estimates, my department does look at it closely and we do know there is a problem with rental accommodation.

• (1025)

### Rental Allowance Increase

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** To the same Minister—and Hansard says 19 percent—because of this inadequate rental allowance, this Government does indeed direct most recipients where to live. There is a very limited market often in unsafe, unsanitary conditions that I had alluded to. The Government clearly has a responsibility and indeed holds a bargaining chip, the money, to ensure better accommodations for families on social assistance.

Will this Minister either raise the allowances so that recipients have a broader selection or will she consult with the city to enforce sanitary and safety by-laws?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security):** I heard the Member to say, will I raise the rental allowance? Every year at this time there is a review of the rent guidelines for social assistance recipients. It is raised in concert with the office of the Rentalsman's guidelines for rental increases. I believe this year the funds allocated to that increase amount to some \$3 million.

I am wondering if the Member wants us to throw away the guidelines for rental. We have to have a guideline in order to get some semblance of order in budgetary measures. We cannot just indiscriminately pay rent. We have to have a guideline.

**Mr. Rose:** As expected, this Government continues to demonstrate that it is far more conservative than it is progressive, as their election promises show.

### Rate Review

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** With a final supplementary to the same Minister, almost every day we hear price increases on staple goods and services which affect low income earners and those on social assistance—milk, phone, hydro and now MPIC—in the core areas particularly. When will this Minister next appraise social assistance payments?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security):** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the last few words of the question. Could the Member repeat them?

**Mr. Rose:** The Minister said before that she would reappraise in view of the higher inflation. When will her next reappraisal take place on social assistance payments?

**Mrs. Oleson:** I find that question interesting because just this morning when I was driving to work, the radio station which I was listening to—and I forget which one—was announcing that the CPI for last month had gone down from the previous month.

I notice the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) is not asking me if I should lower them this month or what. Anyway, I will assure the Member that I had said before that they are monitored and we will continue to monitor that.

### Hog Producers Tripartite Agreement

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** My question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). The hog producers of this province have been in the tripartite stabilization since 1986 and, at that time, when we negotiated the terms of the agreement, the Hog Board indicated that weanling producers should be left out in that there was a good relationship between weanling producers and hog finishers in terms of returns and they would share in those returns. This year, with hog prices hitting the low fifties, we have seen many weanling producers having to virtually dump their produce on the market and receive what can be clearly termed as disastrous prices in the marketplace.

I ask the Minister whether he is prepared to reconsider the terms of that agreement and discuss that with the Hog Board? There have been in other provinces different terms set up for weanling producers so that a fairer sharing of the returns and stabilization could be shared between weanling producers and hog producers who are protected by tripartite and weanling producers are not.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Certainly, because of the low hog prices, there is no question that weanling producers have been caught in an unfortunate situation.

It is my understanding that some of those weanling producers have contracts with finishers that give them an opportunity to share in some of the benefits but

not all. I have had representation from weanling producers about some remedy to this. What I would like to see is the weanling committee of the Hog Board come back through the board to us with a recommendation that the weanling producers would like to see put in place. We are prepared to sit down and discuss it with the weanling committee of the board and see if we can find some resolve that gives them the kind of price protection that they need through this period of time.

**Mr. Uruski:** I thank the Minister for his positive response in this area.

\* (1030)

### **Drought Assistance Funding Availability**

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Could he be as well positive to indicate whether cheques, in fact, are being mailed? Most of us who are rural members are receiving calls from producers regarding the direction of the feed security program, but basically the drought program, whether those payments are in fact being made?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** I can assure the Member that those cheques are ready and, to the best of my knowledge, they will be hitting the mail today or tomorrow.

**Mr. Uruski:** I thank the Minister.

### **Eligibility List**

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Could he indicate to this House or provide Members with a list of municipalities which in fact have qualified under the program? I have not yet seen the results of the crop insurance determination of which areas of the province are in fact eligible for those payments. Because of the calls we are receiving, we are unable to deal with the farm community to say which area is getting the payments and which area is not.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** I have a copy, not with me, but I will definitely supply it to the Member by Monday.

I will assure the Member that there is some variability between municipalities and because of that, we have set up a review committee that will consist of six producers: two appointed by the federal Government, two appointed by the provincial Government, one appointed by UMM and one appointed by the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association. This decision was arrived at through a meeting with municipalities and MCPA on Thursday and Friday of last week where they agreed that this appeal process would be used to deal with municipalities and producers that would have reason to appeal because of the determinations that were made and the payouts that are occurring.

### **Property Taxes—Winnipeg Reassessment**

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, on such an auspicious day, I am pleased to be able to represent a doorstep issue of my constituents. My question is to the Deputy Premier (Mr. Cummings) and it has to do with the assessment of property taxes in the City of Winnipeg and particularly the unfair assessment to Class 3 groupings—condominium owners and cooperative housing unit owners. This particular problem, on behalf of my constituents, crosses political boundaries. Important individuals from all Parties clearly want to see this unfair tax eliminated. There have been petitions on behalf of thousands of people in the City of Winnipeg. There have been requests from various groups. There have been questions asked in the House of the Minister, and in Estimates. Will the Minister please advise this House what progress he has been able to make on this specific issue?

**An Honourable Member:** We had a meeting this morning. We had it at seven o'clock.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** As my colleague says, we have had a meeting this morning at seven o'clock on assessment as a matter of fact.

To be specific to the question—and it is a serious question and I appreciate the concern that the Member has—if I could have a moment to speak, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) and myself have consulted very closely on this. We have had an opportunity to discuss it with the Mayor a short while ago.

We will be sending a letter to the city indicating that if the city chooses to adjust the mill rate in that classification so that it is equal to the Class 1 property that Cabinet will be prepared to accept it.

**Mr. Angus:** Mr. Speaker, through you, just so that I am absolutely clear, I would like—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert has the floor.

### **Classification Changes**

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Mr. Speaker, it is always enjoyable when progress is made on the behalf of people and when wrongs are righted in terms of progress. I am very pleased the Minister has taken this positive step and I applaud him for it, but I want to be absolutely clear for the record. The Minister has said that if the city requests it, this Government will allow them to combine the regulations that will enable the Class 3 group to be classed in the same group as single-family homes, so that condominium homes and cooperative housing units and single-family homes will all be charged the same rate of property tax.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I think there might be a slight difference

in semantics. I did not say that I would recommend or accept the recommendation of a change of class. But I would indicate very clearly, that we are prepared to accept the recommendation of the adjustment of the mill rate for the 1989 year, because the classes were originally set up as a mitigating measure. The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) has indicated that he would support that action as well.

### Reassessment

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** My final supplementary. Again, I believe that the Minister and I are on accord in this regard, but I would like to see it in writing and, more specifically, if he would be prepared to table in this House what he is offering to the city to allow them, and what regulations need to be done, and what sort of time frame we are talking about. I wonder if he would be kind enough to provide, at least me and other Members of this House, exactly what it is he is offering and how he sees this tax break, this fair tax offering being provided to these property owners.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** Again, Mr. Speaker, I am indicating a response that we are prepared to take, as a result of initiative from the city, if the city is prepared to take that initiative. I, and the Minister of Urban Affairs and myself, will be communicating by writing with the city. After they have had an opportunity to examine that correspondence, I will be willing to share it with the Member opposite.

### Lake Dauphin Advisory Cttee. Progress Report

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Penner). Last month the Minister indicated that he was proceeding with the Lake Dauphin Enhancement Program by designating four staff from his department to form a technical group to review the numerous studies. In fact, I would call it "study the numerous studies" that have been done on Dauphin Lake and to identify funding sources—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Member for Dauphin, not half the Cabinet.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you for that nice reception last night as well. It is the season of giving. Let me just rephrase my question. I wanted to mention the technical committee that was allegedly put in place to identify programming costs and to identify funding sources. The Minister has also indicated, in this vein, that Lake Dauphin was going to be one of the priorities under the water strategy. He mentioned it when he had his press conference on water strategy and sustainable development.

I would like to ask the Minister whether he can indicate, at this time, what progress has been made on the enhancement program. Can he give a timetable for the work and indicate whether funding sources have

been identified, including from the federal Government, for this program.

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** It is rather interesting that the former Minister of Natural Resources should ask that question. He was in a position, I suppose, for at least six months in his tenure of office that he could have put in place a total program in the Dauphin Lake area had he wished to do so.

It is, however, interesting so far in our research done into what is already there, and looking at some of the studies that have been done on Lake Dauphin, we have yet to find that the former Minister has done any study on the Lake Dauphin area at all. There are a number of them that we have in fact brushed—

\* (1040)

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

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Speaker, you had indicated in your ruling regarding my request on a matter of privilege the other day, that misinformation or misleading the House was a matter of a point of order. I want to, at this time, raise a point of order because the Minister continues to put misinformation on the record here, and I am raising it as a point of order. The fact is a water commission report was done and was completed in 1984 during our time in Government. This Minister has not put in the correct information—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order— a dispute over the facts.

**Mr. Penner:** As I have indicated before, I think the Honourable Member is hard of hearing. He simply did not hear me say that during his tenure in office as Minister of Natural Resources—I want to indicate to the Honourable Member though that the committees' investigations and studies are proceeding quite well. We hope to have a report ready by about springtime, which will indicate fairly clearly a course of action to be taken in the Lake Dauphin area. As I have indicated previously, it will be part and parcel of the initiative that was announced just a few short weeks ago in our soil and water strategy.

### Committee Members

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, on November 10, I wrote the Minister and expressed serious concern about the fact that he was not naming an advisory committee for Lake Dauphin. This has been followed up as well by—incidentally I have not received a response from the Minister other than an acknowledgement on December 1. This is over a month, six weeks, and I still have not received an answer from this Minister.

As well, the Turtle River Conservation District, the Dauphin Opportunity Centre and the Manitoba Wildlife Federation have expressed concern about the fact that this Minister is backing off of an earlier commitment to put in place an advisory committee.

I ask the Minister, in view of those concerns, will he reconsider his decision and name an advisory committee so there can be local input into the decision-making that is required now. Will he name that committee now?

**Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Natural Resources):** It is interesting to note that the former Minister, under the previous administration, had a substantial amount of time and that being his home riding you would have expected him to immediately put in place an advisory committee, as well as making sure that funding would be put in place to do exactly what he is advocating now. However, I have indicated previously to this House that I am willing to consider the formation—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**Mr. Plohan:** Mr. Speaker, issues mature at different times and it is the fact that this Minister has the misfortune of being Minister now when this issue is very timely for the people of Dauphin.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, briefly.

**Mr. Penner:** As I was about to indicate to the House that, if and when the technical committee comes with its final report, and there is a need to establish an advisory body to implement the recommendations that are going to be contained in that report, then we will make those considerations at that time.

### Waste Disposal Site Regulations

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** The question I wish to pose to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Connery) this morning deals with special provisions nine of them in fact which are a deviation from a Class 1 licence for the disposal grounds at Poplar Point in that Minister's riding. I will list those points and ask for a response on them.

The points are: no public hearings held; no studies on impacts; the burning of domestic garbage; the burning instead of flushing of chemical containers; no permits for burning operations; septic waste dumping, which is at variance with the licence involved; sludge dumping, again, at variance with the licence involved; non-existent site security, which the Minister, in the paper this morning, is quoted, and I would suggest I hope it is a misquote because otherwise he does not know what is going on; and very interesting, and last, No. 9, the dumping of rotting vegetables in volume, again, at variance with the licence. Would the Minister like to comment on that?

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health):** I guess, Mr. Speaker, I resent his very last comment, the dumping of rotting vegetables—they were not rotten.

I asked our staff to go over that dump very carefully to review all of the regulations. There was some environmental—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Connery:** —damage, yes, by the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor).

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please.

**Mr. Connery:** The variances that were granted to the City of Portage la Prairie for their Class 1 licence was granted on March 2, 1988, before we came into power. All of the investigations and work that should have been done was not done by the previous Government.

I can assure you that the allegations that the Member is making, I have covered with our staff. He says there was some burning of chemical cans, it was prior. All of the things that he is saying happened were prior to it becoming that Class 1 licence, before the City of Portage la Prairie moved out there. They have only been there about two weeks. They admit that the fencing is not chain-link fencing because they are looking for an alternate site that is closer to the City of Portage la Prairie because of the cost being incurred in travelling that far.

We will be looking at the fencing in more detail on Monday. I have instructed our staff to talk to the R.M. to ensure that it is safe. But as far as the chain-link fencing, if they are going to maintain that as a dump, then it will be done in the spring.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for oral questions has expired.

### HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** The Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will sit on Monday morning at 10 a.m. to complete its work and, by leave, the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will sit concurrently with the House on Monday evening at 8 p.m. to complete its work.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave granted? (Agreed)

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT MOTION

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the Constitutional Amendment Motion?

**Mr. Speaker:** Constitutional Amendment Motion, first day of debate, on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey),

WHEREAS the Constitution Act, 1982, came into force on April 17, 1982, following an agreement between Canada and all the provinces except Quebec; and

WHEREAS the Government of Quebec has established a set of five proposals for constitutional change and has stated that amendments to give effect to those proposals would enable Quebec to resume a full role in the constitutional councils of Canada; and

WHEREAS the amendment proposed and Schedule hereto sets out the basis on which Quebec's five constitutional proposals may be met; and

WHEREAS the amendment proposed in the Schedule hereto also recognizes the principle of the equality of all the provinces, provides new arrangements to foster greater harmony and cooperation between the Government of Canada and the Governments of the provinces and requires that conferences be convened to consider important constitutional, economic and other issues; and

WHEREAS certain portions of the amendment proposed in the Schedule hereto relate to matters referred to in Section 41 of the Constitution Act, 1982; and

WHEREAS Section 41 of the Constitution Act, 1982, provides that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor-General, under the Great Seal of Canada where so authorized by resolutions of the Senate and the House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each province.

NOW THEREFORE the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba resolves that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada be authorized to be made by proclamation issued by Her Excellency, the Governor-General, under the Great Seal of Canada, in accordance with the Schedule hereto.

**MOTION presented.**

\* (1050)

**Mr. Filmon:** In June of 1987, the Premiers of the 10 Canadian provinces, together with the Prime Minister of Canada, reached agreement on a series of amendments to the Canadian Constitution.

That agreement has come to be called the Meech Lake Accord.

Among the participants in that meeting was my predecessor as Premier of Manitoba, the Honourable Howard Pawley. Like all of the other First Ministers at that meeting, he accepted, on behalf of this province, an obligation to introduce a resolution to amend our Constitution into this Legislature.

In the debate on the Speech from the Throne beginning this Session, this House accepted that obligation.

I rise now, Mr. Speaker, to discharge that obligation by introducing the Meech Lake Resolution to this Chamber.

And as I do so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate for me to remind this House of the words Premier Pawley used when, returning from the signing of the Meech Lake Accord, he rose in his place in this House and said: "The Accord is an historic document. It is historic because of what it contains and because of what it symbolizes: a renewed spirit of good will and reconciliation across Canada."

And he went on to say: "I think Manitobans have a vision of Canada, of our place within Canada, that will be well-served by this Accord. It will maintain a strong central Government with the capacity and the continued responsibility to respond fairly to the concerns of all regions. It strikes a balance that will give Manitoba room to create, to grow and to make the best possible contribution we can to the future of our nation."

And Premier Pawley concluded his remarks that day with these words: "I truly believe Canada will be stronger because of what we achieved, that (it) is good for our country and that (it) is good for Manitoba. I commend the Accord to this House."

Mr. Speaker, as we begin our consideration of this resolution, I think it is appropriate for us to remember his words.

In considering this resolution, we will be considering a change to Canada's Constitution. Unlike some other provinces, Manitoba's Legislature has a clear process, as set out in Rule 36.1, for the consideration of constitutional changes.

These rules were proposed by my Party, then in Opposition, and accepted by the then Government during consideration of the status of the French language in Manitoba some five years ago. It was a hard-won process, but an extremely important one. Prior to that time, there was no such requirement in Manitoba but we believed then, as we believe now, that in matters as important as constitutional changes the people of Manitoba ought to be heard.

The rules call for a resolution to be introduced into the Legislature, and for Members to be provided a reasonable opportunity to debate and comment on that resolution.

It is then required that a committee of the House hold public hearings to permit the people of Manitoba to express their views and their concerns.

Following those hearings, the committee reports back to the full Legislature, and there is a final debate in which Members have an opportunity to debate the resolution, consider amendments if any, and finally to vote, expressing the will of the Members of this House with respect to the resolution.

I am beginning that process today with the introduction of a resolution "The Constitutional Amendment, 1987," which contains the precise words agreed to by my predecessor and the other First Ministers of Canada. In the next few moments I will

suggest that it is important for all of us to remember the situation that existed in Canada prior to this 1987 agreement among the 11 First Ministers.

We will examine the process that led to the Meech Lake Accord. In discussing the main constitutional and other impacts and significance of the Meech Lake Agreement, I will be suggesting that Meech has a significance over and above the specific constitutional changes that it will make, and we should all be sensitive to that reality.

Mr. Speaker, in the process we are beginning today, we must all strive to reach a reasoned decision as to whether or not we shall support the resolution; and as to what other steps we should take as part of Manitoba's response to this historic constitutional initiative. In introducing this resolution for debate in this Chamber and through the public hearing process throughout the community of Manitoba, I point out that the 11 First Ministers who signed this agreement viewed it as a bold step saying "Yes" to Canadian unity.

In fact, Premier Pawley said again when he returned to this Legislature from introducing the Accord, and I quote, "The Accord could not have happened without give and take by every Government, by every province, by every region represented at the table. What emerged was not exactly in the form we might have wished but I am absolutely sure that the Prime Minister of Canada, the Premier of Ontario, the Premier of Quebec, the Premier of Alberta, and every other Premier would say exactly the same thing, it was a remarkable achievement. In a partnership which means something, the partners have to compromise. They have to find accommodation. That is what Canada is all about and as Premier Ghiz said yesterday, that is what makes Canada work.

But it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we begin our consideration of Meech Lake by asking what is the real significance of the Meech Lake Accord? One view of the Accord is that it is nothing more nor less than a constitutional compromise that was reached for the sole purpose of permitting the Province of Quebec to enter fully into the Canadian Constitution.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is much more than that. I believe this agreement can more usefully be viewed as an exercise of political will on the part of 11 heads of Government, an exercise aimed at making a new beginning after what had been one of the most divisive and difficult periods in our national history.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, for us to think back to the period in our history between the years 1968 and 1984, a period in which, with one brief interval, the federal Government was led by the Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau. During those years, we saw a situation evolve in Canada in which the regions of this country—East and West, French and English—were divided from one another and especially from the federal Government in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, that situation reflected Mr. Trudeau's view of Canada, but it was not then and it is not now the view of this nation that Manitobans share. We want a Canada of unity, not of discord. We want a Canada

based on cooperation, not on confrontation. And that is not the Canada we saw evolving around us during the Trudeau years.

Those were the years when the Prime Minister of Canada said to western farmers, "Why should I sell your wheat?" and made rude gestures and abusive remarks to the poor and the unemployed. That was the period of the so-called "National Energy Program" in which the energy resources and the hopes for prosperity of the western provinces were attacked by Ottawa.

That was the period during which the "Fiscal Arrangements", the arrangements between Ottawa and the provinces for the financing of health services and higher education, began to be steadily and remorselessly eroded by the federal Government, imposing an even greater burden on smaller provinces like Manitoba in particular.

That was the period when development in Newfoundland and the Maritimes, Canada's poorest region, ground to a halt as the federal Government abandoned cooperation and instead fought over the control of those provinces' resources, both off-shore oil and the fisheries, dooming those Canadians to continued poverty.

That was the period when the separatist movement in Quebec reached its peak. Quebecers elected an openly separatist provincial Government. In the 1980 referendum, fully 40 percent of the people of that province—and a significantly higher proportion of French-speaking Quebecers—voted to take a major step toward severing their ties with the rest of Canada.

All of that is part of the background to Meech Lake, part of the history of confrontation, of failure and division that marked the Trudeau years. It was all part of a time when the vision that Manitobans' share of this nation was replaced by a vision based on conflict and distrust.

\* (1100)

It came to a head with the federal Government's effort to patriate the Canadian Constitution unilaterally without consultation or agreement with the provinces. It was an effort that was stopped only by the Supreme Court of Canada after references by the provinces. That effort ended in a forced compromise: it gained for Canada the Charter of Rights, but it excluded the province of Quebec. The result of that exercise, in constitutional terms, was a deadlock.

We had started out to bring Canada's Constitution home, but with 30 percent of Canada's population left outside the agreement, all we had achieved was the equivalent of a set of constitutional handcuffs. We found that none of the other issues that called for constitutional renewal could be dealt with. The list was long:

- Senate reform to provide a stronger voice for smaller provinces and the regions within the federal government;
- Property rights, constitutional rights,

constitutional guarantees that Canadians can be secure in the ownership of their homes and farms and businesses without fear of Government interference

- Recognition and protection for the position of Canada's Native people;
- New ground rules for the relationships between the federal and provincial Governments.

But there was no effective forum or mechanism for any of these issues to be addressed among the Governments of Canada.

All efforts to break this deadlock were frustrated. They were frustrated largely because Canada really did not have a constitutional consensus upon which to build.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the constitutional legacy of those Trudeau years. That is the constitutional background for the Meech Lake Accord that we will be debating and considering in this House. But the deadlock that bound Canada extended far beyond our ability to change and renew our Constitution. That deadlock extended into virtually every aspect of federalism. Another part of the legacy of those years was a level of distrust and friction among the regions and Governments of the country that made it impossible for federalism to work.

So on social issues like the evolving need for Government involvement in developing and providing the child care services that Canadian families require, on fiscal issues like cost-sharing and tax reform, on environmental issues like water and soil conservation or nationwide standards of forest management, on industrial development opportunities from B.C. coal to Ontario information technology to Newfoundland's offshore oil resources, Canada was unable to act.

That too was part of the inherited legacy of the Trudeau years; a divided Canada, a Canada in which the sense of partnership that Manitobans believe is essential waned, in which controversy flourished; a Canada that was at odds with our vision of this nation.

It became clear to Manitobans, and to the Premiers of Canada's 10 provinces that this situation could not be permitted to continue. It was time to begin to rebuild the basic Canadian consensus and a sense of shared purpose among the regions and Governments of Canada. It was time to begin work to recapture our vision of Canada.

It was time to return to the Pearson/Diefenbaker tradition of cooperative federalism, federalism based on partnership rather than conflict, on accommodation rather than confrontation. Manitobans, Canadians everywhere shared that view. We elected a new federal Government committed to national reconciliation.

Provincial Governments and Premiers of every political stripe soon found that although there remain disagreements and differences, the federal Government was willing to meet and discuss important issues such as the economy, aboriginal rights, constitutional reform—all in a spirit of cooperation.

In Quebec, the people rejected separatism. Quebecers elected a new Government, a Government

committed to federalism. That Government began efforts to negotiate a new agreement that would permit them to feel that they were equal partners in Confederation and that their partners in Confederation respected them and their unique traditions.

And over a year-long period, the Premiers and officials of the provinces met with the encouragement of the federal Government to try to devise the basis for a new agreement.

In August of 1986 at the annual Premiers' Conference in Edmonton, the 10 Premiers agreed that serious discussions should begin. The discussions were given tremendous impetus by the fact that the new federal Government had installed annual meetings amongst the First Ministers as a regular feature of the interaction between the two levels of Government in Canada.

At the annual First Ministers' meeting in November of that year all 10 Premiers and the Prime Minister endorsed the process and instructed their senior officials to lay the groundwork for full scale constitutional discussions.

I have traced the progress of these efforts because some have suggested that the Meech Lake Accord is an agreement that was reached in haste. Far from it.

Meech Lake did not grow out of the two long, hard negotiating sessions, one at Meech Lake itself, the other at the Langevin Block in Ottawa. It grew out of more than a year's efforts by the provinces and the federal Government striving to rebuild the fabric of federalism. In a very real sense, it grew out of the 15 years of failure, bitterness and frustration that was the Trudeau legacy in Canada.

Manitobans and other Canadians and their Leaders decided we had had enough, and so the Meech Lake Accord was created as an effort of political will and the results of months of sustained work by the 11 First Ministers.

And so we in this Legislature are challenged to reach our own verdict on that Accord and on the new beginning the 11 First Ministers were striving to build for our nation. Through our public hearing process, Manitobans everywhere share in that challenge and in that critical decision.

But what precisely is the Meech Lake Accord? What does it say? What will it change in our Canada? What is the nature of the challenge that we face?

In constitutional terms Meech Lake implements three main changes. First, Meech Lake makes it possible for Quebec to rejoin the Canadian family. The key words from Quebec's perspective are "distinct society." Meech Lake recognizes that Quebec is a distinct society within Canada.

Some have suggested that this is a revolutionary statement, that it undermines the Charter of Rights and that it affects the rights of women in particular. Is that the effect of Meech Lake? Is that the intention of those who signed the Accord?

Let me quote from one of the First Ministers who signed the Accord and who has already received the

approval of his Legislature for this new beginning for Canada. I quote the Honourable Joseph Ghiz, the Premier of Canada's smallest province, Prince Edward Island:

"First Ministers have for years tried to recognize the historic and sociological fact of Quebec's distinctiveness as a statement in the Constitution. That has been achieved in the Accord as an interpretative clause which takes nothing away from the effectiveness of the Charter of Rights."

And Ian Scott, the Attorney-General of Ontario, in agreeing with Premier Ghiz said:

"This clause does not override anything in the Charter of Rights. Since it is merely an interpretative provision, it is subordinate to the Charter."

And Ed Broadbent, the Leader of the federal NDP had this to say about the "distinct society" clause:

"We would not have supported this Accord had we believed the Charter was endangered or diminished. I say this with great conviction."

Mr. Speaker, the "distinct society" clause achieves one thing, it brings Quebec back fully into the Canadian family. It is nothing more than a restatement of reality, a reality that has been recognized in every constitutional arrangement since Canada became a nation.

The second major thrust in the Meech Lake Accord is a clarification of the basis upon which the two levels of Government will work together in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

The Accord says that, in areas of purely provincial jurisdiction, in the event that the federal Government wishes to introduce new shared-cost programs, provinces who wish to design and administer their own programs may do so. They are assured "reasonable compensation" provided that the program "is compatible with the national objectives."

Some have suggested that this clause affects existing shared-cost programs, medicare, post-secondary education and the various social services provided under the Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Speaker, that is an error in fact. The Accord has absolutely no implications for existing shared-cost programs. Those programs exist and will continue to exist. The new provisions apply only to future programs.

Some have suggested that this clause diminishes the power of the federal Government to provide nationwide responses to nationwide problems. Is that true? John Turner thinks not. In the House of Commons, he said: "There has probably been a strengthening of federal power by explicitly recognizing for the first time that it may be exercised in areas of provincial jurisdiction."

Ed Broadbent, in this case, agrees with Mr. Turner: "We will have written into the Constitution for the first time the right of the federal Government to spend in areas otherwise in exclusive provincial jurisdictional authority."

And my predecessor, the Honourable Howard Pawley, stood in his place in this Chamber and said: "We

wanted to make certain that the powers of the national Government remain strong enough to enable it to establish new national programs, to ensure that all regions will share more fairly in the benefits of Canada's development. The spending power provision in the new Accord meets that objective."

Mr. Speaker, we have heard statements attacking the new agreement on federal-provincial cooperation in areas of provincial jurisdiction, but they have come from two sources: from the remains of the Trudeau branch of the Liberal party—now primarily in the Senate of Canada; and from Separatists in the Province of Quebec.

Let me tell you what the federalist Premier of Quebec, Robert Bourassa, heard from the Leader of the Separatist Opposition in the Quebec Legislature when he returned after signing the Meech Lake Accord. Pierre Marc Johnson said to the Quebec Premier on that day that the Meech Lake Accord was:

"... essentially a confirmation of federal spending power and it will henceforth force the provinces, including Quebec, to bend before national standards if they are to see again the money from their own taxes."

\* (1110)

Mr. Speaker, that is the Separatist view of Meech Lake, and against it I believe we should consider the views of Howard Pawley, who said when he returned from signing the Meech Lake Accord on behalf of all Manitobans, that the agreement: "... gives the provinces the breathing room we require to design programs which reflect our own circumstances. The spending power provision gives all provincial Governments the opportunity to make positive and creative improvements in program delivery and in design. But it also makes clear that the Government of Canada will have a strong role in establishing the direction of these programs, in ensuring that they are consistent with national objectives and in the national interest."

I do not have to remind Members of the House that that is precisely the way that the child care issue has developed, with the kinds of standards and programming that have been developed in Manitoba being carried to a national level.

Mr. Pawley captured what many in Western Canada believe is one of the most significant improvements that Meech Lake makes in the workings of the Canadian family. It recognizes, as the federal Government refused to recognize through the Trudeau years, that in Canada we are all distinct societies.

Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, Manitobans and their successive Governments have never operated a federal-provincial cost-shared program that was exactly the same as those operated in other provinces.

We have responded to the reality of our own province and of our own people, a reality we know better than any bureaucrat in Ottawa can possibly know, a reality of rural populations, of Native peoples, and of a multicultural community.

In many cases, Manitoba programs have exceeded the standards set for cost-shared programs by the federal authority: in health care, in higher education, in social programs, in legal aid, in economic development, in tourism, and in assistance to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, there will be new shared-cost programs in the future. For example, we will see such programs in the child care field, an area of purely provincial jurisdiction. Other programs will undoubtedly be developed to help with any adjustments needed in the wake of the Free Trade Agreement.

Through the Meech Lake Accord, 10 Premiers argued, and the federal Government recognized that Manitobans and Canadians in the other provinces are mature enough to identify our own specific needs and to respond to them. Meech Lake recognizes that we are loyal Canadians, proud Canadians, who accept national goals and objectives, just as we have in Medicare, in the social services, in which Manitoba has always been a pioneer, as we have in every aspect of the cooperative federalism that we know is needed to reach the goals we share for ourselves and our fellow Canadians.

The 11 First Ministers believed that the new arrangements for cooperation between the two levels of Government, in establishing new programs in areas of provincial jurisdiction, were a significant strengthening of the Canadian family, a strengthening that is sorely needed after the trials of the Trudeau era in Canada, a strengthening that brings alive once more the Pearson/Diefenbaker dream of cooperative federalism.

Mr. Speaker, the accord takes another important step in the renewal of the Canadian partnership. It includes the beginnings of a road map for a continuing process of constitutional reform.

I would ask all Members to remember the prior constitutional process, where from time to time Mr. Trudeau would summon the other partners in Confederation to come to Ottawa at his convenience. Meech Lake includes a significant change in this:

- the Meech Lake Accord establishes that there will be annual Constitutional Conferences at which any province can put items of concern to its people on the agenda;
- the Meech Lake Accord establishes that the first items on the agenda of the First Constitutional Conference, after the Meech Lake Accord is adopted by all provinces, will be Senate Reform and fisheries—two items of special interest to smaller provinces like Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the provinces of the Atlantic region;
- the Meech Lake Accord establishes that any province or the federal Government may put other items on the agenda of the first or subsequent meetings of the Annual Constitutional Conference;
- that is particularly important for the western provinces. In the past, there was no way that

we could put issues of importance to us on the Canadian constitutional agenda without first persuading Ontario or Quebec to support us. After Meech is adopted, Manitobans can choose to put matters that concern us before a National Constitutional Conference without having to go hat in hand to any other Government in Canada to beg permission.

Mr. Speaker, these are the four most significant constitutional changes resulting from the Meech Lake Accord:

- Quebec is in the Canadian constitutional family.
- New ground rules to permit the two levels of Government to cooperate in the invention of new programs and responses as these are needed in Canada, with both Governments having a clear role and a right to contribute.
- The Accord establishes a process of constitutional amendment in which all provinces are equal and in which Manitoba carries the same weight as Ontario, another protection for less populous parts of the country, and an orderly process of annual constitutional review.
- It provides the beginnings of a road map for ongoing constitutional renewal, starting with Senate Reform, fisheries and extending to such other items as any province may wish to advance.

\* (1120)

There are other items in the Meech Lake Accord: cooperation between Ottawa and the provinces in the selection of Senators until we have completed Senate Reform, cooperation in the selection of Supreme Court justices, to ensure that these critical appointments are seen as legitimate in every part of Canada, and provision for the provinces, all 10 of them, to participate in immigration policy and programs. All these are important changes, Mr. Speaker. All of these are reasons why eight provinces and the federal Parliament have already passed the Meech Lake Accord. They are reasons that deserve the serious attention of the Members of this House and all Manitobans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish that I could say to the Members of this House and to all Manitobans that a decision to support Meech is a simple decision. The accord does strengthen the Canadian family. It does put the Trudeau era of confrontation and division once and for all behind us. But we, in Manitoba, expect more from our Constitution than simply a clearing of the air or a correction of the excesses of that 15-year long period.

We want to move ahead. But as we look at Meech, we all, all of us in this House and all Manitobans, share a dilemma. Approving Meech Lake is not an easy choice for any of us. Let us look at the proposition before us. It is a very straightforward proposition.

We can accept this resolution as the 11 First Ministers have agreed to it, or we can reject it. There is not

middle ground. Were we to change or amend this resolution, it would undoubtedly be lost.

Eight provinces and the Government of Canada have already passed it. A change now would require that each and every province and the Government of Canada accept our amendments. It would require that all 11 Governments meet again and that the 10 other Governments present the Manitoba version to their Legislatures. It would require that all of those Legislatures agree.

I am enough of a realist, Mr. Speaker, and I know enough of the history of repeated efforts to achieve constitutional agreements, that I know the odds of that ever happening are very long odds indeed. I would hope that Members will be forthright about that. Let there be no pretending or posturing. If this House changes the Meech Lake Accord, we have abandoned and lost the Accord and the new beginnings it stands for.

There are other parts of the proposition before us, and that is the question of the good will of those who signed it and have supported it since its signing. There are some who, for whatever reason, choose to read ominous meanings into the wording of the accord. If we are to believe these people, my predecessor and my old opponent, Howard Pawley, with the support of his entire Cabinet, men and women we all know well, were either malicious or misled, and with them the Premiers of all the provinces, the Legislatures of the eight provinces who have already passed this resolution, the leaders of all three national Parties and the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been skeptical of the "great conspiracy" theories of history. But a great and malicious conspiracy that involves Howard Pawley is simply unthinkable.

The Meech Lake Accord means exactly what it says, no more and no less. So I would hope that in our discussions here no Member will pretend otherwise. Eight provincial Legislatures, representing some 93 percent of the people of Canada, have already approved the Meech Lake Accord. The Parliament of Canada, with active and vocal support from the Leaders of all three national Parties, has already passed Meech Lake not once, but twice.

Why did the House of Commons have to approve Meech Lake twice? It was necessary because the Senate of Canada, the unreformed Senate of Canada, dominated by Trudeau appointments attempted to block this historic agreement and return us to the conflict and division that marked the Trudeau years.

But John Turner and Ed Broadbent and Brian Mulroney and all three elected federal caucuses were steadfast in their decision to support this agreement as a new beginning for constitutional renewal and cooperative federalism in Canada.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us in this House do share a dilemma as we look at Meech Lake. I do not believe there is a single person among us who would wish to return Canada to the constitutional and political deadlocks and confrontations of the Trudeau era. That is not our vision of Canada.

But we have and we share concerns about Meech Lake, and our chief concern is that this accord does not achieve enough for Canadians. In particular, we are concerned that the beginnings of a road map for continuing constitutional renewal that are found in Meech Lake are simply too narrow.

We agree that Senate Reform is urgent. For smaller provinces like Manitoba and for less populous regions like western Canada, a renewed and reformed Senate offers the best assurance that the interests and aspirations of our people will not be discounted by a future federal Government as they have been in the past by Governments made up of both major federal Parties.

We are receptive to an early move to examine the Constitution as it affects Canada's fisheries. We know that for the Maritime Region of Canada, the fishery is as important as wheat and agriculture are to the West. But we believe deeply that Canada needs a broader agenda for constitutional renewal—an agenda that may include a wide range of the issues about which Manitobans feel deeply.

Part of the challenge that we face in this House and through the public hearings we will conduct is to identify those issues. They could include constitutional guarantees for Native people, or stronger protections for women, or property rights—guarantees of the rights of Canadians to own their own homes or businesses or farms without undue Government interference. There are many issues about which Manitobans feel deeply.

So I believe that for most Members of this House, and for most Manitobans, the fundamental problem with Meech Lake is that it does not go far enough in charting the next steps in constitutional renewal. As a result, I think we question whether or not it is too narrow a foundation upon which to build. And those who feel that share a dilemma. We know that if we reject Meech, then realistically we will face a wait of eight or ten or more years before the process of constitutional renewal can begin again.

We know that Meech Lake is a necessary first step if we wish to move promptly to address the other issues that concern the next steps in constitutional reform, and we know that we must take the first step before we can take the second one.

We know that there is only one practical way to achieve that first step, and that is to pass the Meech Lake Resolution as it was agreed by the eleven First Ministers, as it has been passed by eight other provincial Legislatures and the Parliament of Canada.

How then do we register, in a forceful and effective way, the determinations that Manitobans share that the agenda for future constitutional renewal must be broadened?

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a solution to that dilemma, a solution that could enable Manitobans to join other Canadians, in accepting this historic constitutional initiative without compromising our fundamental beliefs. It is an approach that is consistent with Manitoba's tradition of leadership within Confederation.

I think it is often forgotten that the cornerstone of cooperative federalism—federal equalization to balance the public services available to Canadians in richer and poorer parts of this nation—resulted from the leadership of a Premier of Manitoba, the Honourable John Bracken.

Over the years, Manitoba has benefitted less from equalization than many other parts of Canada because our prosperity has, in general, been at or about the national average. The main beneficiaries have been Atlantic Canada and the Province of Quebec, although we, too, in recent years have received significant federal equalization payments.

But Manitoba stood for the principle of a united Canada in which people had comparable opportunities, the principle upon which equalization is based.

When the federal and provincial Governments were negotiating in the Diefenbaker and Pearson era for shared cost approaches to agriculture and to education, Manitoba's Premier of the Day, Senator Duff Roblin, provided invaluable leadership.

\* (1130)

During the 1980-81 round of constitutional negotiations, it was Manitoba Premier Sterling Lyon who provided the wording for the section of the Constitution that guaranteed and enshrined our tradition of equalization. And during the deadlock that followed those discussions, my predecessor, the Honourable Howard Pawley, led the fight to include aboriginal Canadians distinctly in our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, through our deliberations on the Meech Lake Accord and through the response that we give to our partners in Confederation, I believe that we can and we should continue that tradition of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Meech Lake Accord is only a first step in the process of constitutional renewal in Canada, and I believe that we in the province could look beyond Meech Lake to the next steps in that important and historical national process.

Could we not, during and after the public hearings, as we listen to the views of Manitobans, look to that second step in the process? Could we not, in addition to considering the Meech Lake Accord itself, also consider adopting a companion constitutional resolution—a resolution setting forth the other issues on which Manitobans want urgent constitutional action—defining the second step in the process that only begins with Meech Lake?

Our rules here, calling for public hearings in the case of any constitutional amendment, are unique in Canada. Could we not, in the hearings that will be held, ask the people of Manitoba for their advice not just about Meech Lake, the first step, but also about the steps beyond Meech and the other issues they wish to see addressed?

Could such a course of action provide us with the means to address the concerns that the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Doer) has voiced—concerns that, in some respects, all of us in this House and many others across Manitoba share?

When we gather again to consider the report of the committee after the public hearings on Meech Lake, I will invite him and the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) to meet with me to see if such a resolution can satisfy their concerns and respond to the advice we receive from Manitobans during this process.

I believe that such a resolution can be more than a gesture, Mr. Speaker, if all of us in this House work together as we have been, as we must, under a minority Government. It is possible that such an approach may permit us to enjoy the best of both worlds, to join with the other provinces and the federal Government in the first step of Meech Lake, while providing national leadership in shaping the next steps in this ongoing process of constitutional renewal.

Under the terms of Meech Lake itself, with its recognition of the equality of all provinces, Manitoba could place that resolution on the agenda for the next constitutional meeting of the eleven First Ministers. Beyond that, if we in this House agree, I believe that all of the Party Leaders could use our influence with our supporters, with Members of our Parties in other provinces, including other provincial Governments, and with the Leaders of our national Parties. We could work together to ensure that the Canadian partnership as a whole embraces the enlarged agenda for constitutional renewal that we will propose.

We may have an opportunity to move beyond the first step to provide leadership and direction for the next round of constitutional deliberations—a round that would begin immediately should we and New Brunswick have approved the Meech Lake Accord.

I invite all Members of this Legislature and the people of Manitoba, through our public hearing process, to join me in providing that kind of leadership and direction.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by restating some facts.

In constitutional terms, the Meech Lake Accord brings Quebec back into the Canadian family. It provides an improved approach for the federal and provincial Governments to work together in areas of provincial jurisdiction. It charts a partial road map for future and ongoing constitutional renewal.

Experts assure us that it does not in any way diminish the protections that Canadians everywhere enjoy under our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and that it does not in any way reduce the ability of the federal Government to initiate new programs in all parts of Canada or to achieve appropriate nationwide standards.

It does provide a stronger voice and stronger protections for smaller provinces like Manitoba, and it charts a partial road map for ongoing constitutional renewal, a road map for the first step, and we may after our public hearings are completed agree that Manitobans can contribute the map for the steps to follow.

But the significance of Meech Lake goes beyond the specific constitutional changes that it will be achieve. The real significance of Meech Lake goes to the heart of the idea of cooperative federalism. After 15 years

of conflict, confrontation and growing distrust, Meech Lake marks a new beginning for federalism, a new beginning based on the Pearson/Diefenbaker tradition of cooperation, mutual respect and trust:

So let us, Mr. Speaker, if we choose to accept this new beginning, this first step in a return to constitutional renewal and cooperative federalism, also consider the opportunity to begin to chart the next steps. Let us ensure that Manitoba speaks clearly, forcefully and with one voice as to the next round of improvements we wish to see in Canada's Constitution. Let us articulate our vision of Canada, a Canada of cooperation and partnership between regions and among Governments, a Canada of trust and accommodation and mutual respect. And let us ensure that that Manitoba vision of Canada becomes part and parcel of the next round of constitutional meetings involving Canada's 11 Governments.

Mr. Speaker, our deliberations on Meech Lake go to the heart of the workings of federalism. Today in Manitoba the federal-provincial agenda is a crowded one. Important matters that were lost during the deadlocked years are now coming to the fore: child care, the Southern Development Initiative, new initiatives for industrial and resource development, for science and technology, innovations in Northern Development, improved services to seniors, enhancements in health services, new environmental measures in which all the Governments of Canada can work together.

After being stalled in confrontation and distrust, Canadian federalism is beginning to work again through a renewed spirit of consent and cooperation, and it is critical to the people of Manitoba that we get on with that work.

In the process we are entering, we will not be talking solely about the Meech Lake document. We will be talking about the idea of Canadian federalism and how it ought to work, the idea of partnership and of sharing, the importance of job creation, the necessity for a strong and responsive social safety net. We will be talking about Canada and our vision of Canada and that is the proper subject matter for a discussion of constitutional change.

Mr. Speaker, I know how easy it is to criticize. In my four years as Leader of the Opposition I found it simple and even entertaining to be the devil's advocate, to be the chief critic. But I was struck when I reviewed my own response to Premier Pawley the day he returned to the House from signing the Meech Lake Accord by a sense that this is an issue above partisan politics.

I have quoted a number of Canadians in these remarks today. None of them have been members of my political Party. But I would like to close my remarks by quoting from one Progressive Conservative:

"I thank the Premier for his statement to the House today, and I compliment him for the efforts and the effect that his participation in the constitutional talks had. I know this is an example of the kind of achievement that can occur as a result of good will on the part of all participants.

"All of us know the great differences of opinion that exist among the regions of Canada. That was overcome

by a sincere desire to achieve the purpose of ensuring that Quebec could join as a signatory to the Constitution. With that good will there, with the leadership of the Prime Minister and all of the Premiers, and certainly including the Premier of Manitoba, that was achieved.

"We will look forward to the public hearing process. We will assure the Premier and the people of Manitoba that we consider the process to be important and one that should be meaningful, and we will do all in our power to assure that it is meaningful."

\* (1140)

I apologize for quoting myself, Mr. Speaker.

As I began my remarks today, I said that the former Premier of Manitoba had accepted an obligation to introduce the Meech Lake Accord into this Legislature. This House accepted that obligation in approving the Speech from the Throne that opened this Session.

Today I have begun the process of discharging that obligation that we have all accepted in good faith. I hope that we will all continue to display good faith throughout the process of debate and public hearings on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to set aside partisan political interests in these discussions. I urge each man and woman in this House to view these discussions as an opportunity to participate actively and positively in nation-building. In the first step, that is Meech Lake, and in the subsequent steps of ongoing constitutional renewal and cooperative federalism. Thank you very much.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Rouge (Mr. James Carr), that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I have not had a chance to discuss it fully. I am prepared to speak today and allow the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Sharon Carstairs) to speak on Monday. There is still some time.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** If leave is going to be granted to speak today, then I will speak.

**Mr. Doer:** This is a very important debate. We are prepared to adjourn the debate, by leave, and follow on Monday.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**Mr. James McCrae (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, shall we call it 12:30?

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to call it 12:30? (Agreed)

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