

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, September 29, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

* (1005)

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Yesterday in this House the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) raised a point of order based on remarks made by the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation (Mr. Connery). At that time you took the matter under advisement until you were able to review Hansard.

Later that same day the Minister confirmed his remarks outside of the Chamber. This morning we have further confirmation in the unedited version of Hansard, although in this case the remarks are attributed to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). As you have often noted, all Members of this House are Honourable Members. An incidence such as the one yesterday, if left on the record and not addressed by the House, reflects on us all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Members of this House are honourable, and I believe that no Member of this House wants to leave on the record any reflection on the heritage or profession of any other Member of the House. Therefore, I move, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), that the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation (Mr. Connery) be asked to withdraw his comments and to apologize to the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) and to the House.

Mr. Speaker: On the matter of privilege raised by the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock), I would like to comment that it is a matter that I have already taken under advisement on a point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), but I do realize that a matter of privilege is a very serious matter, and at this time I would entertain comments by the other House Leaders if they so wish.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to withdraw any comment that I made yesterday that was found offensive to the Members opposite or to Members of this House. I can assure you though, Mr. Speaker, there was no thought, intent, deliberate or otherwise, to have any racial aspersions or intent with that statement. There was none, but for other words I apologize and I withdraw those comments.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Chair is satisfied. It does conclude the matter on the point of order raised yesterday and I believe on the matter of privilege raised here this morning.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the First Report of the Committee on Public Accounts.

Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts presents the following as their First Report.

Your committee met on Tuesday, January 26, and Thursday, January 28, 1988, and Monday, January 23, 1989, at 10 a.m.; and Thursday, January 26, 1989, at 7 p.m. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building; and Thursday, September 28, 1989, at 10 a.m. in Room 255, to consider the Public Accounts and the Annual Reports of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1987, and March 31, 1988.

On January 23, 1989, your committee accepted the resignation of Ms. Hemphill as a Member of the committee and elected Mr. Cowan to replace her. On January 26, 1989, the committee accepted the resignations of Messrs. Roch, Gilleshammer and Storie, and elected Mr. Kozak, Hon. Mr. Downey and Mr. Harper to replace them. On March 16, 1989, the committee accepted the resignation of Mr. Lamoureux as a Member of the committee and elected Mr. Alcock to replace him.

Your committee received all information desired by any Member from Mr. Fred Jackson, Provincial Auditor; Mr. John Singleton, Assistant Provincial Auditor; Mr. Rick Mayer, Director—Special Audits; the Minister of Finance; Mr. Charles Curtis, Deputy Minister of Finance; Mr. Eric Rosenhek, Comptroller Division; and staff from the Provincial Auditor's Department and Department of Finance with respect to the Public Accounts and the Annual Reports of the Provincial Auditor.

Prior to the passing of the Annual Reports of the Provincial Auditor and Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1988, your committee adopted the following recommendations:

THAT the Minister of Finance consider implementation of accounting standards for employee pension obligations in Government financial statements, as recommended in November, 1988, by the Public Sector Accounting and Auditing Committee of The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, namely:

(A) Defined Benefit Pension Plans

- (1) The statement of financial position should account for the pension liability and the statement of revenues and expenditures should account for the pension-related expenditures on the basis of the value of the pension benefits attributed to employee service to the accounting date.
- (2) An accrued benefit method should be used to attribute the cost of pension benefits to the periods of employee service.

- (3) The projected benefit method prorated on services should be used to attribute the cost of pension benefits to the periods of employee service.
 - (4) Marketable pension fund assets should be valued at market-related values.
 - (5) Non-marketable pension fund assets should be valued at cost.
 - (6) Actuarial assumptions should be based on the Government's best estimates of expected long-term experience and short-term forecasts.
 - (7) Actuarial assumptions should be internally consistent.
 - (8) Estimation adjustments due to experience gains and losses and changes in actuarial assumptions should be amortized to the liability and the related expenditure in a systematic and rational manner over the expected average remaining service life of the related employee group.
 - (9) The amount of any unamortized estimation adjustments should be disclosed in the notes to the financial statements.
 - (10) The cost of plan amendments related to prior period employee services should be accounted for in the period of the plan amendment.
 - (11) Gains and losses determined upon a plan settlement or curtailment should be accounted for in the period of the settlement or curtailment.
 - (12) Financial statements should disclose:
 - (i) a description of pension plans, benefit formulae and funding policy;
 - (ii) the amounts of each component of the pension liability and the pension related expenditures;
 - (iii) unamortized estimation adjustments and the periods of amortization;
 - (iv) a description of significant changes to pension plans during the period;
 - (v) assumptions about long-term inflation rates; and
 - (vi) the date of the most recent actuarial valuation performed for accounting purposes.
- (B) Defined Contribution Pension Plans
- (1) For defined contribution plans:
 - (i) The pension liability should be the difference between the amount a Government was required to contribute and the amount that was contributed to the accounting date including accumulated interest on any outstanding amounts payable to the fund at the accounting date;
 - (ii) The pension liability should be accounted for in the statement of financial position;
 - (iii) The pension expenditure should be the amount of required contributions provided for employees' services rendered in the accounting period. Interest accrued during the period on any outstanding amounts payable to the fund should be accounted for as a pension interest expenditure; and
 - (iv) The pension expenditure and the pension interest expenditure should be accounted for in the statement of revenues and expenditures.
 - (2) For defined contribution plans, financial statements should disclose:
 - (i) a description of pension plans, contribution formulae and funding policy; and
 - (ii) a description of significant changes to pension plans during the period.
- (C) Implementation
- (1) The initial unrecorded pension liability should be accounted for in the statement of financial position as a change in accounting policy applied retroactively.
 - (2) Financial statements should disclose whether prior period amounts have been restated.
- (D) Timing of Actuarial Valuations
- Actuarial valuations of pension obligations for accounting purposes should be done at least once every three years.
- Your committee considered the Public Accounts and the Annual Reports of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal years ended March 31, 1987, and March 31, 1988, and adopted the same as presented.
- All of which is respectfully submitted.
- Mr. Herold Driedger:** I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), that the report of the committee be received.
- MOTION presented and carried.**
- TABLING OF REPORTS**
- Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** I would like to table this morning the Annual Report of the Public Schools Finance Board. In addition, I would like to table the Annual Report of Brandon University, the Annual Report of the University of Winnipeg, and the Annual Report of the University of Manitoba.
- * (1010)
- Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** I am pleased to table the 1988 1989 Annual Report of the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Hon. Jack Penner (Minister of Rural Development): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce for Legislative Review Supplementary Information for the 1989-90 Estimates for the Department of Rural Development.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 14—THE LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 14, The Liquor Control Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la réglementation des alcools.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that all Members of the House will support this Bill. The amendments that are being proposed are very minor, but they are very symbolic. They are designed to put a minimum amount of fines for underage drinkers who are caught drinking in establishments. It becomes symbolic, and I think it is very important that we, in the strongest possible terms, deliver messages to the youth through education process, through the high school, that underage drinking is an illegal offence punishable in the courts and I would respectfully request, Sir, that all Members of the House support this Bill and lend the volumes of educated and moral support to the problem that is quickly becoming apparent.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

BILL NO. 44—THE TRAVEL INDUSTRY ACT

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 44, The Travel Industry Act; Loi sur l'industrie du tourisme.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, this is not a minor amendment or symbolism in any way; this is a brand new Act. Manitoba has not had a travel Act in its history. So far this year, six travel firms have folded in Manitoba. Fortunately they have all been soft landings, and there have been no consumer losses as a result. As there are many signs of an upcoming recession, and coupled with the dramatic doubling of charter seats in the last two years in the Toronto market, the potential for losses is increasing.

A Travel Industry Act would do many things, Mr. Speaker. One, it would provide a fund for reimbursement of customers' monies when a supplier defaults. No. 2, it would provide strict rules of what constitutes fair and accurate advertising. It would provide financial accountability, it would provide standards for agency personnel, it requires that all firms must be registered in Manitoba in order to operate in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, every month in Ontario several thousand dollars are paid out to customers from retail agents

or tour operators that have closed their doors. The Travel Industry Association would administer the fund of some half million dollars which would be collected from agents and tour operators. While B.C. and Quebec also have Travel Industry Acts, this Bill is patterned more on the Ontario experience.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is preventative medicine. I believe it is time to act before major disaster befalls us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Sustainable Development Centre Site Announcement

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the continued abuse of our environment has been acknowledged by all in this House and, indeed, by most world leaders as the No. 1 threat facing the future of this planet.

* (1015)

A year ago this week, Manitobans were proud to hear that a world class centre for sustainable development was to be centred here in Manitoba. However, in the 12 months in which we have been waiting for this development, we have seen this Government not only sell off the future of the Souris River to the Rafferty-Alameda Project but has been willing to have one-fifth of their province stripped of forest in order to sell pulp to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, although this Government has no idea what sustainable development is all about, we are still awaiting the centre for sustainable development.

Can the Premier at least tell this House when we are to have the centre and where it will be located?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, because I know that the Member for Selkirk would not want to leave false information on the record, although I think it is becoming an epidemic with that side of the House, particularly with the Liberal Party, I would say that she ought to know that, and it is unfortunate that she and her colleagues have not followed the environmental hearings with respect to the Repap development. They are going through the entire process of public hearings, in which case their entire plans are being reviewed and it has the most progressive, most enlightened arrangement anywhere in the country, in the history of our country, that every tree that is harvested by Repap must be replaced by a growing tree—

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Filmon: —one growing tree for every tree that is harvested. There is no such thing as stripping one-fifth of the forestry of this province. Every growing tree that is harvested will be replaced by a growing tree, not just a planted tree but a growing tree. This is the most progressive agreement in the country.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to our leadership in sustainable development, we are recognized across the

country and indeed throughout the world as being leaders in sustainable development, in the development of policies that harmonize with economic development, with the environment, and all of those kinds of things. We are indeed being seen as leaders.

Therefore, last fall the Prime Minister announced the development of the Sustainable Development Centre here in Manitoba. That was reconfirmed in this year's throne speech in Ottawa. Work has been progressing between our province and the federal Government with a senior officials working group who are putting together the plans, Mr. Speaker, and the plans have been progressing very well.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please. I would like to remind all Honourable Members that lengthy questions, multipart questions, do tend to lead to lengthy answers.

Forest Management Clear Cutting

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that this Government supports clear cutting over 108,000 square kilometres of the forest in its sale to Repap. Now we see yet another forest in Gypsumville to be clear cut.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) tell this House when this Government will bring forward a policy on sustainable forestry, which means to allow clear cut after cut in perpetuity to take place with knowledgeable harvesting, not clear cutting?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): I indicate to the Honourable Member that the practice with respect to forest harvesting that has in fact been in place for the last 15, 16, 17 years is currently under review in the licensing process that my Premier referred to. But more importantly perhaps, it is our intention to commence fairly quickly the major review, including forestry management of Phase 2 of the project at Repap. At that point in time, Honourable Members, indeed interested members of the public will have an opportunity to review the forestry practices, the forestry management regimes that we will be putting in place.

Mrs. Charles: Mr. Speaker, the LGD of Grahamdale has seen their forest devastated this spring by fire. Now, well after this decision has been made, they are told that their last mature standard jackpine is to be clear cut.

My question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) is: when will your department become involved with our environment and halt this attack on our future?

* (1020)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I find it passing strange that this Member of the Legislature is criticizing us for actions in the Gypsumville area in the Interlake. She is the one who held a news conference with her colleague, the Member for Springfield (Mr.

Roch), and said that we ought not to be spending so much time and resources fighting the fire in the Interlake—(interjection)—but we ought to, she said instead, you should be spending more—

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

Mrs. Charles: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that in reviewing that with the newspeople, they realized they misquoted me in the press conference—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. What is the point? The Honourable Member did not have a point of order. The Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), with a new question.

Red River Management Plan

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have a new question to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings). The citizens of Winnipeg are very concerned that they have safe, clean, water to drink. We have heard this Government expound on its efforts to ensure that supply, and we would applaud any of these efforts.

However, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Ann Adkins, a microbiologist for the University of Winnipeg, tested the Red River this summer and found it to be 120 times above the safety guidelines. Users of the Red River are at risk of developing severe gastrointestinal disorders.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) is simple. What is he going to do about the condition of the Red River, and when is it going to happen?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Liberal Opposition suffers from the same misunderstanding as the third Party does when they refer to actions that we are embarking on with the City of Winnipeg to improve the quality of water and doing that by licensing and controlling the discharges that go into the rivers in this province.

The obvious concern that the Member has about Shoal Lake and the quality of water that Manitoba receives from Shoal Lake, again they need to be a little bit more cognizant of the discussion and of the answers that have been given in this House. We are progressing very quickly, No. 1, on the Consolidated Professor issue, and No. 2, onto a further base and management plan. I am sure they will be pleased with the results.

Red River Health Concerns

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, while this Minister talks there is possibility of bacteria causing illnesses from typhus and cholera to be in the river, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). What is he doing to ensure the safety of those who come in contact with the Red River water?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the issue my honourable friend raises is an

issue that has been before successive Governments for a number of years. I need not remind my honourable friend from Selkirk that the constituency she represents today was represented for seven years by a Premier and no action was taken. I congratulate my Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) for taking a pro-active approach to resolve the problem in co-operation with the City of Winnipeg.

Red River City of Winnipeg

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Does he support the \$41,000 spent by the City of Winnipeg on a brochure aimed at telling us about what a great job the city is doing in keeping the Red River clean, and if not, what is he doing to ensure that the City of Winnipeg will comply with The Clean Environment Act?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we expressed this on the floor in the Legislature many times that the Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings), myself, and our staff have been meeting with the City of Winnipeg to solve the problems that were unsolved by the previous administration.

* (1025)

Family Services Mary Humphrey Removal

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). For weeks now we have been asking the Government to clear the air on the status of the director of the Child Care Office. We have received numbers of letters, and so has the Premier, one of which was referenced in today's media about the concern of the child care community as a whole on scapegoating a meritorious public employee. I would ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon) today to clear the air completely for the community and confirm that Mary Humphrey will stay in her job as director of the Child Care Branch in the Department of Family Services.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), being a former Minister, knows that personnel matters are matters that are carried on within the department between employees and management, and senior management. Anytime that changes are made with respect to employee status, they are well reported. They are well discussed. He may be aware of some changes that have been made to staff in my department that have certainly been well-known and made public. This Government has nothing to hide and will be happy to make public any decisions that it makes, and that is the case with respect to anybody who works for this Government.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, there are enough problems between the child care community, both the professional

people, the volunteers, and the children, without confusing the issues of where the status of this individual, who has credibility in the child care community, is.

Can the Premier (Mr. Filmon) please give the public, the public that is crying out for a straight answer, an answer on whether Mary Humphrey will be the director of the Child Care Branch in the Department of Family Services? It is very important, when this issue becomes so public, that the Premier clears the air publicly. We have asked the Minister, we have asked the Minister of the Status of Women (Mrs. Hammond), and I think it is time for the Premier to show leadership and tell us where this position is and where that individual stands with the public of Manitoba.

Mr. Filmon: Personnel decisions with respect to various departments in the Government are not made by the Premier, and that is the case. So there is no need for the Premier to clear the air when the Premier is not involved in making decisions with regard to personnel in those departments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Doer: We ask the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Hammond), we ask the Minister responsible for Family Services (Mrs. Oleson)—people are writing the Premier every day. We have a copy of a letter that says, we are deeply disturbed at the recent disintegration of the Child Care Office and most especially about the apparent scapegoating of Mrs. Humphrey. That is going to the Premier. We are calling on the Premier, who is the chief executive officer of this province responsible for all of the departments, to clear the air and clear the air today so we can get on with the other issues in our child care community.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I will assure the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) that I respond to all correspondence, and any letters that I get from people asking questions about all matters will be responded to very clearly.

Mr. Doer: The Premier is showing absolutely no leadership at all. We have a potential crisis in our province. Instead of acting in a peacekeeping role and a leadership role, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is escalating a war, which I think is tragic for the children, the parents and the child care community in this province.

Child Care Association Meeting Request

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my final question to the Premier is: in light of the fact that he was able to speak about the child care situation at the Chamber of Commerce luncheon yesterday, and in light of the fact the Child Care Association has asked the Premier for a direct meeting, why has the Premier not responded to a meeting with the Child Care Association and will he, today, agree to meet the Child Care Association on a priority basis because of the urgent crisis in our child care community?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): This is a multipart question. Let me tell him two things.- (interjection)- Mr.

Speaker, if you will give me the time, I will respond to every single interjection, every single question, every single cheap shot from that side of the House, but I need the time, and this Member has asked many questions.

Firstly, I have responded to the Manitoba Child Care Association with respect to their request for a meeting.

No. 2, if there is, indeed, a crisis that somebody is attempting to develop with respect to child care in this province, it is the New Democratic Party and their friends who are fomenting it. It is his Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) who comes in here grandstanding, dumping peanuts in the Legislature. It is his Member for St. Johns who goes around this province trying to foment a strike to the detriment of the children in care in this province.

* (1030)

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

Mr. Doer: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be clear to you and all Members of this House that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), unfortunately, is impugning motives in terms of raising these questions, which I think is unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member does not have a point of order. The Honourable First Minister.

Mr. Filmon: I am not impugning any motives. I am telling him that it is the irresponsibility of him and his colleague, the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), who are attempting to create a crisis in this province, who are coming in here and dumping peanuts, who are every day urging the child care workers of this province to go on strike.

We have made our commitment. We have indicated to the child care community a 45 percent increase in less than 16 months in child care funding in this province. We have put \$13 million of additional funding into day care in this province in less than 16 months in Government, Mr. Speaker. We have made our commitment to quality child care. We are doing everything we can to ensure quality child care in this province.

Manitoba Telephone System Northern Telecom Contract

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Again, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System (Mr. Findlay). The Minister announced yesterday that MTS has awarded 166 million contract to Northern Telecom to install new equipment. That is 166 by the way for every man, woman and child in this province. It is a contract in which the production will be done on Northern Telecom's—they have not decided that. It will be either their Alberta, Ontario facilities; there will not be in Manitoba. Considering that Northern Telecom has a plant in Winnipeg which employs over 500 people, why did the Minister not insist that this work be done in Manitoba?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System): I will try to give the Member a little bit of education on how Northern Telecom runs its plants across Canada and hope that he will understand why the process is done the way it is.

Mr. Speaker, it was a bulk tender bid to get a bid for digital switches over the next six years of the service of the future program. By the bulk bid process they saved \$30 million. Northern Telecom has plants spread across the country and, for efficiency purposes, they do the construction of certain kinds of equipment in the different plants. Over the past few months Northern Telecom has undergone some streamlining of their operations. They closed down a plant in Quebec and moved jobs to Winnipeg. From there they produced products in Winnipeg that are sold across the country and worldwide. It is a world leading plant with the nature of telecommunications equipment they produce here, but the digital switches that we are producing are produced for efficiency reasons in plants outside of Manitoba. So Manitoba is a clear winner in terms of the saving in the contract of \$30 million. They are a clear winner in terms of a solid 500 jobs in the City of Winnipeg whose products are sold elsewhere in the world, and we are very pleased to have them.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Minister did not insist that these jobs be done in Manitoba. It is my understanding that one of the other three bidders on this contract was prepared to open a plant in Manitoba to perform this and probably other work. Why was this option not pursued? Is it because as the Minister has stated, "the provincial Government has no objections to sending work elsewhere"?

Mr. Findlay: That Party has talked about not wanting interference with Crown corporations, not wanting interference with Crown corporations and taking the lowest bid and now he gets up and says, interfere, interfere. Northern Telecom is the only company that bid that has a presence in Manitoba, the only company.

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that his colleagues in Ottawa have taken away the CF-18, have taken away the Canadair plan, are—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Roch: Mr. Speaker, the Minister clearly had the ability, the opportunity to insist that a contract, a job be done here in Manitoba. He did not. Why did this Minister, given the fact that his colleagues in Ottawa are doing their utmost to destroy the economy of this province, not insist that this job either be done in Manitoba or consider the other option of which a company would indeed build a brand new plant and create more jobs here in Manitoba?

Mr. Findlay: If we follow his line of thinking, Mr. Speaker, we would have created an instant site here for jobs to

create digital switches, and we would have allowed a contract in Saskatchewan or B.C. to have taken the 500 jobs out of Manitoba. Is that what he wanted? I mean we are taking a rational approach of dealing with interprovincial barriers so we can guarantee the 500 jobs in Manitoba in a non-union shop because the wages and the conditions for work are so good that the workers would not want the interference that that kind of Member is promoting in terms of contracts that are tendered in this province. We will never do that sort of interference.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Order. Order. The Honourable Member for Springfield, on a point of order.

Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield): Let the record show that the Minister has refused to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member knows fully well we do not comment on Ministers not answering questions. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

Substance Abuse Federal Rehabilitation Funding

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Yesterday, the Minister stated in this House that the ADTR, The Alcohol Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Agreement, which he has regrettably yet to sign with the federal Government, was, and I quote the Minister, the offer of temporary 50-cent federal dollar. Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. The five-year cap originally set on that program was lifted some months ago by the federal Government. The funding has been extended indefinitely.

Last year there was \$10 million available nationwide. We got none. This year, until March 31, 1990, there is an additional \$20 million, and unless he signs this agreement we will get none of that. Will he finally access Manitoba's fair share of this agreement?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, not that I want to try and point out some basic facts to my honourable friend, but past federal Governments have undertaken, with provincial joint funding, various projects. After the projects are in place, with promises and commitments similar to what we are facing in this one, federal contributions have declined or been curtailed, leaving the province with the entire bill.

We will access that fund for the benefit of Manitobans, the taxpayers of Manitoba, and those who need services. But, Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns that I have had and have expressed to the federal Government is that they insist on the narrowed rehabilitative treatment aspect of drug and alcohol abuse. We find that we would prefer to share a much extensive education and promotion program with the federal Government, but we are unable to do that. Mr. Speaker, because of the narrowed criterion of the federal policy.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, I do not have much faith in his cousins in Ottawa either, but I do think we should access funds that are available to us.

Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba Budget Reduction

* (1040)

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister kept referring yesterday to programs delivered through the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, but this very Minister has cut \$7,400 from service directorate and he has given program delivery 1.6 percent of an increase, well below the rate of inflation.

How does he expect AFM to deliver new programs when they do not even have the money to deliver the programs they are mandated to do now?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the obligation of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba has not changed. It has not changed in the last month, the last 16 months, or indeed in the last number of years. The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba operates on a budget in excess of \$10 million. They operate a number of programs. Those programs serve a variety of clients in Manitoba and meet changing needs and priorities within the addictions and alcoholism problems faced by some Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, the range of programs available to and available from the AFM constantly changes and continues to do so to meet emerging needs in addiction of not only drugs but alcohol. They are a partner with Government in assuring we deliver the best quality program available to the people of Manitoba.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, but the AFM itself acknowledges that they are unable to deliver enough programs to the youth of this province who need them.

Amalgamation - Health

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister tell this House today if it is the plan of his Government to merge AFM with the Department of Health? What delays will that result in future programs to serve young people in Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, obviously my honourable friend has dug up, I guess, a six-year-old report called the Pascoe Report in which one of the recommendations was to merge the AFM with the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

Mr. Speaker, that recommendation has been before Government for a number of years. That was one of the very first issues that I discussed upon becoming Minister of Health with the Chairman of the Board. I can tell my honourable friend that is a recommendation that from time to time is undertaken and reviewed by Government. We have no intention of following through with that recommendation. It is one of many that is made from time to time. My honourable friend, if she was more current in her research, would know that we are not planning to merge the two.

Women's Pavilion Nursery Environmental Concerns

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): My question is for the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), and I want to reiterate what both I and the Minister of Health said yesterday, that the babies in the intermediate care nursery in the Health Sciences Centre are getting excellent care from the nurses. The fact that the infection rate is low is a credit to the quality of nursing that is given there, but we know these conditions are a disaster waiting to happen.

The Minister has been receiving information since January. During this time staff has complained about environmental stress and health problems. Nurses are reporting that they are unable to provide safe care and the Department of Occupational Environmental Medicine and the Maintenance Department have both reported unsafe conditions. What steps is the Minister taking to deal today with the dangerous overcrowding in the intermediate nursery, to deal with the serious environmental problems in the nursery and to deal with the serious potential for cross contamination?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, following my honourable friend's questions yesterday, I reiterate there are now two plans of action. One of them from yesterday that I indicated that, after 10 years of planning for redevelopment, including the intermediate care nursery, those plans are actively being proceeded with and will be completed by this Government.

Secondly, as a result of my honourable friend's question—and I find it very interesting that my honourable friend had this information presumably six weeks ago and chose the forum of Question Period to bring it forward. As a result of Question Period yesterday, some very immediate steps are being taken by the Health Sciences Centre, namely in moving, I believe, six or eight of the slots to another floor and making some operational changes. But I reiterate that the staff and the people delivering care at the intermediate nursery have done an excellent job. The conditions have been trying and that is absolutely of no question. Mr. Speaker, we are moving in intermediate steps as well as long-term steps to resolve the problem.

Nursery Improvements

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): I know we are all pleased to see that both the Minister and the administrator feel that this is an important issue and that they are taking steps. I think that they have to outline a little more clearly exactly which steps they are taking so that the parents of the babies who are in the nursery understand what they are going to be. They address some of the questions that are raised in a letter that I want to table. It comes from one of the parents who has recently had the personal experience of having a baby in the nursery and raises a number of concerns related to the nursery being hot, crowded, not safe, and lacking adequate rooms.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member's question is?

Ms. Hemphill: Will the Minister indicate what steps he is taking to deal with such issues as inadequate space for breast-feeding bonding and the parents having time to spend with their babies?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I personally am not taking any steps. The management of the Health Sciences Centre are immediately taking those steps to assure that. The people who are responsible for the management of the budget of the Health Sciences Centre are doing exactly those today.

My responsibility as Minister of Health is to carry out the necessary and achieve approval for the necessary capital expenditures which will achieve the long-term solution. That commitment was made yesterday. That commitment was made several weeks ago to the Health Sciences Centre prior to my honourable friend raising that question. That is my responsibility, to provide adequate funding and capital improvements which will relieve the problem. Those are on track.

Mr. Speaker, the management of the Health Sciences Centre are diligently moving to resolve the operational problems known to my honourable friend for six weeks and brought to the House yesterday.

Mrs. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the Minister that management does not take care of babies, nurses do.

Nurse Recruitment Strategy

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): Will the Minister take immediate steps to deal with the high turnover rate of nurses, where five quit this summer and the difficulty of recruiting nurses for this highly stressful working environment, by allowing job-sharing and part-time jobs with a prorated share of the benefits for nurses as is presently done at the St. Boniface Hospital?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, that may well be an option that the Health Sciences Centre management wishes to pursue to assist in any staffing problems that they have experienced in that area of the hospital. I am sure, if that is a workable solution and the nursing staff are in agreement with that, the management of the Health Sciences Centre would fully entertain that as a partial resolution to the problem.

In the interim, Mr. Speaker, let me assure my honourable friend that action is being taken. This issue is not new to the Government, and we are moving on the capital redevelopment that was before my honourable friends for a number of years and will be completed by this Government to provide quality care for infants in that intermediate care nursery.

Drinking and Driving Initiative Education Programs

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). In the Minister's drinking and driving initiative announced

in May of this year, he committed himself to an aggressive educational campaign aimed at getting the message across that drinking and driving is dangerous and not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Surgeon-General's Report Workshop on Drinking and Driving states in part, and I want to quote very briefly, "The private and public sectors have a shared responsibility to educate and protect the public against impaired drivers." Happily, the private sector has responded; sadly, the public sector has yet to do that.

Mr. Speaker, my question is: Manitoba is already way behind other jurisdictions in this area, when is this Minister going to catch up and make good on his promises made in May of this year?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the Honourable Member. I suggest that in this and other areas relating to impaired driving and suspended driving, Manitoba leads the pack.

Mr. Edwards: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the Minister who cannot put the Alert vehicle on the road for the Christmas drinking and driving season. This is the same Minister.

Drinking and Driving Initiative Education Programs

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): My supplementary for the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). We are particularly far behind—

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

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Actually, I prefer to answer the question raised by the Honourable Member with respect to the Alertmobile. When he makes the allegation that there will be no Alertmobile by this Christmas, I would like to know where the Honourable Member is getting his information?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) does not have a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), kindly put his question now.

* (1050)

Mr. Edwards: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the Minister of Education, we are particularly far behind in this province in educating youth about drinking and driving. We are way behind provinces like Alberta. What has this Minister done to get the message across to youth

in this province that drinking and driving is not cool, not socially acceptable and, in fact, wreaks havoc on youth? It is a leading cause of death, and some 3,000 youths in this province under the age of 19—

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

Mr. Edwards: —were injured or killed in motor vehicle accidents in 1987. What is this Minister doing to address that?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I think all of society and all Members in this House particularly know and have experienced, I guess in their communities, incidents where drinking and driving have resulted in tragedy to families and to the community. No one wants to continue on that kind of a route.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say in all sincerity that the Department of Education is working together with the Department of Health and the Minister of Justice's (Mr. McCrae) department in putting together programs that are, in fact, going to make people in Manitoba aware of the dangers of drinking and driving.

Through my department, Mr. Speaker, there are several initiatives, and we are working with several agencies, the Manitoba Alcoholism Foundation, the Manitoba High School Athletic Association, many organizations that we are working with on a continuous basis, not only to address the dangers of alcohol, but also drug abuse which is becoming a serious problem in this province.

Mr. Speaker, those results that perhaps the Member opposite is expecting cannot be seen overnight. But I can assure him in all diligence that we are working very aggressively towards ensuring that Manitoba is the leader in this whole—

Mr. Speaker: Order, the Honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear that they are working together. The fact is this was referenced in the Speech from the Throne in 1988. How long are we going to have to wait?

Drinking and Driving Initiative Education Programs

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): This is my final question for the Minister of Health. The Minister says federal funds available in this area are too narrow for his broad educational purposes. Mr. Speaker, what new initiatives has this Minister taken to educate the public about the dangers of drinking and driving, given that same Surgeon-General's Report goes on to state, education does not occur in a vacuum, it must be a part of a comprehensive public health approach to driving while impaired that includes social and environmental action?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, I would offer the services of staff from the Alcoholism Foundation of

Manitoba to him who can take him through the number of support programs, not only in the schools but in co-operation with superintendents and trustees, whereby a number of programs that have been successfully in place do just that for the students of Manitoba.

They involve, Mr. Speaker, on a co-operative basis, members of the City of Winnipeg and the RCMP, in terms of educational seminars and presentations to students in high schools, discussing the problems with drinking as a youth. There are even previous reformed individuals who have been addicted to alcohol and drugs who are available for those kinds of lectures in co-operation with the school system and AFM. I would be pleased to have my honourable friend be made aware—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mini-Skool Closure Replacement

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). Today the Jefferson Mini-Skool closes its doors. Parents of at least 13 children are left without any care arrangements for their children. Many others have been placed in inadequate situations.

The Minister knew about the situation at the end of July, did nothing. She had received letters from the group, has done nothing.

On Tuesday of this week she said in the House she had met with the group. She did not meet with the group.

I would like to ask the Minister if she would like to clarify the apparent misinformation she has placed on the record and to give her an opportunity today to indicate that she is prepared to meet with this parents' group who have asked for assistance in establishing a parent-run co-op day care and make it possible so that all children are placed in adequate care arrangements?

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): If I gave the impression that I had met with the group, I apologize. I indicated that staff had met with the group, and if I left the wrong impression or said it incorrectly, I do apologize.

I had indicated that I had gotten a letter from the parent group, my staff immediately met with them to discuss options of how they could form a day care centre of their own. Previous to that, however, as soon as we knew the date that they were closing, staff sent information to the centre, the Jefferson centre, indicating to them what spaces were available in the neighbourhood and tried in every way to help parents find spaces for their children.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Well, I would hope the Minister will tell that to Sharon Dyck and Barb Lemanski and Anna Draper and others who have not received any assistance from this Minister.

Day Care Parent Co-op Funding

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): My question to the Minister is this. Given that this group of parents is desperately trying to put in place a parent-run co-op day care but needs some assistance and resources from this Government, will she agree today to provide some start-up funds for the ex parents and children of the Jefferson Mini-Skool so that they can put in place a co-operative day care in their own community?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that staff are working with this group to attempt to come to a resolution of the problem and they will continue to work with them.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for St. Johns, with her final supplementary question.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: My final supplementary to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) is this. Will she indicate in the House today that she is prepared to consider the request, the formal request from this group, to assist them financially to tap the fund of the \$75,000 start-up grant that she has mentioned in her most recent announcement and ensure that this group has some of those funds so that they can put in place this day care? They cannot do it on their own. Thirteen children are left homeless, these parents are in a quandary. Will the Minister do something today?

Mrs. Oleson: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member will want to change her wording. These children are certainly not left homeless. In answer to the Member's question concerning the funding, I indicated to her that we are looking at the problem. My staff is meeting with this group, and the \$75,000 that she refers to was a policy decision of this Government to assist with workplace day care. She is getting the funds mixed up.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Do I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Carr: At sundown today, Jewish people all over the world will be celebrating Rosh Hashana, the Jewish New Year. It may be of some interest to Members of this House to know that this is the year 5750 on the Jewish calendar. Mr. Speaker, this is time for reflection on the year past, on renewal and on celebration

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

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

Mr. Carr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But even beyond the religious significance of Rosh Hashana, it is time

for families to get together to renew old acquaintances. Very often sons and daughters, uncles and aunts and grandparents will come from thousands of miles so that families can gather in synagogues together to celebrate the Jewish New Year. On behalf of our Party and I am sure all Members of this Assembly, I wish the Jewish community of Manitoba, Happy Rosh Hashana, Good Yam-Tov and a Happy New Year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bills 27, 31, 32, 6 and the rest in the order listed on the Order Paper?

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 27—THE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), Bill No. 27, The Fiscal Stabilization Fund Act; Loi sur le Fonds de stabilisation des recettes, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock). (Stand)

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise on behalf of our caucus to speak on this very important piece of legislation which indeed was hotly debated in the last election. Of course, we made our position known at that time, having studied the law in detail and studied the effects of the law.

* (1100)

We support the repeal of final offer selection in this province. We feel that it is an unwarranted intrusion into the labour relations environment. We share the concerns of the many union leaders which spoke out at the committee stage on this issue and continue to oppose final offer selection as a means of settling disputes. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that disputes are settled by final offer selection, that is true. It is a mechanism by which a settlement is forced and let me briefly go over some of the details of how final offer selection works, because I think it is important to get beyond the rhetoric that has surrounded this issue, and get into the specifics. I think it is the specifics of this which have led many of the more enlightened union leaders to oppose this as a way to deal with potential strikes and the strike threats which face our province.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, there are two windows in which final offer selection can be applied for. In those

windows a final offer selection request can be made by either management or labour. However, after the request has been made, it automatically goes to a vote of the union membership and, that results in a number of things. First, it is assumed that in most circumstances the union will have the support of its members, and that certainly is the case in most organized workshops in Manitoba. That in effect means that the union, given that they have the support of their membership, can achieve the final offer selection process.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, when management asks for final offer selection, I think we can assume that, especially leading up to a contract expiry date, or in the course of a strike, the management is not likely to have the support of the workers. That is simply a fact of the strike situation or the pre-strike situation. That in effect means, putting it very bluntly, that one side has a gun which is loaded, the other side does not have that loaded gun. It may have the gun, and it can pull the gun and ask for final offer selection, but it has no bullet because in the vast majority of situations it will not of course have the support of the workers.

That I think, in essence, reflects how this works and we have statistics put forward by the third Party ostensibly to show that final offer selection does work. They suggest that a settlement, a contract, is a contract, is a contract. They suggest that to get any contract is better than a strike always. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that. I think that if they knew and had studied the labour relations environment in this jurisdiction and how it developed, and how it developed in the common law world, they would realize that it was built on the premise that the parties would negotiate in good faith and would attempt to come to a solution which would best serve the workplace, best serve the employees and the employer.

Mr. Speaker, the ultimate weapon of the two sides, of course, are the lockout and the strike. It is regrettable when strikes occur. We all lose by strikes, but it is sometimes necessary to settle a dispute. That is the fact of our labour relations system. To bring in anything which can expedite or assist the settlement process in the spirit of negotiation, we applaud, and many of those things have been put into our legislative framework. We make certain people mediators, available both at the provincial and the federal level, to assist in that settling of disputes. Ultimately the union leadership, the negotiators for the workers, are responsible to the workers for their decisions and for the choices made. When they settle a strike, when they feel they have a contract that is acceptable, they take it to the membership for a vote.

(Mr. Harold Gilleshammer, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

This process, this final offer selection process, really subverts the underlying principle behind our labour relations system as it stands today. That is, it says, no, the parties do not know what is best for the workplace; a third person, someone who may have no knowledge of the workplace, both from the employee side or the management side, is the person best able to decide how this workplace is run.

Mr. Acting Speaker, that is the kind of intervention into the marketplace, into the labour relations

relationship which, in my view, erodes the fundamental basis of our whole system. Let us be clear that union leaders opposed final offer selection for good reason and, frankly, I think some of the enunciated reasons, while they are very cogent, do not represent all of the reasons why final offer selection is bad for organized labour in this province.

It strikes me as regrettable, but perhaps not that unpredictable, that the third Party today who was the Government at the time, chose to ignore one of the very rare occasions when labour and management actually agreed on something. They actually came to this committee and pled with the Government not to go ahead with final offer selection.—(interjection)—The Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) says the Manitoba Federation of Labour supported this wholeheartedly. They did, as did the Food and Commercial Workers, but the fact is other unions, the majority of unions that presented at that committee—Mr. Acting Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon goes on to say they are now supporting it; that is absolutely false.

* (1110)

There remain union leaders in this province who opposed final offer selection for a good reason, in fact, leaders in the Manitoba Federal of Labour, experienced leaders, resigned over this very issue. This is an issue which divided, not just the labour relations community, but also divided the Manitoba Federation of Labour itself. As a result, I think of that stated opposition, this Government saw fit to put a clause into the Act which meant that it would be reviewed in a certain period of time.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we have now had the opportunity to look at the results, and they confirm the feeling expressed at that committee stage, and expressed by our caucus, that this is not good for Manitoba's labour relations environment.

I want to go on to say that, as well as being an unwarranted intrusion into the labour relations environment, I believe that final offer selection weakens unions. There is a provision in The Labour Relations Act which says that unions, of course, are responsible to their membership and should not discriminate against their membership. They are ultimately of course, through the democratic process in a workplace, answerable to their employees just as corporations are answerable to their shareholders.

Mr. Acting Speaker, what the final offer selection process does is allow a union leadership to in effect pass the buck for how the workplace is organized and what the future years bring for employees in a workplace. What they can do is ask for final offer selection and, presumably, and of course in the vast majority of cases, they will have the support of their workers to get that final offer selection process. Then they submit their final offer, as does management, to a third party selector. Management, of course, being forced to make that submission and having no recourse to demand final offer selection, as the other side of the labour relationship does.

If the selector chooses, the management side chooses their final offer. The union leadership then can say to

the membership it is not our fault, it is the fault of the selector. He or she chose the other final offer, not ours.

Mr. Acting Speaker, that erodes the fundamental accountability of union leadership to their members because they are not ultimately responsible for a negotiated contract. That is the essence of a union's job in the course of a negotiation and in the course of a strike, to be answerable to the membership. The membership runs the union. They have spokesmen, they have people who do the work at the front lines, who negotiate contracts but, ultimately, accountability of an executive in a union is what unions are all about.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I believe that strong unions, unions that do not fear that accountability, do not like final offer selection for that very reason. They do not mind being answerable for their negotiations and for their successes and for their failures. Final offer selection brings a third party into the process by demand who may know nothing about the workplace, who may know nothing about the needs of the employees, and who may know nothing about the plant, what it manufactures, who its customers are, or what its future is.

That person decides the fate of the workplace. That is to the detriment of the workers primarily, in my view. Of course it is also to the detriment of management because the whole labour relationship suffers. What you get is a contract that the parties do not feel they have participated in. You get a contract that one party knows it has participated in because it is its contract in its entirety which is accepted. Now let us be clear, this is not an ability on a final offer selector to choose something from this contract and something from that contract, and make a contract. This is choosing one in its entirety or the other in its entirety. That will, of course, focus on the major issues.

The major issues such as pay, obviously, in most strikes, or job security, will be the ones which determine which contract is chosen in most cases. All of the rest that are in that contract, all of the other issues that are negotiated and may be very important in the coming years, have to be taken. You can not pick and choose. You have no ability to make the best contract.

That is in contrast I might add to the first contract process whereby that picking and choosing is available. In this case it is not available, and that in my view means that final offer selection does not achieve what its proponents say it does, that is a peaceful workplace. It may end the strike. Will it create a peaceful workplace? Not a chance.

That is not to say that where the parties choose to use final offer selection, by agreement, by consent, they should not be able to do that. Of course, they can, that is their choice. We do not need laws to do that. I said early on in this debate that if there is any way that the Government can assist the parties in using final offer selection should they so choose, that of course is something that the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) and the Department of Labour should facilitate. I am sure they would, as we have mediators and we have the ability for application to the Minister of Labour to appoint a mediator or a final offer selector if the case arose.

In certain industries, certain negotiations, final offer selection is chosen by the parties and that is important to remember. Where the parties choose it, sometimes it can be the best thing. But the fact is, as a rule, in our entire labour relations environment, it erodes and cuts at the basic principles which we stand for in our labour relations environment. That is, we strive for a strong company and a strong union. When they get together to negotiate, we let them do it in good faith. We have laws in this province which say you have to negotiate in good faith, you can not subvert the process. Yet the same act brings in a third party who may know nothing about the workplace by demand of one side of the labour relationship and says that that is somehow in keeping with good faith. It is not.

I could quote at length some of the comments made by the people who presented to the committee. As I have already referenced, it was one of the very rare occasions in the tenure of the previous Government in which both sides agree. I do not propose to go on and reference those comments. I think they stand for themselves. They are on the record and they were made at the committee stage.

I simply want to say that the process, in addition to, I believe, eroding the strength of unions in this province, and I believe that union leaders have recognized that, also is not fair in the way it works itself out in the process. When a window is coming up for final offer selection, management knows that the union has the ability to demand it, given that they have the support of their membership. Management does not have that same opportunity. What has happened is that in an effort to not go to final offer selection in an effort not to have a third party, in effect, dictates what goes on in the workplace, management makes it final offer coming up to that window and with good reason because they do not want the final offer selector to make the choice. Even if they did want the final offer selector to make the choice, they could not demand it. They know there is a gun which is being raised to their head very shortly, so they make their final offer.

Contrary to that—and let us be clear that unions, of course, are very skilled negotiators as well. We have a lot of them in this province. We have a relatively high level of unionization, which of course this caucus applauds. But a union, coming up to that window stage, knows that they can save their final offer for final offer selection. Because they, and they alone, can ask for final offer selection and demand that it takes place.

* (1120)

Mr. Acting Speaker, I simply want to say that I recognize that this issue has split the union community. It has also split the Manitoba Federation of Labour itself. The individuals who resigned at that time, Ms. Lord and Mr. Moist, I hope will sew back the old wounds which divided the Manitoba Federation of Labour. I think we all want a strong Manitoba Federation of Labour. I think that this issue has run its course in this province. It has been unsuccessful; it has caused disruption in the workplace, which is not warranted. It does not stop strikes. In my view it creates unrest in the workplace and will continue to do so. I think that

is supported by the majority of people who spoke to that committee.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I simply want to conclude by saying that I certainly think that it is time that we tried to have a Government that struck a balance in the labour relationship. We have had successive Governments in this province, which could speak to only one side of the labour relationship, and that is unfortunate. The politicization of the Department Labour is very unfortunate. Because as the labour management review body proves—which joins labour and management—when the parties get together in good faith and talk about the labour relationship and the labour environment in this province, it is my experience that cutting through the rhetoric, cutting through the hostility, both parties are after the same thing. I do not believe enlightened management fears a strong union. I do not believe that enlightened union management fears a strong company. In fact, they should welcome it. They should welcome, and I believe that they do welcome, negotiation in good faith on all issues which are contentious.

Mr. Acting Speaker, our caucus supports speedy passage of this Bill. We have attempted throughout, and we will continue to attempt to cut through the rhetoric, to get to the root of what this Bill and what this process does. We will attempt to sew the wounds in the labour relationship in this province, because we believe that it is time that a balance was struck. Neither Conservatives nor the New Democratic Party have done that for many, many years in this province.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edwards: It is time that this province had politicians who played their proper role in the labour relationship facilitating strong unions, facilitating strong companies, and actively getting engaged and facilitating good faith in negotiations on issues of contention between the parties. That is what we stand for. We believe this Bill is important because it works towards that end and we look for speedy passage. We believe that if the New Democratic Party would step down from the rhetoric and look at the Bill and look at the real effects, they would support this Bill as well. We welcome their comments on this issue and look forward to hearing them speak on this Bill, because I believe that given the split in the union community, they will no doubt realize that this Bill is bad for Manitobans, both worker and employer. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): I move to adjourn debate on Bill 27, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 32—THE CITY OF WINNIPEG AMENDMENT ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), referring to the City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg). (Stand)

**BILL NO. 6—THE LAW REFORM
COMMISSION ACT**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act (Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit), standing in the name of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). (Stand)

**BILL NO. 7—THE INTERNATIONAL
SALE OF GOODS ACT**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), No. 7, The International Sale of Goods Act (Loi sur la vente internationale de marchandises), standing in the name of the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). (Stand)

**BILL NO. 8—THE ENDANGERED
SPECIES ACT**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill No. 8, The Endangered Species Act (Loi sur les espèces en voie de disparition), standing in the name of the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak). (Stand)

**BILL NO. 9—THE FOREST
AMENDMENT ACT**

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill No. 9, The Forest Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les forêts), standing in the name of the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles).

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Acting Speaker, we are blessed with only so many resources in this world, and in Manitoba we have probably more than many nations have. One part of our province's major forest industry occurs—as much as we are known as a prairie province, we do not have to go far north of here to come into our wonderful wilderness, our wonderful areas covered with forest that so many people and so much of nature depends upon.

It has been very discouraging this year to see the method that our forests have been treated by this Government. Earlier on, Mr. Acting Speaker, as you are well aware, we were sitting in committee to discuss the sale of one-fifth of our land area to a company for the purpose of being able to clear cut the forest when the Government would refuse to debate any further the decisions and plans for the sale of this company and, indeed, ended up walking out, leaving the Opposition Members, the minority Government, with a majority Opposition sitting and waiting at their beck and call for us to discuss the future of our province.

It is because of the actions, therefore, of this Government that I can just barely be able to support a Bill that wants, in words, to support a forest and a

forest industry when in fact this Government has no intentions or ideas of how to do that.

I have had many opportunities over the last year to visit small operators which harvest our forest and understand the practices of renewable and sustainable development in the forestry industry. I have been taken way up in the Duck Mountain hills and shown stand after stand of large trees which have been blown over by the wind and are now unuseable for forest products but were not allowed to be cut because of policies of this Government. They were not allowed to be cut by a small forester even though this person knew that the time was limited on these trees and that by harvesting these trees he would be able to encourage the forest to generate new trees and to grow and keep the whole ecosystem, that the forest indicates and presents, as a whole being.

This Government speaks often of how it will be planting one tree for every tree cut and that indeed is an improvement, but it is not a solution. It takes, in this climate, hundreds of years to grow a tree of any size.

Today I spoke of the forest in Gypsumville and I understand that the trees there are about 80 years old, or 10 to 12 inches in circumference. These are not large trees and that gives you an indication of how long it takes, in our climate, to grow trees of any size.

* (1130)

So when we go in and cut away huge tracks, unknown and incomprehensible sizes of tracks of our forests, cut them all down and destroy the culture that has developed around these forests, we are not saying that in 10, 20 years these forests will be regenerated, we are looking at lifetimes. If today a tree is cut in The Pas area, I will never see it in my lifetime grow to be a sizable tree of the one it is replacing.

When we talk about giving away 108 square kilometres of our forests, and over a period of time to have this clear cut, we cannot expect any of us, probably not even our children, to see those forests back to the standards that we today can view them. That, Mr. Acting Speaker, indicates to me, a very shameful situation.

What are the alternatives to the forestry industry? Well we certainly have come to recognize, as a population, the value of recyclable paper. Jurisdictions in other areas have brought in legislation to encourage recycling of paper, to put quotas of recyclable paper that must be used within any given industry. There are options and encouragements to make to the public and to industry, to develop a recycling industry and to encourage those that can recycle to recycle. The energy it takes in recycling paper is very much less than the energy it takes to create new paper. In recycling paper we are saving trees, but we see no indication that this is an area that this Government has any plans of pursuing.

We have the options of encouraging industry to develop its projects here in our province so that at the very least, if we are destroying our resources, we gain some benefit that money can be retained within our

province and put back into industries and programs that will encourage recycling and sustainable development of other areas of our resources. We do not see that.

Repap is only creating an industry that will be further finished in the States. We are not making paper here in Manitoba through the Repap industry, we are making pulp and that will be shipped to the States and generated into a finished product to be used by another nation.

I think this is a beginning of a trend that we will see after the Free Trade Agreement, where our resources will be used by another nation, and we will gain no benefit that someday future generations will wake up and wonder where our water has gone and our trees have gone, where our soil has gone and look to the States and see them having their landfill sites full of our resources.

I do not agree that this is a future that any of us would want to see, but that is in truth the direction we are going. Some faces across the way would indicate that they do not believe this, but study after study is indicating that today is the day we must change things around with the environment because we do not have too many tomorrows left. We have had unfortunately, over this summer, a record number of forest fires that have jeopardized the many areas of our forests in the province. I have yet to hear from the Minister involved any statement on what the plans are in balancing this destruction with the plans of selling our sustainable forests off to the Repap industry. It would seem that when we have already seen a stress of our forests that we should not at the same time negotiate with a company to sell and destroy yet even more of it. We only have a limited amount of forest. It may seem like we have enough to last forever, but that is not the case. It is a limited supply.

Now, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) today spoke of the environmental impact assessment that has been done on the Repap deal, and we have had at many of the hearings Members from our Party attending. I believe we had five Members in total attending the hearings from time to time.

We never heard of a study that has been undertaken to catalogue the whole forest environment, and yet it has been recommended by the Environmental Council that we need a cataloguing of what resources are available and what condition those resources are in. I did not hear that in the environment hearings. How can we know how we are going to affect the forests when we do not know what condition the forests are already in? It seems to me that we are taking stock without even knowing what stock we have.

As to the Bill itself, I cannot say that there are major problems with what is proposed. It is more the problem of what is not proposed. There are minor considerations that I will be discussing when we go into committee, some, it would seem, discrepancies in the translation of some areas.

We have to look at the Bill, and what is the intent of the Government. The intent of the Government is

to appease the environmentalists, it would seem, so that we will not have to face them as lobby groups. I do not think that this Bill is going to succeed in that desire. I hope that in committee we will have group after group come before us and that we will hear from independent foresters, that we will hear from environmental agencies and lobby groups, and hear the whole spectre of what the people feel about our resources, that we cannot just assume that we can use them and throw them away.

We have independent foresters that understand sustainable development, and we have industry that understands clear cutting and profit. The decision of this Government has been to support the latter, and that is not where the future of sustainable development will lie. I will refrain from further comments and discuss this Bill in detail in committee, where I hope, as I have said, that we will hear the lobby efforts of many groups come forward in support of what our province has as a wonderful supply and future in our forests.

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I move, seconded by the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman), that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 12—THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY MANAGEMENT COMMISSION AMENDMENT ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Premier (Mr. Filmon), Bill No. 12, The Legislative Assembly Management Commission Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Commission de régie de l'Assemblée législative), standing in the name of the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). Stand.

* (1140)

BILL NO. 19—THE GROUND WATER AND WATER WELL AMENDMENT ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), No. 19, The Ground Water and Water Well Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les eaux souterraines et les puits), standing in the name of the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles). The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Acting Speaker, again I rise on a Bill presented by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). As the Member for Selkirk, I am very pleased to speak on the condition of our water in the Province of Manitoba.- (interjection)-

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) asked, why is that. That is because this Government continues to support the past Government's willingness to allow a dangerous situation to occur and the pollution of the Red River. The Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) says

that is not true, but if that is what I think, okay. Well, it is what I think because I have not heard any statements made of whole plans laid out by this Government. They keep saying that they will do something about it, that they are talking, that they are discussing it. Well as they talk and discuss it does not get any better.

There are immediate plans that can be undertaken to improve the condition of the Red River and failing that we can have an overriding body that monitors the Red River pollution, so from week to week we can be warned of the dangerous levels that exist. So if it supercedes even the most unbelievable level that does now exist, we can make our own judgment calls of whether we should or should not be on the river.

I find that in this age where we are always supporting tourism, and we have such a wonderful resource as the Red River running right through our City of Winnipeg and on up through Lockport, through the marsh, into the lake, that we abuse it. We are leaving ourselves open, and God forbid it comes true, to a dangerous health situation.

A report came out just lately taken by a doctor of microbiology at the University of Winnipeg saying that levels have exceeded 2,400 parts per 100 milligrams of fecal coliforms in the Red River. This is when it enters the city from 100 to 200 parts per 100 milligrams. There is no doubt that the City of Winnipeg is polluting the Red River. There is no doubt that it also can stop polluting the Red River. It only takes the will of a Government to make that decision.

I can understand that it will not change overnight, and I will support any Government that will at least admit that it has to change and lay out a strategy for how it will change. I do not see this as yet and I hope—(interjection)- The Minister of Seniors (Mr. Downey) says that you will get my support. Well, you will. You certainly will. I will be the first to congratulate you if I can see a plan that will work, come out of this Government along with the City of Winnipeg, to clean up the Red River. It will take a couple of decades to do that, I believe, but there are plans that can be put in place to reduce what now happens to the Red River and it can be done immediately.

In the same lines, I want to commend the Town of Selkirk, the many past councillors and the present council, that has continued to fight the City of Winnipeg in the courts, saying that the City of Winnipeg pollutes the Red River and are willing to put up taxpayers' dollars to argue that. I think it is unfortunate that they as a small community have had to hold the burden of the costs of that lawsuit.

The Ministers are asking me what it has to do with this Bill. (interjection)- I am sorry? Okay, I am corrected. The Minister was asking what does Selkirk do with its sewage. It treats it and the water they put back into the Red River is cleaner than the water they take out of the Red River. I think it may not be perfect, but it certainly is better than the City of Winnipeg. (interjection)- Well, it is the truth. The Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) says that is questionable, but I correct him. It is the truth.

In my area as well, we have other sources of pollution seeping into the Red River, because no one is above improving or having to improve the environment. These many areas are in septic fields and in holding ponds for trailer courts and so forth. We have water leaking from septic fields and polluting ditch after ditch which inevitably ends up running water into the Red River. So that when I see a Bill put forward to improve The Ground Water and Well Water Amendment Act, I have to wonder what impact it will have on our water tables when so much is being done to pollute our water tables without any commitment to improving those areas.

There are major planning problems as the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) and past Minister of Municipal Affairs and I have discussed that we have to face as a Government, as legislators, that will not necessarily be popular with the population. But we have to make these decisions on what is going to be happening to our developments where sewer systems and treatment centres are not available.

Many experts I have spoken to over the last eight years are fearful of the situation taking place, or possibly that will take place, around the City of Winnipeg, where major developments are occurring in large lot systems where septic fields and wells are drilled and placed side by side. There is a limitation to what nature can take and, again, we as people seem to think nothing of abusing it to the point where it becomes a problem, and then trying to deal with a quick fix.

Lots outside of the City of Winnipeg, and some within the City of Winnipeg, with septic fields and wells side by side run the risk of polluting each other. This has happened in several cases in East Selkirk where overuse of land, putting too much effluent into land areas, has caused oversaturation of the land and running down into other people's basements and lots, and indeed affecting the well waters in some areas.

We have a Mr. Landygo that I have spoken of to a couple of Ministers. His problem—where people behind him have continued to expand their house and put in swimming pools and have large septic fields, the land is saturated, and the effluent is ponding in his backyard.

We have another lady in East Selkirk who has come to me for help in that the Housing Department has put up a multifamily unit beside her on a very small lot, and the saturation point continually overloads and she is affected by it.

* (1150)

We have wells in East Selkirk that have been polluted by septic fields, and this will not be the first nor last case where this occurs if some decisions are not made to change the regulations, the monitoring, and the policing of what goes on in our developments. This is going to take the will of all levels of Government to do that. It is not a fault of any one level, nor the solution will be taken by any one level, but I would hope that we can soon see, and more discussion taken place, on how to avoid these situations increasing or developing in the future.

The Bill being discussed allows for the right of entry for Government Services to inspect or deal with

pollution of groundwater or water in a well. I will hope that there has been legal counsel taken on this, and that this does not supersede any rights of the people, but the fact is that even if people can come on and admonish those who abuse their rights.

It still does not help preventing the pollution. Sometimes when pollution takes place, in fact most often when pollution takes place, it cannot be reversed just because it is discovered. I would hope that we can see an addition to this Bill that would encourage more education of what can happen and will happen when certain practices take place, that we will make citizens aware, particularly in the areas of where wells are common place, of what their rights and responsibilities are in drilling wells, and that we will look into the uses of lands and make people aware of what the rights and responsibilities are in ground water pollution.

We have to make sure that we prevent pollution rather than just deal with it after it occurs. We must also be able to in some manner be able to implement and enforce this Bill, and yet within the sections put forward there does not seem to be any measures that that will take place.

I think the most surprising part of this Bill is that it is aimed, or it would seem to be aimed at the small polluters. I use small in quotation marks, because any pollution is really of great impact.

How can this Government put forward proposals to limit individuals who are practising water management or failing to practise water management, when this Government supports the continued construction of the Rafferty-Alameda project, which will pollute the Souris River as has been determined by study after study. There is no reason why large pollution should be allowed and small pollution should not be.

We continue to see the Red River polluted, the Souris River will be polluted, Shoal Lake situation has not been fully dealt with, septic fields allowed to be developed, holding ponds allowed to be continued. Yet this Bill deals with none of those issues. So I feel that as much as it is being proposed it must have been something they took off a shelf and dusted out because I do not believe there is any belief in what they are proposing in this Bill.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 33—THE ECOLOGICAL RESERVES AMENDMENT ACT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) No. 33, The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune), standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). The Member for Dauphin.

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Acting Speaker, I would like to speak on this Bill and have it remain held

in the Member for Thompson's name, if that is in agreement?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): Is there leave?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gilleshammer): Agreed. It will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton).

Mr. Plohman: It is my pleasure to speak to this Bill today, Bill No. 33—The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act, since I had an opportunity to work on the development of this Bill at some length in 1987 and '88 prior to the infamous vote that took place in this House.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

As a matter of fact, I was looking back through some old documents and saw that on January 26, 1988, I had a meeting with the staff to review all aspects of this Bill and then on March 8, 1988, which was only a day or so before the vote on the budget that took place in this House, I had a memo from the Legislative Council office to myself as Minister of Natural Resources with a copy of the Bill. At that time, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Counsel indicated to me that the office of Legislative Council had recently adopted the practice of sending a copy of each draft Bill to the office of the responsible Minister so that the Minister could review the various portions of the Bill to ensure that it was according to the desire of the Government, and the Minister, and the caucus and Cabinet at that particular time.

So what we did in fact have on March 8, 1988, almost a year and a half ago, just before the election of 1988, is a Bill that looked almost exactly like the Bill that was brought in the other day by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act. As a matter of fact, the various items in it were identical, the only thing is that the form of it was somewhat changed. So, in fact, what we had was a Bill exactly as it had been prepared in 1988, now finally presented to the House one year and a half later. I found it rather strange that the previous Minister of Natural Resources and now the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) did not see fit, or was not able to get a grasp on this issue in time to actually bring this forward last year during the sitting. It did not have to wait this long, and I am pleased that the current Minister, the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Natural Resources, has followed through with this initiative that was developed in its entirety by the previous Government, the amendment to The Ecological Reserves Act.

Clearly, there was a need within the department, having discussed this with the staff that were involved, to strengthen this Act because there is a real danger of losing many very significant areas of plant life in this province forever, because they have not been protected to the extent possible, although since this Act was brought in in the '70s, there has been a lot of activity

by many groups, including the Manitoba Naturalist Society and others, who have worked very diligently to identify ecologically significant areas in the province, such as the tall grass prairie, for example, which is one that is in danger of being lost forever to our civilization because of the many years that it was not protected.

But there have been a number of areas designated as ecological reserves and ecologically significant areas in this province under that Act. At the same time, there was a very difficult area of the Act that did not provide for proper enforcement and penalties, agreements, regulations by the Minister, authority from the director. There was no director designated. As a matter of fact, there was an ecological reserves board which is still in place, but there was not the authority to ensure that these were protected. There was no provision that would disallow the sale of land that is held in private hands that might be designated ecologically significant, or as ecological reserves. Crown land could be sold as well by a Government, perhaps, that did not feel that this was as an important matter as perhaps another Government at any particular time.

But this Act adds teeth to the previous Act that was in place and ensures that there are the required legislative powers to enforce and protect ecologically significant areas. It provides, for example, for direct ministerial authority for making ministerial orders and regulations. This was missing in the original Act, as I indicated. It provides for signage for these areas so the public is aware that these areas have been designated. There was no specific provision for that previously.

It provides for agreements with private landowners, with other Governments, with the Government of Canada, with municipalities, with individuals, organizations, such as the Manitoba Naturalists Society and others, so that they could agree to protect a particular area of our plant life.

It provides, as I indicated, the disallowance of the land being sold once it has been designated permission or without approval. It puts a director in charge of the operation, specifically in charge of the area that deals with ecological reserves, whereas previously there was no director in charge, which was a great inadequacy. As a matter of fact, the director of the Resource Allocation Branch will now be responsible for the administration of this particular Act on behalf of the Minister. He will also, or she will also, be responsible for preparing a report every five years to the Legislature to outline to the Legislature the various important issues that have arisen over that five-year period concerning ecological reserves in this province. That was missing.

* (1200)

It is an area that will, I think, raise public awareness. It will raise awareness of all legislators. It will mean that it can be discussed in more detail because of the information contained in that report, of course, during Estimates, and it will ensure that the public is aware in detail of the various provisions of the Act and the goings on in that area of the previous five-year period. That is very important, because I think more and more

people are becoming aware of the need to protect endangered species, and of course not only of wildlife, animals, but also plants and trees and vegetation generally. It is something that has been growing, an awareness by people. Years ago, perhaps, the vast prairie and forest that we have were looked upon by people who were settling as something that was limitless and so bountiful that really it could never be destroyed and eliminated from the face of the earth.

Over the years, as greater population moved into the areas, these areas have been depleted, and there is an extreme need—a desperate need—to protect those areas that are ecologically significant so that we can have access to those in the future, for future generations, for our children, grandchildren, and well on into the future, which is not the case in many areas of this world where civilizations over the years have totally destroyed the native plant and animal life in a particular area—and even insect life and so on.

As a matter of fact, when I think of some of the articles I have read on the destruction of the rain forests in South America, it certainly brings to my attention that thousands and thousands of species that are very unique in this world are being destroyed every month as they destroy the rain forest, species of insects and animal life that can be found nowhere else in the world, and they will never ever be catalogued, will never ever be photographed, will never be studied, because they will be lost forever to human kind in this world.

It is time that we show leadership in this country, that we show leadership in this province to protect the rare species of plant and animal life that we have been blessed with in this country and perhaps not always have appreciated. There has to be strong action taken by Government. That is why it is important that this Minister followed through with the initiatives that were begun by our Government in this area.

I reiterate, once again, in looking at the Act, that it is basically the same provisions, the same Act that I was taking forward to caucus and to Cabinet in 1988.

Now the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness), unfortunately, was not here when I said that at the beginning of my speech, Mr. Speaker, and so he missed the direct references that I made. He responds spontaneously from his seat. That is not true. If I felt that he really meant that and was saying it with some authority, I would ask for him to withdraw that, but I know that he does not know that for sure and he just said that, and so I am not going to press him on that. But I want to just draw to his attention that January 26, 1988, the document that I have in my hands outlines the various provisions of the proposed amendments to the Ecological Reserves Act at a meeting that was to take place in my office, as the Minister of Natural Resources, with staff to discuss these amendments on January 26, 1988.

Following that, on March 8, R. Walsh from the Legislative Council Office had provided me with a copy of the Act as it had been revised and drafted to that point in time. That particular Act, as outlined, is almost identical, for the Member for Morris's (Mr. Manness) edification, to the Act that was tabled by the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) at this time.

I had indicated at that time that the former Minister of Natural Resources, now the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), had somehow failed to bring this forward, even though it was laying on his desk ready to go along with the Endangered Species Act, which I also have a number of references, but I am not speaking on that Bill at this time, so I will not go into that.

We are prepared and ready to go, and that is why I feel very good about the fact that this Government has brought this particular Act forward, because I was a very strong advocate as Minister at that time of these two pieces of legislation. I was looking forward to bringing them into the Legislature for debate and for passage at this subsequent date.

I, of course, had hoped that they would not be lost in the weeks, months following, and they have not been lost. That is very encouraging to see, the work of Government continue from one particular Government to another.

The civil servants that remain working on very important projects continue to put the same kind of effort, initiative, in many cases, unless, of course, the Government Minister or Cabinet decides in policy direction that they do not want the Civil Service to follow through with anything relating to a particular issue, it stops. That was one of the concerns I had. Were we uniquely concerned about preserving our heritage and preserving our ecologically significant plant life in this province, or was this something that was universally accepted and of concern, in terms of urgency, by all Parties?

It seems that this Government now has adapted and adopted this particular Bill and brought it forward, because I hope they believe strongly that it is also very, very important.

I want to go back, Mr. Speaker, briefly to some of the provisions of the particular Act without getting into the clause-by-clause discussion, as I know is not appropriate during second reading.

I think the fact that we are now going to have a director in charge of this Act is going to be a tremendous step forward. It was kind of lost and drifting in the department as to who was directly responsible for the administration of this Act. That will no longer be the case.

The fact is that this Act will provide for the requirement that licences and permits be issued before anyone can undertake any activities in ecological reserves. It is very important because, in the past, people may have inadvertently destroyed some of the areas that were to be protected as a designated area, inadvertently destroyed those areas because they did not realize that they were ecologically significant areas and they were designated as reserves.

As a matter of fact, they, in many cases and probably in the past, have actually done that, because the people do not want to destroy wildlife and plant life that is rare and endangered. They want to preserve it. I think most people have that natural inclination but many times it does happen inadvertently, accidentally.

That is why it is important to have the proper signage in place. That is why it is important to require licences and permits for any activities. That is why it is important to have an education process, so that the public is aware that this is going on around them, that the Government is taking initiatives to identify these areas in conjunction with other naturalist groups that believe strongly that their whole reason for being is that they want to preserve these significant areas. Working together with those groups, Government and the public, we can make a significant difference in protecting these areas and stop the destruction that has taken place over the years, that has taken place in many countries, such as the United States, which is much more heavily populated and has lost many of the natural areas that they once had because of the swiftness with which civilization has entered and pounced on those particular areas.

We have a chance to do things differently yet in Canada. It is not too late. In Manitoba, even though many people might not feel that we have great areas of significance, we do. If I had the list before me, which I had seen at some point in time, there is a long list of very significant ecological reserves that have been established in this province, and there is a need for many more in the future.

* (1210)

I think we have to do more than just pass legislation, and that is why I support legislation in this area. But I think what is more important is hand in hand with that report to the Legislature that is supposed to come every five years as a result of these amendments to this Act should be a communications process with the public, through the schools, so that the children—our future generations—in the schools study ecologically significant areas in our province, do research on them, do field trips on them, and have a very good appreciation and understanding of why they are significant and why they are important to us as a civilization, as a people.

If that can be instilled at a very young age in our students in the schools, I believe that we will have a generation who will grow up believing in the necessity to protect our environment, and to protect and preserve what we have been blessed with when we came on to this world and not to destroy it. It is something that all of us can develop a greater awareness for as we continue our lifelong experience of education. As we become more aware of these areas, we become richer for it, and we become more knowledgeable. We pass that on to others, and it enhances the quality of life for everyone in being able to preserve these tremendous benefits that were passed on to us by past generations.

So I believe that this Act fits in very well with a broader picture of preservation of our environment, the concerns that so many people have for what is happening, the disgrace of the garbage that is left along our highways and the destruction of so many of the things that were natural when we were growing up as children and are now being lost, the fact that we are throwing so many things out that could be preserved for future generations. The fact that we are not taking advantage

of recycling techniques, to use over again various products, at least as raw materials for new manufactured products.

We have to do so much more in that area, and people are becoming aware of that. They are becoming aware of what the destruction of the rain forest in South America is doing to this planet that we live on. They are becoming aware of how the use of plastics is destroying our atmosphere and the ozone layer. They are becoming aware of the fact that there is so much pollution in our cities, and they want to do something about it. They want to have a part in assuring that trend is reversed so that as we go along into the 21st century, that we have a world that our children are going to be able to live on in a healthy state. I have very real concerns that that may not be the case if things continue the way they are now.

We hear that, for example, even though we are doing our best and showing leadership here in Manitoba and Canada that in the Soviet Union now there has become a new awareness, in China, of the terrible destruction of the atmosphere there, of the terrible pollution that is taking place in the rivers and on the land in those areas. The fact is that is an awareness that has grown out of a more open society in the last number of years, although I would not say that now with much degree of certainty with regard to China but, certainly, in the Soviet Union and the eastern European countries, and more and more of the people are becoming aware of what is happening to their environment and they want to do something about it. So we as a Government in the Province of Manitoba can show leadership that can demonstrate to them that we can preserve our ecology, our environment, our atmosphere, our land, our rivers, our water for future generations, and so we can show leadership there. Just like when we as a Government declared Manitoba a nuclear free zone, many Members in the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker, laughed at that and said well, what did you have to do that for. The point is, it is one small step forward; it is recognition that we do not believe in the proliferation of nuclear weapons in this province.

In a similar way, we can take small steps when it comes to preserving our plant life and our trees, our forests and our endangered wildlife species in such a way that we can demonstrate to others in the world that we care about these things and that they should also care about these things.

There are things that they can do as awareness grows globally, which is absolutely necessary; because as I pointed out, there is this growing awareness that there is terrible destruction in some of the countries behind the Iron Curtain. As this awareness grows within our schools, within our children, and they grow up to be future generations of this world, that they will take the necessary steps on a global basis to stop the destruction and reverse that destruction and begin replacing as much as is possible the natural environment that was there before with another good clean replacement as opposed to the pollution that we are doing at the present time. I look at this as a very important step in the whole process of recognizing the importance of stopping pollution, reversing that trend, I look at that as a way to preserve our environment for future generations.

The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act, The Endangered Species Act—there are two parts of it. We can only hope that the Sustainable Development Centre follows in the future and that it will not be taking a great deal of time. The Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) raised that in Questions this morning. We have no satisfaction that indeed the Government is making any progress, that in fact the Prime Minister was serious about that promise that he made over a year ago at the United Nations with regard to a Sustainable Development Centre, world class in Manitoba. We can only hope that does in fact take place in this province, and that will also add to our general reputation as being a leader in concern for our environment.

We, as a Party, will bring forward many other recommendations as a result of the task force that we have set up with regard to the environment, that I believe will be accepted in this province, probably accepted routinely within another 10-year period. It will show leadership at this particular time, but over a period of time, as the thinking matures in these areas, more and more people become aware of the need to protect the environment and get on, shall I say, the bandwagon. Even the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) will eventually feel that is important and will become an advocate for the environment, as he becomes more aware of the importance. He, as a matter of fact, has now said that he is already. That is a giant step forward over say two years ago when he probably had no awareness.

I am pleased to see that happening one by one as they stand up and admit that they are moving forward in their concern for the environment, and if we can have each of the Ministers and the MLAs in this House announce that conversion, we are going to see some real difference in this country and in this province in particular.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again congratulate the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) for bringing forward our Act and the provisions of the Act as we have outlined them. We are pleased to see that support and that initiative now being taken, and we will look forward to supporting this Bill as we move forward.

I am sure many others will want to speak though at some length the details of this and to see whether it goes far enough with this Act and these amendments, but I certainly feel that it is a step in the right direction and provides the kind of leadership that Manitobans will be proud of for future generations.

I guess if anything is missing, as I said earlier, the most important part that we have to identify here is that there is not that education component. Perhaps it does not have to be legislated, but we would like to have a statement from the Minister because that was inherent in our initiative, and the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) is saying well, it was your initiative you are saying. Well, yes, it was and inherent with that and hand in hand with the education component, the move forward in the Department of Education to provide more education on the need and the concerns with regard to and the need to preserve our environment.

* (1220)

Now those were initiatives that we were undertaking. I can only suggest, and we will see whether an amendment is appropriate, to the Members of the Government side and to the Liberal Opposition as well that they ensure that proper pressure is put on the appropriate authorities that education components in the schools, at a very young age, are included and go hand in hand with these initiatives that are being undertaken here—The Endangered Species Act and The Ecological Reserves Amendment Act.

Those are very important to ensure success, those kinds of steps, and it is not in the Act, but it is something that the Government must ensure takes place. We must go forward in a united way to ensure that, because we know that small children can absorb a great deal and are naturally concerned about their surroundings and their environment. They will want to hear about this, they will want to see, they have the inquisitive nature at a very young age to learn all about what is around them, what is going on. They will want to go out and travel on field trips to see the significant areas, to know what the significance is, to know why it is significant. They will want to learn about the destruction that is taking place and how they can reverse that. Those are all things that we have to put as the real test as to our sincerity to make a difference.

We can only ensure through those initiatives that this will carry on and that in fact future generations will be able to reverse the destructive trend that has taken place in the 20th Century. It has been a terrible destruction, one that we should not feel at all proud of passing on as a legacy to our children, and one that we will be judged for in future generations no doubt. In a small way we have some repentance with Acts like this, to show that we are concerned and we want to make a difference. Let us ensure that the education take place, information, communication with the public, so that everyone is working together and moving forward to preserve our environment.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on what I believe is a very significant issue.

Mr. Speaker: As previously agreed, this Bill will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak).

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will sit next week, October 3 and 5 in Room 255, to consider the 1987 and 1988 Annual Reports of Manitoba Mineral Resources.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader for that information.

Mr. McCrae: 10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: 10 a.m.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS (Cont'd)

BILL NO. 9—THE FOREST AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill No. 9, The Forest Amendment Act, Loi modifiant la Loi sur les forêts, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles). (Stand)

BILL NO. 35—THE WILDLIFE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), Bill No. 35, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor). (Stand)

BILL NO. 38—THE STATUTE RE-ENACTMENT AND BY-LAW VALIDATION (WINNIPEG) ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 38, The Statute Re-enactment and By-law Validation (Winnipeg) Act; Loi sur la réadoption de lois et la validation d'arrêtés concernant la Ville de Winnipeg, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards). (Stand)

BILL NO. 39—THE HUMAN TISSUE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch). (Stand)

BILL NO. 40—THE LAND SURVEYORS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko). (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader, what are your intentions?

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Honourable Members would like to call it 12:30 p.m.

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

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