

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 11 March, 1987.

Time — 1:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to table the Manitoba Health Research Council's Annual Report for the Year 1985-86, and the Department of Health Annual Report for the same year.

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

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased to table the following reports: the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1986; the Manitoba InterCultural Council 1985-86; the Manitoba Arts Council 1985-86 and le rapport annuel pour le Centre Culturel Franco Manitobain.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table the Annual Report of the Department of Natural Resources for the fiscal year 1985-86, as well as the Five-Year Report on the Status of Forestry for the year ending 1985-86.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. G. DOER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Ville de Winnipeg.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have eight students of Grade 9 from the Ecole Secondaire from La Broquerie. The students are under the direction of Mr. Ray Le Fleche, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Lotteries - Convention Centre Casinos

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Lotteries who was here a moment ago to give a Ministerial Statement or to introduce a bill. Madam Speaker, I shall wait until the Minister returns for my question.

Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Lotteries, and it surrounds her department's and the Lotteries Foundation's experiment with respect to holding casinos at the Convention Centre on a five-day-a-week basis. Given that merchants at the Convention Centre are threatening to withdraw as a result of the experiment; and given that the Convention Centre Board has expressed concerns about its negative impact on attracting conventions to Manitoba; given that the Mayor has expressed concerns about the deterioration of the image of the centre as a result of this five day a week casino operation, would the Minister cancel the second phase of the experiment which is scheduled to begin on March 24 in lieu of the very serious and legitimate concerns that have been expressed about this operation five days a week?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Lotteries.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The very purpose of the pilot project is to welcome and receive comments from all sectors of our society, including the Convention Centre. The staff of the Foundation have been in discussion with members of the Convention Centre Board and staff there. There has been no request made to us to cancel our pilot project. I think that all of us, including members of the Convention Centre, are looking anxiously at the final results of this project after the total pilot project has been completed.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, given that many public groups are expressing concern - church groups, community groups, family-based groups - about the potential for an increase in crime, concerns about the effect that it has on families, addiction to gambling and all those things that could be increased as a result of five-day-a-week casino operations in Manitoba, will the Minister assure the public that she will hold public hearings after the experiment to review all aspects of the potential operation of casinos five days a week, so that all these public groups will be heard before any permanent decision is made on the matter?

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I certainly take seriously all the concerns that are being expressed

to me and my colleagues about any extension of casino days. We welcome that expression of concern, because that was precisely the reason for the pilot project to begin with.

The purpose of the pilot project, to repeat for members opposite, was twofold: No. 1, to determine the financial viability and the efficiency of an extended operation; and secondly, to determine the public reaction to the extension of casino days.

I think that we're receiving considerable feedback, and I'll be willing to report at a later date about the results of the pilot project. If any Manitobans feel that they are not being heard, I have an open door and welcome any comments.

Lotteries - stats re casino patrons

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I regret that the Minister won't commit to public hearings on the matter, because that is the important thing is to listen to those groups and invite their comments, not just open your door and close your mind.

Madam Speaker, my question is, further to the Minister, given that many of these groups are expressing the concern that lotteries, casinos and gambling and their revenues to the province are in fact a tax on the poor, does the Minister have any studies to indicate what is the financial status and indeed the economic status, the income status, of those who patronize casinos in our province?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: First, Madam Speaker, let me say that I find it hard to understand the first part of the Leader of the Opposition's question, when he suggests that I should commit myself to public hearings now when we have not yet made a decision about whether or not we will even extend casino days.

Madam Speaker, there is some preliminary evidence in existence, done throughout different parts of the country about casinos and who plays the games and who buys lottery tickets. That preliminary evidence suggests that the greatest users of lottery tickets and the greatest players of casinos are from middle and upper-income categories.

However, Madam Speaker, as I said, that information is probably not comprehensive, and I am certainly anxious to receive more information about who plays and how often and how much is spent. I think the most important point to be made to the Leader of the Opposition is that considerable money has been generated over the last several years, and all of that money has gone back into meeting very important community non-profit charitable priorities of our communities.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, that's our major concern is that the government is now so desperate for revenue that this has become the reason why we're having wide-open casinos.

MADAM SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: But, Madam Speaker, my specific question to the Minister is: does she have any studies that have been done in Manitoba with respect to the

average income or indeed the economic circumstances of those people who play casinos here and, if not, will she ensure that we have that kind of study being done concurrently with the study of a proposal to expand casino operations?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I find it interesting to hear this position coming forward from the Leader of the Opposition when, I believe in fact, the Member for Charleswood has suggested that Manitoba would be the ideal location for the "Casino of the North."

I take very seriously the suggestion for comprehensive research on who plays casinos and who's involved in lottery activities generally, and will certainly look at attempts at different ways to get that kind of very important research that is an important part of this pilot project.

MR. J. ERNST: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood on a point of order.

MR. J. ERNST: For the attention, Madam Speaker, of you and other members of the House, that the Minister making a statement that I had said something, which I in fact did not say.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have a point of order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my very specific question is: has the government any studies about the income or the economic circumstances of the people who engage in gambling, lotteries and casinos in Manitoba under the MLF?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I have asked staff to try to begin to put together that kind of data and that kind of research that is required. The minute I have anything available, I'll certainly be glad to inform the Leader of the Opposition.

Farm land - relief from education taxes

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I have a question to the Acting Minister of Finance.

In view of the Minister of Urban Affairs' desire to have the members of the Opposition grant leave to deal with Bill No. 8 today, my question to the Acting Minister of Finance is: will he assure members of this side of the House that the area of relief from education taxes on farm land, which has long been advocated by members of this side of the House, farm organizations and farmers throughout Manitoba, will be dealt with in this Budget on Monday of next week?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I'm sure as the member has heard on previous occasions, the Minister of Finance has gone on tour throughout the province to get the input from all sectors of our society as to what should be happening in our Budget. He has taken that all into consideration, and I'm sure that all the advice that he has been given, including members of the Opposition and members of our caucus, has all been taken into consideration. The Budget will be coming forward on this Monday when you will receive that information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, just for the purpose of clarification then, can the Minister inform this House as to whether or not the Minister of Finance and his department and the government have received specific recommendations on this particular subject, and they are receiving active consideration?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am sure that the member has been in the House on previous occasions where there have been specific questions asked to the Minister of Finance as to what subject is going to be revealed in the Budget. I don't think that it would be proper of me to be giving out information of that sort at this time. I am sure that the members of our agricultural community will not be disappointed with initiatives that are being taken by this government.

Winnipeg Tax Assessment - rural residential mill rate

MR. G. MERCIER: A question to the Minister of Urban Affairs, given his desire to have members of the Opposition grant leave to deal with Bill No. 8.

Would he commit his department, his ministry and the government, to creating a new classification for the City of Winnipeg to deal with the problem of rural residential lots, at least to give them the opportunity to adopt it and apply a special mill rate if they so desire, given that the residents of these areas have not had an opportunity to make representations to the Executive Policy Committee yet but are scheduled to do that sometime next week? It would give the city the discretion to deal with the problems that have arisen in Headingley and south St. Vital, as well as a number of other areas with respect to rural residential lots.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, first of all, the question was put in terms of desire for leave for this bill. I believe it's in the best interests of all of us. We received a copy of the proposal from the City of Winnipeg less than seven days ago. We immediately moved on that proposal for phasing-in legislation, because all the members of this House have expressed over the last 12 months, indeed the last number of years, the potential need for phasing in. We did not want to proceed on a unilateral basis, as suggested by the honourable members before, on phasing in legislation.

When we received that proposal from the city, we immediately moved. We had the legislation drafted over

the weekend. We had it on the Order Paper Monday for potential first reading today and other readings in the best interests of people who will be hit in a very hard way by tax increases through reassessment that hasn't taken place for 25 years. So we think it's in the best interest of those people who will be hardest hit with the high increases, and that's why we would recommend that to this House. Again, it's consistent with feelings of all members in this House dealing with a 25-year-old reassessment.

I should point out, Madam Speaker, that along with the issue of the extended appeal period dealing again with the unique circumstances of this year, the bill does not have a provision for any classifications because the classifications pursuant to Bill 57 are by Order-in-Council. Therefore, this bill, quite frankly, is not affected by the issue of classifications.

I've also stated, Madam Speaker, on other occasions that we have been working in consultation with the three representatives of the city, the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor and the Chair of the Finance Committee on these classifications. We haven't agreed on all matters. Some matters we've had to consult on further. For example, if we would have put curling clubs and golf courses together, as recommended by the city, it would have been a mistake. That's why we studied it, so we were careful and sure. But as I indicated yesterday, certainly we do not see an additional classification.

I thought it was honest for those people who were requesting it, notwithstanding the fact that some of those councillors had moved from deferral to extra classification. I thought it was more important to be up front with those people in terms of where we would see it happening. We see eight classifications. We see the movement taking place within those classifications, in the homeowner category, in those other categories, but not a ninth classification.

Bill No. 8 - sole item of business

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, given the government's desire, Madam Speaker, a question to the Government House Leader.

Would he agree that, if leave is to be granted to deal with this bill today, it will be the sole item of business today and tomorrow, and that public hearings will be called on the bill for Thursday evening, Friday morning and afternoon, if necessary and if necessary, Monday, or I believe the Minister has indicated Saturday would be preferable to them?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, well, we've had an opportunity to have some brief discussions on how this House might best expedite this business, and I would be prepared at this time to take it one day at a time and to agree that, if there were leave to proceed today, indeed we would hold this out as a sole order of business for today's sitting. We would have standing committee hearings - and that would be a matter to determine as to which standing committee would hear these. But we would have standing committee hearings on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, if required.

As for tomorrow's order of business, there are some concerns that I want to discuss further with the Opposition House Leader and would be prepared to make a statement regarding that tomorrow, but would certainly not make any commitment regarding the ordering of the business of the House tomorrow until I've had an opportunity to pursue this a bit further with the Opposition House Leader. To be quite frank, it would be our intention to bring forward at least one other order of business tomorrow, if we can reach that sort of agreement between now and then.

Emergency debate - farm economic situation

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, given the government's desire to proceed by leave with this matter, I have a further question for the Government House Leader.

Would the government give favourable consideration then to granting to the Opposition, after the debate on this bill and the Budget Debate, an emergency debate to be raised by the Opposition to deal with the farm economic situation on some date after the Budget Debate is finished?

HON. J. COWAN: There certainly are a large number of opportunities for Opposition members to bring forward their concerns regarding the agricultural sector and conditions surrounding agriculture in the Province of Manitoba. There are also mechanisms for members on this side of the House to bring forward those concerns as well. Those mechanisms have been utilized in the past by members on both sides of the House.

What I would commit to at this particular time, in respect to the specific request, is that I would be prepared to sit down with the Opposition House Leader within the next day or two to determine how it is we might be able to set aside a specific day for discussion on an emergency debate, or some other mechanism which might be brought forward to utilize the time of the House to discuss this very important issue.

It is an issue which members on both sides take a great deal of concern in and would like to see discussed to the fullest extent in this House, given the rules and the procedures and the practices that have existed heretofore for discussions of that sort. But I would certainly be prepared to sit down in a cooperative fashion with him to determine if there is a mechanism to bring forward a debate following the Budget Debate, if they believe it's required at that time, which would be of one day's duration, more or less.

Winnipeg Tax Assessment - information meeting for MLA's

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

It relates to a commitment he gave to the Member for Morris at the last Session of this Legislature to call a meeting for MLA's with assessment officials in order that members may ask some questions which they wish

to about the assessment situation, particularly in rural Manitoba. The Minister did not live up to that commitment, and I would ask if he would now live up to that commitment and call that meeting for MLA's with assessment officials during the next two weeks.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As I recall, the commitment was to the Member for Charleswood in respect to the City of Winnipeg reassessment. I don't recall the assessment for Morris, but that could well have been.

The reassessment issue that has been of prime concern to me for the past number of months has been the Winnipeg situation and, in this respect, I did speak to my critic about two weeks ago. I reminded him that I had made that offer and, if the members of the Opposition still wanted to have that session, I was quite willing to convene a meeting with my staff, members opposite and members on this side to deal with the City of Winnipeg reassessment.

The reason it had not been held earlier, I should indicate, is that we have not been receiving very full information from the City of Winnipeg and, as the member knows, with respect to the problem with the large lots in the periphery of Winnipeg, we still don't have all information. It's been coming in in dribs and drabs and, for that reason, no meeting has been held.

I'm still very prepared to deal with the City of Winnipeg reassessment issue, if there's a desire to have a meeting, to know what the impact is, and also with rural Manitoba when we get into that issue. At the present time, the departmental staff are looking at the further implementation of assessment reform but, in terms of the potential impact, nothing much has been prepared in terms of where this may end up in, let's say, 1990 or so.

Universities - funding and accreditation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education.

University spokespersons have announced that the funding increase to existing programs will be only 3.9 percent for this coming year, which is less than the inflation rate and well below the announcement of 5.2 percent that was announced by this government. As a result, the quality of education will continue to decline and the danger of losing accreditation for faculties, such as, Industrial and Computer Engineering, Dentistry and Internal Medicine will still not be addressed.

Will the Minister please answer the following question: why has he chosen to let the universities down by doing so little to combat the threat of losing accreditation?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I have indicated on many occasions that this government would like to

be in a position to do more. I've said at every university, and had an opportunity to meet with the presidents and the students unions, and I think I have received a fair hearing from them about this government's ability and commitment to post-secondary education. I think that, if the Member for River Heights would care to review perhaps the last University of Manitoba Bulletin in which the President of the university said, we got more than we expected. We appreciate the fact that the government has attempted to deal with our problems. The University of Winnipeg President has said essentially the same thing, as have student bodies.

Madam Speaker, the fact of the matter is, that 5.2 percent increase was given to the universities. That represents both operating and miscellaneous capital. It's a significant sum of money and it represents funding beyond inflation, contrary to the implications that the Member for River Heights may have left with the Chamber.

Universities - Library grants

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

What specific grants are going to be given this year to university libraries to remedy those difficulties endured, for example, by the Law Library at the University of Manitoba which is no longer able to carry such basic subscriptions as the Canadian Labour Law Journal, a journal which I would think would be of specific interest to this government?

HON. J. STORIE: Madam Speaker, I believe that this government has already indicated that there will be some additional support being made available to the universities to enable them to regenerate, to rejuvenate the equipment and the resources that are available at universities.

I should say, Madam Speaker, that I commend the universities and the students and the faculty at our universities for their commitment to this process. Indeed the fund-raising efforts that are under way at our universities, I think, reflect in a very direct way their understanding of the importance of this issue. I can indicate that the Provincial Government will also be making its contribution in line with its abilities to do so.

Universities - establishment of task force

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: A final supplementary to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

Will the Minister establish a broadly-based task force to study our universities, an inquiry which would include the role of the Universities Grants Commission, the funding of our universities, the quality of our universities and the accreditation of our universities?

HON. J. STORIE: I think that there is merit in that suggestion, and it certainly is something that has been considered. I have indicated in this House and publicly that the Universities Grants Commission is going to be taking a stronger role in determining and assisting universities in establishing priorities in line with the

ability of governments to fund the necessary improvements to our universities. I think it's also true that the universities are taking a stronger role in planning and preparing longer-term financial plans and program plans. I think there is, obviously, a need to work closer together with the universities, and that is under way as well.

Assessment - meeting re

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, last year in Estimates, in the Department of Municipal Affairs, in response to my question dealing with a request for the Minister to convene a meeting of assessment officials within his department to meet with members of the Opposition so they may be better prepared to debate all issues associated with assessment, in response to that question, the Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated on July 3, 1986, and I quote: "I do welcome the opportunity to have staff from Municipal Affairs make a presentation to both sides of this House, hopefully within the next month to six weeks." Further, Wednesday, September 10, the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs said to me, Madam Speaker, just briefly: "Since the Minister has spoken in conversation with him . . ." - meaning me - ". . . he will be contacting representatives of the Opposition to set up a date in a very short order, within the next week to set up a date."

My question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs: why did he deliberately mislead this House in response to these questions on that date and also today in response to the question of my House Leader?

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

As the honourable member well knows, it is unparliamentary to accuse a Minister of deliberately misleading the House. Would the honourable member please withdraw those remarks?

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, can the Minister indicate to me why he has broken his promise to members, not only in the Opposition but to all members of this House, with respect to this matter? Why does he have such a callous disregard for those of us who are trying to learn better the system of assessment reform that's going on within this province?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

First of all, I would indicate, it is not callous disregard; it is an oversight on my part. As I indicated, we have been preoccupied with the City of Winnipeg reassessment. My recollection was of a commitment to the Member for Charleswood.

I did raise the matter with the Municipal Affairs critic some two weeks ago, proposing to hold a meeting if such was desired at this time. I must admit that it had slipped my mind that there was a bigger issue, the

assessment question as part of the province-wide reassessment, and I will review that. I would be very pleased to have staff meet with members from both sides of the House within the next two to three weeks, if that is the wish of the Opposition.

MR. C. MANNES: Madam Speaker, this assessment question isn't a city or rural-type problem. It's to be one that, hopefully, is brought about in a total manner which will be fair to all. That was the reason for the request for the meeting.

I ask the Minister if he now will undertake to present to all of us members within this Chamber an opportunity to question his officials as to the specific process taking place and where we are towards an even assessment procedure that affects all Manitobans?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Well, Madam Speaker, that was the very commitment I just gave two minutes ago. Now that it has been asked, the meeting will be arranged within the next two to three weeks.

Assessment - urban area

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I would direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

It is imperative that, where the city dictates minimum lot sizes such as the two- to five-acre lots south of the Perimeter, some form of assessment allowance be established to compensate for mandatory lot size. Can the Honourable Minister answer, will he take this problem to Cabinet concerning a ninth assessment classification to cover large lots in the urban area south of the Perimeter Highway?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

One of the proposals in this bill is to extend the assessment period of time or the ability to appeal assessments. Secondly, a second feature in the bill today will be the phasing-in legislation, which will be very valuable to the people who you're talking about.

The value of land, Madam Speaker, depends on the location, the zoning, the number and type of services and the desirability of the land. Those are the criteria under the act that I can't change that will be used to establish assessment, and will be used as the criteria for hearing appeals that every individual has the right to file before the Assessment Appeal Board.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I hear the Honourable Minister advising that consideration has been given for the phasing-in and for appealing the assessment, but has any consideration been given to this area that has fewer services than other suburban areas?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, as the member knows, the issue of services is an issue that is in the administrative jurisdiction: (a) of the city; (b) the issue

of services is a factor that can be taken into consideration when an assessment is established on a particular piece of land in the city totally; (c) that assessment is subject to appeal of any individual in terms of all the criteria that I mentioned.

Madam Speaker, the Bill 57 that we passed last year will save a potential shift of some \$26 million onto homeowners in the City of Winnipeg, and we are proud of the fact that differential mill rates in the City of Winnipeg will prevent the shift from going onto homeowners as a general classification. It will not stop shifts within those classifications, Madam Speaker, and that, of course, is because of the fact it has been some 25 years since reassessment has taken place in the City of Winnipeg. We have had a bill that will stop a shift of some \$26 million, or close to \$200 per home, by the introduction of Bill 57 last year, a bill that has been endorsed - in fact, many city councillors have taken credit for it in the last October civic election.

Winnipeg Tax Assessment - Headingley

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs. I know this sounds a little repetitious, but the fact that North Headingley also falls into the same classification as South Headingley, South St. Vital and River East, and there is an urgency out there that the people are terribly concerned in all these areas, I am just wondering if the Minister would reconsider his former decision and bring in that ninth classification to relieve these people of the mental anguish that they are going through.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, it's rather ironic that many of the members opposite, who were responsible for some of the administration in the city, have left a legacy where they can't even pull the numbers out for us to determine, in fact, even the severity of the issue. There will be shifts, Madam Speaker, in the homeowner category, there will be shifts in the commercial categories, and we are not creating a separate classification for big business versus medium-size business versus small business, we have one classification for the commercial sector. We are not creating a separate classification for big land users, for homeowners, medium-sized land users, semi-big-medium-sized land users.

Madam Speaker, there will be shifts in the homeowner category and if the services are deficient there should be a lower assessment based on the criteria in the act. Madam Speaker, Bill 57 will save some \$26 million if the city goes ahead with differential mill rates, which we have provided, onto the homeowner classification. We feel that we have done quite a bit in terms of the anguish of homeowners in this city, and we believe it is now time, the reassessment process is 26 years old, subject of course that this bill proceeds, and proceeds in a fair way because we know that some people have been overpaying in their homeowner taxes, and we

know that some people have been underpaying over the years.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs again, in his deliberations would you take into consideration that none of these rural residents are really part of the City of Winnipeg because they wanted to be. It was The City of Winnipeg Act that was created by the Schreyer Government that put them in the position that they are in today, and if they had their druthers they would druther be elsewhere. So would you, in considering it, would you at least consider holding public hearings so that they could present their case before you?

HON. G. DOER: Madam Speaker, the Government House Leader has indicated his intent, in terms of public input, and I respect his commitment to this House. I understand there will be opportunity for other public input at city council next week with the EPC. There was a Community Committee meeting last evening; there have been other public forums, in terms of this group.

I think, Madam Speaker, that it is serious when radical increases in taxation are introduced, and that is why we wanted to protect the homeowner category, generally, because the value of their lands had gone up considerably, and that is why we brought in Bill 57, as a fair way of saving those people some \$26 million spread over the city. That is why, Madam Speaker, we are proposing, not based on our own particular self-centered priorities, but rather the priorities of the total city, to bring in phasing-in legislation, and that is why we are also proposing to extend the appeal period so that these individuals will have more time to look at it.

There are other means in the act, for example, decreased assessment based on services. There are other features that can be looked at and we hope that the appeal process is . . .

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

I am a bit concerned about the direction which some of the questions and answers have been taking this morning. I am not quite sure, from my Chair, whether the bill has been distributed. I don't want us to be anticipating a debate that will be taking place that's on the Order Paper, and I'd like to caution all members to try to keep both the questions and answers within the guidelines.

Swamp Fever - mandatory testing

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I direct this question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

Earlier this week I received a distraught phone call from one of my constituents who had, in the last few days, lost some 12 pregnant mares to the disease of Swamp Fever. I appreciate, Madam Speaker, that this is under the control of the Federal Department of

Agriculture, Animal Health section, but concerns that horsemen in Manitoba are expressing is that they would prefer to see a mandatory testing program carried out in Manitoba, and I wonder whether or not the Manitoba Department of Agriculture could assist Agriculture Canada in determining (a) whether or not that is indeed the wishes of Manitoba horsemen, and (b) whether the Provincial Minister would undertake to encourage the Federal Department of Agriculture to proceed in that direction.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I thank the honourable member for his question and indicate that there is great concern, both in the large horse community, people who have horses in the periphery of Winnipeg, and outside of Winnipeg, in terms of the losses of horses to the virus. I will certainly want to take his suggestions under advisement and check with our own staff at the Veterinary Services Branch to fully ascertain their involvement in this area and to see what other kind of measures might be instituted along the lines that he has offered as a suggestion.

MR. H. ENNS: I thank the Minister for that answer.

Compensation for loss of animals

MR. H. ENNS: A supplementary question to the same Minister.

As well, and again acknowledging that this is a federal program, but like so many programs they become outdated, the compensation for a horse that has to be destroyed is some \$200, and even for many of our PMU operators, who are losing mares to this disease, that represents a considerable financial loss. I understand in the older program, the brucellosis program, or an eradication program carried on, there was at least some acknowledgement of those purebred animals, in the case of cattle, where there were higher classifications. Those people, of course, that are running purebred horses, raising those kind of horses, are in severe jeopardy in terms of financial loss. I would ask him to ask the Federal Government to also look at re-examining the compensation program that is being offered under this program.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, I certainly will want to have staff provide me with more detail than I have had today on this matter and see what discussions there have been in this area, and certainly want to take up the suggestion that the honourable member has offered.

Manitoba Hydro - loss of revenue due to mild winter

MR. H. ENNS: I direct a new question to the Minister of Energy.

Madam Speaker, while most of Manitoba has, I'm sure, enjoyed the moderate winter that we've had, I wonder if the Minister of Energy can give us any idea how many millions of dollars of lost revenue this has meant to Manitoba Hydro this year.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Madam Speaker, I'll take that question as notice, the Member for St. Norbert had raised it with me yesterday, as well, and I indicated to him that I would be getting that information. I am not sure we can get all the information till the books are closed as of March 31, which is not that far away. I do know that there has been a drop in revenue because of the warm weather. That is both a boon to the people of Manitoba at large, but it means that there is a drop in revenue, although I do not think it will lead to Manitoba Hydro being in any loss position for this year. But I'll get that information for the honourable member.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: On Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, would you please call the Order for Return, standing in the name of the Member for Emerson, please?

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, just as a matter of House Business, I'm not sure that the Fourth Estate is aware of it, but could the Government House Leader indicate that the House will be sitting tomorrow morning? The Thursday will be treated as a normal Friday, and the House will not be sitting Friday in order to accommodate members of the government who wish to attend the federal NDP Convention.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: That's an accurate reflection of the agreement which has been reached in respect to the hours sitting for this week. It's the type of agreement that we reach normally when either of the political parties in this House have a convention to which they must attend and have to have some travel time allotted to them. I appreciate, in the past, that members opposite have provided us with that sort of cooperation, and I'm glad to be able to provide that sort of cooperation to them when it's required from our side.

ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 9

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Brandon West,

THAT an Order of the House do issue for return of the following information:

1. The effective date, amount and full description of each increase in fees, licences and any "miscellaneous charges" made pursuant to the authority of the Minister of Natural Resources, 1982-1987.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, we've had some brief discussions with the member responsible for this Order for Return, as well as the Opposition House Leader, and have agreed to accept the Order for Return on the basis that information which has not already been gazetted and, for that reason, already is public information, will be provided to the member as per the requirements of the Order for Return.

However, that information which is already on the public record as a part of the Gazette would not be addressed in our response to this Order for Return.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, as is probably apparent from earlier discussions in the question period, there have been a number of discussions ongoing today respecting the calling of the order of business for the House for today's sitting.

I will be asking, Madam Speaker, for unanimous leave from all members of the House on two counts. The first is that Bill No. 8 be given Second Reading less than 48 hours after distribution to the House, and the second count is that we have unanimous leave provided to pursue the bill through two stages in the same day, so that we can first have the bill brought forward. We've already had First Reading, so we have to go into Second Reading today.

It has also been agreed that this will be the only order of business that will be considered by the House today, perhaps with the exception of the Private Members' Hour. I have to enter into some discussions with the Opposition House Leader in that regard, and will be able to report back later to the House as to the conclusion of those discussions.

As for tomorrow's order of business, there was a question earlier by the Opposition House Leader. I'd like to reinforce that we have agreed to this being the only order of business for today only. I will have to be involved with more discussions with him to determine what agreement we can reach, if any, in respect to the ordering of business tomorrow and the calling of government motions and bills.

But with that in mind, Madam Speaker, I will seek that unanimous consent. It is my understanding that there is at least one member of the Opposition who

Wednesday, 11 March, 1987

may wish to stand, with leave of the House, to make some comments regarding the request for unanimous consent, and we're prepared to offer that leave.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I rise to make a brief comment on providing the leave to allow the government to proceed on the path in which they are proceeding on a matter that . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: First of all, may I ask if the honourable member has unanimous consent to make a speech on this unanimous consent? (Agreed)
The Honourable Member for Arthur - most irregular.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I want to make two points and I want to make them very brief. No. 1, I find it a giving up of a privilege, as a member of the Legislature, to allow this kind of activity to take place in a very short period in this Session of the Legislature, and I don't take it lightly.

I want to as well say, Madam Speaker, that I do not believe it is the Legislature's responsibility to dance to the tune of the City of Winnipeg. The priority as far as Manitobans are concerned, in my estimation, is some 15,000 to 20,000 farm families out in the country who have seen a reduction in their incomes and are facing, what I would call, a national crisis as far as their futures are concerned.

Madam Speaker, I think that is the urgency which I would have found it much easier to deal with, if the Minister of Agriculture or the government had proceeded at the same time to introduce a bill doing something for the education taxes on the farm community. I could have found it much easier to give leave to proceed than the path in which we're going.

I do however, Madam Speaker, thank my House Leader for asking and putting forward the provision - and this is not a provisional leave. I'm granting leave that, in fact, we do have the opportunity in the near future to expect the same kind of consideration from all members to bring to this Legislative Assembly the opportunity to recommend, as an Opposition, some of the options which we think could be introduced to help the farm community.

I thank you, Madam Speaker, and members of this Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, therefore, on the Orders of the Day, would you please call Bill No. 8, with unanimous consent on the two counts which were referenced earlier having been given?

As well, Madam Speaker . . .

MR. J. WALDING: A point of order on that, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital on a point of order?

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, a leave has not yet been asked to do this particular thing. I assume it is going to be requested.

MADAM SPEAKER: I assume as well.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, if I can proceed and continue with my remarks, would you please call on Orders of the Day, Bill No. 8? I would assume that when you do that, given our earlier comments to which all members should have been listening, you will be asking for the unanimous leave of the House to proceed. We have already indicated that we will need unanimous consent on two specific counts. I would assume that those requests will be made when the bill is called.

I also want to thank all members of the House for their cooperation, and I know there are some concerns that they hold very strongly. I do want to thank them for their cooperation in assisting us to deal with this matter in the way in which it's being dealt with today and appreciate their feelings, their concerns, and also want to reinforce my earlier suggestion that we will be meeting with the Opposition House Leader to determine how we might be able to bring forward an opportunity for the debate which has been requested around agricultural issues in the near future.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent of the House to have Bill No. 8 called for Second Reading at this time?

The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. J. WALDING: Madam Speaker, I do not give leave to suspend the rules.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister does not have unanimous consent.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Madam Speaker.
Will you please call Bill No. 2, standing for Second Reading in the name of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs?

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 2 - THE OFFICIAL TIME ACT

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK presented Bill No. 2, An Act to Amend The Official Time Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le temps réglementaire, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
The proposed amendments to The Official Time Act, extending daylight saving time from the last to the first Sunday in April, will synchronize Manitoba's daylight saving hours with those of other Canadian provinces, and with time zones in the United States.

I noted from a news item yesterday, that most of North America has or will move their clocks forward by one hour on the last Sunday in April, with the exception of Saskatchewan and parts of Indiana and Arizona. So with the implementation of daylight saving time during the first Sunday in April, without this

proposed amendment, Manitobans would be facing a host of scheduling problems within the workplace and the home.

An added and welcome bonus will be the three weeks of extra daylight hours Manitobans will be able to enjoy in the early spring. The proposed amendments will be very straightforward; it's a matter of simply moving implementation time to the first Sunday in April, and daylight saving time will continue to end on the last Sunday in October, as it has in the past.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Madam Speaker. I just have a question before the matter is dealt with, for clarification. Could the Minister define Central Standard Time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'll have to remember my geography, but as I recall, Central Standard Time is a time zone which, I believe, is five hours behind Greenwich mean time - six hours.

I do realize that the National Research Council has circulated some correspondence to some elected officials, suggesting that we do get away from the term Central Standard Time and use coordinated universal time. We have checked this out and apparently that is not being done elsewhere so we're staying with the term, Central Standard Time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Will you please call Bill No. 3?

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Second Reading on Bill No. 3, the Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

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

I'm pleased to be able to speak in the House on the Second Reading of this very important legislation. Madam Speaker, in fact this is a historical day for all of Manitobans, not just the women of the province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Minister have the motion?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS presented Bill No. 3, The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act; Loi sur le Conseil consultatif manitobain de la situation de la femme, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: I'm delighted to be able to speak in this House on the occasion of the Second Reading of this very important historical piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, this is an important day for all Manitobans, not just the women of the province but for men and women alike everywhere in the Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, this legislation will take us one step closer to achieving our goal of true equality between all women and men of this province. It will take us one step closer to achieving that very important goal of full and equal participation by women in all aspects of our society.

This legislation, Madam Speaker, reflects a commitment on the part of this government to ensure that progress is made steadily and steadfastly towards equal treatment and opportunity for all women. As I said on First Reading, Madam Speaker, the intent of this act is to entrench the existence of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women into the structures of government. It will establish the permanence of the council and it will address the commitment of this government to the importance of the role played by the council.

Madam Speaker, through the entrenchment of the council, through this legislation, and through the establishment of an arm's length relationship between the council and the Province of Manitoba, all members of this House can be assured of good, independent, well-researched, objective advice that will benefit all of us in all of the decisions that we have to make as decision-makers. I think that this legislation, Madam Speaker, will help us avoid the kind of situation that happened several years ago around the national Constitutional debate, when the federal Liberal Government tried to prevent the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women from holding a conference on the importance of the entrenchment of women's equality in our national Constitution. Fortunately, in that instance, Madam Speaker, the women of Canada won the day and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women was able to succeed in presenting to the people of Canada the options for entrenching women's equality in the Constitution, and as a result, as all members know, the result is that women's rights are forever entrenched as a constitutional right.

I think, Madam Speaker, that this legislation couldn't have come at a better time. Given the news that started off this week, Madam Speaker, when women across this province were saddened to learn that there still existed in this province another organization, another institution that shut out women, that kept women from equal participation, and I hope that the council and this legislation will help the Conservative Party and members opposite in dealing with the difficult situation

and in dealing with the closed door policy of the Conservative Club of Greater Winnipeg that has for years excluded women and in the year 1987 continues to exclude women.

And, Madam Speaker, I think we have to remember that an organization, a political organization more than any other organization, needs to be open to women to deal with the very problem that is at the heart of all of these inequalities, and that is the underrepresentation of women in political life.

And, surely, we will never begin to deal with that underrepresentation and those inequalities that women face throughout our society if we do not begin to ensure that our own houses, our own political organizations, are open to women, and that not only are they open to women but that women are encouraged to participate and to develop and grow into future leaders of our province and country.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women will provide some help and advice to members opposite in dealing with this very difficult problem and hope that they will soon find a way to open up the doors of this club to the women of the province.

MR. G. FILMON: If that's the most difficult problem that we would have to face in Manitoba, then she is out to lunch. What about the battered women; what about the women who are on welfare; what about the women who don't have day care?

A MEMBER: And you're worried about the Conservative Club of Winnipeg.

A MEMBER: What a joke you are! What a joke you are!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Obviously, Madam Speaker, we have hit a sore point with the Opposition - obviously defensive about this obvious embarrassment to members opposite - and the Leader of the Opposition suggests, Madam Speaker . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Tell us about what you're going to do for the battered women; tell us what you're going to do for the women on welfare who can't find a job; tell us what this act is going to do for them. The most important thing is who can join a club, eh! Boy, are your priorities screwed up.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition please come to order. Every member who wishes to debate on Second Reading will have an opportunity.

The Honourable Minister has the floor.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: As I have just indicated, I think that one of the most important institutions and organizations in our society that should be opened to both men and women are political organizations because of the underrepresentation of women, and I

admit it's a problem on the part of my political party, and I hope that members opposite would begin to put measures in place that will deal with an historical pattern of underrepresentation since women got the vote in Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asks what members on this side are doing about women on welfare, about women needing day care, about women in the employment sector. Madam Speaker, the record of this government on those issues is clear.

As I pointed out in my speech addressing the Speech from the Throne, in a total of 13,000 words used by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech addressing the Speech from the Throne, he failed to use the phrase "equality of women" even once. Now where are their priorities, Madam Speaker, and when? And not only failed to use it and address the issues and suggest that money go towards women on welfare or women needing day care, what did he do? He used the Advisory Council on the Status of Women Jobs Fund Report to criticize the Jobs Fund and to suggest that all that money should go towards rural needs. Nobody on this side underestimates the needs of rural Manitoba, but for the Leader of the Opposition to make that kind of attack and not even make one suggestion or one proposal that one penny should go into one program for women of this province, I think is appalling and embarrassing.

Madam Speaker, I think the most important question to address while discussing this legislation is why in the first place the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women is necessary. Why are Status of Women portfolios necessary? Why the U.N. Decade for Women? Why the women's movement, generally?

I think the best way to begin to answer that question is to say that we hope some day all of these efforts will be superfluous, that we will be able to work ourselves out of a job and ensure that all of these organizations are defunct and actually self-destruct.

The problem is, Madam Speaker, that the way things are going, it is going to take quite a while yet before such organizations and important institutions such as the Advisory Council on the Status of Women won't be necessary. The examples that I pointed to, of this week, are one good example of why advisory councils will continue to be needed for some time yet. But, Madam Speaker, the important reason and the most important issue facing all of us in addressing this legislation is the fact that equality is still somewhat of a long, distant goal, that inequality is still pervasive in our society.

It took 100 to 150 years for women to first achieve a vote, to become persons, to become less than chattels and second-class citizens in our society; and I think, Madam Speaker, it's going to take some time yet for women to be able to change structures, for men and women to be able to address the barriers in all of our institutions before we can say with confidence that we have achieved equality.

I look forward to that day, Madam Speaker, but in the meantime, all of our efforts must be speeded up, all of our talents must be used in the direction of ensuring that we get a little closer to that goal of equality, and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women in Manitoba can play a very important role in that regard.

I think the best way to look at the goal that we are trying to achieve is to look at it through the eyes of

Judge Rosalie Abella who stated that when this is understood and acted upon; when it is no longer a source of wonder that a woman has performed exceptionally well or a confirmation of prophetic hindsight when she has performed with mediocrity; when the appointment of a woman causes no more public or private anxiety over whether she is genuinely qualified than does the appointment of a man; when for that matter the appointment of a woman is so routinely accepted that the gender of the appointee is not even discussed; when aptitudes are accepted as accruing to particular individuals rather than to particular genders, then, and only then, will society have achieved a form of gender equality.

Madam Speaker, we all have different definitions of full equality and we all have different understandings and methods for getting to that point in our history, but I think we would all agree that, in essence, equality is summarized in the principles outlined at the beginning of this legislation; some principles which demonstrate the foundations upon which the advisory council rests, but also upon which all the policies and programs of this government rests. Those principles have to do with full and equal participation in all of our economic institutions, social institutions and legal institutions; but they also have to do with a sharing of responsibility for children in our society, and a recognition that through those kinds of progressive policies that we are looking for, and through reasonable attitudes with respect to the sharing of responsibilities, then and only then will we be able to begin to say we are addressing equality in a serious way; and, in that regard, I fall back on a definition used earlier about what equality is and what that means for all of us.

Madam Speaker, that definition would include the words, "moving toward the goal of equality, and a society where every individual, irrespective of sex, shall have the same practical opportunities not only for education and employment but also in principle, the same responsibility for his or her own maintenance, as well as a shared responsibility for the upbringing of the children and the upkeep of the home."

Madam Speaker, I refer members opposite to the legislation before them and hope that they will look very carefully at the principles that have been enunciated at the beginning of that legislation.

Madam Speaker, the inclusion of those principles in this legislation makes this legislation unique in Canada. Certainly, this is not the first such legislation in Canada to entrench an advisory council's status and position, but it is certainly the first legislation to enunciate principles that tie in very closely to that important goal of equality: principles like women and men should have equal rights, opportunities and responsibilities; principles like changes in social, legal and economic structures are required in order to make full equality and access a reality; and principles like the role of women in child bearing should not be a source of discrimination, and that the upbringing of children requires a sharing of responsibility between women and men and society as a whole.

Madam Speaker, in addressing this issue and addressing the fact that we have some distance to go before we can confidently say equality has been achieved, I would not want to leave the impression that significant progress has not been made. I think the

sheer existence of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and its active history over the last three years is a sign and an indication that progress is being achieved and that Manitobans are listening and acting on the advice of that council.

Significant progress has been made, Madam Speaker, if you look at the fact that it was only 58 years ago that women were declared persons, and to refresh the minds of members opposite, the persons' case occurred on October 28, 1928, when the British Privy Council determined that Canadian women were fit and qualified persons and therefore eligible to sit in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, considerable progress has been made when you think that only 71 years ago women became eligible to vote in Manitoba. But when you look at the economic situation and you look at the social situation in Manitoba, and right across this country, the statistics speak for themselves and they indicate that action must be always ongoing and that commitment to the principles of equality must always be at the top of our political agenda.

Let us look, Madam Speaker, briefly, at the statistics relating to the economic situation of women in Manitoba. Let me say at the outset of listing those statistics that it is because of these statistics and this data that this government has acted on many fronts, including training, pay equity, child care, measures against violence in our society, and the list goes on and on.

Madam Speaker, today, the average earnings of women continue to be significantly lower than men's earnings even in occupations that are overwhelmingly female dominated. In 1980, the average annual employment income for Manitoba women was 52 percent of the average for men, and that gap in total incomes was largest in the 35-54 age category and for individuals with lower levels of education. Among full-time, full-year workers, Manitoba women earned only 66 percent as much from employment in 1980 as Manitoba men.

Madam Speaker, data from the 1971 and 1981 census shows that there is a narrowing of the gap between women's and men's incomes in Manitoba, and I think we can attribute that narrowing of the gap to the consistent and persistent efforts on the part of members on this side of the House in dealing with that kind of problem. But we know we have a long way to go. Seventy-five percent of all part-time workers are women and that, of course, translates into inadequacy of income, inadequacy of job security, inadequacy of permanent full-time child care arrangements, and the list goes on.

I think, by and large, we have to remember that women are still among the poorest of all citizens in our country. Particularly, we know that older women are the poorest of all in our country, that there is still a significant wage gap between men and women, that women are still concentrated in job ghettos, that women are still unable to get full-time job opportunities when they want full-time job opportunities, and that training in non-traditional areas, in new technological fields is still very much inaccessible to women throughout our country.

So the first issue, Madam Speaker, for all of us is dealing with that kind of economic situation, and I would hope that we would get more from members opposite

than simply the suggestion that all the Jobs money should go into rural Manitoba without a penny going to women's employment programs, training programs, pay equity efforts, affirmative action and initiatives, and child care strategies. All of those issues require ongoing commitment and funding in a reasonable, progressive manner.

I was dismayed, to say the least, in reading again the comments from the Member for Lakeside when he basically dismisses initiatives in the area of day care because it costs too much, and by suggesting that at a time of a high deficit, when so many other needs are apparent, that day care is not a priority, and in fact lump together all those people who are fighting for day care and good, decent, affordable child care as militant feminists.

Well, Madam Speaker, if that's a definition of a militant feminist, then I wear that title proudly, and I'm sure all women in Manitoba and Canada wear that title proudly, because if it means fighting for a little bit of peace of mind and a little bit of knowledge that our children are safe and secure, and if it means finding affordable child care and accessible child care in order to be able to combine our work as parents and as workers in the labour force, then I think we're all proud of that title.

Madam Speaker, the only advice that one can get from the Member for Lakeside is that we need to be more militant, so I guess that's exactly the direction the women of Canada will have to go in.

Madam Speaker, speaking of day care, given the fact that the Member for Lakeside had dismissed the whole issue and any efforts in that regard as being too expensive and not on equal standing as other priorities of the member opposite, I think we do have to look a little more seriously at the kind of direction Manitoba is going in, how that compares with other provinces, and what it will mean for all of us in the months and years ahead.

I certainly hope what he is suggesting is not what his fellow colleagues are involved in federally by both sitting on the issue for months and years and on top of that tampering, as the Free Press suggested, with the day care report that is supposed to be released on March 21. I think all of us are concerned that there is that kind of manipulation of data and rational responses to a very serious problem going on at that level. I hope that the Member for Lakeside is not suggesting that this is the appropriate way to go in terms of day care.

I point out to members opposite, particularly the Member for Lakeside, that this province, this government, has taken a reasonable and progressive approach to the issue of day care by putting money into it as the services are able to meet the child-care needs and by ensuring that we have excellent standards, that we have well-qualified day care workers and by ensuring that all of the children of this province, whether they be infant or preschool, are able to enjoy the best possible child-care service around.

To use, as a contrast to our approach, I think I would like to refer the Member for Lakeside to the Winnipeg Sun article of this past Sunday, which said: Alberta Monster, Worst System in Nation. Why is it the worst system? Because they have done exactly what this government has not done and that is: pumped money into the system without any kind of standards, proper

procedures and trained day-care workers; and, as well, pumped all kinds of money into profit centres without any regard for the care of children and the kind of standards that are being provided and the qualifications of the day care workers.

Madam Speaker, the approach of Manitoba is best summed up in that same Winnipeg Sun article with the headline: Manitoba's Day Care System is the Best Structured in the Country.

Our commitment is to continue to meet the need for new day care spaces, for part-time day care spaces, for day care spaces for emergency workers, for shift workers, for sick kids and to continue to put as much energy and effort into this direction as possible. I think our record speaks for itself. The best day care system in this country is nothing to laugh at. Madam Speaker, it is a result, not only of the commitment of this government, but it is a result of the advice provided by the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women and other organizations like that right across the province. I think we have to give credit to those organizations and to the women of this province for keeping those issues in the forefront of the political agenda and for keeping us all informed about the best way to proceed on these issues.

Madam Speaker, as I hinted at earlier at the outset of my remarks, one of the obvious reasons for a Council on the Status of Women, for women's organizations generally, is the underrepresentation of women in political life. That underrepresentation, as I've said on previous occasions, is evident in this House, is evident right across this country and I would hope that all members of this House are committed to finding ways to reduce the cultural conditioning within our own political parties, to open up male-only clubs and to find ways to give women the training and the background that is required to enter political life.

I don't need to remind members that it was in 1921 that Agnes McPhail was elected the first woman to the House of Commons and she had great hopes at that time that women would be following immediately in her footsteps. However, as we all know, there certainly was no stampede. Look around us, as I've said, only eight women in this House, 9.8 percent in the federal House of Commons, and the list goes on.

That kind of underrepresentation is a result of many factors, obviously one of the biggest is still attitudinal. The attitudinal barriers are evident in this House and probably most often from members opposite. I only have to refer to - I think the first month that I was in this House - being confronted with the remarks by the Member for Portage la Prairie that because I had a playpen in my office, that I must have been a high-priced babysitter. Now if that isn't an attitudinal barrier to women getting into politics, then I don't know what is an attitudinal barrier.

Or, Madam Speaker, I refer to federal counterparts of members opposite on the numerous occasions when women were clearly insulted by the remarks generated from members of both the Liberal and Conservative Parties. I think of the occasion in the House of Commons when the Member for Vancouver East raised the question of violence against women and the guffaws that were heard to have arisen from the benches of members from the Conservative and Liberal sides was an embarrassment and an insult to women right across this country.

Or I think about a more recent event in October of 1985 when the issue of women who were married to members of the Armed Forces were told that they could not meet to discuss issues and to put together positions on issues of importance to them and noting that the Member from Calgary and the Minister of Defence, Harvey Andre, said he had no objections if the women wished to hold Tupperware parties.

I'm glad to see that members opposite are taking all of this very seriously and we are not hearing laughter and ridicule coming from their benches as we go through these difficult issues and attitudinal barriers that face women. The attitudinal barriers and the cultural conditioning of our legal professions is also of significance and also a reason why the Advisory Council on the Status of Women is absolutely critical.

I guess we all had hoped that racism and sexism and prejudice and discrimination that was so prevalent on the benches a decade ago was disappearing and no longer a matter to be concerned about to any great extent. But I think some recent examples suggest to us that there is still very much a pervasive attitude that ascribes to women a particular place in our society, a certain set of characteristics, and as a result ensures that their full and equal participation in all aspects of our society is not achievable.

I think of the recent incident in Nova Scotia last January when a judge was removed from the bench when in making some legal decisions he relied heavily on his interpretation of the Bible for his opinions on women's proper place. While I think that we all respect the passages of the Bible and we all use the Bible as a basis for social progress and for progressive and meaningful activity in our society, I think we're always shocked when the Bible is used to contribute and further advance the cause of those who would like to see women's positions in society defined in as narrow a way as possible.

I was concerned, closer to home, here in Manitoba, in a Manitoba court recently, a male lawyer, feeling somewhat surrounded by female judges, or females in the court - the judge, the Crown Attorney, probation officer and others - hinted that his case may have been handled differently by men.

This lawyer, in representing a client who was involved with a ring of girls, ages 10 to 13, and who sold sexual favours for money and sniff, argued that the biological urge that a man is born with is something that takes a lot more control than someone of the opposite sex could maybe appreciate. Worse than that, Madam Speaker, the lawyer cited Romeo and Juliet as examples of great romantic figures to justify man's biological needs for young girls.

Well, fortunately, and in a signal that the times are changing and signalling that women, as judges, can make a difference, the judge in that particular said, "I found myself at times becoming livid during the course of your submission. I really don't think that any of this is related to normal male urges. The world is full of males who have urges. They're not out picking up 10-year-olds to satisfy them."

She also told this lawyer that if he found that looking at 10-year-olds was a normal male urge, maybe he'd better see the probation officer himself.

I think, Madam Speaker, that that kind of illustration indicates that cultural conditioning in all of our

institutions is still fairly pervasive and that all of us need to work to diminish and to eradicate those attitudes from all of our activities and institutions.

I think that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women can play a big role in helping us reach that goal and achieve those ends. I know, based on the past three years of activities, that the Advisory Council will never hesitate to bring those kinds of examples of stereotyped notions about women and discriminatory attitudes about women, that they will bring them to our attention, to all of our attention, and I hope that we will all be ready to deal with that kind of constructive criticism.

It was also apparent to me this week that cultural conditioning and discriminatory attitudes is still very much prevalent in all of our institutions. There was another example this week in the newspaper about the RCMP indicating that current policy of the RCMP makes it difficult for spouses who are both working for the RCMP to work and live in the same location. I think that kind of policy is out of touch with reality in this day and age and the kind of policy that needs to be changed with the advice of organizations like the Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

In fact, I think that that whole issue of ability to work in whatever profession we choose and to still be responsible and good parents and to have a meaningful family life along with a meaningful career is probably one of the biggest challenges facing all of us, and certainly one of the reasons why I took such offence at the Member for Portage la Prairie's remarks when he took some umbrage with the fact that I had a playpen in my office.

I think it was a progressive step that we were able to change the Rules of this House somewhat to ensure that there is a little more time for families when we pursue this kind of career. I think we all have to do more in that regard and probably we should start with working together to put a day care in this building so that all of us could either, on a part-time basis or a full-time basis, bring our children; and not only that, encourage younger men and women to enter politics knowing that some of those attitudinal and structural barriers have been dealt with.

A MEMBER: Judy, not just younger ones . . .

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Not just younger, no. I correct myself. But I think the absence of . . .

A MEMBER: She also would include old cronies like you, Harry.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, all of us are interested in reducing the attitudinal and structural barriers that prevent women from entering any occupation in our society, and whether day care is required at the place of work or in the community, it's all a priority for us, and I think we should all be working to ensure that options are available for women and that good quality, accessible child care is available generally throughout the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, to go back to that whole area of attitudinal barriers, because that is certainly an area that confronts us daily on a very personal and painful

way, and it is an area where all of us can begin to change and improve in terms of our response to women of this province. I think where we need to begin is dealing with the position of women in our economy and the attitudes that prevent women from accessing, in a full and equal way, job and training opportunities.

I think back 10 years ago when it was quite common for politicians of the day, particularly members of the Liberal Government, to suggest that the unemployment statistics, that the unemployment stats showing women, particularly - let me start that again.

Looking back 10 years ago, showing that the statistics around women's unemployment were particularly serious, the response from members of the Liberal Federal Government at the time was, "Well, they really aren't so bad after all because you've got to eliminate all those women who are only working for their mink coat or for the second car, and after all, they're only taking jobs away from men."

I hope that things have changed from that time of 10 years ago, and I hope that there's a recognition on all of our parts that what all of this is about and why the advisory council is so important is that women should have the freedom to choose whether they want to work in the home looking after children on a full-time basis or in the labour force on a full-time basis or a combination of both. I think that's what all of this is about in making those choices possible and putting in place programs and services and initiatives that help women fully realize the choices that they make.

I know that things have changed somewhat over the last decade, but I still get concerned when I hear about unemployment counsellors telling women that you should just consider yourself damn lucky that you've got a job at all, or why don't you just go home and collect separation payments instead of looking for work, and the list goes on and on. Those are recent statements, statements that tell me that attitudes on the part of all of our institutions which have a real impact on women's opportunities are very much a problem and have to be dealt with.

When it comes to attitudes that we have to overcome, I referred to some of the issues that are confronting members opposite and the work that needs to be done. I'm pleased to see a little progress has been made from the days when Sterling Lyon has said that the Progressive Conservatives were among the best breeders in the world, but I don't know, in a substantive way, in a policy way, if much has changed on the benches of members opposite.

If you consider also the comments made by Sterling Lyon back in 1977 around the issue of matrimonial property law, when he went on record opposing The Family Maintenance Act because, as he said, the law is impertinent and an unwarranted intrusion into people's private lives.

Fortunately, the women of Manitoba again were victorious in overcoming that kind of oppressive attitude and the legislation was introduced and Manitoba became the first province in Canada to have community of property and the most progressive matrimonial property legislation anywhere in this country; but I think we all have to give credit to the efforts on the part of members on this side of the House and to the women of the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, the Advisory Council on the Status of Women can therefore play a very important role in

terms of ensuring better access and opportunities and a change in attitudes in all of our institutions, whether they be economic, social, educational, legal, the list goes on and on, and I know that the Advisory Council, over the last three years has had a significant impact on reducing barriers in all of those institutions and on proposing policies and programs that help us as government and as members of this House in formulating plans that will further advance the status of women.

I refer specifically to recommendations to this government relating to the government's affirmative action policy and programs, the question of equity in family maintenance awards, the question of adequate funding and continuity of services to victims of incest and wife abuse and sexual assault, information and advice regarding equal access to training, education and employment, advice regarding accessibility of all Manitoba women to the full range of reproductive health care.

Through all of those kinds of briefs, presentations and advice, members of the government and, indeed, members in this entire Chamber, are better able to respond to the needs of Manitoba women and to ensure that our policies and programs are in tune with the majority of women right across this province.

The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women can also play a very important role in giving women themselves the resources and the tools to advance the status of women and to ensure their own full and equal participation in all institutions in our society; and that again points to another reason for a special effort around status of women, a separate organization that brings together women of all experiences, of all ethnic background, of all ages, of all regions and to pool their advice, share their experiences and, out of that, ensure not only their own personal growth, but new directions on the part of government policy and programs.

That area of providing women with the tools and the resources to equip themselves to participate fully is a very important one that should be recognized by all members of the House because, as we all know, women generally have to prove themselves twice as good as a man in order to be thought half as good. As Charlotte Whitton would say, "Fortunately, that's not too difficult." But it's because of that kind of situation that has shaped women's experience, that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women can play a major role, or I could probably put that notion in a different way.

We've all heard that Fred Astaire is a good dancer, right? But we should also remember that Ginger Rogers danced just as well, but she did it backwards and with high heels on.- (Interjection)- There you go; I said that there's cultural conditioning on this side too. I never said we were free from all cultural conditioning. I just said that it was considerably less on this side than on that side of the House.

Madam Speaker, the importance of an organization that is focused specifically on the status of women, that involves women, that works with women, that trains women, is vital for the future of our society. Such organizations and efforts can help us deal with that underrepresentation of women in public life and to ensure that women are able to have their voices heard and are able to exert influence and power in decision-making at all levels of our society.

How much time do I have left, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has unlimited time.

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, I have, throughout these remarks, focused on three major purposes and reasons for the Advisory Council on the Status of Women and, hence, the legislation to entrench the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, to remind members they are No. 1, to ensure that we keep moving in the direction of equality in all of our institutions, economic, social, legal, cultural, educational and so on; No. 2, that any effort that brings women together, that trains women, that teaches women to become full and participating members of our society must be recognized and, No. 3, that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women can provide necessary leadership to all Manitobans, particularly to members opposite when they deal with difficult issues like the Conservative Club of Greater Winnipeg that excludes women.

Madam Speaker, we need that kind of leadership and members opposite may identify with the words of Nellie McClung, when she said that disturbers are never popular. Nobody ever really loved an alarm clock in action, no matter how grateful they have been afterwards for its kind service.

To begin to conclude, let me say that I think it's significant that this legislation is introduced around the time of International Women's Day and is introduced at a time when women everywhere are making increasing demands upon governments and on legislators for pay equity, for better day care, for adequate pensions, for freedom of choice in all regards, for fuller participation in all of our public and political forums; and I think it's significant that at this time we not only recommit ourselves to greater action, but we remember the efforts of those who have gone before us and remember the women of the province who have contributed so much toward equality everywhere.

There is no question that for many women change is sometimes slow and sometimes cumbersome, and there is no question that for many others, particularly some members opposite, that change is often too fast and too significant. But the reality of the matter is that significant work remains to be done, and it's going to require all of our resources and all of our efforts to move in that direction. It is the Advisory Council on the Status of Women that can play a very important role and resource for all of us as we recommit ourselves to that work.

Let me conclude, Madam Speaker, by saying the existence of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, these efforts to entrench the Advisory Council through legislation, and to entrench the principles of independent arm's length advice on status of women matters comes out of a philosophy and approach that says that women are not trying, through these separate organizations and special efforts, to work less with men. On the contrary, all of us are making special efforts in order to give women fresh inspiration and knowledge and skill so that they may become full participating members of our society.

It is in our determination that this philosophical attitude for members, at least on this side of the House,

be shared by all of us, and that it be shared because in that sharing of responsibility and action our strength lies. For as we all know, there is a vast reservoir of untapped potential and incredible talent sitting there, waiting to be developed and deployed for the benefit of all of us for all of our society and for generations to come. Because, as has been said very often, at least on the part of members on this side of the House, until all of us have made it, none of us have made it.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I move, seconded by the Member for River East, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Madam Speaker. Just before I move to the Second Reading of Bill No. 4, I am tabling - I'm drawing to the attention of the House - the roll of statutes referred to in the bill which was not my agreement circulated in that massive quantity to every member of the House, but it sits on the Table by agreement as being . . .

A MEMBER: How much did we save . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Personally? You mean by not circulating it to every member of the House, tens of thousands of dollars, about \$80,000 I think.

BILL NO. 4 - THE RE-ENACTED STATUTES OF MANITOBA, 1987 ACT

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 4, The Re-enacted Statutes of Manitoba, 1987 Act; Loi sur Les Lois réadoptées du Manitoba de 1987, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Madam Speaker. I'll be brief in introducing this bill.

This bill is the first of a series of bills required, Madam Speaker, to implement the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, that the laws of Manitoba are to be enacted, printed and published in English and French languages. This bill will re-enact 344, and those are the ones in those binders, of the 393 statutes in the continuing consolidation of the Statutes of Manitoba that are not in both languages.

The bill repeals a further 10 statutes that are spent, those of course are statutes from the continuing consolidation. The remaining 39 bills in the continuing consolidation will be repealed and replaced either by new legislation this Session or by a second re-enactment bill at the next Session.

In effect then, all the current laws of Manitoba will either be re-enacted by what we're doing today or will

be ready for re-enactment this year, well before the expiry date of the period of temporary validity on December 31, 1988, as set down by the Supreme Court of Canada in its order following the Manitoba language reference.

I expect as well, Madam Speaker, in 1988 to present for re-enactment or repeal, the unconsolidated public acts for the years 1870 to date that are still shown as in force on the statute books. Just to emphasize, we are dealing with the major public acts in the continuing consolidation. We are not dealing with the unconsolidated public acts, and we are not dealing with the private acts.

As members of this House are no doubt aware, the last two years have witnessed substantial implementation of the order of the Supreme Court of November 4, 1985. For example, a number of significant changes have been introduced into the procedures and practices of this House, to make sure that every step of enactment complies with the requirements as set forth by the Supreme Court of Canada.

There have been important changes in the form of the bills, which appear before the Legislature, and to the regulations, which are considered and enacted by Cabinet, by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Bill No. 4 is a further and probably the most important step towards ensuring the continuing validity of all of our laws. It provides a positive indication that Manitoba is surely and carefully taking those steps necessary to bring us into compliance with our constitutional obligations.

Madam Speaker, I wish at this time and have given to the Clerk to table, an interim report. It's a brief one, on all of the activities which are currently under way to comply with the Supreme Court order, well before in each instance, well before the period of temporary validity coming to an end.

This report which I'm now circulating, through the Clerk, incidentally complies with an undertaking given to the Supreme Court, that periodic reports would be provided to the Legislature.

Madam Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that the changes which have been made in the operation of the House and the presentation of this bill, in the way in which it is being presented, were facilitated by the Legislative Assembly Management Committee, the Office of the Speaker, as well as by the cooperation of the Opposition House Leader and by the Member for River Heights.

I would also be remiss if I didn't commend the tremendous role played by Legislative Counsel and staff who worked with Legislative Counsel in making this happen in such an expeditious and effective way.

I would like to urge the House, I must leave it of course with the House, to pass this bill without undue delay. It is estimated, Madam Speaker, and one I think can appreciate, in looking at the volume of material to be printed, that the printing and publication of the re-enacted statutes will take at least nine months from the date of Royal Assent. It's desirable that the laws of the province in both languages be available to the people of Manitoba as soon as possible. I would hope that that is borne in mind as we proceed with this re-enactment. It is in the spirit of cooperation required to ensure the continuing validity of our laws, that I recommend this bill to the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a few questions for clarification and for the record for the House.

Can the Attorney-General confirm that in these statutes before the House, there have been no changes in legislation which existed up to this point of time?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, I can, Madam Speaker. The only changes that will be found in any of the acts contained in the rolls are those that in effect are revision, where outdated dates or passages, minor corrections in grammar and punctuation have been made, but there are no substantive changes whatsoever in any of the bills contained in the rolls.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, could the Attorney-General not indicate to the House that the printing of the statutes could be commenced at this point in time or does he anticipate amendments? I asked that because he's suggested that the bill should be passed quickly because the printing will take nine months.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, I do not anticipate amendments. If, after due consideration, it is the advice to me of the Opposition House Leader that there will be no amendments proposed by the Opposition, then I think we can, with assurance, undertake the commencement of the printing of the bill. That would be very helpful. I would consult with Legislative Counsel to see if there is any legal impediment. I don't think though, because obviously they would be printed in anticipation of Royal Assent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I'm interested in confirming, in accordance with House procedures, this bill would be referred to Law Amendments Committee or committee for public hearings. I ask that question because a party has already indicated that they wished to appear and make a presentation on one of the 344 bills. It may very well be that others may want to make presentation on the contents of any of the other bills.

HON. R. PENNER: I think that I would ask our House Leader to confer with the Opposition House Leader as the best procedure to follow. I would like to examine the precedence with respect to revisions that have come forth in 1954 and 1970, whether those revising statutes and the rolls went to one of the public committees or to the Committee of the Whole. But I think without foreclosing that possibility, I'm open on it; I would like to leave it to discussion between our House Leader and the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: One final question for clarification.

Could the Attorney-General confirm that the format of the statutes was put forward by the government, and there I'm specifically referring to the fact that the English and French are both on one page, that the format of the printing of the statutes was put forward to the Supreme Court by his government?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Madam Speaker, we clearly looked at what would be the least costly and legally

the most effective way of presenting the statutes and we came to the conclusion that the double-column format, as is used by the Government of Canada, would in fact be the least expensive of what is a fairly expensive - well, a very expensive - printing endeavour, altogether in the neighbourhood of about \$1,800,000.00. That was the least expensive and legally the most effective way of doing it; that was the advice we had and the advice we gave the Supreme Court.

MR. G. MERCIER: Sorry, Madam Speaker, that just leads to another question.

Can the Attorney-General confirm that in the Province of Quebec that they have separate English and French statutes, so that if someone wishes to purchase a set of statutes they can purchase either the French or the English?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, my advice is that is in fact the situation in the Province of Quebec although there have been questions raised as to the legal validity of statutes printed in that way.

MR. G. MERCIER: I thank the Attorney-General for those answers to those questions.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. In terms of House Business, would you call Bill No. 5, standing in the name of the Minister of Government Services?

BILL NO. 5 - AN ACT TO REPEAL CERTAIN STATUTES RELATING TO EDUCATION AND OTHER MATTERS

HON. R. PENNER presented Bill No. 5, An Act to Repeal Certain Statutes Relating to Education and Other Matters; Loi abrogeant certaines lois concernant l'Éducation et d'autres questions, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Madam Speaker, this is again part of the process to which I referred a few moments ago.

This bill repeals 51 acts respecting education matters passed between 1901 and 1975. The various acts dealt with subjects such as: debenture issues, so that they were in a sense one-time acts only; school district or division boundaries that have changed from time to time; creation and dissolution of districts and the elections held in certain areas where some technical deficiency required validation by subsequent statute.

The purposes of the legislation having been achieved are effectively expended. There is no reason to translate and re-enact these statutes. Each act has been researched and considered by my department and by

the Department of Education. Madam Speaker, we'll appreciate the significance of eliminating such legislation, particularly in view of the cost of translation.

A great deal of legislation currently alive in our statutes is being reviewed to determine whether it is indeed spent, and I referred to that a few moments ago when I talked about the review of the unconsolidated public acts and subsequently we will be looking at a somewhat different process with respect to the private acts. Many private municipal acts fall into this category, that is the category of bills presently under review and they are being reviewed so that similar repeal can take place when appropriate.

I should add that where legislation is not spent, this process provides an opportunity to consolidate legislation prior to its re-enactment. This review, then, Madam Speaker, will result in fewer acts being carried forward beyond their life span. Considerable monies will also be saved by eliminating spent statutes. Here, again, I would want to commend Legislative Counsel and his staff for an excellent piece of work in being able to bring this forward so expeditiously.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister.

Though all the acts referred to in the bill, or in the annex of the bill, relate to educational matters, it was my understanding that the order of the Supreme Court was to translate all statutes. I'm wondering, is there special consideration, or was there a special order that the dead statutes that seem to be referred to here are the ones that have ceased being useful or functional? Were they not supposed to be translated as well or is there a special provision where this can be done?

HON. R. PENNER: What the order of the Supreme Court in effect was, and it has to be related to its opinion on the reference, an order of temporary validity. It simply said that until 1988 and 1989, and in another case in 1990, all of your statutes are valid. Now, if you want to keep those statutes alive, then you will have to translate, re-enact, publish. But it may be that for various reasons, you don't have to keep this or that statute alive, in which case you simply either repeal or simply don't translate. We'd rather be upfront and show specifically those that we will not in fact be dealing with by repealing, rather than just do it in a sense of apparent inadvertence.

We are mindful of the fact particularly in dealing with legislation that it may be the case that some legislation, although apparently spent, has legal consequences that still flow from it, in which case we are bound to keep it alive. That was part of the reasoning of the Supreme Court. And what legal counsel, and we have special units in my department working with legislative counsel, are doing, is in every case, ensuring that there are no continuing legal consequences that will require keeping the particular statute alive. Once we are satisfied of that, then we either repeal or, as I've said, we simply don't translate, but we'd rather show by specific reference those bills that are not being carried forward.

MR. C. BIRT: One further question. All of the particular statutes referred to in Bill No. 5 seem to relate to educational matters. Is it fair to assume then that there will be other acts coming forward dealing with other statutes relating to other, say, health or welfare or things like this, as they are uncovered then by the review process that you have referred to?

HON. R. PENNER: You will note, for example that in Bill No. 4 - Bill No. 4, as well as re-enacting, repeals the whole or part of certain statutes. I expect when we bring in the parallel kind of bill in the next Session that there will be a number of statutes that will be reviewed.

I also reference the review that is taking place of the unconsolidated public acts and here there would be likely a whole group of municipal acts where the same things as are proposed to be done by Bill No. 5 could be done with a number of municipal acts where they are entirely spent, the municipality no longer exists, or the particular purpose of the statute has long been expended.

MR. C. BIRT: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that debate on this bill be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 6?

BILL NO. 6 - THE EMERGENCY MEASURES ACT

HON. H. HARAPIAK presented Bill No. 6, The Emergency Measures Act; Loi sur les mesures d'urgence, for Second Reading.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, before beginning, I would like to acknowledge all the work that the previous Minister has done to bring the legislation to this stage and I would also like to acknowledge all the work that Government Services and the Director of Emergency Measures Organization, Henry Eckert has done also in preparing this legislation.

The Government of Manitoba recognizes that it has a fundamental responsibility for the safety and security of Manitobans and their environment and is therefore committed to developing in conjunction with local authorities, the provincial and municipal capabilities to provide for the safety of Manitobans in local, provincial or national emergencies and disasters.

The Government of Manitoba also recognizes that the Emergency Measures Act is out of date and must be changed to more adequately reflect the responsibilities of the provincial and local governments in peace-time emergencies.

The act has been rewritten to more adequately reflect the responsibility of the province and local governments during peace-time emergencies. The existing act was developed in the mid-Fifties when the priority of emergency preparedness and the response was focused more on the possibilities of a war emergency.

As a result, it does not adequately reflect or provide for the preparedness for activities that are more peace-time emergencies. These types of emergencies and disasters range from forest fires and floods, which we have experienced over the last couple of years in many parts of Manitoba, severe weather conditions, blizzards like we experienced in the City of Winnipeg this past November, health epidemics, dangerous goods, road and rail and aircraft accidents.

The major drawbacks of the existing act which was brought in in the Fifties is that municipal emergency planning is stated as an optional activity. Therefore, there is a potential for some municipalities to pay insufficient attention to the preparedness for emergencies and they would not be prepared to respond in case of an emergency.

The existing act also requires a proclamation of a state of a peace-time disaster before the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can exercise emergency powers. And the same Order-in-Council is also provided before the municipalities can authorize a local emergency plan.

In addition, under the existing act provincial approval is required for a municipal by-law adopting a peace-time emergency plan and an Order-in-Council is required for amending the plans. This can also be an awkward and lengthy procedure before it is in place. Quite often the emergency will be over before all those procedures are taken care of.

One other limitation of that act is that during an emergency, authorized municipal powers are subject to the direction of supervision and coordination of the Emergency Measures Organization. Again, this procedure can be time consuming. It is not very practical during the time of an emergency when different communities can be affected at the same time.

I think it is obvious these types of procedures are incompatible with today's emergency requirements, especially at the municipal level where emergency planning is essential and emergency response should be immediate in order for it to be effective. Quite often the emergencies develop and by the time they get their response in place, again, there's much property, and the possibility of life being lost because of it.

In addition to other items that were mentioned over the years, the act has not been supplemented with regulations which clearly outline the emergency responsibilities of government agencies, departments, boards and committees, such as those of the Manitoba Disaster Assistance Board which provides financial assistance to those who suffer losses in times of disaster.

Revisions to the act were designed to address all of these problems with the following principles in mind: Simplifying the layout and the language of the emergency legislation. I think it is important that all local municipalities have the same emergency plans in place and they are all singing out of the same hymn book, so that when there is a disaster they can be coordinated with much greater ease from the Provincial Emergency Measures Organization.

In establishing legislative procedure for dealing with peace-time emergencies, I also wanted to simplify the approval procedure so that Orders-in-Council are not required before emergency measures action can be taken.

We also want to ensure that the province, municipal governments and provincial departments and related agencies develop and maintain emergency plans and train emergency response personnel.

Again, it's important that they all have the same type of response, so it can be coordinated more readily from the province, ensuring that the province and the municipal governments have the authority to respond quickly and effectively to any emergencies that may occur again at the municipal level or at the provincial level, enabling municipal authorities to declare their own state of local emergency, and therefore invoke certain powers for the welfare and safety of that community. So if there's an emergency in a municipality, it's not necessary for the provincial coordinators to be in touch with them. They have the authority, under this new legislation, to declare their own state of emergency and officially designating the Manitoba Emergency Measures Organization responsible for advising, assisting and coordinating emergency preparedness and response activities.

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

One time I was involved in a flood in a small community where there was a lot of time wasted not knowing where the sandbags were available in that community. Now, all the councils will know what procedure there is to follow and it will be much more orderly and there'll be a person to call, so they will be able to get that information much more readily.

All of these revisions will update the act and provide a more efficient method of implementation. The changes to layout and language will simplify the legislation and divide it into three parts: focusing on administration; emergency preparedness; and also, in civil emergencies, recognizing the difference of federal and provincial jurisdictions and the responsibilities in emergency preparedness between peacetime and war emergencies. Only the provisions relating to the emergency preparedness for peacetime emergencies have been addressed in this act.

The Federal Government at this time is talking about bringing in a new act as well, which will deal with wartime, and it is designed that this act could become part of it, will make the necessary changes to become part of the federal act that will be coming in.

The simplification of response approval procedure will allow for the activation of emergency plans at any level of government, and this is consistent with the emergency response principles that have been conveyed in the Manitoba emergency plan. These principles call for the local authorities to provide a first response to an emergency situation through implementation of its emergency plan.

When the capabilities of a local authority to deal with emergencies are exceeded, a second level of response is provided from a neighbouring municipality through a formal or an informal agreement which can exist between the municipalities. When these two combined levels of response are exceeded, the local authority

may request assistance from the Provincial Government and its departments and agencies.

It is important to note that the declaration of a provincial or a local emergency does not automatically mean that provisions of financial disaster assistance and vice versa, the operation and eligibility criteria used by the Disaster Assistance Board, will continue and are unaffected by this bill.

This kind of assistance is provided according to the provincial emergency plan. It is also at this level that federal support and assistance can be arranged by the provincial authority. The new act recognizes the importance of emergency planning. The emphasis on mandatory planning will provide for more effective local emergency response procedures.

Experience has shown that the success of the community emergency response is directly affected by the level of its emergency preparedness. Most of us here are well aware of the gas leak that occurred in Neepawa in a sewer system last year. In this instance, the town had just completed their emergency plans and, with the occurrence of the gas leak, they were in a position to respond very quickly, and in an organized fashion they were able to deal with the emergency and they were able to evacuate the town in a very timely fashion and they were also able to provide the necessary care for the residents of that community.

More recently, in the spring of 1986, the communities of Arborg and Riverton were in a position, during a critical flooding stage, to implement preventative measures in accordance with their emergency plans. One can fairly estimate that substantial savings of property materializes as a result of the quick action within the parameter of their plans.

If we recall the Gimli air crash of 1983, the action taken by police, fire, ambulance and hospital personnel proceeded in a well-coordinated manner. This could be attributed to a recent completion of emergency plans by the town and the Rural Municipality of Gimli.

Alternately and unfortunately, we can also draw upon recent examples where, during spring flooding, certain municipalities did not have emergency plans to guide them in responding to an emergency situation. In those instances, there was loss of livestock, and people were only evacuated and cared for on an ad-hoc basis. There was substantial loss of property and it was because of the absence of an emergency plan in those communities.

In recent windstorms, certain areas of the province were caught without an emergency plan. Little activity was able to materialize by the local authorities on their own, but fortunately our provincial staff at that time were available and occupied several fronts and were able to provide a lot of direction so there wasn't much loss or damage because of that.

Allowing provincial authorities to declare their own state of local emergency affords them the opportunity to do everything necessary to prevent or limit loss of life, damage to property or the environment. During the 1979 flooding, there were certain instances where residents refused to move their livestock in sufficient time to permit their movement by normal transportation. The absence of a delegated authority to local authorities led to a delayed response by these people and therefore later on led to more expensive movement of the cattle. They had to be moved by barge instead of moving

them out sooner, if there had been somebody who was in a position to organize that response sooner.

During that same period there were numbers of individuals who refused to evacuate flooding areas. In order to effect the required evacuation, it was necessary to draw upon an Order-in-Council approval and the specifics of certain emergencies may or may not provide sufficient time to follow this procedure.

Last year, during high water levels on the Saskatchewan River, the Saskatchewan River was overflowing its banks in the area of Ralls Island. The Local Government District of Consol did not have the authority to declare it a disaster area and the Town of The Pas had an emergency response system, but they didn't have the authority to go out there, so it led to some delay until The Pas' emergency response team did go out and assist these people in trying to stop the Saskatchewan River from overflowing the banks. But there was time lost while the procedure was discussed. They had the authority to go into the Ralls Island area to work on that problem.

I've also been involved in a derailment on a railroad where hazardous goods were being carried and a propane car exploded. Unfortunately at this time this was in a remote area where there were no people around and there were no damages. But that derailment could have happened just as easily in the Town of The Pas, went through The Pas where there are propane tanks that are right beside the main line. In a situation like that there could be serious loss of life, and I think it is important that every municipality have an emergency response plan so they can deal with situations of that sort.

A discussion paper outlining the proposed revisions to the act was forwarded to all municipalities in Manitoba: the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities and the Manitoba Municipal Administrators' Association. The Northern Association of Community Councils also received copies of their paper.

The comments and suggestions of all these organizations and municipalities were solicited and addressed. In addition, Emergency Measures Organization staff had visited many communities. They have also conducted telephone interviews with a large number of other municipalities, both large and small, drawing upon a representative sample of those throughout the province called, "Consultation of this Subject with Municipality is Continuing." To date, over 60 recognized bodies have been contacted and there has been support from all of these.

They have been unanimous in their general support regarding the expressed intent of the revised legislation. Some communities have indicated they already have a municipal emergency plan while others indicated a willingness to start the process. They're pretty enthusiastic about starting up their own plans.

While some minor concerns were brought forward, they've been responded to by staff of the Emergency Measures Organization. One of the more common and significant of the concerns expressed related to the question of potential financial implications associated with the provisions of the new act. To this end, assurance has been provided that introduction of the new act will not result in significant cost implications for the municipalities.

Some municipalities have questioned the time period to be made available for them to prepare their emergency plans and programs. They have been advised that there is a general recognition that it is acceptable to develop emergency plans on a time-phase basis. The province recognized that it would be unreasonable to expect municipalities to have their plans available immediately upon proclamation of this act.

A cooperative effort between the province and municipalities will be required to assure a reasonable establishment of a sound state of emergency preparedness for all the municipalities in this province.

A further concern was expressed by municipal respondents with respect to the proposed period of continuation of a declared state of emergency. In response to that concern, appropriate adjustments were made within the bill that is before you now. When the paper first went out, there was a period of seven days and people felt that was too short of a period, so it has now been extended to 14 days.

Some very sincere and meaningful consultations have taken place in the preparation for the current bill. As you can see, the current bill provides for building on the momentum that has been established within the last few years in discussions on this bill. It revolves around a philosophy that sound emergency planning, sound emergency training and a practice emergency response, to the bill for the revised Emergency Measures Act now being introduced, properly reflects present requirements for peacetime emergencies. Its application will provide the province with effective emergency preparedness and response authority.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to solicit the unanimous support of the members of the Legislative Assembly for the Emergency Measures legislation and urge speedy passage of Bill No. 6.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon West, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

PROPOSED MOTION - THE PATENT ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would you please call the proposed motion standing in the name of the Premier?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a standing practice that in the moving of government motions by one Minister of the Crown, it can be moved by another Minister of the Crown for another. It's a Manitoba practice.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cooperative Development, the following resolution:

WHEREAS the availability of safe pharmaceuticals at reasonable cost is fundamental to the health and well-being of Canadians; and

WHEREAS section 41(4) of The Patent Act, as amended in 1969, has provided the vehicle whereby Canadian licencees can produce low-priced generic substitutions of brand name pharmaceuticals to be marketed in Canada; and

WHEREAS according to the Eastman Commission, these generic substitutions saved Canadians well over \$200 million in 1983; and

WHEREAS these generic substitutions resulted in a saving in hospital, Pharmacare and prescription costs for Manitobans amounting to over \$14 million in 1986; and

WHEREAS the drug reimbursement paid out by the Provincial Government through its universal Pharmacare Program has risen from \$4.3 million in 1975 to \$28 million in 1986; and

WHEREAS the proposed changes to The Patent Act, which delay the introduction of new generic substitutions, will result in even higher hospital, Pharmacare and prescription costs while providing few alternative benefits to Canadians; and

WHEREAS the cost to Manitobans of the delayed entry of new generic substitutions will be over \$2 million in the first year after the changes, and could total \$44 million by 1995; and

WHEREAS the increased costs will be borne directly by consumers both at the counter and through increased costs to our Pharmacare program, and will especially affect the elderly and those who require continuous medication; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government, in spite of strong representation by the public opposing the amendments, and in the face of constant pressure from the multinational drug companies, continues to insist on amending The Patent Act;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Government of Canada to withdraw the bill outlining amendments to The Patent Act which would result in higher cost drugs for all Canadians; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly be instructed to send copies of the resolution to the Federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and all other members of Parliament.

MOTION presented.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise today to speak to this resolution and relay our concerns regarding the Federal Government's proposed amendments to The Federal Patent Act, better known as Bill C-22.

We believe that certain policies contained in Bill C-22 will result in a substantial increase in the cost of drugs to Canadian consumers in provincial treasuries and does not provide any guarantees for increased research and development.

I'd like to remind you that during the 1960's, the Federal Government commissioned three studies to review drug prices, all three: the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, the Hall Commission and the Harley Commission concluded that drug prices in Canada were too high.

In 1969, an amendment to section 41(4) of The Patent Act allowed generic copies of patent drugs to be imported and sold in Canada on condition that a royalty was paid to the patent holder, a process most commonly referred to as compulsory licensing. Generic drug manufacturers could now offer consumers cheaper alternatives to drugs produced by patent holders.

However, the greatest impact of the section 41 amendment came in 1970 when several provinces, including Manitoba, introduced legislation permitting generic substitutions. Our legislation was passed allowing generic substitutions with a requirement to dispense at the lowest price.

Bill C-22 will alter this system, putting any potential increase in drug costs onto the backs of consumers and provinces. In 1983, Consumer and Corporate Affairs Canada examined the effects of 14 years of compulsory licensing on the pharmaceutical industry. This review of section 41 failed to identify concrete and convincing proposals for expansion of pharmaceutical research and development in Canada.

In 1985, a federal commission of inquiry on the pharmaceutical industry led by Dr. Harry Eastman stated that: "On the whole, compulsory licensing has caused no decline in the economic health of the patent-holding firms." And that "Canada is not well-placed to become a major world centre for pharmaceutical research or for the production of active chemical ingredients."

Other Eastman Commission recommendations included four-year exclusivity for new drugs, not seven to ten years, as proposed in Bill C-22.

Dr. Eastman's Commission also suggested rewarding through increased royalty rates, only manufacturers who contribute to Canadian research and development and not all multinational patent holders irrespective of their contributions to Canadian research and development as Bill C-22 would allow.

Dr. Eastman said: "If there is any concern about royalties and there may be a legitimate one that the royalties aren't sufficient, then have a graded royalty system where those who could establish that they had invested in more research and development in Canada could get a higher royalty." Bill C-22 ignores that.

The Eastman Report clearly shows the real value of output of the pharmaceutical industry increased much more rapidly between the years 1967 and 1982 than did the output of manufacturing as a whole. The increase in constant dollars for pharmaceuticals was 133 percent, compared to 44.5 percent for all manufacturing. In those years, Madam Speaker, that is a time when we're looking at the continuance of generic drug manufacturing.

I'll repeat those figures: the pharmaceutical industry - 133 percent, compared to roughly 45 percent for all manufacturing. The growth of total assets in the pharmaceutical industry: from \$256 million in 1967 to \$1.3 billion in 1982 represents an increase of 410 percent. The comparable figure for all manufacturing is only 351 percent.

Under Bill C-22, all patent-holding manufacturers will benefit from what we in Manitoba believe will be a

certain increase in drug prices. We believe the proposed amendments may offer a more acceptable climate for the multinational patent-holding portion of the industry, but they offer no incentive to the growing Canadian generic drug industry.

In fact, Bill C-22 penalizes this country's generic drug industry and rewards foreign-owned manufacturers. It does this by delaying the compulsory licence process and removing the right of generic manufacturers to enter the market as the need arises, subsequently causing an adverse effect on Canadian drug prices. The proposed Patent Act amendments do not mandate any change in pharmaceutical research and development in Canada. As always, any change in pharmaceutical research and development will have to be initiated by the industry.

The Federal Minister says that as a result of the proposed amendments, there will be a growth in financial investment of \$1.4 billion and the creation of 3,000 new scientific and research-related jobs. We do not see any guarantees to either of these claims.

Recent announcements by multinational drug manufacturers about research and development investment seemed to have the Federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs believing firm commitments and guarantees have been made. There are no commitments.

A recent quote from a press release by Mr. Andre may help us understand why multinationals are supporting these amendments and Mr. Andre is quoted as saying: "Each drug is priced to maximize profits." For Canada to become a world leader in pharmaceutical research and development, my government believes a critical mass for innovative basic new drug or biotechnical research would have to be developed. In fact, we find it hard to believe that the multinational drug companies would develop a major research effort away from their head office locations.

The Eastman Report supports our belief by concluding: "Canada is not well placed to become a major centre for pharmaceutical research. Any research gains, if they occur, are likely to be in the area of clinical research which tends to be marketing-oriented; that is, for the purpose of selling more high-priced drugs."

It should also be noted that the Eastman Commission reported that: "Canada is not well-placed for the production of active-chemical ingredients." As in research and development, the proposed amendments attempt to tie market exclusivity to making the medicine in Canada, but it is not defined in Bill C-22. My government believes these sections of the amendments create artificial barriers to market entry, do little to encourage the growth of a Canadian raw material synthesis industry, cause the delayed entry of generic product, create longer protection for the patentee and will lead to higher drug costs. Generic drug companies must manufacture in Canada to get on the market at the end of seven years, while patentees only have to manufacture in Canada those rare drugs which might be invented in Canada.

This is a major change from the amendments introduced in June of last year where the multinational was required to manufacture in Canada to maintain market exclusivity. This is a major concession to the multinational drug firms and a further barrier to Canadian generic drug companies and fine chemical manufacturers.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we do not believe there could be any realistic expectation that Canada will contribute to the world as an exporter of raw materials or active ingredients given the cost required to make the medicine in Canada as compared to other countries.

It is important to realize that Canadians will not benefit from lower cost drugs as we will continue to be subject to the artificially high transfer prices of the multinationals. When generic manufacturers are allowed to compete without restrictions in the marketplace, then the benefit of lower cost drugs will be realized. As it reads now, Bill C-22 will not permit this. For example, Torcan Limited's brief to the Parliamentary Committee showed they could produce a fine chemical in Canada for \$3,000 a kilo. The multinational drug company, through transfer pricing, intended to bring the same drug into Canada at a price of \$250,000 a kilo. I repeat those figures, \$3,000 as against \$250,000 by the multinational drug company. It is also obvious that Bill C-22 ignores Dr. Eastman's recommendations on four-year market exclusivity. Bill C-22 severely restricts the entry of generic drugs which recently have been reaching the market earlier and earlier, and thereby permitting real savings to Canadian drug consumers.

In 1983, Dr. Eastman estimated saving through generics at \$211 million. As an example of those savings, the Canadian Drug Manufacturing Association compared 1,000 units of essential drugs. The generic Canadian price for 1,000 units of Diazepam is \$2.60; the price for the brand name product is \$243.28 U.S., a difference of over 9000 percent. Another example: the generic Canadian price for 1,000 of Cimetidine is \$90.56; the price of the brand name product is \$377.60 U.S., a difference of 417 percent. Last year alone Manitobans saved \$1.8 million by using just two generic drugs instead of brand-name drugs. In total, Manitobans saved over \$14 million by using generic drugs in 1986.

Dr. Eastman estimated savings through generics at \$211 million in 1983. Mr. Andre says his policy would have saved \$166 million, or \$45 million less. Using that figure would mean Mr. Andre's policy on delayed entry of drugs will mean \$1.2 billion in drug savings will be lost to Canadians up to 1995.

This is the same policy for which Mr. Andre proposes to offer \$100 million in transitional payments to the provinces over four years. The Honourable Mr. Andre has told us drug prices will not rise, but the fact is drug prices will continue to rise because generic manufacturers will be trying to compensate for revenues lost as a result of the delayed entry of their drugs, and because the Price Review Board has no power. The powers of the Price Review Board are by far the most important and weakest part of Bill C-22, and yet the Federal Government keeps referring to the board as the major method for controlling drug prices. Under the proposed legislation the board's power to require an access information on drug manufacturing costs outside Canada will be severely restricted.

It is obvious that this is a major benefit to the multinational drug firms which will not have to provide information on the real cost of making and marketing drugs. As well, the cost of making and marketing a drug has also been removed as a primary consideration

for reviewing drug prices. Once again, a further weakening of the Price Review Board's power.

The proposed Price Review Board is restrained by other criteria which are favourable to the multinationals. For example, the Price Review Board, besides looking at the Consumer Price Index, must examine the patentee's prices for the last five years. In Manitoba, alone, we have seen patentee's prices jump 20 percent a year over the last five years. The board must also look at the prices of other medicines in the same therapeutic class.

Finally, the board must examine the prices at which the medicine, or other medicines in the same therapeutic class, have been sold in other countries in the prior five years. Would the USA price, plus 40 percent exchange, be a fair price? Dr. Eastman stated Canadian prices were approximately 86 percent of USA prices for single-source drugs, and 47 percent for multi-source drugs in 1983. Should these be allowed to rise 14 percent and 53 percent respectively to meet the American price?

The Federal Minister has himself projected an increase of 240 percent in drug costs over the next 10 years, using an average of 13 percent per year increase in drug costs and utilization, but it is entirely that brand-name manufacturers will increase their prices 20 percent per year, as they have historically done. Combine this with only a 5 percent increase in generic drug prices, and drug prices in this country will be much higher than the Minister's own estimates. Under these circumstances drug prices could rise by 400 percent, an additional cost of \$12 billion over the next 10 years.

In summary, it appears that not only Consumer Price Index 4 percent to 5 percent increases will be acceptable under this bill, but also possibly increases of 14 percent, 20 percent, 40 percent, 53 percent, or heaven knows, even 1400 percent. Therefore, the Federal Minister's analysis of the savings attributable to the Price Review Board are extremely distorted and possibly unrealistic.

Further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the powers of the proposed Price Review Board extend mainly to price comparisons, to markets which are largely subject to the control of the patent-holding multinational manufacturers. Ideally, a price review board should have the power necessary to determine the actual cost to make and manufacture a drug. If the savings referred to by the Federal Minister are to be realized, drug price increases must be restricted to the lesser of the Consumer Price Index, or the actual cost of making and manufacturing the drug. In its inability to impose sanctions, the Price Review Board is weak; its powers are permissive rather than mandatory. Even if a restriction on market exclusivity was removed from a patentee - and that's the club they have in this act - it would take a generic manufacturer up to five years to clear drug regulatory procedures and receive a notice of compliance to market the drug, thus extending the patentee's monopoly on that drug.

It is quite clear to me that the Federal Government should be examining the powers of the Price Review Board with a view to strengthening its powers and its abilities to apply meaningful penalties in price controls. There is an obligation to the people of Canada to ensure that the benefits, in terms of price control, research and jobs are greater than currently provided under Bill C-22.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Manitoba has always endorsed the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry on the pharmaceutical industry which would speed up preclinical new drug submissions, toxicology studies, new drug submissions, and the issuance of Notices of Compliance. These moves would provide that new drugs would come onto the Canadian market two, perhaps three, years earlier, providing a direct benefit to Canadians; would also advance the cash flow and profits to pharmaceutical firms; reduce drug prices; align Canadian clinical research with that of the rest of the world; and, as Dr. Eastman stated in his report, increase research investment by at least 50 percent.

We are pleased to note that steps are being made to speed up the new drug evaluation process. We question whether other economic incentives are necessary. Those initiatives, as recommended by Dr. Harry Eastman, would have a very beneficial effect, and we submit that no further initiatives were necessary. We believe an incorporation of these recommendations would eliminate any proposed regulatory legislative or bureaucratic systems and allow the marketplace to continue to regulate prices.

Contrary to the Federal Minister's analysis of Bill C-22, we have calculated possible drug price increases in the next 10 years of over 400 percent, and a cost of delay in generic drugs of over \$1 billion.

In a letter from the Honourable Mr. Andre to senior citizen groups concerned about The Patent Act, he wrote and I quote: "It has been a long time since Doctors Banting and Best discovered insulin. We believe that by offering fair protection for discoveries, more of this kind of activity will take place here at home."

The discovery of insulin, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was in 1921, not by a pharmaceutical firm but by Doctors Banting and Best.

Our question to Mr. Andre: "Over the ensuing 48 years, 1921 to 1969, what new drugs were invented in Canada?" The answer, "None."

They had all these years, 48 years, of patent protection, not one single new pharmaceutical preparation invented in Canada. Why should that change in the future? It would be naive for all Canadians to think that the \$1.5 billion in supposedly guaranteed research and development is going to come from anywhere else but a substantial and long-term increase in drug cost to Canadians.

At committee hearings in Ottawa, on behalf of the government and the people of Manitoba, I urged the Federal Government to reconsider Bill C-22. This government was the only government in Canada that, through its Minister, presented a formal presentation to the parliamentary committee. That presentation was timed for 4:45 in the afternoon; hopefully, that all the media would have packed their bags and their cameras and their notebooks and gone away, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That committee wanted to shut down its hearings and get the business over with. Why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is because there had been a steady flow of representation to the committee saying, "Look, there is nothing wrong with our drug manufacture in Canada. Why are you determined to change it?"

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to point out that this pharmaceutical industry is one that is not only powerful but very profitable; it's a very profitable industry. I want to read to you from an article in the Globe and Mail

of January 6, 1987, and I want to put this into the record:

"Shareholders could be in line for a bonanza from major pharmaceutical companies which, cash rich from drug sale profits, are buying back their shares and are considering an increase in dividends," analysts say. "Over the next two years, there will be a dramatic increase in the payout ratios, share profit dividend divided by the dividend, of major drug companies from an average of 44 percent in 1986 to 47 percent in 1988," said Barbara Ryan, drug analyst at Bayer, Sterns and Company.

"A major reason for the growing generosity of pharmaceutical concerns towards their shareholders is that they are sitting on piles of excess cash from their booming business. Some of these funds amount to more than \$1 billion, U.S., which can be a drag on the balance sheet in the current low-growth, low-interest rate environment.

"Industry leader, Merck and Company, for example, will have about \$1.5 billion in cash at year-end 1986; Bristol-Myers Company, \$1.3 billion; Pfizer Inc., \$1.4 billion; and Eli Lilly and Company, \$810 million. Some analysts predict that such cash reserves will double over the next two years."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that parliamentary committee in Ottawa shut down the representation to the committee. They didn't want to hear from American senior citizen groups who had been looking at generic drug legislation in Canada, and saying, "Heavens, how we need that kind of legislation in the United States."

That is why the pressure from the multinational pharmaceutical companies. They want to be able to continue to be in the kind of high-profit ratio they have today. These are the same pharmaceutical companies, these same chemical companies who, through their patent rights, have been holding Western Canadian farmers to ransom for farm chemicals for many, many decades. It's only through the efforts of individual farm groups that, when it was possible and the patent had finally run its course, were able to get a generic equivalent of that farm chemical available for use in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these companies are not poor; these companies are not weak; they are not threatened by the Canadian generic drug legislation. What they fear is that the excellent example of the kind of legislation that we have will be a threat to their ongoing complete freedom to charge what the traffic will bear and to reap the kind of grotesque rewards that we see in that analyst's report that I read into the record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are companies that have very great power. They hire lobbyists in Ottawa to affect a change in the will of governments. They have been lobbying successive Federal Governments for over 17 years, creating great pressure on Ministers of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to change the generic drug legislation.

At one stage, through their lobbyists, they were insinuating, suggesting, that Judy Erola, who was then the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, through her lack of sensitivity to their pleas to scrap generic drug legislation, was taking innocent people, little children and others, to early graves because she was preventing the pharmaceutical preparations, new preparations, from coming on the market to save the

lives of innocent sick people. That's the kind of lobbying they were doing.

Those same companies just recently hired Judy Erola for over \$100,000 a year to be one of their lobbyists in Ottawa. These pharmaceutical companies know how to pick the good lobbyists too.

Who do you think is lobbyist for some of these pharmaceutical firms? Well, Jerry Ducette, who's one of the key advisors to the Prime Minister . . .

A MEMBER: No more.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, someone says "No more." Well, goodbye, Jerry. But he was lobbying for pharmaceutical manufacturers.

Then, of course, we have Frank Moores, the former Premier of Newfoundland, who was a lobbyist for the pharmaceutical manufacturers of Canada.

These companies have power, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They have millions of dollars at their disposal to cajole and threaten and pressure government and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have done those things.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have a government today apologetic for the kind of legislation which we have now for the generic drug legislation. The Prime Minister of Canada is saying, "Well, we don't want to be scavengers, do we, of intellectual property." We'd only be scavengers of intellectual property, trying in effect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to put some sort of a guilt trip on the people of Canada that somehow we, through this generic drug legislation, are scavenging on the intellectual property of others.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Pirate.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, "pirate," someone says- (Interjection)- Yes, the Honourable Member for River East says "pirate." That is what Mr. Kempling, the Member of Parliament for Ontario, suggested to me when I was in Ottawa, that's it's an act of piracy, in effect, for us to be able to use intellectual property in the way we do under generic drug legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I trust that most people here know what a pirate is, or knew what they used to be - maybe they still exist. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they don't pay rent, they don't pay royalties.

A MEMBER: Socialist.

HON. A. MACKLING: Socialists, well, let's talk about socialists.

Mr. Roy Davidson, in an article called the Scope of Patents, looked at the controversy in respect to the generic drug legislation and in his article he says: "Rather than backing down on the generic drug legislation, our society should be going the other way." He argues that it's a mistake for us in Canada, if we're considering having a more level playing field in this freer trade scenario, to give away our bargaining in respect to issues like generic drugs - we shouldn't be doing that.

But he goes much further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he suggests we should be doing more of that very thing, getting the ability to manufacture under compulsory licensing, not stealing, paying royalties to

manufacturers, but manufacturing in Canada. I quote from his article. He says: "A still better strategy would be to make clear that, in the event of the failure of the trade negotiations, the government would give careful consideration to generalizing the policy of compulsory licensing across the whole of the Canadian patent system. Innovators would then be rewarded by royalty payments, rather than by having monopolies conferred upon them. This is a serious option."

Listen to this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and those who think that maybe there is some piracy or some scavenging going on here, just listen to this: "This is a serious option. It was recommended by the Economic Council of Canada in 1971, in its 1971 report on Intellectual Industrial Property." Like the recommendations of other government bodies before and since for major changes in the patent system, the Economic Council's report was never implemented.

So, when the Prime Minister of this country talks about scavengers, or any Conservative spokesperson trying to make the best face for their cousins or brothers or sisters in Ottawa, talks about piracy of intellectual property, you'd better know that the Economic Council of Canada suggested that kind of action.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we need in Canada is manufacturing in Canada. What we need in Canada is a continuance of legislation to ensure that where there are lifesaving drugs that can be manufactured and made available to people, they will be manufactured in Canada, will be put on the market as early as possible and they won't be there and their production withheld until there is a creaming of the market for the top dollar.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is clear that our generic drug legislation has worked well. I'm sorry to say that the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa, under the pressure of that pharmaceutical lobby was retreating, was trying to find a way out of the constant pressure that that pharmaceutical lobby was bringing to it.

So they appointed Dr. Harry Eastman to study it again. The issue had been studied, as I've indicated, three times before and with the result of the generic legislation we were getting results. But no, the Liberal Government said that we'll study it again and they appointed Dr. Harry Eastman. His report makes clear that that generic drug legislation has not wreaked havoc on the pharmaceutical industry in Canada, quite the reverse, as those statistics I read into the record point out.

Then why is a Federal Government trying to force a fix of something that doesn't need fixing? It is obvious, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are great powers at work trying to change the will of the people of Canada for private profit.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is an issue that should cross all party lines. The Honourable Member for River Heights and the Honourable Member for Pembina and the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and the Honourable Member for Morris, and I could go on, all should stand in this House as quickly as possible and say: Look, Federal Government, this is going too far. There is no need for this legislation. The people of Canada, through delegation after delegation, through letters, through seniors groups, have been saying to you: leave this legislation alone.

I'm going to give some advice to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, the House Leader of the

Opposition party, to convey to his caucus. Likely he will ignore it, but I suggest to him and his caucus that if there is some way in which you want to lift yourself off the decline in popularity in Manitoba, you must find a way of distancing yourself from your cousins, your brothers and sisters in Ottawa, who are making some horrendous mistakes. Part of the reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of that sharp decline in the popularity of the Federal Conservative Party has to be associated with their caving in to the multinational drug companies of the United States and the world.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Madam Speaker, the honourable members should join with this government and urge the Federal Government to withdraw that legislation forthwith. That is the best advice that I could convey to all members.

Madam Speaker, I urge speedy passage of this resolution so that this message can go to Ottawa in time that they can restore the sanity that should otherwise prevail with that Federal Government and that legislation which has worked effectively to protect Canadians and to facilitate the introduction of reasonable cost drugs in this country, that that legislation continue to exist without being decimated by the proposed amendments that are contained in Bill C-22. I implore all members of the House to give quick and unanimous passage to this resolution.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: I move, seconded by the Member for Ste. Rose, that debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to speak to this resolution.

This was good Liberal legislation, Madam Speaker, and it is being eroded by the Conservative Government of this country.

In 1984, the Tories went to the electorate of this country and they said they were going to enhance day care. They said they were going to enhance the status of women. They said there was going to be a fairer tax system. They said there were going to be jobs, jobs, jobs. They said above all, Madam Speaker, that there was going to be honesty and integrity. The only promise that I can think of that the Conservative Party has kept was their promise to the pharmaceutical industries for the support that they were given in the 1984 election campaign - financial support.

I take some exception to the Minister of Labour who decries the appointing of Dr. Eastman and the establishment of an inquiry to study the pharmaceutical industry because I think Dr. Eastman was appointed for one reason and one reason alone - to prove once and for all that generic drugs are indeed the only fair pharmaceutical practice in this country.

What this government also promised, and I refer now to the Conservative Government, was additional funding for research and development - not one penny has come into research and development. If indeed they believe that the pharmaceutical industry is a growth

industry in this country, then let them provide the tax incentives via research and development to make sure that there is indeed research and development in this country, but let's not put the burden on the poor and the disadvantaged who have to pay far too much for their drugs in this country.

If we take just simple examples, Madam Speaker, of my own drug medication which I take for blood pressure, if I take it under its patent brand, it costs me \$44.00. If I take it under my generic name, it costs me \$29.00. Multiply that over and over again and you know that while the NDP may have, as usual, exaggerated the figures, they have not in fact exaggerated to the point where fairness is in question. Fairness indeed is the issue here.

The senior citizens, many of whom are on fixed income, the drugs required for young children in families which are near or below the poverty line, those drugs must be provided to individuals at the cheapest possible level. Bill C-22 will in fact make us the laughing stock of the world. Country after country has given evidence that Canada has the finest drug law in all of the world, that they have provided under the legislation a means by which people can keep themselves from being ill, can maintain good healthy lives by drugs that are reasonably priced.

I note that the Minister of Labour made reference to Judy Erola, and quite frankly I was appalled that she would accept a position as a lobbyist, having intimate information of the value of generic drugs. She had in fact administrated this legislation, and I cannot believe that an individual would sell herself in that way for \$100,000 a year.

A MEMBER: She's a Liberal.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: She's not my kind of a Liberal.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to stand here as the representative of the Liberal Party and support the government in their resolution, and I too urge all other members of this House to do the same.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Charleswood, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I believe there may be an inclination on the part of members to forgo the Private Members' Hour today and call it six o'clock.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it six o'clock? (Agreed)

The hour being 6:00 p.m., the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXV No. 8A, page 215 - 1:30 p.m., Monday, March 9, 1987.)

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am very pleased to rise today to speak on the Speech from the Throne.

I would like to begin by congratulating the new Lieutenant-Governor and extending my best wishes to him. The Premier's choice was an excellent one, and I am certain that he will serve in his new office as well as he did in the past as a member of this House.

I am also very pleased that he chose a member of a group, a very small group - the Icelandic people. As you know, Dr. Johnson is of Icelandic origin. I say this not only because I have been appointed critic for Culture, Heritage and Recreation, but because my own ancestor was from a small minority group, that of the Swiss, who are less numerous still than the Icelandic people.

I would also like to wish a good Session to all of my colleagues, and to all members on both sides of the House. I have several other comments which I would like to make in French, but I will make them later. I have certain things to say, and I want to be certain that the members of the government understand them.

(English translation of Mr. Roch's speech in Volume XXXV No. 8A, page 220 - 1:30 p.m., Monday, March 9, 1987.)

Since there is very little time left, all I can say is that we will have other occasions and other matters which I would like to discuss, whether it be debate on the Budget or on other matters during the Estimates of the various departments. Madam Speaker, I thought I would have trouble speaking for 40 minutes, and I see now that I have already run out of time.