

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 8 April, 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 Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.  
I beg leave to table the 14th Annual Report of Legal Aid Manitoba for the year ending March 31, 1986.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.  
I beg leave to table the Supplementary Estimates for the Department of Natural Resources for detailed legislative review.

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

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Before moving to Oral Questions, yesterday, in question period, I took under advisement a point of order concerning comments of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

I've reviewed the draft printout of Hansard and find that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie said, and I quote, "Will the Minister now investigate and report back to the Legislature the true facts of the numbers of deaths at MDC," and also said, and I quote, "How can I rephrase it when we have not had accurate information given to us?" The honourable member also said, "Madam Speaker, when will this Minister start to tell us the truth?"

The first two quotes I find contrary to Beauchesne Citation 357(t), and the second contrary to Beauchesne Citation 316(f); and I will ask the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie if he would kindly withdraw those two comments that he made yesterday.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.  
Madam Speaker, as you know, there are some 630 residents of the Manitoba school that we, for some time, believed are not being looked after in the proper way. There are also some equal number of workers at the MDC that we feel the conditions are not conducive to good work, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Minister, through Estimates last year and through

question period, I feel has not given us the information that we need and is now withholding a report on the Manitoba Developmental Centre that I believe is crucial to the betterment of the residents and the staff at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

Madam Speaker, to withdraw that remark, I find it would be repugnant to me and my principles, and I'm not going to abandon the mentally retarded at the Manitoba school.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I've asked the honourable member to retract the unparliamentary statements that he said. It's one thing in this House to have disputes over the facts. It's another thing to express those disputes in an unparliamentary way. I'm now instructing the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to retract those statements.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** I reiterate, Madam Speaker; I will not abandon the residents of the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I will then direct the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to withdraw unparliamentary statements that he has made in this Chamber.

**MR. E. CONNERY:** Madam Speaker, I think you heard me already. You can ask it as many times, the answer will be the same. Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** It is a courtesy that I give the honourable member three times an opportunity to participate in the legislative process in a parliamentary way. I have no option then but to name the Honourable Mr. Ed Connery for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, according to my responsibilities, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Community Services, that the Member for Portage la Prairie be suspended from the service of this House for the remainder of the present sitting.

### MOTION presented and carried.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

The question before the House, it is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Community Services, that the Member for Portage la Prairie be suspended from the service of this House for the remainder of the present sitting.

**A STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

### YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (The Pas), Harapiak (Swan River), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Maloway, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Schroeder, Storie, Uruski, Walding, Wasylcyia-Leis.

### NAYS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Connery, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Pankratz, Orchard, Oleson, Rocan, Roch.

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas, 29; Nays, 23.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The motion is accordingly carried.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Manitoba Developmental Centre - tabling of Ombudsman's Report

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

It has to do with an extensive report that was done by the Ombudsman into conditions at the Manitoba Developmental Centre, a report that the Minister is in possession of, and deals with physical abuse, excessive use of mind-altering drugs, overcrowding, inadequate facilities; all to do with the care of our most vulnerable in society, the mentally retarded who are there.

In view of the fact that the Ombudsman has now said that there is nothing to stop this Minister from making that report public, will the Minister now table that report?

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

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, the report that we asked for surrounding the accident to one individual was expanded by the Ombudsman because they felt that the general concern for treatment of mentally retarded persons in the institutional setting was warranted. Madam Speaker, that is a very valued type of study from our perspective.

The value of the report though, I think, is going to require the departmental commentary and the integration that the Ombudsman can then give the report. Madam Speaker, I say that for two reasons: No. 1, I would be the first to say that conditions at the Manitoba Developmental Centre are far from ideal. Madam Speaker, when I came into office as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Developmental Centre, I was quite frankly very disturbed that we had not as a society come further along. In a sense, I think all

governments are accountable here. What we know best to do for our retarded citizens is not what we all are yet doing.

Since I have been Minister, Madam Speaker, we have been making steady improvements at the centre and in the community. I think the integrated report which will come from the Ombudsman in due course will give us valuable advice in how to proceed in . . .

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

May I remind Honourable Ministers that answers should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, given that the Minister has acknowledged that the concerns that were raised by the Ombudsman were warranted; and given that she has indicated that the conditions when she became Minister responsible had been terrible and that she has sought to make improvements; and given that we are indeed dealing with the treatment of our most vulnerable in society, and the matter must be raised to public attention in order to effect the changes and the improvements that have to be made and have to be made with public support, will she not now make that Ombudsman's Report, in its totality, public so that the citizens of Manitoba can support her in her efforts to improve the MDC?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, I think I said very clearly what I wanted to say, and that is that the value of the department's report, which gives the historical perspective, what have been the conditions, what we're currently doing, what our plans are for improvement, puts the whole situation in some kind of historical context and gives us a sense of direction.

The Ombudsman's initial report does contain confidential material, and I think he has already made it abundantly clear that it's not his practice to make that type of information public. So I think that the final synthesis and preparation and release of that report is properly left in his hands.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, the Ombudsman has clearly said, and I quote: "There is nothing to stop her . . ." - meaning this Minister - ". . . from making the report public."

Madam Speaker, if this Minister has concerns that the report would not fairly deal with the changes that have taken place, with the improvements in the plans of her department, will she then make the report and her department's response jointly public so that the public can understand what their response is and what they're prepared to do about the problem?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, again I thought I said before and I will repeat, the material in the current report does contain confidential material that it is not in the practice of the Ombudsman to release.

I think that the best person to put together the material and present the final report is the Ombudsman. It is arm's length. I think it's appropriate that our department should be able to comment and contribute, but I think it's properly his responsibility to weigh the

two reports and to determine what should go into the final report. Madam Speaker, any issue with regard to policy funding, staffing at the centre, I think I have always gone into as much detail as the members opposite wish to have, and I'm fully prepared to do that exhaustively during the Estimates procedure.

### Freedom of Information legislation - Ombudsman's Report included

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

Given that the Ombudsman has clearly said that there's nothing to stop the government from making the report public, will this report be made available under The Freedom of Information Act?

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

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, I've responded in the House recently about our action pertaining to freedom of information. My answer still holds on that issue.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, is the Minister indicating that this report will not be made available under The Freedom of Information Act? -(Interjection)-well, when it's proclaimed.

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

Could I have the Honourable Leader of the Opposition please clarify if he's asking the Minister something within her jurisdiction? My understanding is, the Ombudsman reports to the Legislature, and The Legislative Assembly Act is not covered by freedom of information legislation.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister, who is responsible for The Freedom of Information Act when it is proclaimed and is dealing with the matters to lead up to its proclamation, is: Will that report be available under that act?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** In my opinion, that question is not under the Minister's jurisdiction.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my question is to ask a Minister, on a matter under her jurisdiction, what information will be available under the proclaimed Freedom of Information Act. The specific item I'm referring to is this Ombudsman's Report.

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** Madam Speaker, as I indicated previously in the House, this legislation . . .

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

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

**HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS:** . . . freedom of information legislation is not yet proclaimed. It will be proclaimed, we hope, within a year. That legislation

prescribes the methodology and the limitations and the parameters for release of information. Once the legislation is proclaimed, we will follow in accord fully with the legislation.

### Workers Compensation Board - reason for deficit increase

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I regret that this is another report that will be withheld from public attention.

My question now, Madam Speaker, is to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board. In the Annual Report, which he tabled a couple of days ago in the House, Madam Speaker, the increase in deficit in the fund of the Workers Compensation Board went from 26.9 million to 84.2 million in one year.

My question to the Minister is: Was that as a result of increased claims or how did that increase in the deficit, such a large increase of \$57 million take place in one year?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition insists in calling this a deficit, but we want to tell you, this is not a deficit in a normal sense of the word. The unfunded liabilities is a special category of a deficit, however its implications are different than a cash deficit. In order to avoid confusion, accountants call it an unfunded liability.

It would be confusing to all to call this a deficit because calling it as a deficit under the government context means it is a cash shortfall. This is not a cash shortfall. Rather it's a requirement that may be required to pay for compensation claims over the next 3, 10, 15 or 20 years.

So I guess the Leader of the Opposition continues to talk about the surplus that was present and the liability that has changed and the unfunded liability that has increased over the last year. We have to remember where we have come. In 1981, we formed a government that services to injured workers were not being delivered

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, Madam Speaker, the president of the Institute of Chartered Accountants has called it a deficit and he knows more about accounting, I would dare say, than this Minister.

My question to the Minister is: Was there an increase in claims in one year of \$57 million that caused this change in the balance sheet from 26.9 million to 84.2 million?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, it is clear that the president of the Institute of Chartered Accountants has a different agenda than we do, as the Government of the Day.

Madam Speaker, when we formed the government, the injured workers in this province, their families and their dependants, were not receiving any of the services

that were required. There were claims that were not being handled for many years. The people were not being told how they should be handling their claims. Claimants were being discouraged from making submissions to the Compensation Board. Very clearly, the injured workers in this province were not receiving the services which they are entitled to under the Workers Compensation Board.

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

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition with a supplementary.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I agree with the Minister. They have a different agenda. It's called, "cover-up" - cover-up of the truth and the facts from the people of Manitoba.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

I do hope the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not imputing motives to the Honourable Minister.

**MR. G. FILMON:** I'm not imputing any motives, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker . . .

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition very clearly said that this government and this Minister are attempting to cover up the truth. That is an unparliamentary phrase which implies that this government is not telling the full truth, and nothing could be farther from the truth than that sort of misleading statement.

Madam Speaker, under Beauchesne, under the Rules, under the precedents and practices of this House, the Leader of the Opposition should be asked to withdraw that statement which very clearly impugns motives beyond the fact that it suggested the government is not being truthful in all instances, which it is.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Would the Leader of the Opposition please clarify that he is not impugning motives or suggesting anything unparliamentary?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I am not impugning motives or suggesting anything unparliamentary.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, my further question to the Minister is how did the deficit, or if he wishes to call it an "unfunded liability," I'll accept his call, but it won't be the right call. It won't be the right call, Madam Speaker, but I'll accept his call because it makes him feel more comfortable and maybe it will give him an opportunity to answer the question.

How does he explain that in one year the fund deficit, or unfunded liability, increased from 26.9 million to 84.2 million?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition classifies fairness to injured workers as a cover-up. I'd like him to . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, I cannot allow the Minister to put on the record an impugned motive that I was dealing with the issue of injured workers. I had absolutely no comment on fairness to injured workers; my comment was on the facts and the financial figures that he has presented.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on the point of order.

**HON. J. COWAN:** On the point of order - the Leader of the Opposition has never had any comment on the fairness to injured workers in any of his days in this House; he's been much more concerned with the balance sheet rather than the human balance sheet.

But, notwithstanding that, Madam Speaker, what is clearly the case here is not an imputation of motives, but a dispute over the facts; and a dispute over the facts is not a point of order, I would suggest to you.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The word "cover-up" is listed as a parliamentary expression in Beauchesne and I'm sure that no honourable members in this House are imputing unworthy, unparliamentary motives to either side in this matter.

The Honourable Minister, to complete briefly his answer to the question.

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asks why our unfunded liability increased this year from \$26 million to \$84 million, and I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition realizes that when they were in government there was no rehabilitation being delivered to the injured workers.

Since that time, we have moved into a rehabilitative program. We have had two years of experience in rehabilitation, and we know that we are not at the point that we would like to be in the delivery of services in the rehabilitative field to injured workers. So therefore we have, based on our two years of experience, the actuaries have told us that based on those two years of experience, we would require \$84 million to not only cover the compensation needs in rehabilitation, but also in the area of second injuries, Madam Speaker, he raises the point that it's going to take a very . . . to explain why we justify the work . . .

#### Workers Compensation Board - Board Review of long-term claims

**MR. G. FILMON:** Madam Speaker, did the Workers Compensation Board, prior to the actuarial study by William Mercer, undertake a review by the long-term

claims committee into this unfunded liability that has now resulted in the major deficit of \$84 million being revealed publicly?

**HON. H. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, there are reams of information in the Lampe Report which shows where there would be a positive return if we went into the area of rehabilitation.

In the Cooper Report, as well, there are several examples of where there would be a return for every dollar spent. There are examples in the United States where, for every one dollar spent on rehabilitation, there will be a \$30 return. There is other information, and if the Leader of the Opposition would like to come, we would like to share any information that we have of how we arrived at this year's annual report.

I give that opportunity to the Leader of the Opposition. If he wants to come and see some of the information we've got, I welcome him to come and have that frank discussion of how we can serve the aged workers, the widows and the dependants in a more equitable manner. That's the system that we are after.

#### **Native land claims - table agreement**

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Native Affairs and Northern Affairs.

Prior to the constitutional meeting in Ottawa last week, the First Minister of the province introduced a document which said there was a land claims agreement reached and initialled by all parties.

I'd ask the Minister of Northern Affairs and Native Affairs if he would table a map of those properties which are part of that land claim settlement with the Native people.

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

**HON. E. HARPER:** The tree line entitlement negotiations are still ongoing. I believe the process that we have reached an agreement with the Chiefs and also the Federal Government is that once the agreement is reached, we would have to get the final authorization, the final agreement through Cabinet, plus it would have to go through the Federal Cabinet, and the Chiefs themselves would have to take it to their communities.

The land selection is just pending on the agreement. Each band has not specifically identified their area for land selection. Whether the agreement will be acceptable to the bands is yet to be seen.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, then it says a lot for the agreement, which was indicated in the statement made by the First Minister. There in fact isn't any official agreement.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Question.

#### **Native land claims - formula used, private holdings**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** The question to the Minister of Native Affairs is: Would he be prepared to provide the formula of which those lands will be derived at, and are there any private land holdings which are involved in the settlements which are being negotiated by the government?

**HON. E. HARPER:** Yes, the negotiations have not been completed; they have not been finalized. There was one portion of the agreement which had to be finalized, which is the contribution arrangement and we have to settle the entire package.

But in terms of the land areas that are identified, or to be identified, it is not final yet, and I can't table a report - I mean an agreement that has not been finalized. However, I indicated before, we had reached an agreement in principle on the other issue, which is . . . the financial aspect, but we'll await and see what happens then.

#### **Native land claims - compensation amount**

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I'm somewhat concerned that there are major negotiations taking place within the Province of Manitoba dealing with lands, and I asked the question - I'll ask it again: Are there private land holdings which are involved in the negotiations of which are being carried out on the land claims; and, as well, what does the compensation package amount to that is being negotiated by the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. E. HARPER:** The final contribution arranged between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government has not been finalized. In terms of the land areas, which are maybe private property, is not a subject for discussion at this time. Once we have an agreement with the bands and the Federal Government and have identified those lands with the bands' wants, then we'll be able to identify those areas. But at this time, I think it's immaterial because it is not fact at this time.

#### **Manitoba Developmental Centre - reporting of deaths**

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

**MR. M. DOLIN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

I'm wondering if the Minister could advise what system is in place for reporting of deaths to the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, my understanding is that not all the deaths are subject of an inquiry under the act.

The Fatality Inquiries Act reads: "Cases of natural death on involuntary patients - 6(1.2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), where a medical examiner, after

examining the medical records of the institution relating to the deceased or other examination, is satisfied that a person who was an involuntary resident in an institution, as that word is defined in The Mental Health Act, has died of natural causes, he may determine not to take charge of the body or inform the police or make an inquiry into the death of the person."

Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that at the MDC, many of the deaths are of elderly persons of natural causes in ordinary circumstances.

**MR. M. DOLIN:** A supplementary, Madam Speaker.

If my understanding is correct then, the medical examiner would examine each and every case of a death at the Manitoba Developmental Centre?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that it's a reporting process. I will undertake to get a full description for members and circulate it as to the practices in place and the correct number, so that if there are any misunderstandings we can clarify them, but this is my understanding at the moment as to how the procedures work.

### **Manitoba Developmental Centre - medical examiner procedure**

**MR. M. DOLIN:** A final supplementary.

Since the Minister has agreed to provide us with that information, could she also provide us with the procedures performed by the medical examiner under the act in these specific cases?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Yes, Madam Speaker, The Fatal Inquiries Act does come under my colleague, the Attorney-General, and the two of us will ensure that information is compiled and presented.

### **Water-use tax - consultation re**

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

This Minister invoked a new tax for water use in the province that was not referred to in the Budget Speech, of course. I'm wondering if the Minister could indicate what kind of consultation he had with the municipalities and with the users involved before he invoked this tax.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'm delighted that the Member for Emerson has provided me with the opportunity to clarify what is happening in this particular instance. There has been reference to this as a water tax. Madam Speaker, the charge that is being implemented is not any more a tax than is the charge that is implemented for the use of other resources such as the harvest of trees and the extraction of minerals within the province. The resources belong to the people of the province and those who utilize the resource pay a fee for it.

Madam Speaker, it should also be pointed out that what we are . . .

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Madam Speaker, the member asked the Minister a very specific question. The Minister stood up and thanked the member for the opportunity to clarify the whole position.

Could we not have the question answered specifically that was asked?

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, it has long been the practice . . .

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

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** It has long been the practice in this House, whether it was members on this side of the House or members on that side of the House who are in a governing position, that when the Minister answered a question, if the premise contained within the question was incorrect, the Minister not only had the opportunity but had the responsibility to clarify that situation and to correct what may have been inadvertently provided as an incorrect premise. That is all the Minister is doing in this instance and I'm certain members opposite in their quest for factual information would want to be certain that members on this side take every opportunity to clarify what may be incorrect suggestions or premises contained within their questions.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson on the point of order?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** No.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the point of order then, may I remind honourable members maybe to clarify for all of us that Beauséjour is very limited in the number of comments it makes regarding the situation of answers to questions in the House.

There are two major ones that we have been following ever since I have been in the Chair - for the Honourable Member for Minnedosa's information - Beauséjour Citation 358(2) says, "Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate."

The other one that I have made consistent reference to is Citation 363(1) "A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order, with no debate being allowed." Consequently the content of a Minister's answer, as I have said on several occasions, cannot be determined either by the Opposition or the Chair. My responsibility is to make sure it deals with the matter raised, it does not provoke debate and is as brief as possible, and I'm endeavouring to do all of those three.

The Honourable Minister to finish his answer, briefly.

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, I would just want to point out that this legislation was passed in 1983. It went through the normal procedure and allowed for representation at committee stage. What we have done at this stage is implemented the regulations which are in support of that particular legislation and totally in compliance with it.

### Water-use tax - revenue disbursement

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, and I've been waiting for days for the Minister to make a ministerial statement so that we could have a clarification on it.

Madam Speaker, my question to the Minister is: In view of this new charge on water usage within the province, what is that money going to be used for? Is that going to be put back into water management or is that going to the general coffers of the government?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Again, Madam Speaker, I'm delighted that the Member for Emerson would give me a further opportunity to clarify this matter because clearly we spend much more in water management. The last year's budget, Madam Speaker, was in excess of \$8 million for water management in the Province of Manitoba. These particular regulations, as they are implemented, project that three years hence there will be an additional \$300,000 in revenue to the Province of Manitoba.

Let me point out to the House and to the people of Manitoba, Madam Speaker, that \$875,000 was spent on one project to divert water from the Assiniboine River to the La Salle to ensure that there's an adequate supply of water. That is our concern, Madam Speaker, that people have an adequate supply of water.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

Could the Minister indicate to this House whether the people in municipalities that use water out of the Red River from the border down to here or down to the lake, whether those municipalities will be forced to pay the charge for water uses, or will they have the same benefit as the City of Winnipeg has by being designated as international waters?

**HON. L. HARAPIAK:** Madam Speaker, we have jurisdiction only in certain areas and we recognize that we, as a province, do not have jurisdiction over the body of water from which the City of Winnipeg draws its supply. Those other municipalities where we do have jurisdiction - it would be not only municipalities. They will be individuals and organizations, industry that draws. Individuals, Madam Speaker, will face charges which range from 85 cents to 16 cents per year, which is less than, as I said on one occasion, one glass of pop.

### Premier's legal costs re defamation suit - insurance coverage

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

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance.

Can the Minister confirm that the Premier's legal costs, including the \$10,000 awarded last week in the Appeal Court to Grant Russell, will this be paid by the publicly supported insurance policy that we have in place?

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

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I can't confirm that the policy that was put in place while members opposite were in government and approved by them will cover the costs of any MLA's who would be in that situation during the period of time that policy was in effect.

### Insurance coverage - MLA's and provincial employees

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** A new question to the same Minister, Madam Speaker.

The defamation coverage that's in place now for all MLA's and government employees for 1985-87 provides for similar coverage, but has a requirement for the Province of Manitoba to reimburse the insurer for damages paid up to \$10,000.00.

Can the Minister confirm that all members of the House and provincial employees will be covered, as the First Minister is, and not be financially responsible for any of its cost?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Madam Speaker, the member is trying to confirm information that I provided in writing to all members of this House. I think the member is aware of the material he has. I think he can draw the same conclusions as he's trying to get me to confirm from that material, and that's precisely why I provided that material. I not only provided a detailed explanation to all members of the current practice with respect to that policy. I attached a copy of the policy to that; so the member knows the answer to that question in the material that he is referring to and reading from.

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** The letter I'm referring to is nothing that was sent to this particular member, any information I'm referring to today.

Madam Speaker, to the same Minister: What will the government's policy be on the payment of the \$10,000 deductible that is applicable to all employees and MLA's?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Madam Speaker, the policy that is in place, the one that replaced the policy that is governing the particular situation the member referred to in his first question, does have a provision for pay back if deemed by the insurance company if, as a result of a court action, a repayment of the money, that is \$10,000 or less, back to the insurance company. That is the present provision that is in the policy that is in effect till later this year.

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** A final supplementary, Madam Speaker.

Are there some agreements between employees' groups and the government on the reimbursement pay back that they would not be liable on the \$10,000 deductible?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** I'd have to take that question as notice, but the pay-back provision in that rider refers only to members of the Legislative Assembly, not to employees. But I will take that question as notice and provide a detailed response.

### **Fund-raising event - government policy re attendance at**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Premier.

I have a copy of a letter that the N.D. Party has sent to numerous people in Manitoba to attend a special dinner for businesspeople, professionals, Manitoba Cabinet Ministers and the Premier of Manitoba. It indicates that this evening is an excellent opportunity for government, business and community leaders to gather, and the evening is also intended as a fund-raising event for the Manitoba New Democratic Party. Tickets cost \$200 per plate, Madam Speaker, and a list of 12 Cabinet Ministers are attached as being in attendance.

I ask the Premier though to advise the House whether it is government policy that government members, Cabinet Ministers and the Premier should attend a fund-raising event for the New Democratic Party, it being advertised as a combination of a government meeting and business leaders, but a fund-raising event for the Manitoba New Democratic Party?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

First of all, may I remind the honourable member of Beausheue Citation 362, which says: "Reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to an oral question is an abuse of the rules." Secondly, that question is, as I've ruled many times, a matter of party politics, not a matter of government policy.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'll ask another question to the Premier then.

Can the Premier explain if it is government policy that business leaders and community leaders in Manitoba have to pay \$200 per plate to the Manitoba New Democratic Party in order to attend a dinner with him and the other 13 listed Cabinet Ministers?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Madam Speaker, no, but I must say that the New Democratic Party in the Province of Manitoba has had a number of very successful business dinners involving people from professions, from businesses and what not.

I'm sure honourable members across the way would never think of attending a Conservative fund-raising

dinner. I'm sure that's never happened in the last 10 years that any honourable member across the way has attended a Conservative dinner anywhere, Madam Speaker.

Yes, Madam Speaker, I've attended fund-raising dinners. I intend to continue to attend NDP fund-raising dinners.

### **MTS - tabling of report requested by PUB**

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

Madam Speaker, the chairman of the board, in reviewing the current application for a rate increase by the Telephone System, has described the attempt to bury the \$27 million MTX loss in Saudi Arabia as creative accounting.

As I asked the Telephone System to come back with a report which is in English and understandable of how this \$27 million loss will be borne by the ratepayers of the Telephone System, would the Minister responsible for the Telephone System table that report, as requested by the chairman of the Public Utilities Board, for the edification of members of this Assembly?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

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

I certainly would table the document that, I believe, is being presented today to the chairperson of the Public Utilities Board. We are proud of the fact that there's a very vigorous examination of the affairs of the Telephone System at the Public Utilities Board.

I think it's very worthy of noting, Madam Speaker, at a time like this, when the Telephone System is going through the appropriate interventions from the public and the Public Utilities Board in the Province of Manitoba, that the Minister of Finance and the Minister responsible for the Telephone System in Saskatchewan, because he lost a court case to the Public Utilities Board in Saskatchewan, has threatened to get rid of the Public Utilities Board in Saskatchewan on the public record.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, the Minister just gave a slick answer which wasn't even to the question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a question?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, to . . .

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable . . .

The Minister of Urban Affairs on a point of order?

**HON. G. DOER:** I said, yes, to the question of tabling the document, if the member did not hear.

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

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I heard the answer and I thank him for providing that. If he'll provide that tomorrow, that will be fine.

Madam Speaker, the slick commentary had nothing to do with the question.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have a supplementary?

### **MTS - rate increase in rural areas**

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, the government has recently appeared before the Public Utilities Board in terms of an application for gas rate increases. In view of the fact, Madam Speaker, that the smallest exchanges in the Province of Manitoba, primarily in rural Manitoba, are now going to experience up to a 15 percent increase in their monthly fees, whereas in the City of Winnipeg, a telephone subscriber in the same circumstance will experience an 11 percent increase, will the Minister intervene on behalf of those ratepayers in the small exchanges of Manitoba and ask for a flat rate increase of 11 percent in those, as the City of Winnipeg is being granted?

**HON. G. DOER:** Madam Speaker, the rate application before the board is for a 60-cent or 65-cent increase for rural areas and a 90 cent increase for city areas, and an increase of approximately ranging from about 95 cents to \$2-and-something for business subscribers.

In terms of the rural services, there's no question that in all the Prairie Provinces including Manitoba, there are a lot of improvements to be made in rural services, and there's absolutely no question of that, Madam Speaker.

I'm pleased that the amount of money we've been spending in capital in the Telephone System over the last four or five years is approximately \$709 million. A lot of that is going to capital in rural Manitoba, as opposed to \$319 million during the period of time when members opposite were in government. We have to invest in our telephone plant, because there are a lot of improvements that should be made.

Madam Speaker, we have too many multi-party lines. We have too many areas that are too condensed, that we have to expand. Madam Speaker, we are going to have an extensive consultation with rural Manitoba, because there are improvements that should be made by the Telephone System.

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, I take from the Minister's . . .

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

Does the honourable member have leave to ask a final supplementary? (Agreed)

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, I heard some no's. Leave has to be unanimous.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES**

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Madam Speaker, I have a change in the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources: Birt for Orchard.

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

**MR. M. DOLIN:** I have committee changes, Madam Speaker.

Municipal Affairs: H. Smith for C. Baker; C. Santos for D. Scott. Public Utilities and Natural Resources: the Honourable W. Parasiuk for the Honourable B. Uruski; and C. Baker for H. Smith.

### **ORDER FOR RETURN NO. 10**

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, on the Order for Return presented by the Member for Turtle Mountain, would you please call it?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. D. ROCAN:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Member for Virden, THAT an Order of the House be returned showing the following information:

The names and classifications of all people who have been transferred, promoted or removed from the Department of Government Services for the last three fiscal years, giving the reason for the transfer, promotion or removal and their present classification.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, I understand that some discussions have taken place on this, and I thank the members opposite for their cooperation in that regard. It has been agreed to that the Order for Return will be accepted on the basis that the names and classifications of all employees who have been transferred, promoted or removed from the Department of Government Services within the Legislative Building for the last two years be provided, giving the reasons, as outlined in the original Order for Return.

On those conditions, we're glad to accept it, and again thank them for their cooperation.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

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

**HON. J. COWAN:** Madam Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 10 for Second Reading?

**SECOND READING**  
**BILL NO. 10 -**  
**THE QUEEN'S BENCH ACT**

**HON. R. PENNER** presented Bill No. 10, An Act to Amend The Queen's Bench Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine, for Second Reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Very briefly these amendments, somewhat technical in nature, are in response to a request from the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and the court itself that members of the Family Division of that court be available from time to time on a rotation basis to serve in the full court.

The bill provides that the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench may designate from time to time judges of the Family Division to discharge other responsibilities in the court. That designation would be done in consultation with the two Associate Chief Justices.

The reason for this is that members of the Family Division would be able to gain some of the wider experience involved in sitting from time to time on other cases. The bill also contains - and I should perhaps add here, it's reciprocal because from time to time where the loading requires, we do use judges from the General Division in the Family Division.

The bill also contains an amendment to a section of the act which is technical in nature. It limits the jurisdiction which the act presently gives to judges of the Family Division pursuant to a section of The Insurance Act, and it limits the jurisdiction of the Family Division, as it should, to matters where the order is made by or on behalf of a spouse, former spouse, or a child of the insurer.

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

The present clause is simply too wide because applications under that section would also apply, for example, to dissolutions of partnerships, where business partners have taken out partnership insurance. That, of course, should not be handled by the Family Division.

As I say, these proposals are technical in nature. The more substantive portion of them is simply to allow judges of the Family Division to sit from time to time, by agreement, in the General Division.

I recommend the bill to the House.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you'd please call Bill No. 6, standing in the name of the Member for Emerson.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE**  
**ON SECOND READING**  
**BILL NO. 6 - THE EMERGENCY**  
**MEASURES ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Mr. Harapiak, Bill No. 6, The Emergency Measures Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

Initially, I stood the bill thinking that I probably would not speak to it, but stood it on behalf of one my colleagues. However, I had an experience since that time where I feel I'd like to make some comments on Bill No. 6, The Emergency Measures Act.

Just in the past two weeks I've had a few interesting experiences along with what could be considered an emergency situation. I was called a week ago last Saturday, I was called by certain ratepayers and by council members from the LGD of Stuartburn, where a situation had developed because of the cold weather stepping in, the drains were not opening up. As a result, what happened is that water was ponding on the east end of town. It could not flow out, and we had approximately 10 homes that were under water, and basements filled.

So, I was asked to come out there, and I met with the council, we looked at the situation. The one dilemma that we had, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was we really didn't know how to deal with it because it was a third order drain. The council felt that the responsibility should be the provincial responsibility. The province apparently, the engineers had indicated to some degree, that just because a drain is plugged with ice or snow, that no, it's not necessarily their responsibility. Then we run into a situation where - who's going to make the decision? This happened to be on a Saturday, in the afternoon, where you can't get ahold of anybody from the government - the engineers, everybody's off for the weekend, and understandably so.

What happened though that myself, as the elected representative, as well as the reeve and council of the LGD of Stuartburn, were meeting. We couldn't really establish what approach to take with a situation like that. So it affected, Mr. Deputy Speaker, maybe only 10 homes in this area, but the impact on these people was quite dramatic.

There were some of our senior citizens who had their basements flooded, their hot water tanks were under water; their water systems were under water. Incidentally, all these people have their own wells, all these wells filled up with water, and we had a situation where they could not use their own water. They had to cut off hydro in some places and stuff of that nature. We were in a dilemma in terms of what to do. On top of that the cold weather froze everything. There was a layer of ice on top. You couldn't walk, drive or do anything properly.

I suggested to the council at that time - I said, you should hire a bigger machine and try and get the ice out of the drain where it was blocking so that we could create some relief, take the pressure off of the community. The council said, yes, we can do that but

who's going to pay the cost? I said, I certainly am not. I said, I suggest you do it, undertake the work but I'm not going to pay it. They said it's a third order drain; it is an emergency situation. Why are we going to be stuck with the cost? I want to illustrate so there's a clear understanding. It is a third order drain that has not had any maintenance done on it for maybe close to 20 years. As a result of that situation, is why part of the problem developed.

I would like to suggest in my comments to the Minister that's presenting this bill, I support the concept of the bill that is being presented. I think it is necessary, but I think there has to be more refinement done on this thing in terms of exactly what role will the municipalities and councils play in this? I personally felt I would have liked to have something provided in here that the elected member, together with council could possibly be involved in making a decision on these things.

Because invariably as elected officials, when we get involved in these things, people look to us for leadership. I had to go there then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, hat in hand, not knowing fully what is my authority, can I tell the council, do it, that government is going to bear the cost. I would like to discuss this with the Minister about the particular case where they did hire the machine eventually. I indicated to council that I would take it forward once the bill was presented, take it forward to the Minister and ask for approval of payment thereon.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can fully appreciate that if it had been a municipal drain, possibly that the onus should have to be on the municipality. But the fact that there was provincial jurisdiction there, a third order drain that has been a designated third order drain, that council felt it was not their responsibility.

I want to continue on a little further and illustrate the situation where, in the case of the R.M. of De Salaberry, R.M. of Hanover, R.M. of La Broquerie, where the Rat River has now for approximately 15 years, you know, the banks burned out years ago when I was reeve, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and since that time gradually, the banks have eroded more and more, to the point where almost half of the river spills out, cuts across country and starts flooding, cutting driveways. We had a situation last year - the municipalities got compensated - but it's a long, complicated way of doing that. The thing is municipalities are not always sure whether they will get compensated, and as a result, there hasn't been any action undertaken.

The same situation developed again this year, except the municipality because of the way they had been treated last year - they felt they had been treated relatively well in terms of getting compensation - they moved faster. In fact, they actually on Sunday moved in and moved out two families, where the roads were being cut, and there was a problem.

The other point I want to raise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Minister is that when is it actually an emergency, when the reeve and council and who else decides it is an emergency. When I ended up at Vita the other day, my feeling was that if this had happened to the people in the Red River Valley or people in the city, we would have moved all kinds of forces to try and correct the situation. But because it happened to be a poor little LGD, and a relatively new council, that we really did not know how to cope with that situation.

I'm hoping that through this that we can establish the guidelines clear enough. My understanding from

the bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that each council has to sort of form their own committee or stuff of that nature. I don't want this to be a big bureaucratic machine that we're setting up. I would want to see the municipalities get a certain amount of authority in this so that they can make decisions, snap decisions, because very often what happened, for example, in the case of Vita, now there's maybe 10 people that have suffered damage, whether it's their basements filled up, how they're going to get their wells cleaned out, stuff of that nature, how do we establish something so that they feel comfortable doing that, and look at the compensation factor as well?

I hope, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as we go through this bill, I hope there will be presentations made by the municipalities in terms of how this will be set up. I hope that the Minister will take additional time to set it up in such a way that it is not going to be a hindrance or an encumbrance and that it can function, because I think we need that. I think we've been without that for a long time, really where we can specify that, and I think that's the intention of the bill. So I endorse that aspect of it.

But I think there are areas here, looking through the bill where I, as we go clause by clause, we can possibly be more specific about that. But the thing that bothers me in one area of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I realize that we can't talk specifically about an area, but the compensation factor, or recovery of expenditures is something that I think will be raised extensively and create a concern for council members when they get into this kind of an arrangement, because this bill gives the right for government to charge any expenses that have occurred that can be charged back to the municipality, that they have to pay the Minister of Finance.

That will create a problem because the money factor, I think if we're going to make this thing efficient, we're talking of emergency. I'm not talking of normal situations developing. I'm talking of a situation very much like I just demonstrated, and if there's going to be the money factor hanging over heads, ultimately, by the time the smoke clears, there will be a lot more damage in the compensation factor, the arguing takes place as to what should qualify or not. I think that area has to be addressed much more specifically.

Just one further little comment to illustrate my concern and I think all of the rural members probably run into that on an isolated basis. I think we have to be quite specific in terms of outlining what would classify as an emergency when we have our committees set up, because each situation might be a little different. In the case of springtime, it might be flooding. It could be a grasshopper situation. It could be many things that would actually qualify under that and I think we have to be specific in terms of what action the councils could take.

Some of these things, as I indicate, it is the emergency aspect of it - like when you see something coming, you can get ready and that covers that as well. But where instant decisions have to be made, I would hope that the monetary end of it will not have to be a deterrent in terms of saving people mental anguish and financial responsibility.

Basically, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the comments that I wanted to make. I think it's quite a

substantial bill and we should take time - I hope the Minister will take time and advice - that we can go through with this thing, that we can refine it to the point where we don't just have another bureaucratic jungle set up, and that the councils can feel free.

I hope that there's going to be dialogue with councils beforehand, including the councils from the LGD's who sometimes are a little removed from all the action, because they, in my mind, are probably the ones that will be faced with more of these situations than maybe the organized municipalities, who are more efficient, quite possibly, and don't have these kind of circumstances arrive that much.

So with those comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm sure some of my colleagues have comments as well, but I'd very interested when we get into the paragraph-by-paragraph stage, the Minister can maybe look at some of these things and if we have to make some corrections that we can jointly work them out. Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I move, seconded by the Member for Springfield, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. J. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Will you please call debate on Second Readings on Bill Nos. 3, 4 and 5, as outlined on page 2 of the Order Paper, in that order please?

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

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, Bill No. 3, The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm pleased to say a few words on The Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we certainly agree with most of the aims and objectives of the act and certainly want equality for women, as we have always stated on this side of the House. I do not believe that by entrenching this particular act for the status of women that it will get us equality any quicker, but if it makes the government feel better, in case someone might decide to disband, then certainly we will have no objections to this particular bill.

I have always felt that the Advisory Council on the Status of Women has done excellent work for this House. They're advisors to the government, but their briefs and the work that they have done on behalf of the women of this province has been, on the whole, excellent. I commend the members that have been on the Advisory Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would just like to mention briefly the Member for Kildonan's remarks with respect to this particular bill. He indicated that when he came into government, "There was an advisory person by the name of Eveline Holtmann, through the Minister of Labour at that time, Ken MacMaster," and I'm quoting from Hansard, ". . . who also, as a sideline, was the Minister responsible for the Status of Women."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for a member who stands up in this House consistently to correct other members in the House on how they say things and how they expect people to react, I feel that that's a little bit on the snide side and not really worthy of the Member for Kildonan. I think that possibly when he was doing his research into this matter and they have no end of researchers - in fact, if he had talked to the Minister, I think the Member for Kildonan might have found out that there was in fact an Advisory Council appointed by the former Honourable Mr. Ken MacMaster, and I'm reading from Hansard of March 6, 1981, when he made a ministerial statement in the House and said - it was on the International Women's Day - he would indicate that, "I would be negligent, Mr. Chairman, if I did not mention the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, which our government established last fall. Members of this House will recall that a variety of women's groups and organizations had recommended the council be formed as far back as 1972." Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I would like to say to the Opposition members and to the Member for Kildonan that they were in government at that time, and yet it took a Conservative Minister, in a Conservative Government, to bring an Advisory Council, to appoint an Advisory Council to the Minister on the Status of Women.

So I would like to just quietly admonish the Member for Kildonan and even the Minister for not paying a little bit more attention to this particular fact. It doesn't hurt occasionally to say that something was done by a former government.

I'd like to go further. In the ministerial statement that Mr. MacMaster had made, he said, and I quote, "I would also like to mention that Manitoba was one of the five provinces which contributed to the Canadian plan of action, which was submitted to the United Nations Mid-Decade Conference on Women last year in Denmark."

Now the present government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has made much about the United Nations Conference on the Status of Women, and I'm pleased to be part of a government who took part in those very important meetings.

I'm pleased to be supporting the Minister on bringing this legislation in, although she doesn't have to worry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on our part for disbanding it, because we started the whole thing. So I don't think there is a necessity to bring in this legislation, but I'm pleased to support it because it's there, and if it makes the government happy to have a piece of legislation on this, then that is fine.

**A MEMBER:** A little bit of window dressing.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to mention the arm's length process that is being referred to. Now, I understand arm's length; I can

understand arm's length and I know that this group in the Advisory Council, as I have said before have done very good briefs. But what I do feel - if you have an arm's length group, it is sometimes nice to have instead of the government, I believe the bill states, "The council shall consist of a chairperson and at least eight and no more than eighteen other members, all of whom shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council."

Now, if I was considering an arm's length group, it might have been nice if some of the women's organizations, such as the immigrant women and the council of women and the farm women's organizations may have suggested and appointed their own women to this particular group. Then I would consider it an arm's length, and I have no objection to the women that the Minister has appointed; but if they want a truly arm's length group then I do believe that these groups could put forward possibly two or three names that the Minister then could choose from. That I would consider an arm's length.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister in her statement on the act spoke about The Family Maintenance Act and she indicated that fortunately, and I'll quote from her speech: "Fortunately the women of Manitoba again were victorious in overcoming the 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."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to reiterate, here again it was the Progressive Conservative Government that brought in this legislation and of course the women's groups were pushing them to do it and so they should, and I would have been pushing them too and was pushing them to get this kind of legislation in but in spite of it all, in spite of all the criticism that the Minister will give, she goes on to say: "But I think we all have to give credit to the efforts on the part of members of this side of the House and to the women of the Province of Manitoba." Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't mind them trying to take all the credit . . .

**A MEMBER:** I do.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I don't mind them trying to take some of the credit but surely sometimes they might try and give some of the credit to that government, because it was good legislation and The Maintenance Act did far more, our government did far more in the way of maintenance than the former government, the NDP Government, ever intended to put into that act and we made it good. Not only that, we brought in the computer aspect of it that allowed women to get better access through the courts to the money that they were owed. And although the system is still not perfect, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was darn good legislation and I had a judge tell me one time that it was the best thing that had ever been done in this country and I quite agree. And we can take credit for it and the members opposite can take credit for the fact that they have continued it.

I don't mind giving them credit for continuing good legislation. Certainly they should, just as we would. But

I think that it doesn't give the government in power a lot of credit to try and take every bit of credit for anything that happened and that anything that this government did they were absolutely forced to do.

We know by looking at this government that you can't force the government to do anything. You just have to look at some of the legislation that they have in place. It didn't matter who, who came up to speak to them, they couldn't get certain pieces of legislation in place.

So when a government has the will to put good legislation in, I think it would be a good idea to give credit where credit is due and I think the Conservative Government deserves credit for The Family Maintenance Act and the women of Manitoba deserve credit for pushing them to do it. I do not for one minute take away any of their credit because of course they've been pushing for this but they've been pushing for a long time and yet it took a Conservative Government to put it in place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, during the speech of the Member for Kildonan, he was talking about women working part-time and there are a number of women in our society, in fact there are hundreds and thousands of women in our society who choose to work part-time because they want to be able to stay at home as much as possible with their children. This is a matter of choice with thousands of women and I believe that when the Member for Kildonan talks about his next door neighbors, he said, and I will quote, "I live in a constituency which is mainly suburban, I have looked at some house prices in my constituency and I wonder how some of my neighbors who are working people, who are tradesmen, small business people, how they can afford a mortgage on a 120,000 house."

Well, the response is very simple. Two or more people in that household must work, and I agree. In some cases they must, but that was a matter of their choice; because I know a lot of young people, in fact most of my family's young friends don't move into 120,000 dollar homes, they move into homes that are \$60,000; \$70,000; \$75,000 dollars because they can't afford this; and I have a number of young people who are friends of the family who have chosen to stay home with their children and they in turn, they have not spent this kind of money on homes.

So this is a matter of choice when someone chooses to spend 120,000 on a house and someone else chooses to spend \$70,000.00. And I understand when these people are saying, and they look around, and they see people both working and into the child care system, and this is another bone of contention that's starting to come up more and no one believes in child care more than I do; but they look at someone who has invested all their money, 120,000, that they both have to go out to work to maintain it and yet the person that's staying at home who is taking a lesser quality house, who is doing all their own work, then is subsidizing this family.

And you can understand that this is a trauma and this is something that's happening between women who are staying in the home and women who are going out to work. And this is just one part of it. I am not talking about the single parent who has to go out to work. My God, they need every bit of help that we can give them; and everybody wants to help them, no one denies that.

But when we start discussing people as though an average is 120,000, I deny that categorically. I, myself, would not go into that type of home because I would not want to have been house poor; and we made those choices when I was a young mother and we had a family. I chose something a lot less so I could stay at home with my family.

And I think that these are one of the issues that we had better start looking at, we had better start looking at the women that are at home because, although they are getting fewer and fewer, a lot of them are wanting to stay home for the first couple of years maybe to get their kids in school. And so what we want to look at is some help for these families, too, and I am not ignoring the plight of people who need day care. I don't want to get caught up into that issue at all, but I do say that it's time that the government, and I hope that the Status of Women - the Advisory Council - will start looking into these issues, and I know they have in some cases, but it has not been a high priority because I know the priorities have had to be wife abuse, incest, child abuse, women working and so, of course, you try to focus on these areas, but we cannot forget the women at home.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to deal, briefly, in relation to what things the council will be dealing with. In their report, the Status of Women Report, they mentioned, on page 6, that within this - this is the Executive Director's overview - "within this three-year period, the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women has evolved from a small group of six council members, without staff, who met in a borrowed room at the Legislative Building, to a body of 15 members, supported by three employees, comfortably installed in a central location."

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm pleased that the Advisory Council is in comfortable situation. I have seen the new offices that the Women's Directorate and the Advisory Council are in and they are very nice. But I just took yesterday, a tour of Osborne House and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to deal briefly on Osborne House and the comfortable situation that these people are in.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** And we bought it.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Yes, Frank, we did. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek mentioned, we bought Osborne House at a time when there was a shelter there and we bought it so that they would be secure from having to pay rent and they would not be evicted from that property.

I want to say that when I went into that facility, and I thought to myself, what a nice old home, and it is a nice old home. It is a nice old home for one family, or maybe two, not 30. And what we have in this house is a 30-bed emergency shelter for women and children who are victims of family violence. When you look at it in this light it is not a nice old home, it is just an old house, and this is what we are putting women, abused women and children, into.

The family violence may have been physical, or it may have been emotional, or a combination of the two. Osborne House offers a variety of help; safety, shelter, counselling and advocacy. And the women at Osborne

House are made aware of their options and the community resources available to them. Child care is available to assist women when appointments take them out of the house; parenting support is also available. Non-resident services are Wednesday Afternoon Support Group; Children's Support Group, one for adolescents and a 7-12 group; one-on-one counselling on a drop-in basis; public awareness by speakers for groups and schools.

I'd like to tell you a little bit more about the facility. It's an older three-storey home, it was built actually in 1911; it is seven bedrooms, one living room, a dining room and a child care area that isn't as big, or it may be just as big, as one of the ante rooms outside this Chamber, which will give you an idea. And that houses children from all ages from one to 15, there is no other place for these kids.

It has a quiet room which I understand now has a leak in the roof and they have said not to use it, so that room is out of order, so there is no quiet room. There's a kitchen and two bathrooms, and when that facility is filled, two bathrooms, there's two toilets, three sinks, two showers, and one tub, and this is a 30-bed emergency shelter. And when that building is filled, or overflowing - socials couldn't get away with this. And I can't understand how this type of thing has been allowed to happen, especially under a government who was willing to spend \$100,000 on advertising family violence, and yet here we have a home that no one sees, and that of course is the idea because you cannot publicize the address. These women are in hiding; these families are in hiding.

And that is the type of thing that I object to very strongly. Where are the government's priorities? Osborne House should be a priority. And when I hear the Minister of Housing talking about building, this is one area that they should really be looking at, and I mean, you prioritize this. These people need help, they don't need to go into dingy quarters - in fact, the Member for Gladstone was telling me a story of someone from Portage bringing a woman into that house, and when she looked at it she just wept. How could she stay here, it's dingy, it's dark? You've got two, three families in one bedroom when it's crowded. There is no private space for anyone.

These are when women are at the depths of despair, and here we have a house like this. It has been very adequate for what they needed at first, now that the awareness has come up, they need more help in this area, and I hope that the Minister will really take a good look, in fact, I asked if she had been through the house and they didn't think she had. So I hope that she will take a tour of this particular house because she'll come back feeling the same way I did, believe me. In fact, she should make sure that the Minister of Housing goes with her, because then we'll get some action because I know it's the women that are going to get the action out of that government and I am depending on the Minister to be able to do something about that house.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

I just want to go on about this house a little bit more. The basement area has been divided into a staff room, staff bathroom, counselling room, director's office,

storage room and laundry room. There isn't a space in that basement that isn't used. Imagine those old houses - you know what old houses look like - everyone of us have seen them, and to have to do any work in those homes is just disgraceful, I couldn't believe it.

The house is overcrowded; it is in need of major repair, and they don't want it repaired. I'll say that right now, they do not want it repaired because what is the point, it's just inadequate. It's got a leaking roof. The quiet room, as I said before, is closed, it's unsafe. Overcrowded office space; poor ventilation. In the summer, because of the safety factor, the main floor, all the windows are sealed and most of them have got plexiglass. No air conditioning, of course not. This is an old building we're talking about. The wiring couldn't even stand it.

And here we're bringing women and children who are coming from homes that may be decent, and yet they're bringing them into this, and this is where they expect them to get some help.

Madam Speaker, I want to state, because I do hear this, the rooms themselves - everything is clean in this building, but it's just inadequate now, because we have broad expectations. Women know where to go for help now, and this is the place - all of Winnipeg, we have one shelter, one shelter for Winnipeg. It's ludicrous.

There are insufficient bathroom facilities for 20 people, let alone 30. It's insufficient for five, as far as I'm concerned. Inadequate kitchen facilities, because of disease and such, the fridges have to stay locked, and now they are having somebody serving instead of the women being able to help their own in these facilities. So you can understand people from different culture backgrounds, who have different needs as far as food are concerned, they can't even get into this - the kitchen is smaller - I have got probably one of the smallest kitchens of anyone in this place. It's smaller than mine, I can't believe it. Yet, they are working and feeding over 30 people in this house.

Madam Speaker, the play space for children is too small to allow appropriate age activity. There is just one little area, and I looked at the outside play activity - how much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 13 minutes remaining.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** I looked at the space outside. It's between two old houses. There is not a bit of sunshine that would get into this area. It's just unbelievably depressing, and yet this is where we have children. This is where we have women.

I just feel that women who are victims of violence, their self-esteem is so low, the guilt, the pain, and it's the lowest point of their lives. It's very difficult in the surroundings that are Osborne House. The staff is doing just an insurmountable job. I cannot commend them enough for the kind of work they are doing under the worst possible conditions.

So when I see in this report that the Advisory Council is in comfortable quarters, I don't deny that they should have. But I tell you there are priorities, and the priorities for this government should be the front-line workers and the women who are actually in trouble. But you see, they don't want to parade people through because,

when you've got women there, they don't want the world looking at them either. It's a most degrading situation.

The community has clearly demonstrated the need for more support groups for women and children, and many women do not want shelter but would welcome an opportunity for one-on-one counselling. At present, 35 volunteers are involved on a weekly basis in advocacy and child care programs. These trained volunteers - (Interjection)- I hear that the Minister for Education said I should be over there. I tell you, I'd like to be over there for five minutes. I'd shake that darn side up in a big hurry. These trained volunteers could be used for counselling if suitable space were available. They are doing a wonderful job on child counselling in this area. In fact, they are being referred by Child and Family Services to do counselling for children, because they have one of the best programs in the city.

There is no ventilation in this house. There isn't room for handicapped; there are no services for handicapped. This is a government who talks about handicapped and every other kind of physical disability, and yet they're allowing the house to say that women who are handicapped are not abused. I imagine that's the message that's going out, because there's no place for them in this house.

The third floor, can you imagine in our summers, the third floor, the heat? You have five beds, six beds to one little room, one little window. This is what Osborne House is. It's a disgrace.

Madam Speaker, what should happen here is that the government should take a look at the priorities, and they should take a look and give some decent housing to the women who have to go into Osborne House.

While I've used this bill as a vehicle to talk about Osborne House, I want to at the same time say that I support this piece of legislation, but there are different priorities. The main priority should be the women who need the help, the people who are abused. I tell you, I was just shaken when I came out of that house, because it is just a disgrace. It's like the government is a slum landlord, and that's exactly what it is. They are keeping that place as clean as it can be. There's nothing wrong with the cleanliness in this place. The staff is doing just a great job as far as that is concerned, but when you look at the spots that they have to go.

You have police coming in who are trying to do reports with these women. You've got lawyers coming in who are trying to deal with their clients. They're meeting in bathrooms; they're meeting in hallways. There is no room for anyone and, if you wanted a quiet moment, Madam Speaker, just one quiet moment, there is just no place to go because, with two bathrooms, you can't even stay there for very long.

Madam Speaker, I hope that the Minister will pay attention to what I have said today about Osborne House. I know that she's going to feel every bit as strongly when she sees this house as I have been. Every male on that side of the House who stands up and professes to be supportive of women should listen to their Minister and the women on that side when they talk about this, and get some money into Osborne House. Do away with that house. Do what you will with it.

Get them proper facilities so that they can do the work, because the Y, that building is sold. So where

they would go for extra space, they won't even have that any more. They're going to be combining facilities, and so there is nothing for them now. I mean, this is just going downhill all the way, and I can't implore the members opposite more to try and do something for these women who are in an abused state to start with. I will tell you, if I was in that house, maybe the abuse would look better than the quarters that I had to live in there. That's what happens to them, is they go back early because they can't stand the surroundings.

Madam Speaker, I think as far as the bill is concerned, I welcome the opportunity to speak on it and to just give a little bit of friendly advice to the government about an issue that is deplorable and needs immediate help.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in support of this bill. It's an excellent move in continuing on toward greater equality for women.

I want to comment a bit about some of the remarks we've just heard. It's, I think, surprising in this year, 1987, that Orwell's 1984 is so much being used in this House by the member who just spoke, who totally turned around what happened during our terms in office and their term in office over the last little while.

The Member for Pembina will recall that one of the very first bills his government enacted when they took office in 1977 was a bill which the name of it was An Act to Suspend The Family Maintenance Act and to defer the coming into force of The Marital Property Act and to amend certain other acts and make provisions required as a consequence. At Second Reading at that time, Madam Speaker, and I'm quoting the . . .

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

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** No, Madam Speaker. I just wondered if the Minister would permit a question?

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** No.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Coward, another coward on that side of the House.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

In introducing that bill, the then Attorney-General, the Member now for St. Norbert, and I'm quoting from page 133 of Hansard, said as follows: "The act also provides for an accounting of commercial assets where an order for the separation of the spouses has been made or proceedings therefor have been commenced. In that The Family Maintenance Act does not provide any grounds upon which a spouse is entitled to apply for an order of separation, this results in a possible requirement of accounting of commercial assets at any time."

That was a good logical reason to eliminate the act. He goes on and says: "Section XI provides that any asset held, used or dealt with during the marriage in a manner indicating an intention on the part of the spouse that it should be treated as shareable is deemed prima facie to be a shareable asset. There has been concern expressed that this may be a trap for the unwary and cause difficulties that were not intended."

Those were the kinds of attitudes with which they brought in that legislation. The husband or the wife or some spouse was going to trap the other spouse into using a shareable asset in a way that made people say, prima facie, this is an asset that belongs to both of us, and we can't have that. We're Conservatives all and we should change that.

The members opposite should reflect on the fact that on 50/50 sharing, in 1977 when the Schreyer Government brought that important principle out, notwithstanding all of the side issues, 50/50 sharing, you had five of your MLA's voting in favour, five in favour of the principle. Get away from all of the little technicalities you used at the time, five people in principle supporting 50/50, 1977, the Schreyer Government.

When we talk about history, that was the government which had the great response when there were concerns about women's issues. You talk about Tories being the best readers. That was the kind of response and attitude that government had. There were some good things done, and to suggest that we have not applauded what happened in terms of ensuring that maintenance was enforced is simply incorrect.

I have frequently heard our Attorney-General say, in this House and outside of this House, that was one of the best things, probably the only good thing I can think of right now, that previous government did. They did that and that was a good thing. There is no question about that. We don't have any problem with that.

But now, we hear members get up in this House and tell us that somehow we're being anti-women because we're not doing everything that should be done. I ask them, how many shelters for homeless women did they set up when they were in office? In The Pas, when was that one set up? I'm sure in 1978, 1979. Wasn't there any concern? And in other parts of the provinces, how many? Where?

**A MEMBER:** Dauphin, Brandon.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Dauphin, yes. Was that set up by Sterling Lyon? Not a chance. Brandon? Was that set up by Sterling Lyon? No.

And at the same time, they tell us that we need more and we know you need more. The same day, we hear examples of where we need more spending, and I agree we need more spending there. We have to find the money, and I wish that members opposite would start talking to their constituents in those terms. It's time that we were prepared to pay for these kinds of expenditures, well priorities. I can go through what every member opposite has been saying.

Your priorities are everything. You're the party party. Everything is a priority. One day it's drainage, the next day it's highways, the next day it's those kinds of things. But when you're in office, you do nothing. When you're

in office, you do nothing, and then you get up and tell us that we haven't done anything.

I read a copy of the Star Phoenix of a couple days ago, a couple of interesting articles. One article - and I don't have it before me, but I'm sure that all of you can get it - deals with the cutback in interval house funding in Regina, a significant cutback. I can't remember. It was somewhere between an 8 percent and 17 percent cutback. It was in the range of \$10,000 less than the year before, not from the NDP Government, from the Conservative Government over there in Saskatchewan, while we have been increasing funding.

In fact, we've had a strong focus on prevention. We've had a strong focus on community-based work, which characterizes our programs on wife abuse, family violence, and it has been in many areas. - (Interjection)- words. Four hundred and forty new licenced day care spaces were added last year - words they say. In Saskatchewan, they're axing them.

There were some 475 workers in 13 communities to complete a training program to upgrade skills. During the time, centres were able to maintain workers' positions at full salary and benefits, and so on; women in second-stage housing, another recent initiative of this government. All of those kinds of things are happening under this government, not under the Tories. In fact we see, side by side, what is happening in Manitoba and what is happening in a province like Saskatchewan, a wealthier province, a province with a greater Gross Domestic Product on a per capita basis than Manitoba, and a province which is cutting back at a time like this on these important areas.

So I rise, first of all, in support of this bill; and, secondly, to say that it is not fair to distort history, to make the suggestion that somehow we should be - I'm sorry, I just got this message here which threw me a bit off track - it is not fair to suggest that here we are doing something that is unfair to women. In fact, we have been far more progressive than that bunch over there in terms of dealing with those kinds of problems.

Madam Speaker, in today's Globe and Mail, I think we see the differences between that bunch and this when it comes to dealing with the needy, with the poor, with the handicapped: "Grants frozen, Epp confirms. The Federal Government has frozen its grants for national social service organizations this year, Health Minister Jake Epp confirmed yesterday. Mr. Epp said the government will give just over \$3.3 million to 28 groups, the same total as last year. The largest individual grants are . . ." - and I'll read the groups out - ". . . Canadian Council on Social Development, National Anti-Poverty Organization, Canadian Association for Community Living." Incidentally, that's a group dealing with mentally handicapped people, frozen. We hear some great rhetoric on that side when they're on that side, and that's why they stay on that side so much because people know what they do when they get into office. Every 25 years or so we need a Federal Tory Government to remind us of why we shouldn't have one.

Canadian National Institute for the Blind - people like that - you're freezing, but what makes this really interesting is the next headline in the same paper on the same day, "Raises approved for federal judges." That includes Sterling Lyon. "The Commons Justice

Committee has approved a \$19,000 annual increase in salaries for federal judges, but it refused yesterday to make the raise retroactive." That was the big story - they didn't make it retroactive. A \$19,000 increase for those people who are already over \$100,000 a year, and zero for the mentally handicapped, zero for the blind, zero for the poor, and they have the gall to lecture us on who does what for whom.

Let the record show that NDP Governments don't do that kind of thing.

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

**MRS. B. MITCHELSON:** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye, that we adjourn debate.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Stand. (Agreed)

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. C. BIRT:** Stand. (Agreed)

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTION THE PATENT ACT

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel.

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is indeed a pleasure to rise on this particular issue. The biggest problem I have with this particular motion, with all so important issues facing this particular government and not that this is not affecting Manitobans, however, are they not in some way confident in their particular NDP colleagues in Ottawa to carrying out their particular jobs in debating this, where it should be debated, in the House of Commons?

However, I'm not surprised at this particular resolution being proposed. This is the same Premier that just some time ago joined with two other Premiers and supported a motion not to hear the Federal Government's position on an issue that was in Newfoundland.

This is the same Premier that in every way has fedbacked to his embarrassment, and because of his uncooperating attitude that he has with Ottawa, it even came out in the particular Versatile where it included 1,200 jobs where he could not take some benefit from that.

Madam Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, when he introduced this particular resolution, used his particular method of introducing and giving facts, using newspaper clippings, and Globe

and Mail clippings, and using particular issues, and not particularly giving you all the particular parts of those clippings.

I'll give you an idea of the type of particular facts that we get from this particular Minister, the same type that maybe got him into a little bit of trouble last year during the Session.

Madam Speaker, the Winnipeg Free Press, for instance, Wednesday, March 11, 1987. The headline reads: "Kareem reaches top of foul list." If you go on to read it, and that's what he would leave, "Kareem reaches top of foul list." He wouldn't mention the last three words though or the last three sentences, that the same Jabbar also is the all-time NBA leader in scoring, games played, field goals made, blocked shots, minutes played and field goals attempted. That's the bottom of the little article. He would tell you, hey, he's got the most fouls but he doesn't tell you about the rest of the particular issues.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Mackling, or the Minister in charge of Consumer Affairs, it is also his responsibility, and I must admit that he has the same type of job that I have, to bring the various facts toward this Assembly so that we can base a decision. However, it is also his responsibility, when he goes on in representing the province as Consumer and Corporate Affairs to give you these facts. There are good sides to every particular bill and there are some off-track issues in regard to these particular issues like in Bill 22.

For instance, he didn't tell you, the Minister, that there are five principal objectives to a bill like this. The bill to transform Canada's pharmaceutical sector into a world class innovative industry led by unprecedented increase in investment and jobs and pharmaceutical research and development. The ratio of research to sales will double from the current level of under 5 percent to 10 percent by the year 1995, thereby directly creating an estimated 3,000 scientific and research-related jobs and putting Canada at the forefront of leading nations in the pharmaceutical field.

The second one, to ensure fair price drugs for Canadians through the creation of an independent drug prices review board. Thirdly, to guarantee that the pharmaceutical industry's commitment for R and D are met. If they are not, the proposed period of protection will be reduced or be eliminated. Fourth, to maintain opportunities for growth for generic companies in Canada. Fifth, to bring Canada's property laws into conformity with international practices.

Madam Speaker, I just like to keep putting it on the record because this particular vote will be coming forward in the House of Commons very shortly and I would feel that we hadn't done our job if we didn't bring some of these points across so that it would not end at this particular issue before that vote comes into play. The people of Manitoba should seek out other opinions on this side of the House and of other members.

Madam Speaker, Canada is the only industrialized country which uses the system of compulsory licences through its intellectual property laws as a means to control drug prices. How does it work? Maybe the member or the Minister should know that step one, first of all, innovative Company A develops a new pharmaceutical product, applies for and receives a patent.

Step two, innovative company begins extensive clinical testing required by Health and Welfare Canada in order to receive notice of compliance and that allows the drug to be marketed in Canada.

Step three, innovative Company A begins to produce and market the new product.

Step four, at any given time, after an inventor has obtained a patent, generic Company B then, at this time, can apply to the Commissioner of Patents for a compulsory licence to import the fine chemicals required to copy the drug.

Step five, generic Company B applies to Health and Welfare Canada for an NOC and its copy of the drug undergoes testing for approval.

Step six, Generic Company B imports the fine chemicals, processes them into pills and capsules and sells them in Canada.

Madam Speaker, the Minister in charge of consumers has reacted to Bill No. 22 and I have to compliment him for that. I feel it is his responsibility, as I previously mentioned, to do so. However, I feel he also has the responsibility to explain the aspects of the bill.

I would like to maybe make some comments about some of the important issues that will come of this particular Bill C-22. For instance, the Minister hasn't told you about the research and development that will take place. No, he hasn't told you about that. The \$1.4 billion more will be invested in Manitoba over the next 10 years as a result of this policy.

The Minister also hasn't told you almost the \$700 million in new research and capital projects that was announced and will be announced and carried out in regard to this bill.

The Minister hasn't told you, the more than 30 percent of the 1.4 million that I previously mentioned will go directly to the Canadian universities, teaching hospitals and private research firms across Canada.

The same Minister hasn't said anything about job creation. He didn't mention any of the job creation and the conservative estimate of 3,000 jobs that I previously mentioned will be created by 1995, and using the generally accepted multiplier that you use in job creation affect this figure and probably increase it to 9,000. In fact, industry representatives claim it will be a lot higher.

Also the same particular mover of this resolution didn't tell you that these jobs in research, technical and scientific sectors provide career opportunities in new streams for our university graduates. That is very, very necessary in this particular country.

Madam Speaker, the same mover of the motion didn't tell you anything about the generic competition that this bill will have. The generic competition will continue; that was not mentioned. There are generic copies for only 7 percent of the drugs on the market, at least 41 more drugs will become open to competition in the next five years. Also, historically, a generic copy has taken 11.5 years to appear on the market which results in the 211 million savings annually as reported by Dr. Eastman.

Also, the member moving the resolution in regard to Bill C-22 did not tell you that it will also permit generic competition after seven to ten years which should preserve and may actually improve the level of savings reported by Dr. Eastman. Through sanctions of the Drug Prices Review Board, drugs which lose their period of protection for price violations will then be subject to the generic competition.

Also, the mover of the resolution did not tell you that in the United States where it's 17 years of protection - 17 years, not 11, not 7 - is provided. The generic industry is the fastest growing sector, 15-20 percent annually of the entire pharmaceutical industry that now accounts for 25 percent of the market.

The mover of the motion also talked, I must admit, a little about protection, maybe he didn't tell you in regard to some of the protection, that this particular or that particular government will establish. Dr. Eastman will chair the Drug Prices Review Board. The member talked quite highly of Dr. Eastman, will use consumer price index as one guide in establishing allowable price levels. Use of this indicator may in fact save consumers millions of dollars, not only of generic copies, but also on the 93 percent of drugs for which there is no competitor.

Also, this particular protection board will monitor prices of all drugs. Now only 7 percent of the drugs are subject to generic protection or competition. Under the new law, more drugs will be monitored for fair prices. That was not mentioned by the member moving the resolution.

Madam Speaker, Canadians already have fairly priced drugs because of the important purchasing power of the provinces which buys 60 percent of all drugs. Thus the provinces play a large role in price setting and are the major reason why Canadian drugs which have no generic competition are still priced at 80 percent of the U.S. levels.

Madam Speaker, policy reviews by government - and it does specify in this particular section, will be in four years - by Parliament in the tenth year, will allow us to change the policy or allow the Federal Government to change the policy if it is not working.

Madam Speaker, 85 percent of all Canadians and almost 100 percent of senior citizens are covered by private and public health care plans which defray or cover totally the cost of prescription drugs.

Madam Speaker, I guess what we should also mention and by the comments by the mover of the resolution that there were not too many supporters around in regard to this particular bill.

Madam Speaker, could you tell me how much time I have approximately?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 28 minutes left.

**MR. G. DUCHARME:** Madam Speaker, supporters of the drug, and I'll read this on the record, "The Canadian Chapter of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Biological Societies, the University and Scientific Communities, the Alberta Council on Aging, the Quebec Federation of Senior Citizens support this policy as a positive move benefitting all Canadians. Also, small research companies and biotechnical companies, pharmacists, druggists and industry all support this legislation."

In a recent poll just put out in the last several days, and to the members' opposite benefit, the poll taken showed that 82 percent of the people also support this particular bill.

Madam Speaker, we probably hear in different cases some allegations. You'll hear from opposite members,

the price board will not work. Madam Speaker, the board has teeth. It will have cooperation with the provinces and the main function - Dr. Eastman will head the board - there will be policy reviews. It's outlined in that particular bill. There is also the allegation government is giving in to U.S. pressure. Madam Speaker, we need the change of international image, need fair treatment for inventors of new drugs. It also is good for the Canadian economy. Madam Speaker, you will hear many, many allegations. You will hear the allegation, drug prices will rise. Madam Speaker, drugs now on the market are not affected by this particular bill.

Creation of Drug Prices Review Board is also a very important factor. Generic competition will continue.

You'll also hear by allegations, industry will not meet their commitments. There are policy reviews set up in the legislation. Announcements have already been made in that regard. Strong incentives for R. and D. and manufacturing. There are also the allegations that we hear all the time, only Ontario and Quebec will benefit as a result of Bill 22. Madam Speaker, it is also outlined in the particular bill that universities across Canada will benefit. Independent labs will benefit. There'll be the technical spinoffs. There will be the national economic benefits. Madam Speaker, there is the allegation that government rejected Eastman's proposals. If anyone wants to read Eastman's proposals and take the time, they did not do that. Eastman did on some of his proposals recognize need for change. Eastman heads Prices Review Board as previously mentioned and some Eastman proposals will be implemented.

Madam Speaker, there are many drugs, and I think what the mover of this particular motion had mentioned is he kept getting back to the costs of drugs. Maybe, on this side of the house, I can give maybe a different viewpoint on how, through drugs, we have saved and we will save the hospital costs throughout Canada. There will be some savings as a result of drugs, and there has been some savings as a result of the drugs.

Madam Speaker, there are drugs that are not allowed in Canada, will not be put in Canada at the present time that would probably save people in Canada. Because there are companies in the United States and elsewhere that will not introduce drugs into Canada because of its antiquated patent legislation that we have right now that was done away with in 1969.

Madam Speaker, maybe I can briefly use an example of - I had an individual in my office, oh, I would say approximately a month ago and he came in, and I saw him at the counter and he said to me, I looked at him and he was wearing a little toque on his head and he said to me, I looked at him, he looked a little drawn; and I said "Gord, what's the problem?" and Gord said to me, he took his toque off and I saw the scars on his head. He said "You know, I've had a brain tumour." And Gord's about 38 years old. I said, "That's too bad," and I hesitated for a minute; and he said, "You know, Gerry, it's amazing, but through drug research, drugs are keeping me alive, and many other people right now." And he said, "that's probably what's keeping me alive, the research that's gone on for drugs in regard to cancer and different sicknesses that we've been faced with."

Madam Speaker, I also looked and did some research and some study with the Kidney Foundation. Now the

Kidney Foundation is probably one of the major people who benefit as far as research has been concerned. They have been ones who probably, like everybody else, depend on research for their drugs. And in their presentation on this particular bill, the Kidney Foundation, the importance of new drugs, and I would like to quote from their particular presentation that they made to Legislative Committee on Bill C-22. And the presenters were people right across Canada and all their national executive directors and the people in regard to the Kidney Foundation.

May I read it? As stated earlier, the solution to curing and indeed preventing kidney disease will only come through medical research. We live in a society where, by virtue of research discoveries, many diseases have already been eliminated such as polio, typhoid fever or tuberculosis. While still others await a major breakthrough, including cancer, AIDS, arthritis, diabetes and of course their major is the kidney diseases.

When these discoveries occur their impact can be very dramatic. It might be helpful here to recall that in six years after the Salk vaccines were made available 154,000 cases of polio with 12,500 deaths were prevented. One billion dollars a year in lost income was averted and two billion dollars a year in hospital costs were saved.

Just wanted to emphasize that with the cost of drugs, I wanted to show that on the other side there are, through the research and drugs coming on board, the costs to hospitals. I go on to quote, "The most reliable cost benefit analysis tells us that the total post vaccine savings per year, per year, were 70 times the cost of all the vaccine research and field trials."

Madam Speaker, they also go on to mention: "We have today, in the fight against kidney disease a striking example, though less dramatic, the value of research breakthroughs . . ."

And it costs, for instance, that the survival rate on transplant organs would continue from its current high rate, thanks to their particular discovery of cyclosporin. The cost of a transplant operation and the first year post-op treatment is \$46,000 and that drug costs are approximately \$5,000 each year thereafter. To finish their particular, and I quote, "Using this model, they then estimated the cost that would be saved if the number of transplants as a result of this drug occurring in Ontario were tripled from the 26 transplants per million population, per year to 75 transplants per million population per year, a dream that is now well within our reach thanks to this particular drug discovery. From this model, the Province of Ontario will potentially save 1.7 billion over the next 20 years. It should be noted that this is a model in which the government is paying for the drugs used in this case and thus the savings have already taken into account the increase in drug costs."

Madam Speaker, they do have their concerns and they did have their concerns in regard to Bill C-22, and unlike the mover of the resolution, who probably didn't give you some of the concerns or he gave you only concerns on one side, their main concern and I'll read it, they want to make sure that Dr. Eastman and the Drug Prices Review Board be given the necessary power to ensure that prices for current and new drugs in Canada not be allowed to increase at an unreasonable rate. And we're not against that, on this particular side

of the House, we favor that and it also mentions those guidelines in Bill C-22.

Madam Speaker, I could give you more and more emphasis in regard to this particular resolution. Madam Speaker, I was more concerned about getting the comments on this side of the House on record before our people in Ottawa, who will be dealing with this, who will be dealing with this and both sides, the Opposition over there have made many presentations in regard to this particular bill. The Member for River Heights had mentioned I think in regard to this particular bill, that she was astounded that we would even interfere with this particular drug, generic type, that goes on in Canada today.

Well, Madam Speaker, in regard to her comments, in closing, I would like to say that it is absolutely unchangeable principle that if we are to have a creation like we have with drugs, invention and development that is necessary on drugs, if we are to have the type of progress that is needed in this country then we have to provide the the inventor, we have to provide the developer, we have to provide the creator, with the right to own exclusively that which he has created. At least for some period of time, and that's what's provided in this bill, in this particular bill. For some period of time. Like you would with any video that you create, whether you invent this particular pencil, you are provided with some time of protection. Why not for drugs that are costly to research in this particular country.

When this policy was abolished, in 1969, when it was . . . out of The Patent Act we did this country an enormous disservice, an enormous disservice, Madam Speaker, it will not be the generic drugs, they will not be the ones that will contribute towards the cancer research that is very necessary and probably will be necessary for our families and the ones who have passed away that we've been close to. All of us have had people in that particular regard that have passed away with cancer. And we have some that are living on day to day. It's not going to be our generic drugs that are going to be helpful in that regard. It's not going to be the generic drugs that are going to contribute towards the research of the controversial AIDS. It's not going to be the generic drugs that are going to do that. They're copycats, that's what they do. And, but also, they do have and they will be allowed to come into the mainstream after you give them, a drug company, a certain period of time.

Madam Speaker, to go back to my first, on this particular motion, the only thing that I can say also in closing is that if this government wants to do any service to the people they're concerned about in this resolution they've put, if they've got any track record in deeming that any availability that they have, I would suggest they forget about thinking of passing this resolution and sending it on to Ottawa when they are not even involved in that jurisdiction.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** Are the honourable members ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for . . .  
Order please. I have a motion on the floor.

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services wishes to speak. If I allow the member to speak, the Honourable Member for Emerson loses his turn to speak.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, to help the government out of their lack of direction this afternoon, would it be possible to allow the Minister for Brandon East to speak and allow the debate to stand adjourned in my colleague, the Member for Emerson's name, so that everything can work out well and the government gets out of their lack of discipline here?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Thompson on the point of order.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** I'd like to speak on this, Madam Speaker.

I believe the intention was that if members opposite did not want to continue the debate further, we were going to call a vote. That's why no speaker was put up, but I think both myself and the Member for Brandon East would, by leave, wish to continue the debate if the member's name can still be standing in this bill.

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

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** On the same point of order, it was my impression that there was nobody getting up and that is why I moved the adjournment of the debate. But, Madam Speaker, I have no objection to having the resolution stand in my name and letting honourable members speak, and this has been done many times in this House. So if that is acceptable, then we can proceed on that basis.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, and the debate will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson then.

The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

**HON. L. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this, but as the Member for Thompson explained, we had the impression that perhaps no one else wished to speak on this matter on the other side, and we had heard the point of view presented by the Member for Riel. We've had a point of view presented by the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who introduced the legislation, and perhaps that was sufficient and we could have a vote and no further debate would be required.

But inasmuch as there may be someone now, it's been indicated that there may be someone on the other side who wishes to speak, then in that case, Madam Speaker, myself and I believe the Member for Thompson would both like to make some contribution to the debate.

This is a very, very important matter to the consumers of Canada and indeed to the consumers of Manitoba,

and particularly those consumers who use a lot of drugs. I was totally amazed to hear the Member for Riel talk about all the groups that seem to want to support this organization, including seniors, because I can advise the Honourable Member for Riel and other members of this House, that the seniors that I've talked to, including the seniors' council for Westman, have categorically stated their total opposition to this bill; and I invite honourable members to go around Manitoba -(Interjection)- Well, no. Madam Speaker, the Westman Council on Seniors had a representative of the drug industry speak to them on this matter. Indeed, they then sent a wire to Ottawa expressing their opposition to the legislation, prior to them speaking to myself.

They had taken a position and then they had asked me to come and comment and discuss the matter with them in Brandon some months ago, but the fact is, Madam Speaker, I believe their view is typical of the view of most seniors' organizations in this province, because seniors of course tend to use a greater amount of prescription drugs than average people simply because of their age and the natural ailments that seem to occur when one gets up in years.

I think if you went to the young families of this province where there are a lot of children in a family, in particular, and you talk to them about what they believe should happen, I'm sure you would find them very much supportive of the position being taken by our Minister of Consumer Affairs and by this resolution. That is that we have to stand up against the multinational drug industry in this country.

Who on earth asked for this legislation in Ottawa anyway? Did the consumers of Canada march to Ottawa and say we've got to have this legislation? Did the seniors' organizations march on Ottawa and send wires saying give us this legislation? Who was asking for this legislation? Did the Canadian generic drug industry ask for this legislation? Certainly not.

Who did ask for this legislation and who has been pressuring for this legislation for years is the multinational drug companies, particularly those based in the United States, and as represented by President Reagan in a recent meeting not too long ago with Prime Minister Mulroney. As far as I can make out, this is a payoff to the Americans by the present government in Ottawa, particularly the Prime Minister.

So what we've got is a piece of legislation that is a result of pressure by United States-based multinationals with the President of the United States being their spokesperson, and here we have a Conservative Opposition in this province of ours who are standing up apologizing for the actions taken by the Federal Government in Ottawa to support the multinational drug industry in this country.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that it's regrettable that not all members of the Opposition are present to hear what I've got to say. I can't mention any names, but the fact is the record is clear that this legislation, this Conservative legislation, is going to cost consumers of Canada millions of dollars per year in additional drug costs. There's absolutely no question about that. One can refer to all kinds of sources.

I'll refer to an article in the Globe and Mail of September 12, 1986, and this is an estimate provided by the Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association, not by our government, not by the federal New Democratic

Party, but by the Canadian Drug Manufacturers Association. They say that this patent protection legislation to drug firms will eventually cost Canadian consumers an extra \$650 million per year added on to the cost of prescription drugs.

The representative, the director of the association, Mr. Leslie Dan, stated - and he's the representative of the Canadian-owned generic drug industries - that the bill will make drug prices soar. "He denounced it as an anti-consumer and billion dollar giveaway to foreign interests." Mr. Dan said that if the legislation is passed, the multinational brand name drug makers will regain their stranglehold on Canadian consumers within a decade. Mr. Dan, incidentally, is also President of Novopharm Ltd., a large Canadian generic drug company. So that's the Canadian industry speaking up on this particular matter.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, that the legislation that we're looking at in Ottawa will lessen competition. It will reverse what happened in 1969. In 1969, the legislation that was brought in by the Government of the Day enhanced the competition. They let the laws of free enterprise, if you will, work. They let the laws of perfect competition or near perfect competition go to work and, as a result, we did get lower drug prices in Canada. As a matter of fact, we have among the lowest prescription drug prices of any country in the world. I might add, Madam Speaker, that prior to 1969, we had the situation that this bill that we have in Ottawa will now return us to.

I want to make a comment in a moment about the investment side, because the argument is for R. and D., research and development and so on, but I want to come to that in a moment. What the bill will do is prevent Canadian generic drug companies from marketing cheaper copies of brand-name drugs for 7 to 10 years after they have been introduced. The question then is: What are we getting for this particular piece of legislation? What benefits does the legislation bring? There's no question that there is a cost involved.

In fact, I mentioned the cost involved to young families and to seniors. I should also mention, for the benefit of the Member for Riel who spoke in favour of what the Federal Conservative Government is doing, that it is also costing the taxpayers of Manitoba a lot more money as well because we, the Government of Manitoba, the Legislative Assembly, vote monies through the Pharmacare program, and there is a real cost to taxpayers as well as to consumers. The estimate incidentally in total cost increase for Manitoba, I believe, is about \$8 million per year. There's no question.

The Member for Riel was trying to make some kind of a case for the drug costs not really going up very much. The fact is, Madam Speaker, the Federal Government has already recognized that the costs of drugs are going to go up, because they've told the Canadian provinces that they're prepared to pay out \$25 million a year for four years to compensate for price adjustments that are going to occur. So there's a recognition right there that there is going to be an increase in prescription drug costs.

So there's no question. There can be no argument that there is going to be a substantial increase in the cost of prescription drugs to Canadian consumers. Regrettably, it's going to be the most vulnerable who are going to have to pay the greatest amount of money.

I'm talking about the senior citizens, and I'm talking about young people with children -(Interjection)- So on the other side, the Member for Riel says, well - you know, I invite the Member for Emerson to go out and talk to the senior citizens in his riding, and he will get a few words from his senior citizens. They'll tell him which way they him want to vote on this matter because they told me which way to vote in Westman. I didn't tell them; they told me. The Westman Senior Citizens' Council issued a letter, a telex to Ottawa, and gave me that information. They said this is where we stand. That's before I spoke to them.

Madam Speaker, the argument by the Member for Riel was that, well look at all the research and development we're going to have. I think he said, \$1.4 billion in Manitoba. I'm sure he didn't mean that. It's \$1.4 billion in Canada over a decade. You divide that by 10, so that's \$1.4 billion over 10 years.

Madam Speaker, I would point out a couple of interesting facts of this. No. 1, and the record is there, what happened before 1969 when you had the protection that this new bill is bringing back into place? How much research occurred in Canada before 1969? Madam Speaker, precious little research took place in 1969 when you had all the protection in place. I submit, Madam Speaker, that with this new bill, we will not get the fundamental research and development that the Member for Riel is promising us and as the federal Tories are promising us. We will, at best, get tokenism. At best we'll get token research and development in Canada. That token research and development will be done in Quebec and Ontario. It will not be done in the Province of Manitoba, I'm pretty sure of that.

The other point I would make, Madam Speaker, is a reference to these multinational companies themselves who have stated, and they're on the record over the years, saying the reason they don't do research and development in branch plants is that's not in their corporate interest. It's in their corporate interest to do research and development in the head office set-up. Therefore, Madam Speaker, the multinationals will continue to do the bulk of their research, if it's a German multinational, in Germany; if it's a Japanese multinational, in Japan; and if it's an American multinational-based, it'll be done in the United States, and we will get precious little, if any, research and development. So I say, Madam Speaker, for whatever imagined benefits that may bring, that is far outweighed by the oppressive increase in consumer prices for prescription drugs that will occur in this country.

The Member for Riel also mentioned, well we're going to have a Price Review Board and we're going to watch those increases. Well, maybe we will have a Price Review Board but, I'll tell you, the Member for Emerson who talks and prides himself as being a free enterpriser, unless he's changed his philosophy . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Not at all.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** He hasn't changed his philosophy? Well, tell me, what does he think will provide the greatest protection for consumers? Free enterprise and free markets, or a price board that is supposed to protect consumers?

The fact is that's what we're being offered in this situation, you're bringing in legislation to create a

monopoly situation and say, but we're going to protect the consumers because we'll have a board. Madam Speaker, I listen to the Member for Riel, and that's what I'm referring to. He's saying, we're going to be protected by a Drug Price Review Board to watch the increases. I say, that is no substitute for competition.

The other point I would make, Madam Speaker, is this. That board is totally meaningless in protecting consumers, because the review of the prices are of increases, not of the original price established by the multinational. So the multinational can bring in a price 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8 times the generic price. That is the beginning point. The Review Board only looks at price increases from the point of establishment. It does not look at the original price. There's no question about it that there's a vast gap. There's a huge difference in the price of U.S. brand drugs and generic drugs in Canada.

I can name some examples just to make my point. For example, diazepam in Canada, 1,000 units of diazepam, 5 milligrams, is \$2.31. Now these figures are probably a year or two dated, but nevertheless it gives you the relative position. Diazepam is \$2.31, the generic price in Canada. The brand price in Canada is \$80.00 for the same thing, for the identical product. In the United States - and get this - the brand price is \$345.93 for the same thing that you can now buy in Canada for \$2.31.

Madam Speaker, the gap between the U.S. brand price and the common generic price in Canada is enormous. It's absolutely enormous, and what the Price Review Board - and if you want to use this as a figure just hypothetically - it's going to look at increases of that \$345.00 and see whether any increases are exorbitant, but after the higher price is established in Canada. Madam Speaker, that is not protection for the Canadian consumers. It certainly does not provide the benefits to the consumers that we have been achieving thus far since 1969 with the competitive situation we've had and with the generic drug situation that we've had.

I might point out, Madam Speaker, that we have a very good situation in Manitoba, because when we introduced Pharmacare, we also set up a review board with qualified professional pharmacists who would look at substitutes, so that the druggist in this province of ours has to look for the lowest priced drug before prescribing it to the individual consumer. In that way, we are doing a great service to Manitobans who happen to purchase prescription drugs. The fact then is that they're able to pass on the benefits, very directly, to the consumers in Manitoba by selecting these no-name generic drugs.

So, Madam Speaker, there is absolutely no question in my mind that this legislation that we have in Ottawa will work to the detriment of the Canadian people and work to the detriment of the Canadian economy. The information is very clear that we, in Canada, have benefited by legislation brought in in 1969, and I see no need to change it.

What is happening, the reality is that the multinational drug companies are engaged in a huge lobby exercise in this country. They've got people going across - I wouldn't be surprised if they didn't lecture the Member for Riel on the matter. They're going across the country in big cities, in small cities, big towns and small towns, putting across their particular point of view. They're

spending millions of dollars in advertising and millions of dollars of lobbying, because there's a lot to be gained. For the millions of dollars they're going to spend on advertising and lobbying, they're going to get hundreds of millions of dollars of increased profits in the years ahead.

This is the most blatant, organized extortion of money from Canadian consumers that has ever been perpetrated, I believe, by a Federal Government of this country, Madam Speaker, for the life of me, I don't know how the members opposite could for one iota, for one moment, wish to support their federal colleagues in Ottawa. I cannot see them, in any way, wanting to vote against the bill, but apparently this is what they're going to do. They're going to vote against the resolution. I say they do so at their own jeopardy, because the consumers of this province, once they understand and have the facts, including the seniors, the young families and others, they will be very, very concerned that they are going to be shafted by the multinational corporations under the protection.

We're moving now from so-called competition that my friends opposite like to have in their theories of free enterprise, and so on. We're moving from that. We're moving into a monopoly and quasi-monopoly situation. That is exactly what's happening, and the consumers are going to pay and the taxpayers are going to pay in this province.

I say, Madam Speaker, the Federal Tory Government - and I hope not aided and abetted by the Member for Riel and the members opposite. I hope that they will vote with us and vote with the government on this, but I hope they're not going to aid and abet their Tory cousins in Ottawa, because the Tory Government in Ottawa is abandoning the sick and the poor in this country of ours to preserve good relations with Ronald Reagan and to bail out the multinational corporations in this country.

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to be able to speak in the debate on this resolution today.

I must say, I had hoped that I would see two things out of the Opposition on this particular resolution. First, they would get up in their places and support it, because I think it is very much in the interests of the people of this country, particularly the ordinary people of this country; and second of all, that they would facilitate seeking a vote on that to express the unanimous view of this Legislature that the bill that has been introduced which would take away many of the generic drug advantages that we've had over the last few years should be rejected out-of-hand.

I hoped that, Madam Speaker, but it is apparent that I am going to be disappointed, as are many people in this province, because today we have seen once again that Tory members of this House have gotten up in their places to try and bail out their federal colleagues. You know, I had thought, if there was any issue on which the provincial Tories would distance themselves from their federal counterparts, it would have been this issue. I mean, here is a clear case of a bill that is not

wanted by the people of this country, that has been lobbied for by the U.S. multinationals. It's been lobbied for by President Reagan, but it has no real base of support in this country.

Here is a bill that could increase the cost of drugs by at least \$200 million per year. Here is a bill that would take one of the best systems in the world in terms of drug availability and drug prices, and would gut many of the advantages that have been in place since 1969, thanks to the availability of generic equivalent drugs. Here is a bill, Madam Speaker, that is clearly not in the interests of this country or the people of this country. I would have thought members opposite on this bill, on this resolution protesting this bill, would have said no, for once would have said no to their federal counterparts.

Well we heard today from the Member for Riel that is not going to be the case. We heard, I think, a valiant attempt to defend the indefensible. We heard some of the same rather lame arguments that have been trotted out by the federal Tories to defend that bill. We heard in fact a fairly extensive speech today, during which he attempted to defend the actions of his federal counterparts. Not once did he stand in his place and say that he was concerned about what might happen - not once. Not once did he indicate any opposition to what the federal Tories would be doing. I think, Madam Speaker, that is extremely disappointing.

I note, for example, that the one Liberal member of the House did have the decency to get up and support this resolution. I think that's welcome from her, particularly given the rather ambiguous stand of her party federally. They, for the record, were proposing introducing a very similar piece of legislation when they were in office, and I would suggest that some of their opposition in Ottawa is rather belated, although it's welcome. I think perhaps they've finally realized the damage that this particular bill could do to a system that has served us well, so I welcome the support of the Liberal member. But I would like to indicate, once again, my extreme disappointment about the fact that the provincial Tories have shown once again their inability to think independently from their federal counterparts, to take a stand on an issue that is of major concern to Manitoba and take an independent stand.

For members opposite, and particularly for the Member for Riel who is wondering about who is concerned about this issue, I'd like to read a few of the organizations that have indicated that they're opposed to the federal bill into the record, so that they know the range and the depth of the feeling in this province about this particular piece of legislation. It's been opposed by the Manitoba Society of Seniors; the Consumers' Association of Canada; the Royal Canadian Legion; the Women's Health Clinic; a variety of university groups which represent faculty, students and administration. It's been opposed by the Inter-Agency Group; Manitoba Teachers' Society; Manitoba Anti-Poverty Organization; the United Church of Canada; Winnipeg Presbyterian; the Winnipeg Labour Council and many labour unions in the province; the Canadian Congress of Women and many other women's organizations. In fact, there's an extensive list of organizations on the record as being opposed to the federal bill.

What I'd like to do today is review something about the present system we have, why I feel it should be maintained; something about the bill that is being proposed by the federal Tories and why I think it is so wrong; and then perhaps look at why that bill was introduced and why we should fight so hard at every level against that bill.

I would suggest to the Member for Riel who raised, I think, the question today of whether we in this Legislature should even be speaking on this, most definitely we should because we have a role, not only in representing the interests of our constituents, who I think are directly affected by this, but we have a role as a province, a province that has a Pharmacare system which is going to be impacted very severely by this particular piece of legislation, and a province that does pride itself in its health care system and the provision of health care services to its population, and how this particular piece of legislation will have a negative impact on that provision of services.

Well, let's look at the present situation. You know, Madam Speaker, we presently have the second lowest drug prices in the world. That was not always the case. In the 1960's, our drug prices were amongst the highest in the world. During that period in the 1960's people felt that something had to be done. What they did essentially, and it was as a result of three Commissions of Inquiry which had recommended change, was that they acted in 1969 and allowed generic drugs to compete in the marketplace.

Now I'm sure if one was to review the record during that period of time, one would find many predictions of gloom and doom from the multinational drug corporations about employment in this country, if such a bill was passed, about research and development. In fact, I hear similar sorts of reflections today from the Member for Riel who was somehow suggesting implicitly that there has not been the employment growth that there should be because of this generic drug system or that there has not been the research and development.

But what has been the situation, Madam Speaker? Well, the facts are that between 1967 and 1982, during a period in which this particular piece of legislation that allowed generic competition was in place, employment in the pharmaceutical industry in Canada grew by 29 percent whereas in the United States, where they have a system similar to the system that would be in place if the federal proposals were to be put in place now in 1987, it grew by 22 percent - 29 percent growth of employment in Canada with generic drug competition and 22 percent growth in employment in the pharmaceutical industry in the United States without generic drug competition. I think the conclusion from that is very clear, and that is to suggest in any way, shape or form that the present system is inhibiting employment in the pharmaceutical industry is patently false.

So let's go a bit further into some of the other suggestions that have been put forward by the Tories in justifying giving new drugs 10 years exclusive protection in the Canadian market - 10 years during which there cannot be generic drug competition.

Well, they have said that they are going to monitor prices and have a review board to deal with price increases. The problem with that is that the companies

can raise their prices and then it's up to the consumer groups and other affected groups or individuals to seek reasonable prices after the fact. In other words, it will place the proof not on the pharmaceutical companies as to why prices should be increased but on individuals and consumer groups who oppose that increase. You know, there's no guarantee that it will do anything really, Madam Speaker, to ensure that there are not exorbitant price increases during that period. That's the significant weakness in the bill.

What else do they say? They say that there is little or no research and development done in Canada and this somehow will change that. Well, Madam Speaker, the facts I think are clear when one looks at the pharmaceutical industry, and that is that the basic research and development is done in the country in which the multinational pharmaceutical company is based. In fact, one can see that in the statistics that have been prepared by the pharmaceutical manufacturers' association. In fact, out of 66 members of that organization only six maintain facilities in this country.

So there is no base for increased research and development by those pharmaceutical companies. In fact, if one reviews the legislation, there's no guarantee that there will be any base in the future.

In fact, there's another indication of how little attention is paid to research by these multinational drug corporations. In 1979, Canadian firms spent 7.5 percent of their sales dollar on research and development while the foreign firms spent only 3.5 percent. In other words, the Canadian firms are outperforming the foreign firms by a margin of more than 200 percent in terms of research and development.

I ask you, Madam Speaker, whether it makes more sense to do as the federal Tories are doing and try and increase research and development amongst companies that have no track record of doing that in this country or whether it would not make more sense to develop a truly Canadian pharmaceutical industry based on a position of strengths, based on expanding research and development amongst companies that are already outperforming the multinational corporations by more than two to one. I would suggest that that is a far more logical approach to follow in regard to this particular field.

Well, Madam Speaker, let's deal as to why this piece of legislation is before us. We've seen, Madam Speaker, that it potentially would increase drug prices by more than \$200 million a year at a minimum. Those are conservative projections that would increase drug prices in Manitoba by as much as \$8 million a year and that is because of this exclusive period of protection during which the cheaper generic drugs are not available to compete with the brand-name pharmaceuticals.

So we've seen that it could cost us a substantial amount of money. We've seen that this would mean increased costs for many consumers of those drugs, for many of the provincial governments which provide Pharmacare programs - insurance programs - to help protect many people, particularly seniors, against the high cost of drugs. We've seen that.

We've seen that the review process for prices is not going to provide the protection that has been suggested by the Member for Riel and by the federal Tories in Ottawa. We've done better in terms of job creation with

generic drug competition than we have without it in the United States, and we've seen that research and development has been far superior in terms of Canadian companies in comparison to the multinational drug corporations.

So we've seen an argument after argument after argument that there is no real reason for this piece of legislation to be put forward and that is why so many groups have indicated clearly they are opposed to it. They see no reason for it. So why then is it on the agenda?

Well, I think the answer is very clear. It's part of the agenda of the multinational U.S. companies; in fact, it relates very much to the agenda on free trade. It was raised, in fact, directly by the President of the United States at the so-called Shamrock Summit as a high-priority item.

Why, when we're dealing with so many issues between us and the United States, whether it be in terms of trade or whether it be in terms of international issues, so many issues that we have to deal with, why is it such a high priority? Is it because the multinational corporations of the United States are so concerned about lost revenue in Canada? Is that the real reason? Well, no, Madam Speaker.

I would like to suggest to you that what they were actually quite worried about is the fact that the Canadian system is becoming something of a model to other nations, particularly Third World nations, who are interested in controlling their own drug prices. In fact, I can confirm that. I recall reading an article in the Economist, a British periodical, which analyzed the Canadian system and suggested that it would be a model for Britain in terms of controlling drug costs and making generic drugs available in that country.

I think it's particularly appropriate in the Third World countries which, in so many areas, are dependent on the multinational corporations who would like to see greater competition, would like to see cheaper drugs available to meet their tremendous health care needs.

That is why the U.S. multinationals are so concerned about this particular piece of legislation. It's not because of Canada costing them money. It's not because it's a bad system. It's because it's such a good system. It's such a good system in Canada that in so many countries, whether it be Britain or whether it be in the developing countries, they are looking at introducing the same system in their own country, and that would interfere with the system that's in place. It would cut back on the profits of those corporations. There's no doubt about that, Madam Speaker.

Why? Well, the reason is because there would finally be some real competition in that sector. I think the Member for Brandon East hit the nail right on the head when he made reference to the comments made by the Member for Riel and comments that are being made daily in Ottawa by the federal Tories, when he talked about the fact that for a party which keeps talking about free enterprise and competition, they have a shocking lack of concern for competition in this particular area, because that's the real issue.

The real issue in this area is as to whether multinational drug corporations will have a protected monopoly position in terms of certain drugs over a certain period of time or whether competition will be available. It's not whether there's going to be any patent

protection; there is patent protection at the present time, but it is patent protection that is balanced by the need for competition, competition to provide the drug consumers, the sick, the elderly, who rely so much on drugs, a break, a price break.

So it's rather ironic that on this issue where I think so many ordinary people in this country, in this province, are concerned, on an issue where they could have distanced themselves from their federal counterparts, where they could have even said it was a matter of principle, that their federal counterparts were disowning a Conservative principle, the concern about free enterprise. Did they show how little concern they have, either for the ordinary people of this country or, for that matter, for the principle of free enterprise and competition?

I'm still puzzled as to why. I can see perhaps that the Prime Minister has an agenda on free trade and other issues where he feels it's necessary to give up our pharmaceutical protection for some other goal, perhaps in a desperate bid to achieve this so-called free trade agreement, a desperate bid to achieve it so that he can revive his sagging political fortunes. I can see his agenda, and I suppose I can see why his colleagues in Ottawa might support it. But why do the provincial Tories have to support it? Are they tied to the same political agenda as Brian Mulroney and the federal Conservatives? Is this the party that only a few months ago was talking about changing its name, changing its name to distance itself from its federal party? Are they not looking at what's happening in other provincial jurisdictions across this country? Have they not talked to their colleagues in Alberta who have gone further? They've actually threatened to totally cut their ties with their federal party because of their disagreement with what that government is doing. Have they not considered doing the same here in Manitoba? I guess not, Madam Speaker.

I still, for the life of me, cannot figure out why, because here is the one issue they could make the clear break on, perhaps not as a caucus. If any individual would get up, I'm sure that individual would receive nothing but support from their constituents, from the seniors in their constituency who are concerned about this, from the health organizations who are concerned about this, Madam Speaker.

Is there not one individual who will stand up and say I disagree? What's particularly puzzling about this, this sort of absolute solidarity that members opposite have with their federal counterparts, is that in 1983 their federal party was opposing the same sort of legislation that was being discussed by the Liberals, and it's in Hansard. I have copies of the federal Hansard available for anybody who wishes to look at it, but the provincial Tories, through their Consumer Affairs Critic were criticizing the Liberals for their abandoning of the generic drug system. So they've got a precedent. They could get up and say that they agree with that. They agree with the original position of the Conservative Party, not the adopted at a later time position, not the second of the two-faced positions they adopted on the issue.

Look at it, Madam Speaker. They could stand up for the ordinary people of this province; they could stand up for a principle; they could stand up for what their party has said in Ottawa only a number of years ago.

What have they decided? As the Member for Kildonan says perhaps it takes a bit of courage for them to do that; perhaps they don't have that political courage. But I would urge all those members opposite, the 26 members, each of them individually, to consult their conscience, to think this over, perhaps the Member for Emerson who will be speaking next on this issue. Think it over, think about the principle, think about the ordinary people in his riding who are going to be negatively impacted by this legislation. Think it over and maybe come to the realization that perhaps the Member for Emerson could be the first one to break from those federal Tories on this unfair bill. Just think about what a profile it would give that member and to that party over there, what profile it would give to the Member for Emerson for being the one Conservative in Manitoba who saw the reality of this issue, who agreed with the Manitoba Society of Seniors who said, very clearly, no, to drug patent law changes, said he agreed with the ordinary people in his riding that he wasn't going to stand for this any more, that he was going to make sure that the provincial Tories did have some concern for principle and for people in this province.

I'm waiting, Madam Speaker. If the record of this Session and past Sessions are any indication, I think I will be waiting in disappointment because it's obvious to me that those members opposite are so somehow cowed by their federal counterparts that they have no ability left to think independently. But let them do what they may.

I can tell them one thing, that the members on this side of the House are going to oppose this. They're going to continue to oppose this and I can tell them, and I think this is a prediction that could be read back in a number of years and I hope it will be. I will predict that if the Tories use their massive majority in Ottawa to bring in this unfair piece of legislation, that the New Democratic Party after the next election, when I feel it will be playing an even more important role in the governing the affairs of this nation, possibly even as the Official Opposition and possibly even as government, but I can tell him and this is a prediction, and I hope Brian Mulroney will note this, too, that the federal New Democrats, when that day comes, one of the first things that they will demand on behalf of the ordinary people of this country is that this ridiculous piece of legislation be thrown out, Madam Speaker, and that we bring back in the current system of drug protection that's served us so well. That's the stand that this party is going to take. We're starting to do that right here in this province, sending them a message in Ottawa that we are not going to stand for this type of legislation. If they want to pass it, that will be in place on a very temporary basis because it will be thrown out without any moment's consideration.

So, Madam Speaker, let's consider this bill, let's support it, let's send a clear message to Ottawa. We want changes in that bill; we want it thrown out totally; we want a system, that's served us well, kept.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Madam Speaker, it's remarkable that those of us who have some concern about the future

welfare of all Canadians - I'll become even more personal- some particular welfare as, I'm sure, many of those groups that the last people referred to, grandparents, of which I'm proud to include myself in that group, who should show some concern about their well-being and to make it possible that lifesaving drug, that drug that just makes life more compatible for those who are afflicted with all the ills that are inflicted on us from time to time, that we put ourselves and our country in a position, and our pharmaceutical industry in a position, that we continue to have the incentive; even, Madam Speaker, managed to put together the very massive pools of money that are required to develop these kind of drugs that are yet to come on the market.

Madam Speaker, I ask the Member for Thompson to name me one lifesaving drug that a generic manufacturer has brought onto the market in this country. Name me one. One. So it can be said that they have contributed nothing, absolutely nothing to the well-being in terms of what drugs do. They have, Madam Speaker, once their research work has been done, once the drug has been developed, they have done precisely as what the name implies. They have taken the chemical components, the generic components of it, and have ridden, so to speak, on the backs of those who produced them, and quite frankly, Madam Speaker, there is nothing wrong with that.

And this bill, in an admirable way, makes sure that unconscionable profits will not be made, that there are controls, and Manitobans and Canadians will not face the kind of fear-mongering scare tactics that are being spread by irresponsible politicians like members opposite with respect to drugs.

Madam Speaker, will a generic drug company find a cure or a solution to that dreaded disease of AIDS that is bedeviling all of us right now? Of course not. Will a generic company spend one nickel, one cent in developing a vaccine for AIDS? Of course not.

**A MEMBER:** Will the multinationals?

**MR. H. ENNS:** Well, yes, they will, yes they will. And this great New Democratic bunch here, who like to get up and talk about multinationals, they will wait till Lilly or till somebody develops it and then, "Oh, me too, me too!" They want to ride on the backs of American research or West European research or any other research anywhere else, but they don't want to allow Canadian companies to have that position, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to put it on the record that this bill is being deliberately distorted by those who are posing it, and they're using what they are quite adept at. They attack those who are often least capable of defending themselves - our senior people, our aged people, who are often more dependent on the use of drugs of one kind or another.

But, Madam Speaker, I will tell you one thing. I have no fear of walking into any senior citizens home and asking them whether they are concerned that their grandchildren will be provided and offered the best possible care with respect to drugs should they be afflicted with some illnesses. Madam Speaker, it is a

selfish attitude, a gross selfish attitude that is displayed by members opposite who are speaking in opposition to this bill.

Read the bill, read the bill. It is not carte blanche open season for the big companies. All present companies, all present drugs that are now being manufactured under the generic label, continue to have the same protection; but, Madam Speaker, as we witness from time to time, and as we particularly at this time in our history ought to be aware of, we don't know when a new and strange and frightening disease will all of a sudden confront mankind.

Madam Speaker, throughout a hundred laboratories across this world, people are risking money, the best brains are at work trying to figure some way to counter, as we have in our culture, successfully, by and large, with some chemical compound, with some drug with a vaccine, that will spare us perhaps from the untold miseries that some are predicting with respect to that specific disease.

And members opposite are happy to depend on the generic industry that hasn't come up with a single drug, a new drug, hasn't come up with an aspirin, hasn't come up with a single painkiller. They're prepared to sit back and wait for somebody else to do it.

Well, Madam Speaker, that depicts people with small minds, that depicts people that are selfish in outlook. They want somebody else to do the work, somebody else to do the risk. Madam Speaker, what is even worse, it is that kind of fear-mongering tactics that they create among the people that legitimately get concerned.

But for anybody that has taken the time to read the bill, to understand the safeguards, what in effect this bill does, Madam Speaker, is it does provide the best of all worlds. It does provide the protection currently enjoyed by Canadians and will continue to provide that protection. It also takes that one step further then, but does not stifle the opportunity of the industry to keep on developing those new drugs, those new cures that Lord only knows mankind will need from time to time, and any man, any woman that is not concerned about that is not thinking of their children, they're not thinking of their grandchildren, and they're not thinking of the public health as a whole.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:00 p.m., I'm interrupting debate.

The honourable member will have 33 minutes remaining when this bill is next before the House.

## **PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

### **PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS**

#### **RES. NO. 4 - CANADA AS A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE**

**MADAM SPEAKER:** On the proposed resolution, No. 4, the Honourable Member for Thompson.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that

WHEREAS the international arms race is threatening the very future of the world; and

WHEREAS the more than one trillion dollars spent on armaments each year is causing increased disparity

between rich and poor and causing nations to neglect education and health care; and

WHEREAS there is evidence that existing arms reduction agreements such as SALT II have been ignored; and

WHEREAS the development of further weapons systems such as the Strategic Defence Initiative threatens to further destabilize the current international situation; and

WHEREAS Canada has contributed to this process by testing the Cruise Missile; and

WHEREAS Canada is not isolated from this global tragedy and could in fact play a major role in reversing this trend;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Federal Government of Canada to declare Canada a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly urge the Federal Government to halt the testing of the Cruise Missile; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly request the Government of Canada to urge the superpowers to resume high level arms reduction talks and if necessary take an active role in facilitating such talks.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** While I'm waiting for the motion, may I please remind the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines that newspapers are not allowed in the Chamber.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this resolution I think addresses one of the most important issues of our time. For the Member for Emerson, in terms of what it will accomplish, I think that if we, as concerned citizens in this province, start taking a stand for world peace, if we commit ourselves to working for disarmament, if we commit this country to a positive role in working for world disarmament, I think that will be the greatest accomplishment that we could ever see out of this Legislature or any other body.

We live in an age in which we spend \$1 trillion a year on the arms race, \$1 trillion a year when we have so many needs in this world, when we have people who go hungry, who go without proper health care services, without proper education facilities, people who have no shelter, people who have so many needs and we spend \$1 trillion a year on armaments. We have the capacity in terms . . . (Interjection)-

Perhaps members opposite aren't concerned about nuclear disarmament, don't treat it with any seriousness, view it as a laughing matter, but I certainly do. I would appreciate if they would give me the courtesy of listening to my remarks and if they would confine their remarks to their contributions in the debate at a later time.

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

They may laugh, they may not have that concern, but there are so many people in our society who do.

When we live in a world in which -(Interjection)- Perhaps members in this House would contemplate on that fact. We have the capacity to destroy the world 40 times over and despite that fact we're continuing to add to that capacity year in and year out. We're continuing to add new weapon systems that add to that destructive capacity that further destabilizes the international situation.

Now, there are many people in Manitoba who are concerned about that and we've seen those concerns expressed over the last few years on so many occasions, whether it be through the direct demonstration of that concern, the peace marches throughout the province, whether it be in Winnipeg or in Thompson where we had our first peace march last year, we've seen it through the sponsorship of discussions. We've seen many events sponsored by the people of this province who are concerned about peace.

Recently, in this Legislature itself, we unanimously passed a resolution that declared Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. You know, as I look back over the last five years that I've been a member of the Legislature, I think that was one of the moments I was most proud of, proud that we, as a province, that all members of this Legislature unanimously endorsed the resolution that declared, I think quite loudly and clearly, our own concern here in this province about the nuclear arms race and our own desire as a province to remain a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone.

My resolution today is in keeping with the spirit of that resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because what I am suggesting today is that we as a province urge this country to declare itself a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. I do so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for obvious reasons.

I feel, first of all, it's consistent with our historic role. We have not been part of the nuclear club, we have strongly resisted any attempts to make us part of that nuclear club. In fact, I remember quite well reading of the debates of the early 1960's, about the Bomarc Missile, when that was very much at stake, when in fact a Conservative Government at the time declared without reservation that Canada would not be a nuclear weapons zone.

So it's consistent with our historical role as a country, but beyond not merely wanting to be part of that, I think it's consistent with the desire of many Canadians to take a lead role in promoting disarmament. I think it's consistent with our role as a peacekeeper over the last 25 to 30 years. I think it's consistent with the view that many Canadians have, that we can make a significant difference, perhaps because of our geographical position, sandwiched as we are between the two superpowers. In a position where there was a nuclear exchange, we most certainly would be caught in the middle. I think it goes beyond that and reflects a feeling amongst Canadians that while we may be a small country, we have so much to offer on the international scene, particularly if we can take an independent stand and a principled stand and work for nuclear disarmament. So I think we should declare this country a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone.

In keeping with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would suggest that we should, at the first opportunity, terminate Cruise Missile testing, because I feel very strongly that testing does violate our traditional role, that it does affect our credibility in terms of working

for disarmament. I think it does affect Canadian sovereignty. For those members who might suggest that it's somehow a NATO commitment, as has been suggested by the Federal Conservatives and the previous Liberal Government before they half changed their position on the Cruise Missile testing - or at least half of the Liberals did and the other half maintained their support for Cruise Missile testing - I would point out that there is no obligation amongst NATO for Cruise Missile testing, none whatsoever. It's never suggested that members of the alliance should test the Cruise. In fact, it was never suggested to the Liberals or to the Conservatives who have been renewing that agreement.

For those members who asked the question, what is the alliance all about, perhaps they should review the historical background of NATO and how it was started and the fact that it was intended to be an alliance of free and independent nations to preserve that freedom and independence and how the type of tactics we've used . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please.

Members are reminded newspapers are not allowed in the Chamber.

**MR. S. ASHTON:** Cruise Missile testing has not been in any way a NATO obligation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel that the Cruise Missile testing that we have undertaken over the last several years seriously does undermine our credibility as a nation. I couldn't think of a statement which sums up the magnitude of that any more than the statement made by Bishop Adolphe Proulx, the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, who stated that Cruise Missile testing in Canada is committing us to, "A military strategy that is not only morally bankrupt but dangerous."

You know, it is morally bankrupt because of the way in which it compromises our traditional view as a nation, but it also is dangerous, dangerous because through the deployment of air launch Cruise Missiles, we would be abrogating the limits set by the SALT II Treaty. Also, it is dangerous because it develops a new weapons system. It's not a form of deterrence by any definition; it is small and undetectable and because of its numbers and locations cannot be effectively verified. So it's a weapon system that inherently creates difficulties in terms of arms reduction. So it's morally wrong and it's dangerous, too.

I mentioned in the resolution the SALT II agreement. My particular concern that while SALT II was not adopted by the Senate in the United States and therefore was never fully adopted, that while that did not take place, there was a clear agreement on both sides by the Soviet Union and the United States to follow that treaty and how that has clearly been abrogated in recent months and years. It's not just a concern that's been expressed by New Democrats.

The Right Honourable Joe Clark, the Minister of External Affairs, indicated clearly in the House of Commons that on the SALT II, that he was fighting for Washington to observe the limits that were set. I quote and he states: "We lost the fight, we lost an argument." It clearly does create further destabilization in the international situation.

Now, what is the solution? Well, I've suggested a number of things I feel this country can do, in terms of becoming a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, in terms of eliminating Cruise testing. But obviously that is something that affects this country, that does not necessarily impact on the world situation. I would like to go further and suggest that we restate our commitment internationally to working for disarmament, and that we encourage the resumption of high-level negotiations at the international level.

I was encouraged by some of the developments in Iceland, some of the recent indications, encouraged but I must say I'm disappointed that it's taken so long for some of the superpowers to realize the urgency of the situation; that it's taken so long for those superpowers to convert themselves to the cause of disarmament, to even agree to the basic first steps of beginning the discussions, of beginning the negotiations.

I do believe that Canada can play a lead role in this regard, by first of all not being part of the nuclear arms race, and second of all, playing an active role in working for discussions and negotiations. I think I'm not alone in that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think there are many people in this country who have that view. In particular, many young people. There are many young people I've talked to, have expressed very, very real concern about what is happening with the arms race. They've stated quite clearly, that they feel that we've got to do something, and that we, in Canada, can and should make a difference. In fact, I couldn't think of something that summed it up better than a report that appeared recently on four students, four students travelling across this country who've made the commitment of taking a year off from their studies, to make their own personal commitment to peace.

One of them stated, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the rationale for their mission. It's not that they seriously believe that the world's nuclear arms nations will come up with a program of disarmament on their own initiative. Change will come because of the people who speak out, all four of them stated. And I quote: "It's not because we have faith in deterrents, it's not because we have faith in technology, it's not because we have faith in our leaders," one of them stated. "It's because we have faith in people." That was their statement. A statement that I think is shared by many young people in this province. They've got a faith in people.

At a time when we're so threatened, so threatened by technology, by factors beyond our control, by that capability to destroy us 40 times over, they still believe that people can make the difference. I believe that too. That's why I've introduced this resolution, and I hope it will be treated with seriousness, because it's a very, very serious resolution, addressing a very, very serious concern. I want to indicate to members of this Chamber that I, too, have faith in people, people of this province, people of this country and the ability of our people to play a lead role internationally in working for nuclear disarmament and for the peace that we all seek so much.

That's why I've introduced this resolution, and I would urge in the spirit that we adopt it, on the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone declaration in Manitoba, that we unanimously support it. I would urge all members to do that today, Mr. Deputy Speaker, make their own

personal stand, their own personal commitment for world peace and disarmament.

Thank you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, the honourable member that introduced this resolution in his brief remarks made several references to the traditional role of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'm prepared to forgive him if his concept of Canada's traditional role is understandably not that completely understood by the honourable member. Perhaps that's attributable to his youth, and I say that as a compliment, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But let there be no mistake about it. The history records of this nation indicate very clearly what Canada's traditional role is. Canada's traditional role is to stand up, stand beside other free western democracies of this world whenever and wherever tyranny threatens, whether it's from the right or from the left. That is Canada's traditional role. And our sons and daughters past have paid dearly, to maintain that traditional role.

So I simply say to the Member for Thompson when speaking of Canada's traditional role, let's be very clear what that traditional role is. There should be no doubt in anybody's mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I agree with the mover of this resolution and that the subject matter ought to be treated in a most serious way. However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he will forgive some rejoinders coming from this side, as we see our friends opposite who so often like to preach to us from such holier-than-thou positions, when we see such obvious contradictions that members opposite have undergone on this very issue, or facets of this issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this resolution talks about the terrible arms race, the waste of money with respect to defence spending. Yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the CF-18 represents certainly the most sophisticated state of the art fighter aircraft. It's our contribution to our commitments to NATO, while undoubtedly classified military information, no doubt equipped to handle tactical nuclear weapons, and we have this government that last Session with great fervor brought in a Nuclear Free Zone resolution, fighting for its very life, and milking every ounce of politics out of it. To do what? To make sure that we played our little part in the contribution of the arms race, as seen in the eyes of the mover of this resolution.

I don't see it that way, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I see it as meeting our obligations to our friends. I see it as meeting our obligations to those who hold freedom and liberty. Perhaps as being somewhat more important than some members opposite do. But I don't say that unkindly. If members opposite wish to challenge me on that I'm certainly prepared to back down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it'll be interesting to note the integrity of the New Democratic Party because, one thing I've never accused them of, they do know how to play the game of politics. They have enough experts around them and I am sure that it has not gone unnoticed by them. What has happened to the Labour Party in Britain that has gone down hill and Margaret

Thatcher, sure as the Good Lord made little green apples, is likely going to win an unprecedented third term and one of the principle reasons, one of the principle reasons is because the people of Britain, who, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have a longer tradition and longer experience of working with labour or socialist governments - the Iron Lady, as she's referred to has not always been the most popular Prime Minister of that country - but what is striking fear in the hearts of Britons who have every reason to understand, is the fact that Labour Opposition wishes to disassociate itself with NATO; wishes to not meet its obligations with respect to any future confrontation where freedom and liberty is at stake.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Honourable Member for Thompson made predictions. I will make a prediction. I predict that in the event - I'll have to qualify it, but in the event that the polls should continue to show favourably for Mr. Ed Broadbent and the New Democrats as we approach the next federal election, they will change their position with respect to NATO. You watch that. They will all of a sudden endorse NATO and NORAD and everything else that that organization stands for, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because they will have milked the politics out of it. They will have it demonstrated for them by none other than Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while the subject matter deserves the most serious attention, I want to make it perfectly clear that any suggestion on the part of any member opposite that suggests that any differing opinion expressed on this resolution, in any way, can be put in black and white terms as they're for peace and we're for war is of course absolute nonsense. All of us, all of us stand for peace, Mr. Deputy Speaker. All of us want to prevent an outbreak of war.

Understandably, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some of us have differing points of view as to how to arrive at that. It can be said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the threat of nuclear devastation is such that it has contributed substantially to the responsibility that superpowers have exercised in not getting into a war. Regrettably, there have been wars, of course but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, vigilance in maintaining the defensive posture has correctly, at least as many people can say, as people otherwise wish to say, that has contributed substantially in avoiding the kind of confrontation that this dear old world has all too regrettably shown it's capable of.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I don't know how many took the time the last two weekends, to read an interesting little review of the Falklands War. It was published in the Free Press in the last two weekends. The Falklands War, unfortunately - and I hasten to add, every war - is inexcusable. To the parent or to the wife who has lost a child or a lover or a sweetheart or a husband, it doesn't really matter whether he is one of 20 who got killed in an action or one of 100,000 who were killed either in the bombing raids over Dresden or in the atomic bombing raids over Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

But what that five-year review of the Falklands War should show us all, the classic example of how, when signals get crossed - you see, Britain did not indicate forcibly enough their will to defend the Islands. In fact, they did just the opposite. The one remaining naval vessel was dispatched back to port to be mothballed. They sent no additional garrisons to the Falklands to

indicate their resolve to maintain sovereignty of those Islands. The intelligence people of the Argentine who were desperately looking for some diversionary tactics because of their own difficulties, economics and otherwise and human rights in their country, they read these signals. They made the calculated guess, the political decision that Britain doesn't have the resolve, England doesn't have the resolve to defend the sovereignty of those countries at expense and at that great distance. Now's the time they could stage a little coup. They would just land some troops there and, before you know it, they would have resolved a decade-long program on the part of the Argentinians, these Islands, the Bolavian Islands (phonetic) I believe they call them.

Well, they miscalculated, Mr. Deputy Speaker. There was, as my leader says, the Iron Lady to be dealt with, and the Brits in due course sent the necessary resources to maintain the sovereignty of the Islands. But the gist of the article - and this is really the point that I am making - is that war was totally unnecessary. The war would not have happened. Four hundred or 500 or 1,000 people would not have died. All those Argentinians would not have died in that torpedoing of the Belgrano, the large troop carrier where some 1,200 Argentinians went down to their deaths in the cold icy waters of the South Atlantic.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

Had England but been vigilant, had England shown its resolve and made it very clear to any aggressor that their intention was to maintain the sovereignty of those Islands, there would not have been a war. Madam Speaker, time doesn't permit but, of course, that lesson is known to all of us about the last great world conflagration that we've seen. There is enough evidence on the record from both sides, from our side and now from captured documents, that one Adolf Hitler would have been stopped had there been some resolve shown by France and England in the early stages of his aggressive moves.

So, Madam Speaker, I don't quarrel with the resolution. I quarrel with some of the implications of the resolution, the implications that Canada can divorce itself from that association of freedom-loving nations, which doesn't seem to matter to the Honourable Member for Thompson. I say we are not a neutral nation, and that is not our tradition to be a neutral nation. Our tradition is to stand up for freedom whenever it is threatened. Our contribution has been substantial.

And if, in the minds of those who represent the free and open societies of the west - France, West Germany, Britain, United States, Canada and others to differing degrees - we have formed our alliances with NATO. We have all the more reason for our more close alliances such as NORAD, with our major partner with whom we share this continent. To suggest for a moment that we ought to withdraw from that, I think, is very short-sighted in terms of ensuring what surely this resolution is all about.

The resolution is peace. The resolution is about preventing the possibility of war. I don't wish to accuse members opposite on the movement of this resolution of parroting a particular propaganda line that is being put out by the KGB or somebody else. I believe his

motives for the resolution. The fact that they happen to dovetail with that propaganda line is not by coincidence, but I think it's absolutely wrong Nobody speaking opposed to this resolution ought to, in any way, be charged with warmongering or with not caring or with not having concern about where the arms race is leading us, but simply putting the priorities in the right order, in the right place.

We are associated with other free democracies in this world because, rightly or wrongly - and I believe rightly - we have reason to believe that from time to time those principles that we have based our freedoms on, that we have based our style of government on, are threatened by other forms of government. That can be argued, but the point is: Should they at any time be placed at risk by not standing up to our responsibilities and showing to the world our preparedness to defend those principles.

Madam Speaker, resolutions of this nature have a kind of instant appeal to many people who watch different documentaries, who read different pieces of information on the subject matter. To suggest that the concept of a nuclear holocaust is not frightening to all of us simply defies imagination. To suggest that, for some reason, only a specific segment in our society is concerned about preventing that from happening, again, defies imagination.

Madam Speaker, we are all too often, as we look at that aspect of it, prepared to ignore, set aside and in fact betray the very principles that make life worth living and make this country worthwhile. Honourable members don't like to talk about that. They simply like to talk about the billions of dollars that it costs, the necessity of whether or not defence spending ought to take place. They don't want to talk about the other side of the equation, why we're doing it, because that, I suggest, even brings them into conflict in their own minds as to whether they can, with integrity, support resolutions of this kind.

Thank you.

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to begin my comments on this very important resolution introduced by the Member for Thompson by reading a little poem which I think will illustrate the role that we, as a nation, can play on this particular issue. I don't know where it came from and I don't know from what source because it's not indicated but the date that's there is February '84. It's called The Last Snowflake, so others might probably have read that. It goes like this:

"Tell me what is the weight of a snowflake," a chickadee asked the dove. "Nothing more than nothing," was the answer. "In that case, I must tell you a marvelous story," said the chickadee. "One day I was sitting on a branch of a fur tree, close to its trunk, when snow began to fall. Not heavily, not a blizzard at all. No, it just snowed quietly like in a dream. Since I didn't have anything better to do, I counted the snowflakes as they settled on the twigs and needles of my branch. Finally, their number reached exactly

3,741,952. But when the next snowflake dropped onto the branch, nothing more than nothing, as you say, the branch broke off." Having said that, the chickadee flew away.

The dove, who since Noah's time has been an authority on this question, thought about the story for some time, then she said to herself, "Perhaps we need only one more person's voice for peace to come about in our world."

"Speak to someone today for peace. Alone we may be nothing, but together we can save our world."

And I think that this is where we as a province, we as a people, in every effort we make when we participate in a peace march, when we adopt a position such as declaring Manitoba a Nuclear Free Zone, and by the way other provinces, I know Ontario has done the same, perhaps others as well - and if we could as a country, go that one step further and do it as a country, we might start influencing other nations to also be counted and do the same.

You know, the facts are so well known on this issue, I don't want to stand here to repeat the facts in terms of the wasted money, the negative impact that this does have on the economies of so many countries of the world, even the superpowers, the destructive capacity of the continued arms buildup. That doesn't have to be made, we know, we all know that the arms that already exist are sufficient to destroy this planet many, many times over, so those are not points that need to be made. We have to accept that it represents a tremendous amount of waste; that it is a factor that contributes to the continued starvation around the world; that it is a factor that contributes heavily to the growing gap between the poor and the rich, not only in developing countries of the world, it has become an important fact in even such countries as both of the two superpowers, the United States and Russia. Only a few short years ago the lowest fifth of the American population benefitted by about 7.8 percent of the wealth of that nation. In a very short period of time that has gone down to 4.7 percent, that that lowest fifth of the population benefits from.

In the meantime, in that same short interval, the highest fifth of that population that derives on the high side of the revenue scale, their benefit from the wealth of the United States has gone from 33.8 percent to 38.5 percent. From 1981, so we're talking about a very short span of time. Now, this is happening in Canada as well. Fortunately in Canada, all people benefit from the social services, even the poor, which they don't in the United States, but that is also as we all know being tapped on in various parts of our country.

The point that I find hard to swallow is that when members of the Opposition, as did the Member for Lakeside, just a moment ago, who speaks on this resolution and pretends to speak on freedom and pretends to speak so dispassionately, with integrity, etc., misses the point totally because he hasn't spoken on the resolution at all. He's totally spoken aside from all of the BE IT RESOLVED portions of this resolution. The resolution says to declare Canada a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, one. Two, to halt the testing of Cruise Missiles; and three, to urge the superpowers to resume high level arms reduction talks and if necessary take an active role in facilitating such talks. Now, am

I to conclude that the members therefore are opposed to these?

**A MEMBER:** They wouldn't support the Lord's Prayer.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** At any rate I didn't hear the Member from Lakeside make any reference to any of those three points which are the only BE IT RESOLVED parts of this resolution. This says nothing about not standing alongside our allies, this says nothing about doing our share in peacekeeping. It doesn't say that we won't do these things; not at all.

But if the Member from Lakeside and other members across the way think that for Canada to play its traditional role in terms of, in regard to peace in the world means to simply stand alongside and say, yes, all the time when our neighbors or other countries across the ocean want to do; or to build the nuclear arms buildup then I say it's high time, if that's what it means, it's high time that we changed our traditional role.

It's high time that Canada starts to be a leader and if necessary that it take unilateral initiatives which it can take, that it put forward ideas; that it put forward proposals to bring about a reduction, a freeze and then a reduction. And that it should start by first declaring itself a Nuclear Free Zone as has Manitoba, as has Ontario.

The leaders and the politicians during the course of the federal election, were all polled in terms of where they sat and where they fit on this whole issue, and at that time, if you look at the results of the polling that was done, they all said that they were in favour of disarmament, that they were in favour of a freeze, or a large percentage of them did, and Trudeau said, when he was in power, that he was in favour of peace initiatives, in fact he got the Nobel Peace Prize, I believe. Turner said he wanted the arms race stopped; Mulroney said he was for peace and disarmament; every one of them says yes to all of these things, the unfortunate part is that they never say when they want these to begin, they never say when they want the arms race to be stopped, and if we continue to be that vague about this important issue, then we really don't want it stopped. If we say, well, in the 1980's or in the year 2000, really we're not serious. The stakes are the very survival of the human race - pardon me. The human race and the planet are what is at stake here.

At the moment, when there is some rough parity between the superpowers is a good time to being. Now is a good time to begin. Even though we are not a superpower, I believe that one of the unilateral actions or initiatives that we have to take is to say no to Cruise Missile testing, because they undermine the ability to verify. What we're talking about, first of all, is to bring about a freeze and, for that to make sense, it has to be verifiable. Here's part of the armament that contradicts that approach and, therefore, I say Canada has to say no to the Cruise Missile.

Madam Speaker, over the last two to three years, a number of municipalities, well over 200 municipalities or cities across the country have, at various times, held referenda on the question of disarmament. Nearly 80 percent of Canadians have indicated that they were in favour of nuclear disarmament. Let's remember, we're talking about nuclear disarmament.

How much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

**MADAM SPEAKER:** The honourable member has three minutes.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you.

We're talking about nuclear disarmament, not just alignments or participation in NATO. That's not what this resolution is about, even though some may grandstand and make that the issue. I think we have to refuse to be humiliated any longer by the lack of action of governments all over the world. Somebody has to begin, and we have to begin somewhere.

Canada has to show an example here. I think it's time that Canada realized there is an important movement across this country which has a high percentage of support. That movement wants the arms race stopped now, and that movement, Madam Speaker, is called voters of Canada. The voters of Canada, contrary to what the Member for Lakeside was saying awhile ago that might re-elect the Iron Lady in Canada, in the future, they may re-elect a government that has ideas and proposals to put forward to bring about a change of direction, to show leadership and bring about the nuclear weapons freeze, to indicate clearly that it will not participate in the Star Wars, that it will declare itself a Nuclear Free Zone.

Madam Speaker, the time has come to first stop the deployment and the installation of nuclear weapons and then start, by mutual agreement around the world, to demolish and destroy the nuclear weapons that are already here.

I want to read, Madam Speaker, the words of Tommy Douglas on that very sentence. He says: "Did you ever

stop to think about what would happen if we were to do that? Did you ever stop to think about the billions upon billions of dollars that would be liberated to destroy poverty, to rid the earth of misery, to provide health care for people in far corners of the earth, to build decent homes and schools and hospitals, to train nurses and doctors and teachers, to raise the living standards of mankind so that humanity could go on marching forward to the great goals toward which we ought to be marching."

That's what would happen if we could stop or freeze the development of nuclear weapons around the world, not to mention, Madam Speaker, the tremendous - all of the environmental impacts that we will be causing if we continue the buildup of scrap, of debris, of pollutants into the atmosphere that destroy the ozone, that cut the sunlight from reaching the earth, etc., etc.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Madam Speaker, I wonder, in view of the fact that it's close to six o'clock, if we could now 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. then, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. tomorrow. (Thursday)