

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 7, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. William Chornopyski (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directs me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko), that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the discussion paper on Harvesting Market Forces to Support the Environment.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Goods and Services Tax Government Position

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the First Ministers' Conference, with respect to the economy, is becoming more critical as each day passes. In this province we have noted that housing starts are down 22.3 percent from last year, bankruptcies from September of this year are up some 71 percent, consumer bankruptcies in the same period up by 53 percent—

An Honourable Member: Bring back the NDP.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the official Opposition.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, the only worse scenario would be to put the NDP back in power in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that Manitoba's concerns on the economy be raised with vigour at this conference, which opens tomorrow evening, but we seem to have different views about an economic issue which goes to the heart and soul of the future evolution of our province.

* (1335)

In view of these different opinions between the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the First Minister

(Mr. Filmon) with respect to the GST, will the Premier tell us what exactly will be the position of this Government? Are they going to be opposed to any form of GST or are they going to be in favour of some form of GST?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) did not get so carried away with her rhetoric that she did not suggest that anybody was realistically looking to the Liberals to form a better Government, I will tell you.

The fact of the matter is we go to Ottawa with one uniform position, and that is the position that was adopted by the Premiers at their meeting in August. That is that we are opposed to the GST as it has been proposed to the other Governments in this country.

The fact of the matter is we say that it will be inflationary, it will have a collection cost of probably a billion dollars, that it will add to the bureaucracy, it will cause problems for us ultimately in terms of our tourism, and it will be a nightmare for small business. On all those counts, we are opposed to the GST. Very simple.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, Mr. Speaker, he said very clearly we are opposed to the GST, as outlined. What kind of GST is acceptable to this Premier, and what will he be telling his counterparts in Ottawa?

Mr. Filmon: The position that I take is the position that all of the Premiers have taken, and that is that this proposal is unacceptable for all of the reasons that I have just put forward.

If the federal Government has different proposals, then the first thing they have to do is withdraw this, get back to the drawing board, and share information, share concerns, and look at the effects on the economy. The Premiers have had a very independent and objective analysis done for them by the Conference Board of Canada. Based on all of that information, people can decide whether or not there is a better proposal to put forward. That is all we have to go on.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have to take from those comments that he is in favour of some form of GST, he just wants a better idea.

Rebate Indexing

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier tell the people of this province that any form of GST acceptable to his Government would have to be fully indexed?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, to index a GST would mean it would forever go up. That is the most stupid idea I have ever heard.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Honourable Leader of the official Opposition.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

Mrs. Carstairs: He knows we are talking about the indexing of benefits to low-income earners.

Will this First Minister commit, on behalf of the people of this province, that any GST acceptable to this obtuse Premier will have to be fully indexed for benefit purposes?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, you know, the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) says that we should be opposed to any form of GST, any form of tax, sales tax, at the retail level. I mean that is absurd, because she knows that nine out of 10 provinces already have a retail sales tax. So we could not be blanket opposed to any form of retail sales tax.

* (1340)

We have indicated in the presentations that have been put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that any form of taxation must take into account the concerns for low-income families, that they must be protected so that they are not adversely affected. That is something that has been in every single presentation he has put forward. He has talked about visibility. He has talked about revenue neutrality. He has talked about all of those principles. They are the basis upon which the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) asked a whole series of questions before. They are the basis upon which there has been discussion in this House.

I cannot understand why, now that we are going to the First Ministers' Conference and the Leader of the Opposition is there as an observer, she has all of a sudden found out that this is a new issue. This is an issue that has been discussed over and over again for months on end, Mr. Speaker—

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

Goods and Services Tax Rebate Indexing

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): This is the whole point. Never once has the Finance Minister (Mr. Manness) of this province addressed the issue of whether any form of tax rebate to low-income earners should be fully indexed. He has never addressed that issue.

Will the Premier today finally go on the record on behalf of this Government and the people of this province to protect low-income earners and state clearly that their rebate should be fully, totally indexed to inflation?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Winston Churchill once said that if at 20 you are not a Liberal, it says you have no heart; if you are 40 and you are not a Conservative, you have no brains.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the age of the Leader of the Liberal Party, but I can tell you the Leader of the Liberal Party is not a Conservative.

Let me say with respect to the indexation of benefits that first, the goods and service tax, or any variation

of the goods and service tax, is unacceptable to this Government.

Let me also say that when there was discussion surrounding the national sales tax that we inherited from the former Government that this Government was a willing participant to be at that table to try and find some tax system that Canadians would accept. Part of that proposal, not so much the goods and services, but part of that national sales tax discussion was the fact that every couple having a family of two, a total family of four, would see net benefits under \$35,000 whether or not there was an indexing component.

So I say to the Leader of the Liberal Party, the indexing aspect, as we understand the GST today, is fully, fully covered even though the GST is totally unacceptable to this Government.

Mrs. Carstairs: I am sure the Minister of Finance will not mind being corrected. It was Sir Winston Churchill, but he was a Liberal after he was 21, and what he actually said was that anyone who was not a socialist until the age of 21 had no heart, and afterwards had no brains, but—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are not debating here. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of—

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, as a Liberal I do not associate myself with socialists or Conservatives.

Goods and Services Tax Rebate Indexing

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Can this first Minister tell the House today, however, why he is so hidebound by his Conservative thought patterns that he will not protect the low-income earners of this province and guarantee that any GST, which is acceptable to him because he has already said something is, will have to be fully indexed in terms of benefits of tax rebates to low-income families?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I repeat for the edification of the Leader of the Opposition that the GST that has been proposed by the federal Government is unacceptable. We have suggested that the federal Government withdraw. We have consistently said that any form of taxation must carry with it protection for low-income earners. We are the ones who on our budget created a rebate that would allow low-income families to get additional rebate by way of their income tax to reduce their income tax. This Liberal Opposition led by this Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) voted against that budget, Mr. Speaker, against help for low-income families. She should be ashamed of herself for that kind of rhetoric.

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Well, the adult day care centre is at it again, Mr. Speaker.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

Goods and Services Tax Government Alternative

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): We do not support the GST in any way, shape, or form. Therefore, we do not support the Leader of the Liberal Party's suggestion to put in an indexing of the rebate for low-income people. We only support defeating the GST and putting in a minimum corporate tax in this country, which is long overdue.

* (1345)

My question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) is: will the position of the Government on the GST be the position of the Finance Minister as outlined on September 19, 1989, in terms of his support of consumption taxes, or will it be the position that the Premiers put on the table yesterday of supporting the NDP position for a minimum corporate tax in this country?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we are opposed to the GST that has been proposed by the federal Government. It is unacceptable, and we have asked them to withdraw.

We have also indicated that we have strongly supported the moves by the federal Government to get us out of tax breaks, to get us out of loopholes and tax avoidance schemes for corporations and wealthy individuals, the same kinds of things that the former NDP Government took advantage of. I mean they took advantage of loopholes for wealthy people. They set up the preferred share scheme that sold all the buildings of the provincial Government into a corporation, Manitoba Properties Inc., to help high-income earners to avoid taxes. They speak out of both sides of their mouth. We are being consistent.

Goods and Services Tax Government Alternative

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), when the White Paper was released, said at his press conference that this tax was good for farmers. He said at his press conference it was good for the manufacturing sectors of Manitoba, and except for a few technical difficulties, he had no problem with this tax. Then he moved a couple of inches over, when you were going to the Premiers' meeting in Quebec City, and said he may have a few more technical difficulties, and then he said in September he supported, quote, consumption taxes.

I would like, once and for all, to know what the specific position of the Government is. Yes, they are opposed to GST. What is the alternative that they are putting on the table at the First Ministers' meeting? Are they putting on the table the \$38 billion in deferred corporate taxes that are unpaid in this country, or are they putting on the table some fix of the GST, in terms of the way it is proposed today?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will have to exercise this opportunity to

correct some errors on the preamble put forward by the Leader of the NDP, who was not present, who was not present, I reiterate, at the press conference held in August whence the technical paper of the federal Government came down.

Mr. Speaker, I dialogued and I set out for the people there six major concerns that this Government had with the technical papers released by the federal Government. They were included within a body of a letter that was sent to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Wilson. As I said at that time, on balance we had some major concerns with the GST. As we became more knowledgeable as to the impacts on certain sectors over the month of August leading into September, our position in opposition to the goods and services tax hardened. I might say, that is the position that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), our Premier, is carrying to the First Ministers' Conference tomorrow.

Mr. Doer: I have a tape from the Minister of Finance's press conference on agriculture and some many other items.

Goods and Services Tax Government Alternative

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is again to the First Minister. There is \$38 billion in this country in deferred taxes. The manufacturers sales tax is around \$20 billion in terms of revenue. The GST is \$27 billion in terms of proposed revenue.

Does it not make sense for Manitoba to be taking a position to get the \$38 billion, as recommended by the federal Auditor General a week and a half ago, get the \$38 billion, which is primarily unpaid taxes from corporations, many of which are receiving record profits this year, rather than going in with any other type of tax reform? Should that not be the first and foremost priority in written form to be tabled at the First Ministers' Meeting this week in Ottawa?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, many times in the past I have given a number of recommendations to the federal Government for ways in which they could avoid having to raise all of the additional revenues that they are proposing to under the GST. I have suggested that they ought to re-examine some of their own spending, take a look at their central bureaucracy, take a look at the thousands and tens of thousands of people whom they have in Ottawa, and take a look at reductions in spending. I have suggested that they ought to - (interjection)-

* (1350)

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Filmon: I have suggested that they ought to look at a lower interest rate policy recognizing that for every percent of interest rate, prime interest rate, in this country it adds \$1.5 billion a year to the federal deficit. We are now almost 4 percent higher than the prime rate in the U.S. We are talking about \$6 billion that

could be reduced, by getting our prime interest rate down as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested to them that they ought to look at other forms of revenue that are not so damaging to the economy, unlike the effects that we have announced for the GST. They have many alternatives to look at, Mr. Speaker, and those alternatives we believe ought to be looked at before they bring in something as damaging to the economy as the GST would be.

Federal Expenditures Review

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): I notice that the Premier, in listing all the items that the Government should look at, never mentioned that \$13 billion in energy boondoggle grants to Tory provinces—Hibernia, Lloydminster, the Oslow Project in Alberta, all of which were pre-election gifts of the Prime Minister to his Conservative cousins in various provinces—which will cost the taxpayers of this country \$13 billion, which is one-half of the first year of the GST.

Would the Premier also on behalf of Manitobans that will have to pay for these boondoggles, ask, urge, and demand that the federal Government, as well as withdrawing the insidious GST tax, also withdraw the \$13 billion worth in spending that will come from Manitoba taxpayers. We cannot afford it and neither can Canadians in terms of the priorities of the Prime Minister and the Tories in Ottawa.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I believe that the federal Government has an obligation to look at all of their proposed expenditures and get them down into line before they bring in something as damaging as the GST will be to regional economies throughout the country. That involves a whole range of expenditures that they have that may impact more particularly on one area than the other, but they have an obligation to look at their own spending before they hammer people over the head for more money.

Meech Lake Accord Manitoba Position Reaction

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of this country would have us believe that the Meech Lake Accord is not a significant aspect of the discussion that is going to take place over the next two and a half days. That is not the way that the Canadian people regard the matter of the Meech Lake Accord. When the Task Force Report was released two weeks ago, the Premier told the press and the people of this province that he would be making contact with other Premiers across the country.

Can he enunciate today in the House what reactions he received from other Premiers with regard to the Manitoba position, and if he has gained support for the outline that we have presented for constitutional reform?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Indeed I have had some discussions with other Premiers, and indeed there is

some express support from other Premiers, and some of it has been indicated publicly. I think the Leader of the Opposition, having listened to the media or read the media, can indicate that there is some willingness to consider other alternatives and perhaps a desire to enter into further discussions, and I think that is a positive step.

I indicated publicly the fact that Senator Murray, the federal Minister responsible for these constitutional matters, indicated that they were prepared to consider the reports and to sit down and discuss them to a degree in the future is a positive step. I think it is a considerable change from his earlier position of saying not one comma, not one "q" undotted, and so on. I think that we are indeed seeing a little movement and willingness to be considerate of the views of Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and so on.

Canada Clause

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Newfoundland, today, Clyde Wells, outlined an agenda for Newfoundland as they go into this particular conference, and in this he recognized the Canada Clause as outlined in the Manitoba Task Force Report along with recognition of aboriginal and multicultural peoples was a very positive step.

Can the Premier (Mr. Filmon) tell this House this afternoon if other Premiers other than Mr. Wells have recognized the broadening of the formerly called Quebec Clause to the Canada Clause and recognize this as a valid contribution to the constitutional process?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say this, in due respect to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), that what I have attempted to stay away from is foxing other Premiers in by quoting them publicly and trying to establish publicly where they are. I think that is the wrong process of attempting to put on them.

* (1355)

I think that the Leader of the Opposition did a disservice to Premier Wells when she quoted him incorrectly publicly about what he was doing about income taxes and tax reform in Newfoundland last spring. She put him in a position where she wrongly quoted him and had him embarrassed and put into difficult circumstances. That is not the way this is going to be done.

We are going to sit down as First Ministers. We are going to create a climate of openness and trust so that we can lead to hopefully an accomplishment of Manitoba's goals, Mr. Speaker.

Public Discussions

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, what I am quoting from today, and I am sure the Premier has also received a copy, is a proposed outline of constitutional reform from Newfoundland and Labrador.

Can the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) commit today to the people of this province, and indeed to this country, that discussions with regard to the Meech Lake Accord will take place in public and not behind closed doors and that there will be no further secret deals negotiated on our Constitution?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting you know that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs), who was one of the signatories to the Manitoba Task Force Report, one of the people on the committee, has already renounced that report and has already changed her position on two of the six fundamental principles in the report, and stated publicly that despite the fact that she agreed to this unanimously and her Party unanimously agreed to this report, she has already got a new position on two of the six issues.

I think it is this kind of public discussion, of throwing away principles and throwing out ideas and throwing away the Manitoba position before you have even begun to present it to the First Ministers, that does not do anybody a service.

I am committed to the Manitoba Report, which calls for the First Ministers not to enter into any agreement without first taking it back to their provinces and having that process followed through publicly in each province across the country.

Centre for Disease Control Site Reselection

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, this morning a number of Members of the Legislature received in the mail a pamphlet called, A Disease Control Centre for Winnipeg, What Do You Think? On the back of this pamphlet it says that the Royal Canadian Mint site has been chosen because, and then gives the reasons.

We have heard in the last number of weeks, Mr. Speaker, a number of politicians at all three levels of Government change their minds on where that site ought to be, including Jake Epp, who said publicly that he was prepared to allow the City Council of Winnipeg a chance to revisit the issue.

My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). Does he have any evidence in addition to what we received in our mailboxes this morning that Jake Epp has in fact reneged on his promise to allow the City Council of Winnipeg to re-look at the issue?

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am not aware of the pamphlet. Second, we will go on record as what we have said before—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ducharme: Mr. Speaker, this Government will go on record as we have in the past. We have suggested to the City of Winnipeg that it will be up to City Council

to make the decision on where they will have their yards and the lab.

Mr. Carr: In a covering letter it announces that there is a public meeting on the 16th of November to discuss the lab site at the Mint with residents who live in that part of the city.

I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Urban Affairs. Has the Minister of Urban Affairs had any discussions at all with the mayor of the City of Winnipeg about any potential provincial participation in the location of that lab in downtown Winnipeg?

* (1400)

Mr. Ducharme: I have had discussions with the mayor. However, the mayor this evening will be appointing his committees. Council will be having a council meeting tomorrow night. Somewhere along the road they will probably make their decisions, and we will base any further discussions that we have with the mayor and council on their decisions.

Centre for Disease Control Lobby Efforts

Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary to the Premier. We were all very encouraged some weeks ago when the Premier pledged to lobby city councillors after the municipal election to allow them to know that the position that the First Minister held, and the position of his Government, was that the downtown site ought to be chosen. I wonder if the Premier could report to the House on how the lobby is going.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): I was being assisted with the answer by some of my colleagues. I wonder if the Member from Fort Rouge would mind repeating his question. I missed the last part of it.

Mr. Carr: My question to the Premier, in recognizing that he had promised Members of this House and really the citizens of Winnipeg that he would lobby successful city councillors so that there could be a revisiting of the site selection for the disease control lab, was to ask the Premier how the lobbying efforts were proceeding.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I think they are proceeding as they should.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Centre for Disease Control Environmental Impact Study

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we on this side are becoming a little concerned about the kind of politicization of the lab site location. There will be a lot of public debate about where the new lab site shall go and it has taken place over the last period of time.

One of the criterion has been—and everybody is in favour of the lab coming to Manitoba, obviously—the

relationship with the health care sector. The other criterion has been the cost, and that has been all over the map in terms of the citizens of the province. Mr. Speaker, there is a third criterion that has not even been considered, and that is the environment. I would ask the Minister of Environment, given the fact that if the city was under the full Environment Act it would have to conduct either an equivalent environmental impact study or an impact study, is the Minister satisfied with the review of the environmental aspects of a disease control lab, a lab that will ultimately burn dead animals after they have been used for research?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I totally reject the Member's comments about whether or not the city is under The Environment Act. Any aspects of this project that would require environmental examination will receive the appropriate controls and licensing. I think that he should choose his words carefully when he talks about what might be emissions from this lab site because certainly it will be adequately controlled and perhaps he is subtly trying to say that he does not want it downtown.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, I think there are three criteria that should be used for the discussion of this lab. One is the health care industry, and I agree that therefore it makes sense to be close to the health care complex. The second one is the cost which the city is obviously dealing with. The third is the environment.

My question to the Minister is this: is he satisfied with the Executive Policy Committee's report on the lab site in terms of the way it deals with emissions and other environmental issues? Is he satisfied with this report, and if he is not, will he have somebody please conduct a review of the three potential sites so that we do not get into another Repap situation halfway through the project?

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Minister of the Environment -(interjection)- Order. Order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Minister of the Environment to answer that question, not the entire Cabinet. The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Cummings: I am very disappointed that the NDP has decided to raise the spectre of improper environmental controls in relationship to what is considered to be one of the highest tech laboratories in North America. It is absolutely bizarre that he would bring those concerns here in that manner and in some way try and show that a process that was developed originally by their Government is somehow deficient in dealing with what should be proper controls with this laboratory.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and anyone who would care to raise the question, that the environmental controls that we have placed on this lab will fall fully within the proper procedure within this province, No. 1, and to make sure that emissions to the environment are controlled and to the strictest possible manner within the confines of law.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Concordia, with his final supplementary question.

Mr. Doer: All I am asking the Minister for is a review of the three potential sites. They are being discussed on the basis of the health care industry. They are being discussed on the basis of cost, and nobody is discussing, and I quote the Minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. And the question is?

Mr. Doer: My question to the Minister is: will he please review the environmental impact or have the city review the environmental impact before we get into these back and forth decisions, because surely the consideration of the environment must be one of the criteria for the lab site which we all support coming to Manitoba.

Mr. Cummings: I suspect that he is saying that perhaps we should provide some sort of a pre-clearance until we have received a proposal. Is that what he wants? What kind of foolishness would that be in procedure? That would be ridiculous. If he is somehow saying that the environmental emissions that would be allowed would be different if it was behind a row of houses or if it was across the street from the General Hospital, if he is suggesting that would be different, then I suggest he think again.

Health Care Anesthetist Recruitment

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Kildonan-(interjection)- Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan has the floor.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, in this June my Leader raised a question in this House regarding the inadequate number of anesthesia medical manpower in Manitoba. There is a shortage of 10 full-time anesthetists in major hospitals and 14 of them will reach the age of 65 next year and another eight will reach the age of 65 in five years. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us what steps he has taken as of June to ensure that we will have an adequate number of anesthesia manpower in Manitoba?

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, those issues of recruitment of anesthesiologists to the various hospitals are completely within the mandate and purview of those hospitals, and they are pro-actively recruiting that specialist to Manitoba.

Surgery Delays

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, this Minister is again wrong. On June 6 he said that this thing is going to be looked at by the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower. Now he is giving a different statement. My question is that in the rural communities there is a decline of at least 64 percent of anesthesia service. Can the Minister of Health tell us what steps he has taken or he will take now to ensure that all the rural communities will receive adequate anesthesia coverage?

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into a who is right and who is wrong debate, but my honourable friend has a relatively consistent record of being wrong. My honourable friend says that SCOMM is involved. Yes, the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower is involved, but my honourable friend's specific question was in terms of Winnipeg hospitals who recruit those kinds of physicians and are pro-actively doing so.

Mr. Cheema: Mr. Speaker, I gave him the number for the whole of Manitoba, not only the Winnipeg hospitals. If the manpower stays the way it is now, we will have at least 20,000 fewer surgeries next year. Can the Minister of Health justify and tell us what steps he will take now to ensure that all the surgical procedures will be performed in time, because we now have a waiting list.

Mr. Orchard: Mr. Speaker, in the world of "if," Liberals live. The reality is that we are addressing these problems in a very pro-active way with the College of Physicians and Surgeons in terms of standards, with the Manitoba Medical Association in terms of shoring up in terms of the fee schedule, with the Faculty of Medicine in terms of anesthesiology upgrade, with the Standing Committee on Medical Manpower to assure that recruitment efforts are successful in rural Manitoba—which was the answer to the question in June.

* (1410)

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the world of "if" that the Liberals live in, all sorts of things might be speculated to happen, but I simply tell you that this Government is pro-actively participating with the major players to resolve these problems.

Agriculture Advisory Committee Background Data

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) yesterday in his statement to this House released the paper entitled "Impacts of a Change in the Method of Payment, a Discussion Paper." I ask the Minister of Agriculture, when will the background data that corroborates the assumptions that have been put forward in this paper be released?

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the paper the Member refers to was released—I gave him copies—by the Advisory Council which is going to report to this Government in due course. They are in possession of those study papers and will do as they deem necessary with them.

Mr. Uruski: Mr. Chairman, in order for farmers to make an adequate assessment on the statements that are being made in this report, it is I believe incumbent on the Minister of Agriculture to indicate to his council the data supporting the statements, like stating that 25 percent and 28 percent of cattle and hog production will increase as a result of changing methods of payment. Where is the data to support that, and will the Minister release that information?

Mr. Findlay: Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Council is going out to meet with various farm groups; Manitoba Pool Elevators this week; Union of Manitoba Municipalities later in the month; Keystone Agricultural Producers sometime this month; and other farm groups. The basis of that information will be discussed at that time and the background information will be supplied for the process of that discussion, which is going to carry on through various farm meetings over the course of the winter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES (Cont'd)

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Orders of the Day, I would like the indulgence of the House to revert back to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Is there leave to revert back to that section? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

Mr. William Chornopyski (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I would like to correct the record respecting the report from the Committee of Supply. Inadvertently, the report indicated progress only. In fact, the adoption of one resolution should have been reported.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Burrows.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): I rise on a matter of House Business. I would like to inform the House that after discussions with House Leaders it is agreed that the House will not sit on November 10, this Friday, so that Honourable Members can return to their constituencies to participate in local Remembrance Day ceremonies. Thursday would be treated as a regular Thursday sitting, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Bill No. 84?

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 84—THE WASTE REDUCTION AND PREVENTION AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment) presented Bill No. 84, The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act; Loi sur la réduction du volume et de la production des déchets et modifications corrélatives, for second reading, to be referred to a committee of this House.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to the Legislature a Bill I believe addresses a concern that all Manitobans feel deeply about, the protection of our environment. The specific problem that the Waste Reduction and Prevention Bill tackles is the growing volume of waste that is filling our disposal grounds and is creating litter problems in our communities. It represents a lost opportunity for reusing and recycling useful product and materials.

Over the past several years we have been bombarded with information about how the integrity of our ecosystem is threatened. Last year one of the leading voices in the environmental movement, Lester Brown of the World Watch Institute, characterized the situation as the earth starting to hit back after enduring years of abuse.

The situation requires immediate action on a number of fronts. We have learned of global problems such as ozone depletion and global warming. We have learned of continental problems such as acid rain. We have learned of local problems such as the quality of our air and our water. These, as you are aware, are all problems that our Government is actively dealing with. The priority that this Government places on sustainable development speaks of the firm belief that protection of the environment must be directly woven into the fabric of our economic decision-making process.

For the first time the environment has been placed high on the agenda of First Ministers for their meeting later this week. I think that we can all share some pride in the fact that Manitoba's Premier has played a leading role in this forum. Our commitment must now be followed by actions, and today we begin.

The issue that The Waste Production Prevention Act addresses is one that is global in proportion, Mr. Speaker, but affects every one of us locally. We in Manitoba are fortunate that we do not face the same waste disposal crisis that is being confronted in large metropolitan communities in North America such as Toronto and New York. In these communities garbage must travel great distances to be disposed of at a cost sometimes equal to \$200 a ton.

The fact that we do not face a crisis of such proportions in Manitoba should not be interpreted to mean that we do not have a problem. A few months ago the federal Environment Minister, Mr. Bouchard, reminded us all that Canadians are the most wasteful nation in the globe. While countries such as Japan are estimated to recycle as much as 50 percent of their waste materials, Canada recycles 2 percent. While a relatively small population and relative distance from major markets does present certain challenges, there is no doubt that we can and must do better, Mr. Speaker.

So while we do not face a waste disposal crisis in most communities, we should treat this as an opportunity for the orderly development of an efficient and effective program and not an excuse for inaction.

Earlier in June, during Environment Week, I set aside an ambitious goal for Manitobans to reduce the volume of solid waste by 50 percent at the end of this century. To assist in the development of a strategy and consult

with the different groups and sectors of society that are today actively addressing the waste problem, I appointed the Recycling Action Committee. I asked the Recycling Action Committee to develop specific recommendations and priorities for actions. I also indicated to them that I would introduce legislation to allow for immediate implementation of their recommendations. I think that is key, Mr. Speaker.

I have asked the committee for interim recommendations before the end of this year. The action committee will issue its recycling action plan early in 1990. The Recycling Action Committee has been quite active in carrying out its tasks. It has issued an excellent background paper and has met with hundreds of Manitobans at meetings across the province. Public response to this issue has confirmed my belief that the public shares the commitment that we must achieve a 50 percent reduction in waste.

Let me clarify exactly what is meant by waste, Mr. Speaker—products and materials that become waste when they are discarded. This can be through proper disposal procedures for collection or through collection at our waste disposal grounds or through improper means, such as littering.

Under The Environment Act there are provisions which govern the standards which are required for waste disposal grounds, or landfills. The regulations which deal with this have been revised and are currently out for consultation as part of my department's regulation development process. We are already well on the way to dealing with one aspect of the waste problem that causes great concern, that is, hazardous waste.

As I indicated on many previous occasions, the Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation is proceeding with its plans to establish a system for safe handling and disposal of these wastes. The Environment Act and Dangerous Goods and Handling and Transportation Act deal with restrictions on proper disposal of hazardous materials.

* (1420)

Despite these measures which are primarily in place to protect the environment, we are left with the problem of an ever-increasing volume of waste, Mr. Speaker. At the present time Manitobans produce approximately one ton of waste per capita. Studies suggest this volume is doubling every 10 to 20 years. Such an ever-increasing volume of garbage represents costs for collection and disposal that are directly borne by our municipalities; costs for allocation of what is often prime land for waste disposal sites; costs and difficulties in siting new landfills; problems such as litter, that take away from our quality of life; potential for environmental contamination from an increased volume of waste; and the squandering of resources which could be put to better use to recover considerable value for our society. Without considering the value of the land set aside for disposal purposes, it is estimated that over \$20 million is spent annually to bury resources that may have a value of over \$10 million in this province.

A critical response to this problem must be recycling, but I remind you that recycling is only one of the four

Rs of waste reduction and prevention. To minimize the volume of waste that we generate, we should look at and actively encourage a hierarchy of alternatives.

The first R that I refer to is reduction, which stands for avoiding the problem in the first place through better design, longer life cycles for products and materials, and through use patterns that do not encourage throwaways. The second R is re-use. This is accomplished when we re-employ a container or return a product or material for some modification or cleaning so that it may be used again for roughly the same purpose. The third is recycling. It take place when we reprocess a product or material to make a new product or material into a similar product, such as an aluminum can, a glass bottle or paper product or something which has a cellulose fibre insulation. The fourth R is recovery, where we recover the energy of a product through its destruction or decomposition, such as is accomplished in composting or incineration.

There will eventually remain some residue or waste to be disposed, but there are tremendous opportunities for reducing this volume. So how do we go about accomplishing waste minimization, Mr. Speaker? A good place to start would be a fifth R in our thinking.

It has been said previously that I have met the enemy and he is us, and I will leave you to judge who said that, Mr. Speaker, but in a re-use we are the enemy when it comes to waste generation. As a result, everyone has a role in making waste reduction and prevention work.

Industry has a responsibility to consider source reduction, re-use and recyclability in designing products and packaging and using secondary materials in their manufacture. Citizens have a responsibility to learn about products and packaging they buy and they waste and the waste they create. What is in the product? What is recyclable? What is potentially harmful? How long will the product last and how much will it cost to dispose of it? Every individual and corporate citizen should assume responsibility for waste disposal and adopt a pay-as-you-throw attitude, a recognition of the true cost of disposing of the wastes that we generate.

The Government has specific responsibility to make sure there is an even playing field for everyone, to provide leadership, to provide co-ordination, and to make sure that its own House is in order. Government is a major consumer of products and materials in Manitoba, as everywhere else.

Perhaps the key problem that the WRAP Act addresses is whether or not there are the proper incentives presently in the marketplace. Do we have an even playing field or is it one that is tilted in favour of disposal and throwaway, which is exactly the opposite direction that we want to go?

Throwaway products with no design for re-use or recycling have a competitive advantage in their disposal costs in that their disposal costs are socialized, which is a polite way of saying that we all end up paying for their disposition.

Deposit systems are in existence. There are problematic incentives. Beer cans, unlike beer bottles,

for example, have a value that is less than the deposit paid by the consumer. Accordingly, there is an economic incentive for the producer not to encourage returns. This corresponds to an estimated one-half million dollars annually in unrefunded deposits retained by producers, and the incentives end up going in the wrong way.

Accompanying the table of the WRAP Act Bill, I am today releasing a Discussion Paper on Harnessing Market Forces to Protect the Environment. The fact of the matter is that we have through the market the most efficient process for allocating costs to society. As was pointed out recently in the Financial Post, however, there is an important distinction between the market and an attitude of environmental laissez faire.

The system of allocating resources must include incentives for proper care and conservation in a market economy. That means prices charged for the recovery and use of these resources must capture their true economic costs to society. That involves not only the standard economic problems of recycling, the relative scarcity of different resources and the costs of using one in preference to another, but the costs of the pollution given off in the course of the production, whether it is cleaned up or simply endured.

Putting the market to work for the environment calls for Government action on two fronts—stopping policies that encourage pollution and starting policies that discourage it.

The WRAP Act Bill is a facilitative and enabling piece of legislation that lays out a framework and allows for the application of the principles discussed in the Discussion Paper. It specifically lays out an orderly process for reducing waste. This approach is required by the nature of the far-reaching problem. Several jurisdictions have concentrated their efforts for example at measures exclusively dealing with beverage containers, which only constitute, Mr. Speaker, a small percentage of the waste stream, and where we presently have a system in place in Manitoba, but where we would like to see further progress.

The starting point for the process is the issuing of a Waste Reduction Prevention Strategy by the Government. This will identify priorities and targets to be reached based on an analysis of specific problems and opportunities. A first report will be issued within six months of the adoption of the Act and subsequent reports will be tabled annually in the Legislature.

The general problems such as a collection system and market development will be addressed. The focus of the process will be on products and materials which have the potential to become waste and to ensure that incentives and systems exist to minimize the rate at which this occurs.

The second step in the process is the adoption of a target for waste reduction and prevention in consultation with the producers and consumers directly involved. These targets will be graduated to allow for reasonable and feasible progress in accomplishing longer-term goals.

An intention of the legislation is to allow the greatest possible flexibility in meeting targets. Producers who

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

have the most intimate knowledge of their industries will be given the opportunity to develop programs for meeting the targets set for products and materials. If these cannot be met, then performance will be audited and reviewed so that future targets can be established. I believe it is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we encourage that co-operative action on behalf of industry.

In cases where targets are not met through industry-initiated programs, the provisions for deposits and predisposal assessments may be applied. The Minister will be authorized to appoint working groups and committees on such problems. This step would result in the department developing regulations which will incorporate any or some combination of: deposits, including provisions for forfeiture of unrefunded deposits; predisposal fees, whereby a surcharge be set aside for waste reduction and prevention purposes; licensing fees, which will permit a designated volume of waste associated with a product or material; and performance bonds, which would be tied to the accomplishment of a waste reduction and prevention target.

There will also be provisions for rebates to firms who pay assessments based on their performance.

The purpose of the deposit and assessment regime is to ensure that adequate funding is available for waste reduction and prevention programs. These can encompass research and education in addition to collection, processing or other measures to promote the application of the four Rs. The WRAP Act provides you with the ability for recordkeeping so that accomplishment of targets can be validated. This last step will determine whether targets are met, penalties are in order, and how the WRAP strategy will be modified.

In summary, this Act will allow us to systematically meet the 50 percent waste reduction target that I mentioned earlier. Once this Act is adopted, the first waste reduction and prevention strategy report will be prepared and issued within six months. This will lay out the specific products and targets to be addressed in the first set of regulations to be released and consulted upon.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

One other element of this Bill I am putting before the Legislature is the provision which will establish an Environmental Innovations Fund to improve our environment. We will have to be doing a lot of innovative things and we will have to enlist the energies of all Manitobans. This fund will encourage that ability.

The Environmental Innovations Fund will allow financial support to go toward community activities, industrial innovations, research, education, and other new program initiatives. It will provide a vehicle for the Government to target the expenditure of revenues from measures such as the Environmental Protection Tax which was announced in the June budget to new programs for protecting the environment.

The measures included in this Act present a key part of our Government's plans for promoting waste

production and recycling, but there are other actions that we are actively promoting today, from supporting curb-side collection pilot projects, to strengthening Government purchasing of recycled products and materials.

* (1430)

We are on the eve of an exciting decade where we will have to live up to the challenge of making our environment a better place to live for ourselves and for future generations of Manitobans. I am confident the Bill I am placing before you today will take us that much closer to meeting this Goal. Thank you.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wanted to take some moments to participate in second reading of Bill 84, and the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), now we know why he is in a bit of a rush and a bit of a dilemma to bring this Bill forward as rapidly today as possible, and that is to be able to have the Premier (Mr. Filmon) make statements at the Premiers' Conference that we are now in Manitoba moving full speed ahead on controlling waste in our environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister just about let, well, he did let the cat out of the bag and said, look, we are rushing because we are having a Premiers' Conference and we want to have this Bill in place for the Premiers' Conference.- (interjection)-

I hear the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) chirping from his seat. No one in this Assembly is arguing that we ought not to be moving ahead in trying to reduce, reuse, recycle in whatever means at our disposal the waste that we as a society produce. For the Minister to admit that the reason that this Bill is coming in at this moment and he wanted priority for this Bill, is for the Premiers' Conference, I find—now he is shaking his head to the negative.

The fact of the matter is that is what he said. This Bill is basically Conservative optics, Mr. Deputy Speaker. If he had any intention, if he had any intentions of proceeding with doing concrete actions in dealing with waste in our society, he would have put money behind the committees that he set up, that there would be much more than just these few pilot projects in recycling that are now starting up around the province. There is not one recycling depot outside of Selkirk in the Interlake, for example.

When we had the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission before committee last week -(interjection)- I hear the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) say he is going to recycle me. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he spent last election on the podium where they could not put their candidate on the podium with me because he was afraid to debate me, so who did they bring in to the riding? They brought their so-called heavyweight from Pembina, and that is why he cleaned my clock, that is why I am here today. They brought him in, they brought him into the riding. I am pleased that the Minister of Health whipped me because that is why I am back here in the House, I guess.- (interjection)- Yes, I guess I owe my survival to the Minister of Health, back in this House.-

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

(interjection)- I knew you were coming. You are calling—the former Member for Sturgeon Creek was there in the afternoon, and they had the Minister of Rural Development there the day before.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this legislation is one that I would say all Members should be willing to support, but what I do not accept about this legislation is that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) is using this piece of legislation as a means to show or at least in optics that there is some concrete action in Manitoba by law.

We would do far more, and the Government would do far more, by putting its stated policies into action and have the recycling, the re-use, and the reduction of waste in motion so that Manitoba citizens can in fact respond. There are thousands of Manitoba citizens willing to respond in trying to control waste in our environment, to try and reduce the waste, to try and do the kind of compartmentalizing of our waste, segregate the papers, the tin cans, the glass bottles, and make sure that all the waste that we are producing that is now going in and basically being buried, can in fact be re-used, recycled, recrushed and put back into the environment as re-usable products rather than wasting what we are throwing out.

I say to the Government, do not use the environment as a political sham for the Premiers' debate. Let us get on with the job of putting your money where your mouth is and making sure that the kind of programming that is being recommended by environmental groups, by citizens of this province, that those programs go into place.

I find the Minister of Environment's (Mr. Cummings) comments today somewhat in the vein of hypocrisy. His great concern is for environment, yet he was accusing my Leader when he raised the question of having a look at the environmental impact of the health lab which no—waste disposal which is being proposed in south Winnipeg and then of course in the core area of Winnipeg, but no one has examined the environmental implications. The Minister of Environment was accusing the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) of somehow being opposed and being anti to this development. All that we were raising with the Government was to say, no one has examined the environment in this issue. They are looking at costs, they are looking at location, but they are not examining the environmental impact of this project, so let us have a look at it. So I find the Minister of Environment's comments today somewhat in the hypocritical vein in terms of his so-called concern for the environment when he is introducing this Bill.

As well, he takes credit for the setting up of the Hazardous Waste Corporation. I want to tell Members of the Government that the Hazardous Waste Corporation was set up by the former Member for Radisson, the Honourable Gerald Lecuyer when he was the Minister of Environment, and that process was in place. So the Conservatives have a long way to go to basically move away from the rhetoric that we have seen so far that really should be turned into an action plan that Manitobans can see, yes, we are as a Government and as a society concerned about controlling the amount of waste in our environment.

There is another issue that I find the Government with respect to the controlling of waste and concerns about the environment very much questionable. We have an incident and in fact it happens to be the Member for La Verendrye's area, in the Steinbach area. There is presently a proposal by a number of developers to build a golf course in, I think it is the R.M. of Ste. Anne, in the vicinity of Steinbach, just a few miles north and east of the Town of Steinbach.

* (1440)

The location seems to be a very good location if one would say, yes, a gravel pit that is not used any more for a golf course seems to be okay, but do you know that there are more than 20,000 head of livestock in a small periphery of this proposed golf course, and in fact originally it was proposed that there would be condominiums and housing developments in this whole area? So can you see the kind of clash that will take place between the farm community and the developers who in fact want to build this golf course, put in plush condominiums amidst dairy, beef, poultry and hog operations in that immediate area, massive livestock and poultry operations, and we hear from the Minister of Environment, it is hands off. We do not want to get involved.

Well they have a role to play. The producers in the area have said, we want a chance to have a hearing to hear our concerns, and what do we hear from the Government, a deaf ear. We are not about to give you a hearing on this process because it is a land use issue. In the technical sense it may very well be a land use issue but can you imagine the confrontation that will take place in the future, not unlike the situation we saw here in Lindenwoods where the housing development was across a board fence from a dairy operation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not blame the farmer in that area telling those citizens and those developers, you smell what you have smelled for years and unless you deal with me properly there is no way around it. They had to deal with him properly but in this case the Government is turning a deaf ear on the farmers.

What we should have seen is the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) demanding of the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner) that a special development plan be created for this area. Then the Minister of Environment and his staff could play a useful role in this process and the producers of that area, the farmers who surround this development would then have an opportunity to have their say and raise their concerns, and that the Government could facilitate the process by allowing hearings, albeit not necessarily under the Environment Act but under the Act under proposal of the Minister of Rural Development. We do not see the Minister of Agriculture standing up for the farmers of that area. We see silence from the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz). Mr. Deputy Speaker, all these issue are environmental issues. The Minister of Finance says you are not on the Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are talking about impacts and broad policy issues dealing with the environment.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) may want to put little blinkers on and say, this is not about tin cans,

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

you are not talking about tin cans and recycling so you are not talking about the Bill. Mr. Deputy Speaker, my vision is not as narrow as the Minister of Finance's on the issue of the environment.

Mr. Cummings: Point of Order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not wish to preclude the Member from making remarks on the Bill. I would simply ask that he consider that the Waste Reduction Bill that is in front of him does relate to waste reduction and does not deal with all of the other far-ranging issues that he is talking about.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the advice of the Minister and I would urge the Honourable Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) to stick to the relevance of the Bill.

Mr. Uruski: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is about waste reduction. The issue that I raised with respect to the proposal in the St. Anne-Steinbach area deals with the very question of waste and the farm community which will ultimately be impacted either by law suit or by public pressure or by municipal intervention to reduce wastes in an area where they have priority now because of the future development of a golf course which now the developers are saying will not cause any problems and should not be of any conflict with those farmers.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it very much deals with the question of waste and waste control. It is the lack of Government action and Government concern on these types of issues that in fact lead me to raise these issues and point to the hypocrisy of Government action in these areas.

That issue that I spoke about I would urge the Minister of the Environment to re-think the Government's position on the matter of that golf course to allow the farm community to have a series of hearings on that issue. I hear the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) saying, come on, get on with it. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you were to speak with the farm families in that area of Steinbach who have been for months concerned about this development, you would not be like the Minister of Northern Affairs, the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) saying, come on, get on with it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will try not to be diverted by the side comments of the Minister of Northern Affairs on discussion of waste reduction and actions of the Government, the actions of the Government which purports to be so concerned about the environment, so concerned about waste reduction, so concerned about making sure that development is sustainable in this province, because the Minister talked about sustainable development and yet the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) when introducing this Bill admitted that the reason he is introducing this Bill with such haste today is to make sure that Manitoba and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province can go to the First Ministers' Conference and in fact indicate that

Manitoba is moving full speed ahead at reducing of waste in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to as well point out to an incident, and I have done it before, and I will keep pointing it out to this Government on the question of sustainable development, and the Government's hypocritical actions as it relates to natural justice for people. While this legislation deals with waste reduction and the need for the increased recycling, the increased reusal of products that we consume as a society, there is no doubt that all of us can, in fact, do more.

I for one want to say that the efforts, for example, this week of recognition of 4-H in our province and the role that our young people, our 4-H'ers' and leaders have played in the growth of this and the development of this province, we should be very thankful for the efforts of 4-H groups in this province in the role that they played in cleaning up the environment, in the role that they have had in the roadside clean-up, which was started by my colleague the Member for Dauphin and Minister of Highways (Mr. Plohman) a number of years ago, and is being continued by subsequent Governments to be able to deal with the question of recycling, the need to clean up roadsides, the need to show to our citizenry that we can have a better environment if we all pull together, if we all work towards that end.

* (1450)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, legislation in itself will not accomplish the ends that we all want to reach, and that is the reduction of garbage, and of materials in our society which are and can be re-useable. I will not be satisfied with the Government's commitment of a 50 percent reduction because that is their goal, a 50 percent reduction in the amount of waste that can be recycled.

I do not believe that we should be satisfied that a 50 percent reduction in our recycling, reusing and reduction of waste products should be our goal. We should attempt to recycle far more of our products. For the short run, no doubt for the short run it is a laudable goal, but to make it as a policy objective of the Government, I believe while it may be realistic for a two- or three- or five-year span, our goals should be a virtual recycling of practically all products in the marketplace. I think that should be our ultimate goal as a society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased about the requirements of the Bill setting forth the question of deposits, and handling fees in this legislation. There is no doubt that we need to bring about an adequate deposit system that will encourage people to bring back and recycle the products that they take and they purchase. Right now, for example, the question of recycling of soft drink bottles—a 30 cent deposit, I venture to say, is bringing citizens to the realization that virtually every bottle should go back because there is a sizeable deposit on the commodity.

In some instances, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the deposit practically equals the value of the product. In fact, it probably goes above the value of the product when

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

you count the value of the container that it is in. So, I do not think that is a bad move if we are serious about making sure that all products, paper, glass, metal, all the products that we take for granted presently are recycled.

I think the Government should be coming out with statements that not only is it proposing to set-up a depository system that it intends to bring forward a system that encourages financially the return of bottles, of papers, of tins to be recycled and be reused. We have to do that.

I find, and I do not know what it will take for us to bring that about, the question of paper. The thousands of tons of paper that is being dumped day in and day out into our landfill sites is really, you could almost say, criminal because of the waste of our resources. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it may take the Government by the funding that it puts into place or should be putting into place to be able to make sure that the marketplace pays more than, what is it now, a penny a pound? I think that is about all that the recycling depots are paying. That encourages those of us who are very concerned about the amount of trash that we throw out and that we save this type of, well, not all the papers, the newspapers, the print material.

For those of us who come into the city on a regular basis were coming here anyway. It is a matter of taking those boxes, putting them on our half-tons or in the trunk of our cars and bringing them in. For many citizens who do not make those journeys into the city, into the collection depots, it becomes very much a burden and an added cost if they are to be able to take part in a recycling program. We have to do far more in terms of making sure that the proper rebates, the proper charges, the proper deposits, the proper assessments are made to encourage our citizens to recycle waste products.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the one issue that I touched on before, I did not raise it and I said that I will be raising it at every opportunity, I want to indicate to the Minister of the Environment when he talks about his desire for sustainable development and our goals as a province that we want to pursue that laudable goal in all our policies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, he stated on here in the introduction of this Bill and I hear the Minister of Natural Resources saying, yup. I pleaded with the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), the Minister of Community Services (Mrs. Oleson), the MLA for Gladstone to take those words to heart, to take the words of the citizens of Gladstone and Plumas to heart and not hold up their desire to sustain their life and their development in providing them with a water source that is there in a 1500-square-mile aquifer that, it is acknowledged by all in that area, can sustain that development. Here we have the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), whose own Clean Environment Commission recommended the licence to proceed with the drawing of the water, now saying you cannot have it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have evidence from the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) that there have

been numerous test wells over the last, I believe it is 15 to 23 years. Not a year or two, but those test wells have been in place for over two decades. Those test wells on that aquifer have shown that the greatest reduction as a result of the severe drought that has impacted on that aquifer was a reduction in one well. By how much? One-tenth of one metre. That is less than four inches of a drop in the amount of water in that well as a result of the most severe drought.

* (1500)

Yet we as a Government are prepared to deny the communities of Plumas and Gladstone to take out 2 percent more of the sustainable yield of that aquifer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, only 2 percent of 18 percent that is presently committed.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): I rise on a point of order. We do have somewhat of a rule in here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there has to be some relevancy to the Bill of which the Member is speaking. I would think he had been in the Chamber long enough that he would have respect for past rulings of Speakers and the direction you have given, Sir. I would hope that he would be brought to attention on that matter.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): I rise on the same point of order. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), when he introduced this Bill, spoke about sustainable development as being one of the principles of this Bill. My debate in this House, on a debate of negligence on this Government, is about sustainable development. I wish that you would deal with the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Thompson, on the same point of order?

Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader): Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I believe if the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) is listening to the opening comments made by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings), he will learn that many of the comments to which the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) is addressing himself right now, the areas were raised by the Minister in the opening statement including the comments the Member has been making the last number of minutes.

I would suggest, and I can quote from Beauchesne where it does indicate that our rules in terms of relevance are generously and broadly interpreted, that rather than rise on a point of order when in fact the Member has been in order and with his comments, he has been addressing the comments made by the Minister of the Environment.

If the Member feels that this particular debate is out of order, he should have raised that with his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, who made a number of references to sustainable development, the environment generally and the upcoming conference.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

I think the comments of the Member for Interlake are well within our rules. I know you have drawn the attention of Members to the rules. I believe the Member for Interlake, a veteran of this House, has been in fact following your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and is totally in order with his comments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister of Finance, on the same point of order.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the same point of order, the Opposition House Leader, or the NDP House Leader, knows full well that in addressing Second Reading of Bill 84, and I can give you the title of the Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act, in those remarks leading up to that there was reference made at times to sustainable development. The Bill very specifically does not deal with the environment. The Bill very specifically does not deal with sustainable development in its broadest terms. The Bill specifically deals with waste reduction and prevention. Those are the broad principles of the Bill, and for Members of the House to take them to the general global concerns of environment or indeed aquifer problems or considerations in some part of this province, I think is an abuse of the rules.

Mr. Uruski: For your further guidance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would draw to your attention page 13 of the legislation which specifically deals with areas of the environment, and I will quote Section 45.1(4): On the recommendation of the minister, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may authorize expenditures from the fund for payments of grants in Section 45(2), the promotion, development, delivery, or implementation of environmental innovation projects, research in the field of environmental innovation, any other environmental innovation purpose that the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers necessary in environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, all the areas of—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Bill in question is the Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendment. I have reminded the Honourable Member once about the relevance. Again I must remind him about quoting from a script and the Rule 30 which states that speeches shall be directly relevant to the motion. I would appreciate the assistance of the Honourable Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) and all Members in complying with the rule. The Honourable Member for Interlake.

Mr. Uruski: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I certainly respect your wishes on the question, and I know that when we talk about the reduction of waste and the extra costs of maintaining our environment, I will tell you exactly what I have been speaking about with respect to the

Plumas situation and how it impacts on the additional costs of the environment.

Can you imagine 700 farm families having to go in day in and day out and take a truck with a huge tank and line up day in and day out at a pump as much as 20 or 30 miles away from home? As to the expense and the cost to both themselves, the environment in terms of the use of fossil fuels when in fact there may be, and can be, and there is a lower-cost solution and environmentally safe solution and one that by law, by provincial law, demands our attention, by indicating, and we as a Legislature, passed that law where we said there are six principles on which water shall be distributed, and the first principle and the highest priority shall be human consumption.

What is going on, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is while on one hand we are bringing in a piece of legislation saying we want to reduce the costs and waste in our environment, we are de facto adding to costs of several thousands of people in the Plumas-Gladstone area by forcing them to drive many miles to get to their water source and bring water home. Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is in effect what the issue is about, that is what I am raising. It is very much relevant to the issue and I say to bring forward the hypocritical actions of the Government in its laudable statements about dealing with the environment. Just last year the present Minister of Rural Development, he is the former Minister of Natural Resources, issued new licences to farmers to draw water from this aquifer for irrigation of potatoes. We agree with that. On the same hand, he is the same Minister who got up in this House and said, we do not know whether this aquifer can sustain this withdrawal for these people so we are going to do another study.

* (15 10)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): It gives me pleasure to take this opportunity to speak briefly on this Bill because I think it becomes very apparent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if they are going to bring a Bill in at this particular time, obviously it is one that has tremendous importance to the Government. Therefore I think it is imperative that we in the Opposition take the opportunity to put a few comments on record on Bill 84.

I think when one looks at it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not difficult to stay relevant in terms of discussing this particular Bill because I think that what you are faced with here is something that is of tremendous practical significance.

While one may find it a little bit facetious, I think we have all experienced a situation where when one goes to the grocery store these days, what one tends to do is bring home one bag of groceries and then find that they have two or three bags of garbage to take out afterwards.

The reason for that is that I think we have taken a rather strange view to what is important when we are

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

purchasing commodities in this day and age and we place a tremendous amount of attention on the packaging, the type of appearance that the commodities that we purchase have, realizing that when we bring the stuff home the amount that is actually consumable is a very small portion of the total amount that you purchased. In fact, I think that we have to even look at the people who are producing some of these commodities because they are doing somewhat of a con job.

I think we have all gone into a supermarket and purchased something in a box and then you find when you take the box home that you only required about one-half of the capacity of that box to hold the commodity. The rest of it was wasted space. I think that we have to start to think in terms of just what are the practical implications of waste as we see it as the present time.

We are now faced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with many communities in this country of ours and some in this province who, one of their biggest problems is, what do we do with the waste that we are producing. In other words, we are getting into a situation where waste disposal is a very serious impractical problem because of the quantity that is produced. Therefore, it is obviously a laudable objective to try and reduce the amount of waste that is actually produced.

In the Bill, the Minister talks about the cost of reducing the quantity of waste, but I do not think he has addressed the fact that there is a tremendous cost involved with the discarding and the handling of the waste that is currently produced. If we can reduce the amount of waste, obviously we are going to reduce the cost that is involved in doing something with that waste that is produced, and that saving obviously could be utilized in further education and research into reducing the amount of waste that we actually produce.

Now sometimes we, I think, take a very superficial look at what it costs us to dispose of waste at the present time and we think in terms of just what it cost us as far as garbage pickup and disposal is concerned. There is far more to that than just the cost of handling and so on.

I think we have all run into situations where even in the back lanes and in the garbage bins and whatnot around the city, that these are the places that harbour flies. They can have the potential to cause disease. There is the possibility that this is the source of some of the rodent problems that we have within the city and this is the same situation that they run into in the rural areas.

I think that those of us who have lived in rural communities and have had to make use of landfill sites have run into the problems that are associated with those landfill sites. There all you have is, the municipality identifies a piece of land whether it be 40 acres, 80 acres, whatever it happens to be or a quarter section. They dig a big hole in there and then they dump the material in. There is very little monitoring, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as to what goes into those landfill sites.

I have had the opportunity, and I am not sure it is a good fortune, but over the years to have lived in rural

Manitoba and had to have taken stuff to these landfill sites. When you go and you look at what is deposited in some of those landfill sites you quickly come to the conclusion that perhaps there should be greater monitoring of what goes in.

Typically all they do at those landfill sites is one of two things. They either bring in a bulldozer and cover it up or they light fire to it. Now if they light fire to it there is no indication of what is being burnt, and sometimes if you live close enough to one of those you can see a great fume of smoke going up and you can infer from that, that one of two things is happening. Either there is a tremendous amount of old tires being burnt or they are probably burning used oil or some other petroleum product and the soot and smoke that is coming out, obviously, is contaminating the atmosphere.

Likewise, we have all run into the situations and read in the paper where landfill sites at a later date have been utilized for housing developments. Lo and behold the houses are built on these and the next thing you know there is methane problems or problems with some other gas that is being produced from the decomposition and the material that was in those original sites.

We have had situations in this country where entire subdivisions have virtually had to be evacuated because of the fact that those subdivisions were put on what had previously been a landfill site, that somehow or other over history, the fact that that is what it was had been lost, or at least there had to have been adequate checking done to see whether it had any potential for the production of gases that would be detrimental to the people that lived in the area. It has reached the point on occasions where evacuation of areas was necessary and what was actually was an expensive subdivision ends up virtually being a ghost subdivision because of the impracticability of having someone trying to live in those areas.

In addition to that, with the increasing usage of landfill sites, there is the land loss that is involved with that and if those landfill sites were necessary for that specific purpose, obviously, they could be utilized for something that would be far more productive.

(Mr. Gilles Roch, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

In the Bill there is talk made about reducing waste and, of course, one I suppose can extrapolate from that and cover a whole range of commodities. One of those that usually would not be identified as waste particularly and that is the whole concept of stubble and straw which has created problems for us here in Winnipeg in the last few years. It may well be that something in terms of utilizing that which is sometimes referred to as waste could be of a more practical nature and my own view would be that wherever it is possible to incorporate that agricultural waste into the soil that would obviously be the best bet. But when you are faced with situations where farmers feel that the best managerial practice is to somehow or other get rid of that then obviously it would be preferable to have it baled up and used for some purpose rather than have it burnt which is frequently the case at the present time,

where the material is not only wasted in terms of the failure to return the beneficial material to the soil but at the same time creating the level of pollution that on occasion can be serious.

The other type of wastage that becomes of concern in the rural areas, Mr. Acting Speaker, is such things as what is done with bits of pesticides that are left over and this is a frequent occurrence where you go out and you buy a four-litre pail or larger pail of some of these things and it is practically all used. You have a situation where it is subject to deterioration if it is frozen and so the farmer has to make some decision as to what he does with that little bit that is left over. Frequently, I know what happens to that little bit that is left over. It either ends up in a landfill site where you run the risk of it leaching into the soil and actually contaminating the ground water or you run into a situation where it is just dumped someplace which is handy on the farm and that frequently also occurs with such things as used oil. Sometimes when a farmer is replacing antifreeze in his equipment, that antifreeze is simply a wasted commodity. Sometimes it is just dumped on the ground and the next thing you know you have pets or even animals, livestock that are poisoned because of the failure to adequately dispose of this type of waste.

* (1520)

There are many practical implications to the Bill that the Minister has brought forward and I think that one has to be supportive of the Bill. There is not doubt in my mind that it is a very laudable objective and one that is going to take some time to put it into practice and some time to become effective.

One of the obvious objectives and obvious routes to go in trying to reduce the waste is the whole concept of recycling. I think we have to acknowledge, Mr. Acting Speaker, that recycling has not been particularly effective to date and that is illustrated by such things as the accumulation of newspapers. This was a great idea to accumulate, bundle up the newspapers and recycle them. While it is still much easier for us to bundle these things up and store them but we still have not found adequate facilities for the recycling and this simply is not because the technology is not there, the problem is that it is too expensive. The de-inking process for one thing is a very expensive process, the bulk that is involved, and so we have had quite a struggle to date, Mr. Acting Speaker, even coming up with the practical means of recycling and reutilizing newspapers.

Then you start looking at some of the other things that we have to worry about and there has been comment made about glass, glass bottles. Obviously, the breweries, the beverage companies have brought into place a workable recycling system for most of the bottles.

I did run into an experience the other day when I was returning some beverage bottles to one of the beer outlets, and there was no problem when I brought in a couple of dozen empty beer bottles, but at the same time I had a six-pack of apple cider bottles and they

looked at that and they said there is absolutely no place in this city that is interested in taking those bottles that had apple cider in them. So you still run into some difficulties even in the areas where we thought we had them under control.

The other big problem with glass bottles is that frequently they are not whole bottles. To me I would far rather see a bottle lying in the ditch than I would a broken bottle. To my knowledge, there is no plan- (interjection)-

Well, that is right, it may be useful in some manner, if it is still unbroken, but being more practical the concern that I have with the broken bottle is that there is no mechanism for recycling those things, there is not much danger or hazard in an intact bottle but if you have them broken in the ditch or broken anywhere else and I do not know of any mechanism where you can come up with a plan to recycle glass that is already broken and would be collected in that manner as broken material. So I think these are the type of things the Minister needs to take a look at.

Likewise, we still have a tremendous problem with plastics. What do you do with these plastics? You can collect them, you can break them up into small bits but we still have not found a market where it is economical to recycle some of these things. So there needs to be a lot of work done on that to the point where these things can in fact be collected, recycled and somebody be able to make at least an acceptable profit out of going through this procedure. Now whether that is going to necessitate some sort of subsidization, that is questionable, and it may be that that is the only way these things can be initiated. Some of the other things that we find that are difficult to recycle are things like old tires, sometimes they can be used but with difficulty. We also have things such as aerosol containers, urethane foam, styrofoam, all of these things have the potential to produce CFCs which eventually find their way up into the higher levels of the atmosphere and we end up with the problem of ozone layer degradation, which can in effect result over time into the whole concept of global warming and the greenhouse effect.

These are some of the things. The other thing that I have noticed in some of the places I have visited, not particularly here in Manitoba, but it is the problem associated with the disposal of old refrigerator units and old freezers. Now these things, all they tell you to do is take the door off them so that there is not much chance of a small kid getting inside and having the door close behind the child and result in suffocation or whatever. But we also have to remember many of those old units had refrigeration units which the substance in them was also a source of CFCs and likewise potential for the reduction of the ozone layer.

Another area that has always concerned me a little bit, Mr. Acting Speaker, is the whole concept of the waste and the damage that is caused by things that are just thrown away. I am referring not only to glass, but things like nails, and I think we have all run into the unfortunate situation where you are driving down a back lane and the next thing you know you have a flat tire. You go out and check it and what is it? It is

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

an old spike or a nail that somebody has just carelessly thrown away when they were either dismantling an old building or taking apart some other piece of equipment or box or whatever it happens to be. This is the type of thing you are faced with, and it is not the cost of picking this thing up or recycling it, it is the cost of the damage that it has done.

So, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have no difficulty with the concept of this Bill. I am also pleased to see that there is in that Bill a specific component regarding education, because this is one of the more important things, I think. If we are going to move in the direction of reducing the level of waste that we produce it has to be an education process.

I think that many of us have had the misfortune of following behind a car, for example, and finding that you are travelling along at 60 miles an hour, 100 kilometres, whatever it happens to be, and somebody in the back of the car throws out an empty beer can, an empty beer bottle, and something that I find equally annoying but probably less dangerous, is when you see them throwing out discarded cigarette butts that bounce a couple of times on the road and you see that they are still lit. All that could happen there is they bounce again and the next thing you have got is either a ditch fire or a fire moving out into a field, if it happens to be the right season of the year.

I think that the education has to start at the elementary school level. We have to convince people that there is merit in saving, and I think if we do it through the education process, dealing with these youngsters we may be able to convince them that everything they do does not have to have some level of remuneration associated with it, because otherwise, if we are going to try and get the level of waste reduced, we are going to have to pay somebody to do it, and they are either going to have to have an incentive where they get paid for reducing the waste, or they are going to have to have the incentive where they are paid for the commodity that they collect, either for recycling or discard or whatever it happens to be. So certainly the education component is extremely important.

Another item that is mentioned is the fact that there would be funds made available for research, and I think here again we have a tremendous job to do, and I have already mentioned this in the fact that the easiest part of reducing waste is the collection of some of the commodities. It is not too difficult to come up with a blue box program or some other program where you can collect these things. The question is, what do you do with them once they are collected, and I have alluded to the fact that we have already got a bit of a dilemma when it comes to the collection of paper. You can collect far more paper than we can accommodate in terms of the recycling facilities that are currently available.

Likewise we are pretty restrictive in what we can do with the recycling of glass. Obviously those that can be recycled and refilled with the same product that they initially had in them, that is no difficulty, but in the case of some of the other bottles and plastics recycling, the collection is practical, but what do you do with it afterwards? There has not been the establishment of either a cheap way of recycling or of

the establishment and development of adequate markets. So there is necessity of research, not only in terms of the technology but also research into the development of new commodities, and the development of market research so we know where these things can go.

I do not want to downgrade the necessity of incentives. At the present time we have incentives for the collection and the return of quite a few commodities, but they are restricted to such things as aluminum cans, bottles, and so on, but there is no incentive in place for the collection of a lot of the things that are more difficult to deal with. For example, there is a very, very small incentive for the returning of old batteries.

* (1530)

Now old batteries, for example, are a dangerous commodity if they are just lying out and allowed to deteriorate, but you can drop into many farms in Manitoba and if you look around in some secluded corner you will find quite a collection of old batteries because there just is not enough incentive for the return of these things, and as we all know batteries have various corrosive substances in them, acids, bases, various metals and all the rest of it, and they should not be out there in the open, but there just is not enough incentive for those things to be collected. The thing that I think most farmers have run into over the years, and it is something that still I think would startle most of the urban dwellers, is to take a look at the contents of the stomach of some of the animals that have been on the farm for a long period of time.

We like to think that our horses and our cattle, for example, are primarily herbivores—they just go out and eat the grass or the straw or whatever it happens to be—and we always sort of use the assumption that the only animal that tends to be a bit of a scavenger is a goat, but in actual fact there is a large number of livestock every year that are lost simply because of the foreign material that they ingest, and that foreign material can range anywhere from wire, tools, oil, grease that is left around, that type of thing, and many of those things fall into the category of waste.

I think we have also all seen examples in the paper and in wildlife magazines of ducks, geese, various other forms of wildlife that have starved to death because of the fact that they have picked up something when they were swimming or out feeding, and this has either got around their neck or into their throat, and that type of thing and these animals have eventually died through starvation because of the fact that they were in this predicament.

Those of us who have gone fishing, and many of us I think like to go fishing although we are running into more and more difficulty finding something that you can hook because there is not that many gullible politicians around, and because the fish supply is also decreasing. But anyone of us who have gone fishing and trolling have picked up various things on the end of our hooks that we were not looking for, and it ranges all the way from wire and junk that has been thrown into the rivers and streams, and we just saw a few

days ago where they hauled a couple of old cars out of the river that had been driven in there. They were stolen cars, and when they came out it looked as though they had been in there for years. If we were to go and do a search of what is in the river, in the bottom of our rivers here in Winnipeg, we would probably find that we would have virtually truck loads of stuff that either have just been dumped in, or in some cases probably most of these things that we find have been stolen, the valuable components have been taken away and the rest of it is dumped in the river.

We have all experienced, I am sure, the situation where you have just gone out for a pleasant day at one of the local beaches, and the little kid comes running in bleeding from the foot because she has run into a broken piece of glass in the beach area, and so on.

So there are lots of implications to the waste that we are producing, and I think lots of costs that are associated with it which do not normally associate with the fact that we are looking at problems and costs that are associated with the failure of us to reduce the amount of waste that we generate and likewise to be more cautious in the way that we get rid of it and the recycling is critical.

So, in principle, I support the concept of this Bill. The idea of WRAP, the Waste Reduction and Prevention strategy I think has a lot of merit because it is very difficult to put something into place unless the terms of reference are very clear and I think that it is necessary for this advisory committee to be struck and that the terms of reference be drawn up and that those terms of reference be easily understood and practical in terms of the possibility of implementing it.

Therefore, and my colleague from Flin Flon indicates that I am stretching this out into much longer than he had anticipated but I thought I would just see whether I could not carry on as long as he has because I am sure that it has taken many years for him to develop the capability of speaking at length and saying very little. I am hoping that I can speak at length and say quite a bit and so perhaps we could have a contest on this.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Finally, I want to comment briefly on the whole idea of deposits and assessments. I think that it is an unfortunate sign of the status of our society that I think that the Minister is correct in bringing this concept in because I do not think that in this day and age we are ever going to clean up the mess that we are in unless we provide some incentives to do it, but I think the other side of that coin, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I address this to the Minister, is that this has to be tied in with a very detailed and very intense and I think long-term education program because those of us who are beyond a certain age probably have got to the point where we are not going to do much in terms of solving this problem, other than through some sort of enticement. But I think an education process that will bring it into the schools and convince our youngsters that this is a responsibility and a duty and get into the habit of attempting to only discard things in a

meaningful and responsible fashion, this will finally work its way through our school system and I think in future generations we will find that we have a society that is far more concerned about our environment and how we leave it to future generations.

So with that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I commend the Minister for bringing this in, and I would hope that there will be support for it and look forward to having a more thorough review of it as it moves into committee at some later stage. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join this debate. I believe that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) indicated that he wanted a speedy review of this particular piece of legislation, Bill No. 84; The Waste Reduction and Prevention and Consequential Amendments Act, and I can assure the Minister that we on this side intend to review this thoroughly, to debate the principles underlying this Bill thoroughly, as quickly as possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will not -(interjection)- the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) says we are expected to, and that is certainly our duty as legislators. I would say that we greeted the introduction this afternoon with a certain degree of cynicism and skepticism because of the Minister of the Environment's remarks, that this was being done to prop up the image of the Premier. That is hardly justification for the speedy introduction and supposedly the speedy passage of a piece of legislation, to prop up the image of the First Minister.

Certainly I am not anxious to be a party of that kind of legislation, and I believe that the Minister of the Environment's integrity is such that I do not believe that was his intention. If he received instruction from some other party, the Premier's Office perhaps, that it was time to get this Bill into the Legislature, then my condolences to the Minister of the Environment because no Minister should be under that kind of pressure to introduce important legislation. It should be thoughtfully introduced, it should be well-prepared and well-researched and the consultation that is necessary, if we are going to take this kind of legislation seriously, should have been done in the first place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to talk about the principle of this Bill in general. I think, like the Member for Fort Garry, there is going to be considerable support for the intention behind this legislation. There is no doubt that like many other environmental issues, the management of society's waste is becoming an increasingly important topic of discussion.-(interjection)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in response to the Member for Fort Rouge's (Mr. Carr) call for order, the Member—for wherever he is from, Springfield, (Mr. Roch)—asked for a corned beef. So let it be noted that he has no concern for the environment. There are all kinds of nitrates in those corned beef sandwiches.

The intent of this Bill, I think, is laudable. The Government's stated intention of having a 50 percent reduction in waste tapes. The 50 percent reduction in

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

waste tapes could be achieved if I would shorten my speech I suppose by 50 percent, but I have no intention of doing that because this is an important Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the goal announced by the Minister of the Environment was a 50 percent reduction in waste delivered to our landfill sites in the Province of Manitoba. That in itself is a laudable and I believe an achievable goal. I do not think it is unrealistic to expect the people of Manitoba to conscientiously apply themselves and reduce waste.

If I might for a minute, Mr. Deputy Speaker, speak of my own personal experience, my own family experience. My family takes the environmental problems quite seriously and waste management is one of them. As a family of four, I have two teenaged children, we have managed to reduce our waste that we put out on curbside on a weekly basis to approximately one half a bag of garbage a week.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we walk our neighbourhood, and we walk every evening practically and we look at what other people are putting out, it is shameful the degree of waste that there is in our society. Well, I can afford to be critical because—

An Honourable Member: You want a garburator?

* (1540)

Mr. Storie: No, I do not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have a compactor or a garburator. It is simply a matter of taking the issue of recycling seriously so that you are not throwing out plastics and papers and tin cans and glass. Half a bag a week, that is right. We have a composter, we put all of the stuff that can be composted aside. The glass, the plastic, the tin cans, the aluminum containers are all put aside to be recycled. The volume of garbage, it is incredible the amount of reduction that you can achieve as a family.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am making is not a condemnation of my neighbours or other people who do not have the time whatever to initiate that kind of system. It is that up until a few months ago or six months ago, my family was not doing that either. Perhaps we are a little more conscious or perhaps a little more frugal than others, but the fact is that we too, we are a part, and we are a part of a wasteful society. There is no one in this Chamber who can say that they have not on occasion been a party to that. I do not care how conscious they are.

The reasons that we are so cavalier about waste comes from the fact that we are an affluent society, we can afford at the present time to discard, to dispose of goods that normally should not be disposed of, we can afford to neglect the opportunities for recycling because we can afford to replace those regardless of the costs seemingly, and because we are fortunate enough in Canada to have, some see it as an unlimited ability to dispose of waste in landfill sites in Canada. We are a huge country with a relative small population, and I think we believe perhaps too firmly at some point in the past that the whole problem of overcrowding of landfills, of not being able to access landfill sites for

municipalities in this country was never going to be a problem.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know better today. We know that jurisdictions in other parts of the country and even in the City of Winnipeg are finding it increasingly difficult to manage landfill sites, to manage the volume of waste that we produce as a civilization. It is becoming increasingly more difficult for urban planners, for city planners to rearrange the disposal for the disposal of waste in those jurisdictions. So we have a serious problem.

This Bill addresses it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the extent that we are leading other jurisdictions. I want to be complimentary to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) for introducing the concept to the people of Manitoba because he has not only introduced the concept of waste management, an important concept in and of itself, but he has also introduced I think an equally important concept that most people have not accepted nearly as fully and that is that responsibility includes contributing towards the cost of waste reduction and prevention, that these problems which we did not talk about but which were piling up—if you will forgive, well, it is not quite a pun, but a simile or whatever—around us were not deemed to be problems.

Only a few years ago, no one was talking about the real problems that municipalities in Canada at least were having with waste disposal. There have been problems in other jurisdictions. We all remember the visual image of the garbage scow that could not land, that was floating around the Atlantic Ocean, the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and not being able to land, a genuine problem of disposal. We all thought, perhaps foolishly, that this problem was one for other jurisdictions, but we now know that it is coming a lot closer to home.

So the Minister has done two things by introducing the Bill, awaken in Manitobans perhaps the whole question of how we are going to treat our waste and how we are going to deal with waste in the future, but also the question of whose responsibility it is. So those are the good aspects of this Bill, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think quite, quite positive aspects of the Bill.

The Bill also has a resolution attached to it, which is becoming the common practise in legislation, and I think the resolution in and of itself is supportable. We remember the purpose of this resolution is to help courts, help perhaps legislators, help the Executive Council when they are making decisions with respect to implementing this Bill. Certainly we know that the intention here is quite succinct and quite acceptable I think to the majority of Members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, having said that the intent of this legislation is good, I am concerned about some of the more technical aspects of the legislation and some of the principles that flow from particular sections of this legislation.

I will start by saying that while I think the intent is good, Part 2, which is "Powers of Minister," is somewhat redundant. It is a statement of the obvious that really

does not contribute much to our understanding of the Government's intentions in terms of this Bill and I do not think it adds anything particularly to the Bill itself. I am not sure what principle other than self-congratulations is part of this particular section of the Bill.

The Minister, it is quite obvious has the power already to do virtually everything in this. He has the power to encourage, consult, monitor, cause the preparation and publication of educational materials pertaining to waste, production and prevention, and enter into agreements respecting wastes. Those are all powers that he has without having referenced them in sections of this Bill, Section 3 of this particular piece of legislation.

What it does raise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the concern that was raised by my colleague, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), and also the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) about the intention of the Government with respect to this Bill. Is this just fluff?

I believe that while the intention in this legislation is good, it is not clear whatsoever that the Government has done any real thinking about how it is going to implement this legislation, not any real thinking at all. (interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Morris (Mr. Manness) says nonsense. Well, virtually everything of a technical, of a concrete nature that is left to be done from this piece of legislation is left to regulation.

You can go to almost any section of this Bill in terms of deposits, in terms of powers, delegation of powers, virtually everything says "as may be prescribed in the regulations," as may be prescribed; Section 8(1) "as may be prescribed in the regulations"; Section 8(3) "as may be prescribed in the regulations"; 8(4), 11, 12, virtually every section of this Bill has no meat on it. We really do not know, in effect, what the Government's intentions are with respect to this legislation. Is this a ploy? Does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) believe that we are so naive that we do not understand that this legislation, while it presents well, has no meat on it? Does the Minister of the Environment believe that we are not going to ask questions about the impact of this legislation on consumers, on producers, on the small business people who are going to have to deal with the legislation?

Clearly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are literally hundreds of questions that one could ask about the impacts of this legislation. The Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak) encourages me to speak on some of them, and I can assure the Member for Transcona that I will.

Part 2 of the legislation is not the only section which leads one to worry about the ultimate intention of this legislation. It leads one to question whether the Minister of the Environment is going to have the intestinal fortitude that it requires to introduce and carry out this kind of legislation, because, certainly on first reading of the legislation, I recognize that this is a particularly onerous piece of legislation. It has a heavy requirement and it is based on a couple of principles.

The first principle is that responsibility should be accomplished by attaching a fee to goods that create

waste, and a belief that perhaps that is the best way to create an incentive for people to recycle, an incentive for—not an incentive, but a method—by which society can pay for its own waste. I want to deal with the problems I think that it is going to create in a minute. I do not think that that particular approach to the problem of waste reduction is necessarily the best, but I want to deal with that in a minute.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are five concerns that I want to raise with respect to the legislation. The first one, and I have already touched on it, is the fact that the—I was going to say the guts of this Bill—specifics of this Bill are going to be implemented by regulation at some yet unspecified time. The Minister of the Environment may be fooling some people, but he is not fooling all people because we know that the regulations for this legislation will not be enforced prior to the next election. I challenge the Minister of the Environment to have the regulations relating to this Bill ready before the next election, and I would be willing to stake a good deal on the fact that this Minister will not have the political will to implement these regulations into effect prior to the next election, and the reason is because they have some consequences.

* (1550)

We will be awaiting—and the Minister of the Environment is smiling because he knows that this is part of a sham. This is part of the Government's organized attempt to make us believe that they are concerned about the environment. This is only words, what we now find out when we read this Bill is that the real action is going to be determined by the regulations. I defy the Minister of the Environment to stand up, in this House, today, and tell this Chamber that the regulations will be in place prior to the next election, so that the people will know what this Bill is really going to be all about. Mr. Deputy Speaker, he will not do it. He will not do it. He will let that challenge disappear into the Hansard record. He will not get up today and respond to that challenge. I know he will not, because it's easy to be generous if it ain't going to cost you nothing, and that is what this Bill is all about.

An Honourable Member: You should know all about that. Have you ever heard of polluter pay?

Mr. Storie: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard of it. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) asked me if I have ever heard of polluter pay. This does not necessarily talk about polluter pay, this talks about consumer pay, consumer. They are not necessarily the same entity. The fact is that there is no intention in this legislation to make the polluter pay. The polluter is the one who produces a polluting good. The consumer may in fact be the victim rather than the polluter in some senses.

I think that is a genuine concern and the Minister of the Environment I notice to this point, some two minutes after I issued the challenge, has not responded. I will keep a watch to see whether the Minister actually does respond prior to the end of our debating time this

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

afternoon. It is an interesting challenge and one that I hope Members of the Chamber will remember was laid on the floor of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have talked about the potential for delay. I believe that this Bill is short on specifics simply because the Government, while it understands that people are concerned about the environment—certainly it is the topic of conversation in many circles throughout Manitoba, not just the cocktail circuit, but it is the circuit out in Main Street Manitoba and northern Manitoba. People are genuinely concerned about the topic of waste reduction and the topic of environmental concerns.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill also speaks in a generic sense about the need for education. The principle behind this legislation seems to be that if you attach a fee to a certain good, let us assume that it is tin cans, let us say for the sake of argument that there is a two-cent charge on a tin can, somehow that is going to discourage the consumer in some way from purchasing that good or that item. It also assumes that somehow that good or item is not going to end up in someone's garbage at the end of the day. I do not think there is any necessity that those two things are going to happen simultaneously.

The fact of the matter is that people's commitment to waste reduction, people's genuine commitment to waste reduction comes from an understanding of the problem, the long-term problems that this waste is going to have for our society in general.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Bill speaks to the Minister's powers of being able to cause the preparation and publication of educational material pertaining to waste reduction. I do not think that we should forget that the primary motivation for people to reduce their waste is not in any sense a couple of cents a tin can, particularly if that fee or that charge is going to be—

An Honourable Member: Well, I guess you are opposed to deposits, right?

Mr. Storie: No, I did not say that, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

An Honourable Member: Well, what have you said?

Mr. Storie: What I did say was the Minister has assumed in this legislation that the charging of an additional fee, a disposal fee, a recognition fee, a fee recognizing that there is an end cost to society for goods that are disposed of, the Minister assumes that in itself will motivate people to be less wasteful.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

I re-emphasize the fact that we live in an affluent society and, just like the expectation was that there would be a tremendous reduction in the use of gasoline, for example, in the United States when we went through the oil crisis, just as we assumed that car pooling would become the de facto means of transportation and urban transit systems would be developed across the United States, all of those things failed to occur.

An Honourable Member: Is there a point of relevancy here?

Mr. Storie: Yes, Mr. Speaker, those things failed to occur because people maintained their transportation habits, they continued to be wasteful because they could afford it. So I simply caution the Minister not to assume in this legislation that simply attaching a fee to a good is going to mean that someone is going to therefore not purchase it, not dispose of it. Those two things are not necessarily associated with each other.

Mr. Speaker, a fourth issue is the question of the implications of this Bill in terms of additional costs to essential goods. We know that the Minister is talking about an up-front fee attached to an item. So he adds 2 cents to the can. I am fairly confident in suggesting that the Minister has not consulted very broadly with the retailers who are going to have to again deal with this kind of legislation. This is another form of GST. It is another consumer tax in effect. The Minister is going to have to address all of the problems that are attendant with such a tax. Has the Chamber of Commerce been consulted? Has the Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses been consulted? Do we understand how this is going to be implemented and what additional costs there might be to consumers?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is trying to put words in my mouth by saying I am opposed. I am not opposed at all. What I am opposed to is the Minister trying to present this rosy, euphemistic—I do not know what other words I could use—document to the House without any real intention of implementing it. What I am opposed to is the Minister presenting a package that is all gloss and no substance to the House. I am opposed to the Minister introducing new measures purporting to reduce waste without identifying the cost, who is going to pay, how that payment is going to occur, and whether in fact in the final analysis this is really going to work. Again, Mr. Speaker, the principle of attaching a fee to a product that is going to be disposed of is a good one, but it is not the only measure this Government should be considering in terms of finally ensuring that consumers actually reduce their waste.

Remember that this legislation does not require the producer of polluting goods, does not require the producer of tin cans or tires or any other article, to reduce the production of those goods. The Minister of Environment seems to miss that point. There is nothing in this Bill that reduces or prevents or eliminates or even constrains the production of polluting materials. Nothing. What it does is assume that by attaching a fee it will follow from that that the cost will be recovered.

There is another small problem with this legislation. The Minister in this legislation talks about the responsibility of consumers and producers to assess the real cost of waste disposal. We all recognize that when you buy a tire, the cost of disposing of that tire in a landfill site or preferably having that tire recycled is a part of the cost to society of making and disposing of goods. It is part of the cost.

* (1600)

My question is, how does the Minister decide, through this legislation, how is he going to determine what fee

should be attached to account for the real cost, in other words the total cost, of this particular good? I ask the Minister of Environment in all seriousness, how does he assign the cost, a fee that should be charged for 10 pounds of Freon added to my air conditioning or added to an air conditioner? How do you assign a cost to that? How do you determine what additional fee should be charged for a pesticide container or a can of Killlex to control the weeds on a person's garden or lawn? How do you define what the ultimate costs of many of the goods that we use, the chemicals that we use to maintain our style of life. I am not sure that this is all that practical when it comes to the costs of many of the products that we use.

That is why I say that the Minister may want to consider changing the focus that charging a fee in recognition of the disposal costs of an item is a legitimate tool. It is used in other jurisdictions and it is a legitimate tool.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to also recognize that there are many goods produced for which there is really no safe disposal method. We have to recognize that some goods and materials that are produced, the cost of disposing of them, or having them forever perhaps in our midst, is unknowable. At some point we may even have to be more restrictive and at some point we may actually have to say, no, those cannot be produced. It is not good enough to charge a fee and hope that discourages people from purchasing goods.

We may have to—(interjection)—well, the Minister says now we know where he comes from. Let me make it perfectly clear where I come from. I do not believe we should be using fluorocarbon, any products that have fluorocarbon. I think that we should eliminate the production of fluorocarbon. I do not think it is good enough to say well let us do it in the year 2000. There is an international agreement to try and reduce the production of fluorocarbons by the year 2000. I think we should eliminate them today. I do not think we can afford to wait.—(interjection)—Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat the comment of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) because it shows a real lack of sensitivity to how important the question of fluorocarbons is.

It is not a question of whether it is colder up north, whether we do not need air conditioning as much, that is not the issue at all. The issue is for this Minister, and for his information is that his Bill assumes that charging a fee on a good is the be-all and end-all in terms of managing waste, and it is not. There are some more fundamental questions that need to be addressed and they include whether Governments have the will to ban substances for which we are uncertain or which we are unsure about their long-term consequences.

There are many of them, and PCBs may be another example. It took us a long time to recognize that they were not needed despite the industry cries every time someone suggested that this chemical be banned, or this product be banned, or that product be banned. There was always a cry saying that we could not find anything to replace it. It would cause undue financial hardship to those people who were using that chemical

or that product. We find out that was not the case. We find out that there are alternatives if we use our imagination. If there is an incentive, if not an imperative to change our practices, we can actually do it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just go again over the principle concerns I have and then I want to talk about some of the specific other sections of this legislation which cause concern. I am concerned because there is an assumption in here that user fees are the answer, and the equivalent of user fees. I am not disagreeing that is part of the solution. I want that very clearly understood.

I think that user fees, however, are like a consumption tax. That is, if these fees are going to be attached—and we do not know because the legislation is not specific. We do not know what products are going to be taxed in this way but—if this fee is attached to common goods, articles you know, Kellogg's Corn Flakes boxes, if they are attached to the packaging products for food commodities, then this user fee, this tax, is going to impact more severely on the poor again. It is a form of consumption tax. It does not relate to the ability to pay and probably does not relate to the consumption patterns of our society generally.

User fees are not always the best way to go although they have some merit. Certainly for many luxury products, for many recreational products, et cetera, the idea of attaching a user fee has a lot of sympathy from Members on this side.

The whole question of fees is also raised in terms of fairness with respect to its hidden nature. Are people going to understand what this particular tax is for, what the exact cost is per item? Do we know? It is a legitimate question.

Clearly, this is going to increase the cost of living if it is used on a universal basis. We will certainly want to know that the poor can afford to support the environment by paying this additional fee. Is the Minister talking to his colleague about increasing the cost of living tax credit for example or other similar measures to make sure that the burden of protecting our environment does not unduly fall on those who least can afford it?

Mr. Speaker, so user fees are a problem. Number 2, everything by regulation, there is too much left to the imagination with this Bill. Number 3, there is tremendous potential in this legislation for delay. The Government is not committing itself to a course of action. It has avoided talking about the specifics so that people will not know what the Government really intends to do.

Number 4, it is not clear that the business community, that those who are going to have to deal with this complicated fee system and fee structure apparently, because it is not going to be universal or single phased, it is going to be complex. It is not clear that the people, the retailers, how they are going to handle this, how it is going to be handled, what additional costs there might be above and beyond the fee charged to the consumer for implementing this system.

Number 5, it does not deal in any consistent way with the whole question of education as a means of

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

reducing our waste versus the cost incentive.- (interjection)- Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Northern Affairs' (Mr. Downey) information, there is no concern from our part about the intent of this legislation.- (interjection)- The Member for Arthur wants to know whether we are supporting it.

I will make it very clear that I support the intent of this legislation, but what I do not support is the obvious political gamesmanship that is being played with this legislation. What I do not support is the political gamesmanship, because the Minister of the Environment is not going to get up and accept my challenge to tell the people of Manitoba when the regulations will be ready, when they will be introduced. He is not prepared to give a commitment that this Government will actually act before the next election, because this is a ploy.

Having said that this is a ploy, I recognize that the Minister of the Environment has done two very useful things in introducing the legislation. One is to raise the legitimate question of the management of our wastes, who is going to pay, and the question of responsibility. He has also heightened the awareness of the public in terms of the need to act on this legislation. There are several other amendments I suppose that one would like to introduce and that probably will be introduced as this legislation is considered by committee.

We have said that the legislation which deals with the deposits that are to be charged, the refunding of those deposits to both the consumers and the producers seems to be unduly complex. The Minister did not address in his opening remarks in any substantive way how this is going to be handled, how the fees are going to be determined in the first place, who is going to be determining how costly these goods are to our environment and how the fees are going to be established. Nor is it clear from this particular piece of legislation how those who collect this are going to collect it and how they are going to be refunded on overpayment.

* (1610)

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most interesting part of this legislation is Section 14, which is a very short section but raises a whole bunch of questions. The Minister of the Environment is looking rather smug and perhaps he will be able to edify me, but Section 14 says the following: licensing of producers, and I am not sure whether this is what I was getting at earlier with respect to the Government taking initiative to reduce waste by eliminating products, but let me begin by putting on the record what this is about.

The Minister may, and I have "may" circled in my copy, Mr. Speaker, may require producers to obtain licences in relation to such products or materials upon payment of such fees, upon such terms and conditions in accordance with such procedures as may be prescribed in the regulations.

This is a very interesting proposal. The Minister may require producers to obtain licences in relation to such products. In other words, this Minister is leaving open the door for a more pro-active, a more concrete

approach to limiting the production of potentially dangerous wasteful product.

Again the challenge is for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) to be more forthright with the Chamber and the people of Manitoba. It is not good enough for the Minister to say, well there may be—

An Honourable Member: You said this already.

Mr. Storie: This is specifically with respect to Section 14. It is not good enough to say, "may," and it is not good enough to leave open the door in terms of the kinds of products that can be amended.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister likewise in Section 15 says, no person shall use, produce, consume, vend, supply or distribute any product or material if the use, production, consumption, vending, supply, or distribution of the product or the materials is prohibited in the regulations. Again we have to know what products, what goods, what materials are now on the Minister's list. Does the Minister have such a list? Again because it only says, he may, and by regulation, is this fluff? Are we really getting any substance from the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings)? I think it is a legitimate question.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before the cost to business. Section 16 makes it very clear that there is going to be a cost—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's time has expired. The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, I must admit I have some mixed emotions in rising to this Bill, and I intend to reference them.

I must admit that there is a sense of anger because of what appeared to me the sudden introduction of the Bill, very quickly on an Estimates day when we have been admonished by Government that Estimates are not proceeding quickly enough. I came here prepared today to debate Estimates and find instead that we have introduced for the second reading, Bill No. 84.

Now that is something I was not going to allow to happen without permitting myself to put some very serious comments onto the record, because this is a very, very important initiative. It is an initiative that I support the intent of wholeheartedly.

The intent of this Bill is to reduce, to manage, to be able to take care of some of the waste that we produce in this society of ours. I think that as far as waste is concerned, it has been referenced here earlier today already, that there are many, many of us who fall part of the waste-consuming society even without necessarily wanting to be so.

How many of us, as was referenced earlier by the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), find ourselves going to the grocery store as he said and coming home with a certain amount of material, most of which must be thrown out?

How many of us take newspapers regularly and find that although there is time to read some of it, there is

not enough time to read all of it? Most of that newspaper ends up thrown out.

How many of us see that when it comes to purchasing a durable good such as a VCR or a television set or a computer, we find that most of the good that we purchase in the original carton comes to us as air of some form or another. The actual good we have purchased is only very, very well protected within the container, and yet this good, the box, the container, the packing, all of this when it comes into the house is disposed of. There is no place to put it except out the door, and from the door whence it goes to the landfill centres and so on. The concept of waste reduction, the concept of being able to handle the waste that we produce, is one that has finally I think taken root in society. We at least here in Canada, in Manitoba, are very intent on making certain that the production of waste should be reduced. This is being done in this particular Bill with respect to handling fees, deposits, and things of that nature.

There should be also in the same breath, in the same intent, also a movement towards recycling, which is probably the most effective method of waste reduction. I notice that the Minister in his tabling of the report, the discussion paper, *Harnessing Market Forces To Support The Environment*, the report is entirely printed on recycled paper. Now in order for this report to have been printed on the recycled paper, somewhere along the line there had to be a recycling depot to collect papers that people were disposing. These papers were then taken and collected and brought to a place where they could be recycled, de-inked, repulped, remanufactured, and resold and re-used. Unfortunately, and this is where I think the intent of this legislation tends to only go halfway in this province, the Bill does not go far enough in this sense because it is only one-half of the coin.

In order to focus fully on waste reduction you need to focus on recycling. I notice that for Manitoba itself—a population of one million—we do not have a paper recycling plant in the province. The answer is very, very self-evident. It is uneconomic at this point in time to have a recycling plant for Manitoba as a whole, simply because we do not produce enough waste. I ask that question of Members, that it seems rather ironic. Here we are talking waste reduction, and I know that there is a wish, there is a desire on the part of the public that much of the waste that we do produce should be recycled. They would like to recycle some of this waste, and here although we have waste reduction as a Bill, it comes up that we do not have sufficient waste paper in this province to justify our own recycling depot or our own recycling plant. It is towards that end that we should be focusing the other aspect of this Bill.

* (1620)

In order to reduce the waste, direct some of the dollars or some of the monies that are collected in the deposits for waste reduction, and the handling fees that are referenced in the Bill under the Deposits and Assessments Section, Section 8 of the Bill, these should be directed towards recycling, besides the handling. Right now the waste that we do produce, right now

the waste that is handled is paid for out of general levies. People pay for the waste handling in their general tax levies. We now have the addition, we are adding deposits that they are included in the point of sale or in the point of purchase. This deposit is, according to the Bill, referenced in order to facilitate the handling of the waste material.

It needs to go further. It needs to go into the re-education, to point out to people that there is not only besides the will to recycle, there must also be the willingness to absorb the costs of this recycling, because none of the things that we are doing now are done gratis, are done free of charge. The landfill sites which take up large areas of acreage around urban areas require a distinct means of handling of the wastes. You need to dig the holes, you need to bulldoze the mountains of waste, you need to put down your packing materials, you have to burn that part that will not decompose of its own. We have landfill sites which require many dollars in the maintenance, require many dollars if we are looking at landscaping them as we have done in the northeastern part of Winnipeg with the Kilcona site, where a very environmentally friendly attempt at use of a landfill site was taken, but a very expensive method of landfill maintenance. Other areas within the city confines itself, as were also referenced earlier in debate, are now producers of methane gas, are now producers of dangerous gases, which have inhibited development of the land on top of the landfill site.

These are costs, and these are costs that are borne right now by the general taxpayer. Now, when we add to it further costs with respect to the handling of waste as referenced in this Bill, I think we can go one step further. If people are going to be paying, there is an expectation that this money will go to something more than just a burial, or the removal, or the burning of that waste product. The impact, the implication, the expectation is that there is going to be some recycling, some re-use, of this product. Whether this is tires, as were referenced, or plastic bags, or whether this is paper, whether this is cardboard, whether it is styrofoam, it is irrelevant what kind of waste it is, we must be focusing our energies to the recycling and the re-using of these products.

Although one of the earlier speakers was admonished because he was not speaking truly to the principle of the Bill, at the essence of this Bill is the concept of sustainable development. The concept of sustainable development simply means that you do not take from future generations the opportunity to be able to live with a high degree of quality of life and that they are able to do this using the same resources that we have available now, that they should not be suffering a lower standard of living or a lower quality of life simply because we have used up or abused the resources that we have available to us. It is that aspect of sustainability that we must address with waste reduction, waste reduction for the purpose of recycling, waste reduction for the purpose of re-using the product, waste reduction for the purposes of preserving the precious resources that we do have. In much of what we do, waste reduction does not really get looked at.

(Mr. Ed Mandrake, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

We tend to produce—and what we produce and dispose of sort of with the out-of-sight out-of-mind philosophy, we see not where it goes. Ultimately, we are filling up the container that makes up either the landfill site, or the container, such as a lake or a river, that is the receptacle for the product of sometimes primary sewage, sometimes secondary treatment sewage, sometimes, hopefully, and this is the direction to which we would like to go, tertiary treated sewage. But for the concept of waste materials as defined within this Bill, which asks the consumer to pick up a larger cost of the handling and a larger cost of the reduction of the waste, we need to also stress the recycling very much.

One of the things that is not addressed by this Bill is the concept of hazardous waste, hazardous waste which is waste that, once produced, creates a chemical or creates a product that is hazardous to life, that is dangerous to handle, that might be part of a product that we use, or it may become dangerous in the reduction or in the decomposition stage. At any rate, it becomes a product that we cannot tolerate.

We have heard here many, many people complain that they will not put up, they will not tolerate hazardous waste disposal facilities very near where they live, and rightfully so. They fear for what will happen. We have to accept that the hazardous waste that we use should be a hazardous waste that we should tolerate in its disposal. We should not be sending our hazardous waste to someone else. If we use it, we should be prepared to store it until such time as it can be disposed of effectively, safely, efficiently, and in an environmentally friendly way, but the impact of saying we will charge more, a deposit, for the use of the product or the consumption of the product simply because by this statement that taking the deposit, taking the higher cost, implies we have a safe method of handling the product is false. This creates a false sense of complacency in the consumer. If the desire is waste reduction, if the desire is to make the cost more truly reflective of the environmental cost of the waste, then we need to focus, as I have said, on the recycling and this is where I find this Bill sorely deficient. But it is a good first step.

It is a good first step because it does start transferring the cost of the handling of waste into a more visible form. Presently, because most of the waste that is handled is paid for through the levy of general revenues or through property taxes, people do not see the actual cost of what their waste production has created.

* (1630)

However, with a concept as presented in this Bill where deposits are requested, are required, where handling fees are clearly indicated, consumers will realize that there is a very distinct cost. This transfer of cost is also a first necessary step in indicating to people that the storage of hazardous wastes, the filling or simply the disposal of sanitary wastes, the use and disposal of sewage, the use and disposal of simply the products of the consumption, the fact that the tires and the styrofoam cups and the plastic bags that we use which represent our quality of life right now, which

are useful to our quality of life right now, these impose a severe strain on our ability to guarantee a sustainable environment for the future.

This recognition and the implicit recognition that recycling is not for free, that recycling will cost, that recycling—and this is one thing I trust is part and parcel of the intent of this Bill that is to be able to state to all Manitobans wherever they live that the paper, the cardboard, the plastic, the tin cans, the aluminum cans, all products that could if you have the ability to conceive of recycling, to see the product re-used, all of these products have a way of being collected. But this is not a false promise, that the promise of stating that because you have paid the deposit, that because you have paid the handling fee, this means that this product will be recycled.

This implicit promise must be carried through to the extent that people can see the end result of the higher cost that they have to bear—the end result of the visible costs that they have to bear. That is what I feel should be the ultimate direction of this Bill and Bills that I hope like this that will flesh out the concept of waste reduction, waste handling and recycling.

As I said, this Bill is only half the coin. It does not go far enough to address the concept of recycling. Now, part of the Bill, I hear comments of heavy handedness, I hear comments of big brother, I hear comments that this is draconian, that I am suggesting that draconian methods are necessary, that is the farthest from the truth.

If the Government is listening to the people who ask for recycling depots, who ask for means of recycling, if the Government is listening to the ideas of the people today who are much more environmentally conscious than I think many of us in this room are. I think you will find that they are prepared to undertake a greater look at the recycling legislation required in order to deliver on their dream of a sustainable development or a sustainable quality of life not only for themselves but for their children and for their children's children. Being willing to recognize this also implies on the part of the consumer a willingness to take a look to see how this will be done, but they do not want to see false promises, Mr. Acting Speaker, they are interested in seeing a delivery for the cost of what they have to pay.

We have up until now, during the first, well, shall we say the middle 40 years of this decade, allowed ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of complacency as Detroit with the planned obsolescent models, the Fords and the Chevrolets and the Oldsmobiles and the Dodges and the Plymouths, and all the other cars that have come and gone. The planned obsolescence, the style—that this style is wrong, the new style is better. We have been lulled into the sense that there was always going to be a replacement and that part that we no longer need can be simply disposed of very, very quietly and we do not see where it goes. I think many of us have driven past automobile graveyards. We have seen this horrible mess on the landscape and asked ourselves why was this not simply re-used? Well, there are costs always involved.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

I know that some of the first cars that were produced by Japan which were sold here looked awfully good, but we found that they tended to rust out very quickly. The reason was because they were using recycled steel, they were using recycled metal, but inside that recycled material was still this product of rot which was not removed. The implicit in the use of a recyclable product is the concept that this is as good as new, and I reference again the fact that the discussion paper that the Minister tabled earlier this afternoon is printed on recycled paper and I defy anyone in here to say that this product is not as good as the original, if not better than.

It is that that we want to deliver to the consumer. It is that that we want to deliver to the people of Manitoba. It is that that this particular Bill begins to address, and in that respect I support its intent. I am sure that when it comes to the third reading stage, when it comes to having heard further debate on this particular Bill, there will be friendly amendments that probably can be made to make this Bill even better. I reference, once again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it was with mixed emotions that I rose to debate this Bill, but it is not because I did not wish for the debate to continue, but rather because I wanted my thoughts and I wanted my comments to be clearly heard before this Bill is sent on to the third stage. I want to get everyone's impact and everyone's input into this, because this is as important and a useful first step in waste reduction.

One last comment I can make before I conclude is that part of the dollars that are to be collected through the deposits and assessments for the handling of the waste should also be directed at research, research which could be conducted here in this province, research which can go into the more friendly re-usable recycling part of waste reduction, because there are many places, many products, which simply require the inventiveness and the ability of man or woman scientists to focus their attentions on in order to determine how this product can be re-used. I mean, I hear that old tires are discarded, but surely there is a product here that can be re-used. We note that the legislation requiring a cost on non-returnable glass bottles—where are those glass bottles going to go now? Are they also still to be discarded? Are we simply just collecting money for the discarding? Or are we going to find a way of re-using this product? It is that aspect that we need to address, instead of this simply take it in, use it once, discard it philosophy that we have been living with and living by to date.

Once again, just to stress in ending, in conclusion we need to reduce waste, not simply by making it smaller to handle but rather by making it smaller in fact. You actually reduce it by taking and making less and less and less actual waste and using that part that can be re-usable and recycle it. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to speak on Bill 84 being brought forward by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings). I think it is an extremely important piece of legislation that I think if it was brought under different circumstances, but from what I

understand it is being brought forward because of the fact that the First Minister needs a platform when he goes to the First Ministers' Conference and, therefore, he requires this to be introduced in the House before that takes place.

* (1640)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to make a few comments about the discussion paper that was tabled by the Minister of the Environment dealing with the market forces to support the environment. I think in going through this discussion paper it is one that is very worthy of discussion. I am sure that it is going to lead to many great presentations from the public because of the fact that there are many thoughts in there. I know it is just a discussion paper, but it is pretty forward thinking in some of the suggestions that have been made in this when it comes to dealing with sustainable development. I think it is important that we address this, because it has been raised on several occasions the state of the environment of our universe and we, as a developed country, have contributed to a great degree to having that universe in the condition it is in.

I think it is important that we, as individuals, each take the opportunity to reduce the waste that is being generated in our society. I do not think there is any location or community that you can go to that is not grappling with the problem of landfill sites that are continuing to fill up at a much faster pace than what people would like to see happening. I think it is important that we have blue-box programs like was initiated in the constituency of Wolseley. I think we are going to be extremely pleased with the results that will come from that project. I think, from the information we have received from other jurisdictions, in Ontario, which have been going ahead with that program for a couple of years, the results have been very positive and there has been a great reduction of waste that has been generated and taken out to wastefill sites. I think it is important that the Government not let this pilot project go on for too long a period, but I think that we could be implementing a program of this sort right across the province. I know that this Bill is extremely important in facing those issues.

I guess one of the areas that I am concerned about, after reading through Bill 84, is the fact that the Bill will not come into force immediately over time of passing, it will be brought in force later by regulations. I know that the Government will certainly take their time in bringing the regulations into force because there are a lot of issues in this environment which is going to be affecting people in our society. I know that there will be a lot of people who will, if this is implemented fully, then it would be costing the Government votes, especially in some areas. So I am sure that the regulations will not be brought forward before the next election. That was raised by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) that this is great rhetoric, but why not put the regulations in effect right now so that you will not have to wait for regulations to bring it into power at a later stage.

The Minister in the second part of the Bill goes and sets up a series of ideas that come under the power

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

of the Minister, and I think that those are powers that the Minister enjoys right now without the necessity of passing an Act of this sort. One of the things he said he was going to be doing is consulting with producers, consumers, Governments and Government agencies and other persons that make recommendations with respect to improving waste production and prevention programs. I note that this should have been done prior to the Bill coming into the House. Sure he has brought out the discussion paper which addresses these issues, but surely the White Paper should have been circulated before the Bill was tabled in the House.

I think a discussion paper, to go about it in a proper way and have meetings throughout the province, is going to take a lot of time on the part of the Minister or the part of his department.

We had an environmental task force this past summer, which was made up of many people who were leaders in the field of environment, and we travelled right across the province having meetings. I know it takes time to set meetings of this sort up, it takes time to attend meetings, and then deal with a report when you are going to be taking into consideration their recommendations that the people have made to you during those presentations.

I think that this discussion should have taken place prior to the Minister tabling this Bill in the House, but as has been stated previously, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) needed a platform for his upcoming discussion, so that is why this Bill was rushed in so quickly.

An Honourable Member: On a serious issue like this, you should not smile. Wipe that grin off your face.

Mr. Harapiak: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz) says that on a serious issue of this sort I should not smile. I guess I cannot help what my disposition is, and because of the fact that I am smiling is not that I do not think that this is a very serious issue, I believe it is a very serious issue, that we should all be speaking to the issue of the environment—when the time comes that other Members have an opportunity to speak to this Bill.

The environment is becoming more and more a concern of many people of society. I think people are becoming more and more aware of the detriment that we are causing to the environment with some of the consumption that is going on in our society.

There was a discussion just the other day on how much of an effect the burning of fuel in cars causes to the breakdown of the environment. I know that there has been a lot of thought given to how we can improve our transportation modes in an area like the City of Winnipeg where you see most people are driving one person in a vehicle. There is no car pooling going on, and I know it is fairly difficult because of the fact that people work different hours, but when I worked in Sudbury, Ontario, in the mines, car pooling was very much a practice in those days. I think it is time that we started looking at car pooling and, better yet, utilizing the public transportation systems that are in place. I think it is important that we reduce the amount of

carbon that is given off into our atmosphere. While we are talking about -(interjection)- the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) has a question.

The Minister of Education is apparently concerned about some part of my speech. The Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) always has a written speech, so he does not have to worry about putting any words on record, but we unfortunately do not have the -(interjection)-

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the areas, that is of great concern to people who were concerned about the atmosphere is the role that the forest plays in our regeneration of our atmosphere. I think that there are many people who only look at the forests for one reason, and that is the economic benefits that may come from the harvesting of the forests. I think that if we look at the role that the forest plays in the regeneration of oxygen and as a carbon . . . that each one of us should be taking the opportunity to plant trees wherever there is public area that is available, or on some of the private property that is available for that purpose as well. I know that when we were Government, there was a program in place which gave funding to ranchers who were clearing marginal lands. When marginal lands were taken out of forestry, not only did it serve the purpose of regeneration of oxygen and absorbing carbon, but it also provided a safe place for the wildlife in this province.

* (1650)

We were in such a hurry to clear all this land that we were giving grants to farmers and ranchers to clear this land and put it into cattle production. I know when we made the decision at that time that we should eliminate that because it did not make sense, clearing marginal land and putting it into agricultural production. I think it is time that the Government had a serious look at putting some of that marginal land back into reforestation to deal with the needs of the hardwoods that will be required by our pulp and paper industries, or else just have it for the use of the protection of our wildlife. I think the Government should give very serious consideration to do it in that direction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is also some discussion about deposits and the handling fees to consumers, as was raised by one of the previous speakers, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), that the fees will apply unfairly—it will cause an unfair burden to the people who are the poor in our province. I do not think that it is fair to be asking them to be paying a deposit.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member for The Pas has the floor. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

Mr. Harapiak: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was an interesting discussion going on, so I thought that maybe we should listen to the discussion and see what that was going to result in, but I guess we will have to wait for another day to see the results of that discussion.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of effort made to the recent reduction and re-use of materials. I know that there are people who are concerned that there are no deposits for glass materials in this province. Last week I had an opportunity to take in some plastic and aluminum containers. Manitoba Soft Drink was picking up materials, and they could also bring in the glass containers as well. I know the deposit was not a very large amount. They were paying one cent a pound for glass, but I think that is a start. I think there needs to be more co-operation and more research done on how we can use the glass for a marketable material. I know that people would participate to a much greater degree if there was a little better return.

While we were going through the Estimates of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission the other day, there was an announcement that there was going to be some co-operation between the Manitoba Soft Drink group and the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission when it came to gathering of glass material. There was a deposit of 10 cents a bottle that was supposed to be collected and put back into the environment, but from what I understand during the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission's Annual Report, this was taken out of the pockets of the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. I guess it is important that there has been a beginning of co-operation between the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission and how they can have people bringing their bottles back for deposit, rather than having them scattered all over the countryside. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great effort made to mobilize many volunteer groups in our society to try and deal with the problem of waste in our aluminum cans and plastic containers. I think that there has been quite a bit of progress made in that area, but I think that there still needs to be a greater emphasis placed on research and how these materials are marketed. I think that if the Government will -(interjection)- pardon, me?

The Minister of Agriculture has some—Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious Bill, and I think that the Minister is moving in the right direction by bringing forward this legislation. I just wish it had been brought forward under different circumstances, but I think that the Minister is moving in the right direction. I hope that he will change his mind when the amendments are made during the committee hearings to put this Bill into effect for the time that has passed and not wait to deal with it with regulations.

I know that the Minister will stand up to the Member for Flin Flon's challenge to have this Bill come into effect at the time it is passed by the House or when the committees deal with it rather than dealing it with regulations. I am sure that the Minister will accept that challenge of the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and make those necessary amendments during the time that we are dealing with this Act.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other parts of the Bill that I would like to discuss. One of the areas is the powers of the environment officers. I think that is one of the shortcomings of this province. There is an Environment Act in place at this time, but the environmental officers do not have the authority to go

and deal with some of the people who are creating, who are offenders.

I was pleased to learn this morning, Mr. Speaker, that an offender in Ontario who had been a repeat offender on several occasions was taken up by the Government in Ontario and given a jail sentence. I think it is time that we as a Legislature took that responsibility and dealt with it in a very firm way. So, I think it is important that we give the environmental officers sufficient powers to act and deal with people who are not dealing in a reasonable way with the environment. If they are repeat offenders and they have been warned and the environment officers have come and dealt with them and told them that they are repeat offenders, then we should not be afraid to give them a large fine. In some cases that is not sufficient. If the pollution continues then I think they should be jailed. I think once we as legislators show them that we are serious with dealing with the environment, then I think that it is going to be accepted to a much greater degree.

Mr. Speaker, in the paper that was distributed by -(interjection)- the Minister from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) is always very concerned over what people are saying and he will have his opportunity. Unfortunately, when he was the Minister of the Environment, he did not take that opportunity to do something when he was the Minister. He has had to wait until this new Minister come in, and now he has dealt with it. Our Member for Radisson was dealing with this issue, he was bringing forward legislation to deal with it. This Minister sat all the time that he was Minister and did not do a darn thing for the environment.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

* (1700)

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., it is time for Private Members' Hour. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member for The Pas will have 20 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 2—THE LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), Bill No. 2, The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le louage d'immeubles, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). (Stand) Is there leave that this matter remain standing? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 4—THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (2)

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), Bill No. 4, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2); Loi no

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

2 modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). (Stand) Is there leave that this matter remain standing? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Helmut Pankratz (La Verendrye): I was wondering now and again, after hearing these speeches this afternoon in the House on the environment and so forth, I would not for one minute have been surprised if even the Speaker had been confused. In this case I must admire the Speaker. He knew exactly where he was at, and he kept the House and the decorum going smoothly.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill No. 4 has been introduced in the House, and I think it should be renamed. It should be named the "Mark IV Bill," that would possibly address it a little more in its right context.

I think this Bill No. 4 actually is a Bill that is discriminating against the rural constituencies. It is a Bill that I would have wished the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) would have had the courtesy of withdrawing. He should have withdrawn this Bill, and after you carefully listen to my comments that I would like to put on the record I think you will agree why.

Bill No. 4 is referring to the licence plate that, by law, every vehicle that operates on our highways and roadways today is supposed to have as an identification of the vehicle.

A lot of us in the rural areas are very fortunate if we can travel on good gravel roads. We are fortunate. I believe sometime during the conversation different Members of the Liberal first Opposition Party speaking on this Bill also indicated that this Government was spending too much money on highways.

In all fairness this Member for Assiniboia, when he cruises around in his limousine possibly a chauffeur at the wheel, he never does see the country roads or the mud roads. He indicated to me earlier today that he wants to come out to Steinbach, and I would love to show him around and show him some of the roads that we have to travel on. I think I will have to take him around. I do not think he will want to go in his limousine on some of those roads that we are forced to travel on.

I would also venture to say if this Member is so concerned about the numbers on that vehicle that possibly it should be something that should be addressed by the manufacturer. The plates, where they are located, not only in cars or that nature, but also trucks, buses, and even RV vehicles we have today that have to have licences, they are placed right in the back of the vehicle and if we would want to see these vehicles clean then I would assume they should be relocated in different locations, because the back of these vehicles will always be muddy if you have to travel on these roads that we, in the rural areas, have to travel on.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) brought in this Bill and he really did not realize the ramifications that a Bill like this could have on our northern areas.

I was up this spring at Island Lake and some of those, what we would call roads—we would never consider them roads, they are just trails—they are hardly passable, Mr. Speaker. Some of our people in the rural areas, we are lucky if we can move from one area to another never mind having a little bit of dirt on the licence plates.

The other point that I recall when this Member was speaking on this Bill was something about the Friendly Manitoba, and Friendly Manitoba was advertising the province and sometimes that Friendly Manitoba was covered up with some other advertising and some other signs of that nature.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the automobile city of the province, namely Steinbach, and "It's worth the trip" is a decal put on which rides over that plate which says "Steinbach, the automobile city." I am just wondering whether this Member also is possibly against private business, because—

An Honourable Member: I think so, anti-business, anti-business.

Mr. Pankratz: I would not doubt it, because this is very upsetting. As a matter of fact, it is very upsetting to see that this Member has introduced a Bill which possibly could be anti-business.- (interjections)-

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very serious Bill, and we should be very serious about discussing a Bill of this nature. Any Member who brings in a Bill of any nature in this House should be considered very seriously even before he introduces a Bill.

That reminds me, obviously the first Opposition Caucus must have discussed this Bill in their caucus, so they must be basically unanimous on this Bill.

Basically, I would be led to believe that the total caucus of the first Opposition, the Liberal Party, is anti-business and anti-rural and anti-North, with trying to even introduce

* (1710)

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Pankratz: Mr. Speaker, could you tell me—I really appreciate you getting some order in this House—how much time do I have left?

Mr. Speaker: Eight minutes.

Mr. Pankratz: Eight minutes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I want to put on the record, because this is a Bill that I think I should also send out to all the automobile dealers in the Province of Manitoba, that they see what this Member is trying to imply when he states that - (interjection)- for that reason I would like to put on the record what this states.

The Bill, the way the Member for Assiniboia is introducing it, that the number plates shall be kept free from dirt and shall be so affixed and maintained that the numbers, letters and validation stickers thereon are at all times plainly visible and clearly legible and that the view thereof is at no time obscured or obstructed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that -(interjection)- I wish that I could get the attention of all Members in this House that we could address this Bill—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Honourable Members wishing to carry on their private conversations can do so elsewhere.

Mr. Pankratz: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that I also got my thoughts put on the record as the Member of the Second Opposition sometimes is referring to his remarks as "two cents worth." I guess you have to take it in stride, but I do think that in all fairness it would be appropriate, at this time, if we would give the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) the opportunity to withdraw this Bill so that no more of this valuable time in this House would be devoted to a Bill that basically is anti-business, anti-rural and anti-North.

I think when we would be able to get this Honourable Member for Assiniboia to tour around a little more in the rural areas he would see that it is not that easy to keep the back end of his limousine clean. I would also venture to say that maybe this is just the first part of his Bill, and if he could get this passed in the House I believe he has another amendment that he would want to bring forward, which would possibly suggest that all chauffeurs should be responsible to maybe keep them clean, because I think maybe this Member for Assiniboia, when he has a chauffeur it is quite easy for him to—

An Honourable Member: And then there will be a chauffeur's rights Bill after that.

Mr. Pankratz: That is right and I think he is working on that. I think that would be possibly the amendment that will follow this one if he can get this through the House.

I will not take any more time in this House. I think I have made my points very clear that this is an anti-business, anti-rural, anti-northern Bill, and I would wish that the Member would withdraw it from the House.

Mr. Speaker: By leave this matter will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

BILL NO. 10—THE BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield, Bill No. 10, The Beverage Container Act; Loi sur les contenants de

boissons, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). (Stand) Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health. (Agreed)

Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa): It does give me great pleasure to be able to rise to speak on this particular Bill at this moment, it does indeed. In fact, if I may put one word on the record that I think expresses the timing of this Bill, the timing of the one I spoke on just earlier, just absolutely aptly and perfectly that word would be "serendipity."

We have here two Bills acting in concert, two Bills acting together to actually achieve an improvement in the environmental health of this province, and it gives me great pleasure to be able to state those things and say those things.

An Honourable Member: You are going to reread the same speech you gave earlier.

Mr. Herold Driedger: Now the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) says I am going to reread the speech and make the speech again that I was making earlier. Absolutely nothing could be further from the truth, because I would like to, for the Member for Thompson's edification, state that I have new comments, new thoughts, a further elucidation of the argument to stress the fact that we have here, and something that can happen within this Legislature, where two sides working together can improve the lot of the province, where two ideas put together can actually advance the goal, in this instance, the goal of environmental health of this province.

The first Bill I spoke on earlier, just briefly for the edification of the Member here, was with respect to waste reduction, which focused primarily on the collection of deposits for the handling of this waste. I now wish to move on to this Bill here, which references largely, and it is more restrictive in that respect, it specifically states it is the collection of beverage containers, beverage containers which we all are very familiar with, beverage containers in the form of glass, beverage containers in the form of plastic, beverage containers in the form of disposable aluminum and disposal tin, and disposal—I mean the list goes on, lists of containers that we use to contain beverages.

The purpose of this Bill, as the purpose of the earlier one, is to get some kind of a handle on the waste that we have produced. That waste is simply the fact we have now situations or waste we can no longer handle.

I would like to read into the record just a small introduction to a news magazine I think we all received just recently. The headline says Provincial Support of Community Recycling Initiatives Requested, and it starts off very clearly that the Alberta and B.C. branches of Pitch In, Canada have urged our provincial Governments to develop comprehensive province-wide recycling programs. Such programs may need to consider guaranteeing minimum prices for recyclable commodities, the establishment of transfer stations, subsidizing local start-up costs, recycling programs, and the provision of provincially owned storage facilities for recyclables collected.

Bill No. 10 focuses on the collection of beverage containers, the collection of beverage containers that is not discriminatory in this province. Right now we know that parts of this province are treated differently than other parts of the province with respect to the payment of deposits on even returnable bottles.

For instance, as we go further north in the province any beverage container is not collected for recycling, is not collected for return, because of the costs involved in the transfer of now the empty beverage container. This is not fair. There are environmentalists in the North just as there are environmentalists here in urban Winnipeg, as there are environmentalists in rural Manitoba, people who are very interested, very concerned about the environmental health of this province and who look for long-term solutions to a problem with respect to waste management.

Here we have now the fact that we want to have the entire province having the opportunity in this one instance to bring together into one depot, into one collection spot, the ability to dispose of individually purchased beverage containers of plastic, of glass, of aluminum, of tin, any refillable or non-refillable glass bottle, things that simply we use for beverages. These, once collected, need to be disposed of, and this is where the serendipity comes in, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we now have on the order books a Bill which looks to the making of deposits for the handling of and for the purpose of waste reduction.

* (1720)

Now having both aspects in place, the dollars necessary to facilitate this handling of the beverage containers, which are waste in this instance, and we also have the dollars in place to start looking at recycling, dollars in place to look at reusing these containers, and I think we have here a beautiful example of how two Bills can work in concert to achieve a long-term goal. It is in that respect that I wish to very strongly urge the House to support this Bill, just as I urged them also to support Bill No. 84, because it is only when you get this whole aspect of working together that we can achieve what we all individually want.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

This Bill, if I may stress for the benefit of the Members present, is completely consistent with the environmental concerns expressed by this Government in two throne speech addresses. It is completely consistent with the intent of the Bill just introduced earlier today. It is completely consistent with the comments that have been put on the record and with some of the comments I have heard by Members speaking outside of the Chamber.

We also have several other provinces in this country that have moved toward implementing such comprehensive beverage container recycling legislation, and I think the two pieces of legislation acting in concert, acting together, will advance this cause.

Manitoba does, right now, lag behind in this area, and it is long overdue for such a Bill. As we saw earlier today, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings)

obviously also concurs with this, because his Bill works so beautifully in conjunction with this Bill to try and advance this cause.

I suppose if we were to take a look at some of the more esoteric benefits of this beverage container legislation—and I believe we could have also made the same comment with respect to Bill No. 84, the esoteric aspect that once you have in place incentives to collect unsightly containers that cannot be returned—because there is no incentive to return them—once you have in place regulations and legislation that will provide an incentive, perhaps in the form of deposits, perhaps in the form of returnable deposits, or perhaps in the form of recycling programs. Once you have these in place, you will have people willingly moving to clean up much of the unsightly aspect of our environment.

There is an anti-litter component in not only what this particular piece of legislation proposes but also in the piece of legislation proposed earlier today by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). I think that is laudable, that is commendable and that is something that we should support completely.

There is one other aspect that perhaps should be raised just now—I alluded to this earlier in my remarks—and that was that not all materials that we now would like to collect, not all materials that we have produced, not all materials can at the present time be recycled, but if the programs are in place, if the dollars start to be assigned, particularly with respect to education on the part of the consumer, we will begin developing the long-term technical and commercial solutions to waste management. I think we need to stress commercial solutions because if business can make a profit in managing waste, then business should be encouraged to do so and business should be enabled to do so.

We should be able to provide for them the raw material. The raw material in this instance is the waste that we do not wish to bury out of sight, out of mind, the kind of waste we do not wish to put into somebody else's back yard, but rather waste that we would like to see reused—and in this instance I will repeat a line I used earlier today—in order to guarantee the future health and quality life of future generations through sustainable development.

It is only by reusing, by recycling that we can do that. One-time use is one-time abuse, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and one-time abuse is one time too much.

Any legislation that will advance the cause of the environmental health that will prevent in a small way, in a large way, in all ways, the environmental degradation of our planet, that is legislation we should support.

Some Members may find small aspects that are vague. These should be strengthened. Members may find parts of the legislation which may not go far enough. Then they should be extended. They may feel that even if we put the two Bills together, parts of the Bills do not state what they mean clearly enough, then we should in third reading clarify them, but we should not prevent them from going ahead. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By leave, the Bill will continue standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Agreed? (Agreed)

**BILL NO. 13—THE MANITOBA
INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL
AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), Bill No. 13, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba), and on the motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Thompson) that the question be now put. (Stand)

**BILL NO. 17—THE EMPLOYMENT
STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), Bill No. 17, The Employment Standards Amendment Act (Loi modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi). (Stand)

**BILL NO. 18—THE OZONE LAYER
PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), Bill No. 18, The Ozone Layer Protection Act (Loi sur la protection de la couche d'ozone). Is there leave for—The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. James Downey), on a point of order.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): Leave? I was not aware that I had adjourned the item but that is all right. I will speak following the Member for Fort Garry.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak briefly on this Bill because while on first reading one may take it as being rather a minor Bill, I think one has to appreciate that the whole concept of the ozone layer and the fact that it is being depleted is a part of a much more major concern. While I do not criticize the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) for not bringing it all into place, I think one has to realize that this is one component of the whole concept of global warming and what is sometimes referred to as the issue of the greenhouse effect.

What we are faced with here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the fact that there is a very complex situation which leads to this whole issue of the global warming. I think that it would be appropriate to quote very briefly from a small article or small paper that is referred to as Worldwatch Paper 91, and the title is "Slowing Global Warming, A Worldwide Strategy." This is a publication that is under the directorship of Lester Brown who, I think most people are aware of, was one time involved with the World Bank and is also a very well recognized individual as far as the whole concept of the Third World and the problems that are associated with feeding the Third World. I quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in relation to the global warming, that changes to the earth's atmosphere are global and, for all practical purposes, irreversible, not only in our lifetime, but in our children's and grandchildren's as well.

* (1730)

In other words, this issue of global warming is beyond what we would regard as a minor issue. It is already there, it is serious and it is something that has to be confronted almost immediately. I will continue to quote very briefly. It goes on to say: Coping effectively with global warming will force society to move rapidly into uncharted terrain, reversing powerful trends that have dominated the industrial age. This challenge cannot be met without a strong commitment on the part of both individuals and Governments. Among the unprecedented policy changes that have now become urgent are a curtailment of chlorofluorocarbon production, a reversal of deforestation in tropical countries, enactment of a carbon tax on fossil fuels and a new commitment to greater energy efficiency and the development of renewable energy sources.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are already to the point where something has to be done quickly and, while you can find in the literature some debate as to whether or not we are already experiencing a global warming, there is evidence that several things have occurred in the last 150 years which were not found to have occurred prior to that, and one of those which is very critical is the fact that in the past 150 years the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has increased by 25 percent. There has been a 19 percent increase in nitrous oxide and—I stress this—a 100 percent increase in the atmospheric content of methane.

Those are very critical compounds and they are compounds that are critical for more than one reason. Their main concern is the fact that of course they are involved with the warming process, but the nitrous oxide in particular is also one of the compounds that is critical as far as acid rain is concerned.

The final one that I want to comment on is the one that is a new compound. It is a compound that is not normally found in the atmosphere, in other words, it does not occur naturally in the atmosphere, and that is the group that are referred to as the chlorofluorocarbons or more commonly referred to as CFCs. They are becoming a very significant factor in our atmosphere.

Now, at the present time the average global temperature is .6 degrees Celcius higher than it was a century ago, and that seems to be relatively insignificant. The average global temperature right now is .6 degrees Celcius higher than it was 100 years ago. The critical thing though is, that warming trend is rapidly increasing and we are now looking at a group of scientists, all who are credible. They vary a little bit in what they anticipate to be the extent of that warming, but all of them, all into the range of coming to the estimate that that global average temperature increase over the next century will fall somewhere between 2.5 and 5.5 degrees Celcius. Now that again, when one looks at it superficially, does not sound like a great deal, but it is a great deal when you start thinking of the impact that is going to have on a world scale. What it will mean is that there are areas now that are productive that will become deserts, there are areas now that are very productive that may become extremely wet. We may look at devastation of some

our forests either due to the fact that it has become too dry to sustain them, or we may even find situations where they disappear because of lack of moisture. As my colleague from The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) has mentioned, one of the other big things with the global warming trend is the increase in the level of our seas and the likelihood of devastating flooding occurring in some of those areas.

Now it is unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have headlines such as the one that was in the Free Press today, and it says—this is today's Free Press—"Global Warming, Summit Falters". Here you have a situation where 72 countries are gathering at this present time in the Netherlands, and some of the big ones, the critical ones, have stated that they do not feel that they can come anywhere close to abiding by the proposal which has been put forward by the Netherlands. Those that are saying that they cannot abide by it are: the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan, and Britain. This, I think, is significant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in that those would be regarded as four of the major industrial countries of the world. So they are the ones that have the resources that they should be able to do something about this and reduce their emissions and come to grips with this problem, but they are not prepared to take the initiative and to carry on with the types of incentives that would be necessary to have their industry move in the right direction.

Now, getting back to the CFCs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that it is important to take a look at exactly what is happening on a world-scale basis as far as some of these deleterious gases are concerned. In the case of carbon dioxide—and it is hard to believe the figures because it is difficult to put them into context—but at the present time we are annually adding 21 billion tons of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere annually. The bulk of that of course is coming from the use of fossil fuels for such things as our cars, heating, and of course the other great source of the disposition of CO₂ into the atmosphere is the deforestation of our tropical forests. At the present time, as far as the current greenhouse contribution is concerned, it is estimated that the greenhouse contribution that can be attributed to carbon dioxide is 57 percent of the problem is now due to carbon dioxide. Of that 57 percent, 44 percent comes from coal, oil, and natural gas, the other 13 percent from deforestation. But the interesting thing about the carbon dioxide, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the annual increase of that is only .4 percent, so it is not increasing rapidly.

Of the CFCs, the interesting thing with them is that at the present time they only contribute 25 percent of the greenhouse effect that can be attributed to the CFCs. They are increasing at an annual rate of 5 percent, but the thing that is critical to remember is that the so-called relative greenhouse efficiency of the CFCs is 15,000 compared with a figure of 1 for carbon dioxide. In other words, a unit of the CFCs is 15,000 times as detrimental as far as the greenhouse and the warming effect is concerned as one unit of carbon dioxide.

The others that are critical are methane, which now accounts for about 12 percent of the greenhouse effect,

and it is decreasing at 1 percent annually. The other one that should be mentioned is nitrous oxide, which of course is one of the major culprits as far as acid rain is concerned, and it now contributes about 6 percent to the greenhouse effect, and it is only increasing at .2 percent annually, so the rate at which it is increasing is relatively slow.

We have heard from colleagues in the House the sources of the CFCs and we have heard such things as the fact that they are in the aerosol bomb sprays, they are in the refrigeration units in fridges and freezers, they are in the air-conditioning units in cars, the styrofoam cups—although I think the ones we are currently using are not. They are not in these, they are in some of them. They are not in these, but they were in them. They are also in some of the packaging, the urethane foam packaging.

While we may not realize it, some of the most commonly used anesthetics also are halogens which contain compounds that when they release into the atmosphere create this problem, but the ones that are most important are the CFCs that they refer to as being CFCs 11 and 12.

Now my colleague from The Pas mentioned these, but the thing that he did not mention about those particular CFCs is the amount that is being released annually. This is where it becomes, I suppose to use the jargon, a little bit scary, because CF-11 which is one of those that is used in the aerosol bombs and in some of the refrigeration units, there is 350,000 tons per year of that being put into the atmosphere. CF-12 which is the other one that is a very serious atmospheric pollutant, 400,000 tons of that one are going into the atmosphere annually. So they are the big two. The ones that are used for anesthetics are relatively minor and because of the significance to them as far as our health and medical requirements are concerned is minor.

In conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is imperative that we in this House take cognizance of the fact that this is a serious issue. It is not one that we can just ignore over a period of time. It is an insidious thing. It is coming in slowly, and the remedial action has to start somewhere. We can look at Manitoba and say, well, we are not a major culprit in terms of the increase in these products in the atmosphere.

Canada is a factor. We know the situation in places like Sudbury and some of the other mining areas. They are not putting out CFCs, but they are putting out compounds which are leading to the global warming, the greenhouse effect, and in combination with the CFCs you have a very serious situation. We could be looking at a 2-degree, 3-degree, we do not know what it is, but in this article that I quoted from the Free Press today, and I want to just quote the final couple of paragraphs and it states, experts warn if greenhouse gas emissions grow at current rate, the earth surface temperature will rise by up to 4 degrees in 40 years, which could turn rich farming areas into desert and flood entire countries due to rising sea levels from melting ice caps.

So the seriousness of it is there. There is some conjecture as to just how serious it is going to be, but

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

I do not think there is any scientist working in that area that now do not agree that it is a problem. They disagree to some extent as to how immediate it is and how serious it is going to be, but they all agree that it is a problem.

* (1740)

Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support in principle the Bill that was put forward by my honourable colleague from The Pas (Mr. Harapiak). I am not going to go into some of the issues as to the levels of penalties and that type of thing because I assume that there is a rationale as to why he utilized those particular figures, but I do support it in principle that this is an urgent issue and one that should be addressed very soon. I do not think it is irrelevant that it be addressed in this Legislature because I think the responsibility has to start somewhere, and this is a very logical place because it would not be too expensive for us to initiate some of these measures. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs): I rise today to make a couple of points as it relates to not so much the Bill 18, but it will be relevant, somewhat different than what some of the speeches we heard today on Bill 84 which some of the New Democratic Party Members spoke on.

One would have to ask the question, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why after as many years in the Manitoba Legislature that the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) has been here that it has now taken him until this particular time of his term to be concerned about the ozone layer? One would really have to question the motives of the Member for The Pas.

I would point out to you and make a case that earlier today the New Democratic Party and Members of the House criticized my colleague the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) for trying to hastily rush a Bill in dealing with sustainable development and recycling of wastes and doing away with some of the waste material in this province. Moving that legislation in today really upset them. Yet, he had six years, eight years, how many years did he have as a Member of this Legislature to deal with the protection of the ozone layer in this country and advance legislation?

An Honourable Member: 15 of the last 20.

Mr. Downey: That is right, 15 of the last 20, his Party were in Government, and it is now we finally see the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) waking up to the need for legislation.

It is hard to support legislation or resolutions when one has to really sort out the sincerity of the introducer of the Bill, whether they are doing it because they care about the ozone layer in the environment or whether they care about their political future, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that is really what he wants.

That is the question that has to be answered by the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak). Why has it taken him this long to bring forward any concern at all for the ozone layer and the greenhouse effect?

The Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) put some numbers on the record and one has to be somewhat of a non-observer to see what is going on in western Canada and western United States as it relates to what some people refer to as the greenhouse effect.

I guess back in the 1930s they referred to it, and I know the Member for Fort Garry is a product of the dust bowl of Saskatchewan. I am sure that he can tell many stories.

An Honourable Member: It still shows. It has never been fertile up there. The crop is short.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is not an ozone layer that is missing, that is a layer of hair that is missing.

Seriously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one would have to be a non-observer to see what has taken place in our climate in our prairie provinces with the warming trends, with the lack of moisture and the concerns that are legitimately there, being pointed out by many people that are part of the area.

I think it is generally observed that we are entering to a warmer climate and the lack of rainfall is causing some concern. A lot of scientists will say that it is in fact a hole in the ozone layer or the problems, I have no reason to disagree with that but we do have to—I am surprised, I am again surprised at the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) in his approach and his Government's past lack of initiative to support conservation, to do things that would enhance those people who are trying to maintain the soils and the waters in these communities.

In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have never seen anyone so anti-water conservation in all my life as the New Democratic Party. I do not think in the history of this country have we seen lack of money spent as to what it was under the New Democrats as it came to the conservation of our soils and our water.

Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a two-sided sword. It is not only protecting the ozone layer, but it is enhancing conservation projects that we have to deal with.

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

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): On a point of order, the Minister of the wind tunnel has once again—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Harapiak: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I withdraw that comment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. May I remind the Member that we refer to all Members as Honourable Members, Honourable Ministers.

Mr. Harapiak: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologize to the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) for using the term wind tunnel.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention the fact that we started up several conservation districts when we were Government and we also started the help committee which brought into being many environmental projects, so I think the Minister should check his facts and have a little bit of relevancy when he gets up and speaks on any Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A dispute of the facts is not a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs has the floor.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can fully appreciate the sensitivity of the Member for The Pas and the lack of action of he and his Government. I can understand clearly why he is so sensitive.

What he has not answered, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is why did it take him so long to introduce legislation as it relates to the ozone layer and the protection of the ozone layer? Why has it taken him so long to come to the realization that there is a concern there? I would only have to put it down to political opportunism that he and the New Democratic Party felt that it was the right political thing, that the consumers, the people of this country, were finally and seriously conscious about the environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no better example than that of the way in which he and his administration operated the Manfor complex at The Pas. It was in fact a disaster, outside the environmental Act and outside an environmental licence.

* (1750)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Ironically, we have had a number of points of order from this particular Member who is speaking in terms of relevancy, and I would ask that you would perhaps read the same admonition you have read to other Members in terms of relevancy because the Minister seems to be at some great length from the Bill. I would ask that you ask him to have his comments, particularly in light of the number of points of order he has raised, be made a little bit more relevant to the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I thank the Honourable Member for his advice and I would remind the Honourable Minister that the relevance to the Bill under consideration is the ozone layer.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I fully appreciate what you are saying, and as well I again appreciate the sensitivity of the New Democratic Party in their negligent way in which they managed the Manfor complex and the impact it had on the environment in the riding of the Member for The Pas. I would be sensitive if I were them as well in the way in which they operated outside the environmental licence and the lack of concern for the environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, not many minutes ago we heard the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) again criticizing my colleague, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), for the Act which he introduced, Bill No. 84, that the Act was not substantive enough, and that it depended heavily on regulations. I invite Members of this Legislature and you, Sir, to take a look at the Act which the Member for The Pas has introduced and asked us to support.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, talking about fluffery or talk about non-substantive, this probably is the greatest example of political posturing, and then having to write regulations to make it an effective Bill in any way, shape or form. Again -(interjection)- No, I am not against protection of the ozone layer. What I am against is the hypocrisy of the the New Democratic Party and their political posturing to try to catch the imagination of the public when it comes to the ozone layer and the protection of it and the environment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is not a bigger disaster than the New Democratic Party as it comes to the concern of the environment. Again, posturing for the public. I would like to have the Member, because he is asking this important body, this Legislative Assembly, to support an Act, he is suggesting that there be strong powers introduced, there be strong penalties and substantive jail sentences which society has to take into consideration when you give this kind of law and this kind of power to the courts.

I would like him to know how he intends to do the policing and carry out the inspection of the activities of people who may be impacting the environment with the substances, whether it is from air conditioners, discarded refrigerators. I would like the Member to be a little more clear on what he is asking the Legislature to do. I cannot figure out totally what his main objective is.

Again it is political posturing by the New Democratic Party, probably dreamt up by the Leader of the Party who has really over the past few months added very little to the Legislative Assembly and the activities, because he has been more concerned about the challenge to his leadership and his inability to keep that group together. That is probably the bigger concern of the Member for Concordia -(interjection)- Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are somewhat concerned that I am reading a Bill. Again I will make reference to the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), who earlier today criticized Bill No. 84 for not being substantive and not having anything in it. This is something that is very nonsubstantive and lacks substance and has to have regulations to make it worth anything.

Tuesday, November 7, 1989

Mr. Deputy Speaker, to conclude my remarks, I just want to reiterate the points I made. It took the New Democratic Party six years, or the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), to bring this forward. Today they criticized my colleague for advancing very quickly an Act that will reduce waste and will recycle waste and protect the environment. That is what we have in the New Democratic Party, absolutely and totally political posturing, irresponsible, falling like a stone in the polls, in fact -(interjection)- the Member says, call an election. We all know that the New Democratic Party have within their ability to upset the Government and force an election. We know the New Democratic Party have it within their ability to vote against actions of this Government which could cause an election. If the Member wants an election, then he knows how to cause one. I think the people of Manitoba are satisfied with the Government -(interjection)- they are—

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. The Honourable Minister's time has expired.

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-Operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), the Leader of the third and distant Party in the Legislature says, and made an erroneous and a total falsehood statement on CBC, that I was not concerned about the ozone layer because it was not large enough. The Member knows full well that there is no truth in that allegation at all.

Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to take over as Environment Minister to find out that yes indeed the NDP did pass The Environment Act. That was the only thing that was in that office. Previous Ministers under the NDP, whatever was there, decided they would talk about it, including the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), who never could make a decision on anything, including the ozone layer, made no decisions, all he would say was let us study it some more. Let us be well aware, Mr. Speaker, -(interjection)- well I guess the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has to flap a little bit because he does not get any recognition otherwise.

Yes, I have read the Bill. I read it while the former Member was speaking. I did not need to read the Bill to have a little bit of an understanding of what the ozone layer is all about. -(interjection)- Absolutely, I am a very generous person by nature so signing cheques is quite easy for me.

Mr. Speaker, when we took office there was a report card out that the previous Government was 10 out of 10. Out of all the provinces in Canada, they were the worst. Taking office and seeing that there was nothing there, it was quite obvious that there was nothing there. The previous -(interjection)- how are you doing, Gary? That is okay, I love you too, Gary. -(interjection)- Oh, no. I turned over a new leaf, and why not.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that this is a serious subject. I will give compliment to the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) because obviously in his speech he did his research and he had a fair bit of knowledge about which he spoke. I think this subject is one that, yes, is the possible survival of our universe, and if we do not get busy with it we might just not be here in some 50 or 100 years, or our grandchildren will not be here.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of the ozone layer does call for a lot of study. I can assure you that on my desk throughout the time that I was Environment Minister was a package that was kept on being added to, dealing with the problem of the ozone layer.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor), when I saw him on TV one night on—what do you call it?

* (1800)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Minister will have 11 minutes remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).