



Second Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 3B - 8 p.m., MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmore	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 11, 1991

The House met at 8 p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render) for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme), who has 40 minutes remaining.

Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise today and lend my support to the Speech from the Throne. I did not participate in the last throne speech. I participated in the budget at the last session, but it is indeed a pleasure to participate in the second session throne speech of the Thirty-fifth Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate you, a friend. I think of you as a friend, and I know you will do the honourable job that you always have in dealing with the House. Now you have a new Government Services minister to deal with also.

I congratulate the new Sergeant-at-Arms. I welcome you to the Chamber and I am sure you will enjoy, like the rest of us, the wise words and the things that go along with—

An Honourable Member: On this side of the House.

Mr. Ducharme: On this side of the House—well, there are wise words the odd time on the other side of the House, in this particular House, like Harry has over all, pardon me, the member has from all these years.

Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate the return of the pages who you remarked, or someone remarked, that there was such a short session. Maybe to them it was a very, very long session last time.

Congratulations to my two new colleagues in the cabinet, the honourable member for Kirkfield Park, the new Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), and the honourable member for Assiniboia, the new Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh). Like the rest of their cabinet colleagues, I am sure

the new ministers will find their time in cabinet challenging as well as rewarding. I look forward to working together, and I wish you both good luck and much success in your new roles with the new government.

I know the new Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh). I remember the work she did before she was elected in the Legislature, and I know that she will carry her work well. With the new Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson), the honourable member, I know him well from the City Hall days. When I was EPC chairman, he was chairman of finance and did his work very, very well and was very, very respected; a long-awaited member to come here and to be elected in this House. I am sure he will do it well.

I also, though, at this time would like to say that I enjoyed working and always will continue to work with my friend from Portage la Prairie who always did the work at Consumer and Corporate Affairs and was always—give you those wise moves at cabinet, and I appreciated the friendship and carry on that friendship with you, Mr. Connery from Portage.

Also to the former honourable member, Mr. Penner, I know the work that he did on assessment when we were in a minority government situation. He passed a very heavy assessment bill that the previous administration either did not have the courage to do or the knowledge to do. Well, he carried it in a minority situation and carried it very well.

I must say also most dealings with him were with the regional planning group that we established in the last year dealing with the outlying municipalities, and I appreciate co-chairing that with him, and I know the work he did in that.

At this time though, I would like to thank the people of Riel for their continued support. I enjoy the day-to-day contact with my constituency, and I think that for most of our members in this House that is probably one of the most rewarding things there is to being a member, an MLA, the contact, day-to-day rapport that you have with your constituents. As a minister, I appreciate their having patience when as

a minister, as we know, you do not have the time to spend on a day-to-day basis, but you do work with them continually.

* (2005)

I also must say that I have enjoyed working the last five months with the two new members from the St. Vital area. We have two outstanding members. During our recess, I met many people in the St. Vital area, where I was a former school trustee and a former city councillor. They told us how outstanding a job these two members are doing and it is a pleasure for them to have these type of people representing them. They have learned very quickly. They are doing their job well, and they are certainly a credit to our caucus.

I would also like to welcome all the members back into the session. We have had meetings with them on the off period of the session. We even had a hockey game together. We have been successful both in and out of the session, and we were very successful when we took on the media when all the MLAs got together and worked together to defeat the media. We did very, very well, and we enjoyed it immensely.

I am sure this session of the Legislature will be very interesting and taxing on all of us. The recession in our country and the debt our province is carrying presents a unique opportunity for all members in the House to find solutions to our problems so Manitoba will come out of this recession in good economic shape. I hope all of us can work together to find these solutions.

I look forward to the new role as Government Services minister. I look forward to working with the different members in regard to -(interjection)- well, the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) is speaking up already, Mr. Speaker. He better watch. I have one power left in me, and maybe that is to take away his parking spot. I know he loves it, my parking spot.

I also look forward though to a new role working with the seniors as the member responsible for the seniors, but I really look forward to the continuing relationship with the member for Elmwood and maybe find another spot out in the flower garden for him, but I really enjoy that.

However, for the past couple of years as Minister of Urban Affairs and Minister of Housing, I have had the privilege of working with many dedicated and hard-working staff members. I would like to thank all the staff of Urban Affairs and Housing for all their help and support while I was their minister. I feel I

had a good working relationship during my tenure, and as a result, during my tenure, our government accomplished many changes to The City of Winnipeg Act with the passage of Bills 32, 61 and 62.

In our first term, we managed to change the structure of the Winnipeg City Council, giving the mayor and Executive Policy Committee more power in order to make council more accountable to its electorate. The mayor no longer chairs City Council meetings. There is now a presiding officer. This leaves the mayor free to defend the decisions of Executive Policy Committee on which he is chairman, and vote during council meetings.

Bill 32 that was worked on also merged the different City of Winnipeg pension plans, which were established by by-law, into one pension plan as well as making it necessary for the City of Winnipeg to avail itself of an ombudsman.

For the first time, candidates running for City Council will have to declare their expenses and contributions to their election campaigns. Each candidate must submit an audited statement after the election. This first case was just last fall when we had an election out in the St. Norbert area as the result of a member from St. Norbert being elected to this Chamber. There was an election out there, and I believe that the new election expenses act worked out quite well. There probably will be some changes required to that part of the bill, but the feedback I have received from City Hall is it worked out quite well.

* (2010)

Then Bill 61 set out the administration portion of The City of Winnipeg Act, i.e., the commissioners, and this bill was to deal with the nonpolitical. This is to deal with the so-called bureaucrats at City Hall, the bureaucrats to show that City Hall could have more flexibility in dealing with their administration, the nonrequirement of their having a commissioner. They can call him and set up the administration level to whatever they see fit, and I am sure they are looking forward to that level and that authority once they go between the 12 and 15 councillors for the next election.

Bill 62 abolished the additional zones around the city of Winnipeg, that is, removing planning jurisdiction for the areas within that zone from the City of Winnipeg.

In this vein, it was our government which set up a Winnipeg region committee comprised of

representatives from the City of Winnipeg and municipalities surrounding the city. This was established to provide a forum for discussion and development of strategies for issues which affect the city of Winnipeg and the rural municipalities which surround Winnipeg. In the past, many of the decisions made by City Council or vice versa have impacted on the surrounding municipalities or the city in a negative manner. With the establishment of this committee, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have a forum to discuss issues affecting them before these decisions are made.

Urban Affairs, Rural Development, the City of Winnipeg and the municipalities have had three or four of these meetings. The members throughout there have been very, very keen. We have now included Selkirk in those discussions. The mayor of Selkirk came to our last meeting. He partook in the meeting. He was very, very encouraged of what was going on. Also all the reeves and the councillors in that area participated, and we have probably all the municipalities for the first time. They do sit down with the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and the bureaucrats of the City of Winnipeg and they discuss these many, many concerns that are in this. It has worked out very, very well.

Speaking about the City of Winnipeg, I would like to maybe just remark about one item that I saw on today's docket paper. I have a lot of respect for the member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr). However, I guess the member for Crescentwood, not through his lack of, probably his lack of knowledge is what I would have to say very, very politely, because he still does not understand City Hall.

In his resolution that he put before the House, he reads in Resolution 10, WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg clearly states that an independent body composed of the president of the University of Winnipeg, the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Returning Officer of the City of Winnipeg shall be responsible for the drawing up of the new electoral boundary districts for the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, on one hand he is saying that he would like to abide by the boundaries, yet when this government and this minister went through that type of program back in 1988, the same Chief Justice, the acting president of the University of Winnipeg and the Returning Officer went about the city, meetings after meetings after meetings.

They came back to this minister and to this government, they came back with a

recommendation, with maps and showing 24 members were to be elected—24 councillors. Now, this member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) said he would abide by the ruling. Yet at that time he just ignored all their work, and now he says, in the rhyme that he is in, that he would accept their recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, that is as pure political as you can possibly get. I must say that the member just probably does not understand that there are reasons why you send out different committees. There are probably reasons why the NDP, and the socialist government at the time, sent out people to do the Cherniack report. There are reasons why we would send out a group, and a very, very qualified group of people, to do a report, come back with discussions in regard to the boundaries in the city of Winnipeg. If anyone would like to question or go over the experience of the three people selected—they are very, very good representatives. They will do the job well, and I am sure they will listen to the people and come back with recommendations to the minister.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like to say in regard to a couple of remarks put on the record by the socialist leader of the official opposition, what he mentioned in regard to different types of reports coming back to the government, I would like to maybe remind him that he wants to speak about people going out in the areas. I remember it very well. In 1970 there was a committee that went out to the public. Their committee composed of a minister, Cherniack, and a minister, Green, who went around the different parts of the city and said, here is the plan we are going to come up with. We are going to come with a plan. We are going to take all the 13 municipalities, put them all together and make sure it works.

* (2015)

They were going to take that closeness that was involved at the time of these different small areas of the city of Winnipeg, who were telling them at every meeting, we are happy with our garbage collection, we are happy with our police protection, we are happy with our fire departments. They took all these different municipalities and put them all together, so you lost all that personal contact.

He gets up on the floor today and he tells us today that because we are setting up boundaries, and because we are going to maybe have different kinds of boundary configurations, that he will not support that. Mr. Speaker, they are the ones who created

this monster that caused the trouble in 1970. They are the ones who came back with 50 councillors. Can you imagine 50 councillors to deal with the citizens of Winnipeg?

He is the one—it is his government that caused the trouble. He is the one who took that personal grass roots away from the people in the local areas—the old St. Vital's, the old Fort Garry's, the old Transcona's, the old areas of Elmwood. They are the ones who said we will decimate, we are going to lump them into one soup, one vegetable soup, and we will have them all eat the same kind of soup. They were the ones who could care less of what people were saying at those particular meetings. Then their government comes back in 1985, and they go out with another report. The first one they have the minister, Cherniack. The next one, oh, no, we are going to be nonpolitical. We are going to bring the son of the minister and let him chair the meetings so they can come back and tell us what we require.

Now, that is what they did. This is the nonpolitical, socialist attitude of that particular government that was in power. So do not that minister across the way, or their leader of the socialist party across the way, tell us that he knows anything about City Hall when he criticizes the method that is going to be used for this particular process.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the member did not understand City Hall when he was across the way, when he was the Minister of Urban Affairs. I think he brought in about four housekeeping bills or something along those lines. I know that he ignored the Shoal Lake agreement that was worked many, many years. He gets up and starts telling people across this way that we do not understand, we are going through the wrong process. He can go on and on and on, but it was his government, his socialist government, that created the monster of 50 councillors that is now coming out and coming forward showing you cannot operate that way.

When we came into office we suggested right away that there be a reduction in council. We now have decided and will have a committee come back and make suggestions to us supporting the reduction of council. If the member across the way figures that—if the opposition figures across the way that he is on the right side of the angels on this one, he better go outside and talk to these people who are telling him. He better go out and look and listen to people and see what they suggest about the size

of council. The member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) should go over there maybe also. He can go through that way and talk to the people of reduction in council.

Our government has appointed a Winnipeg Wards Review Committee comprised of three people, all excellent representatives. In phase 1, Mr. Speaker, the committee will submit a report with recommendations on the number of council, somewhere between 12 and 15, whether committees should exist, whether they have one councillor elected from each ward, or a new ward system with more than one councillor representing a ward and the configuration of these wards. That is what they are coming out with. Yet they want you to believe that you are going to destroy the inter-little community committees. Anyone who has ever sat in City Hall will know that these different wards and community committees have not been ignored, and they will not be ignored.

If you take a look in the last four or five years, you will find out which community clubs were done in the last few years, you can look at the roads that were put in the last couple of years, you will see what Core Area has done in the last couple of years, you will see what North of Portage has done in the last couple of years. They are not being ignored, and they will not be ignored, yet they want to emphasize that you are taking the word away from these people in these little areas. That is wrong. They did that in 1970; they are the ones who created that monster and took that closeness that is required at City Hall level. They did it, Mr. Speaker. Presently these people will be going through on this committee approximately six public hearings in six different areas regarding the recommendations of the Legislature. They will be introduced in the House during this session.

The mandate in phase 2 is to submit a report to the government with recommendations on the boundaries and the names of each ward in the city of Winnipeg. There will be a public hearing involved in this phase as well, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the original dog-and-pony show that was put on by the previous socialistic government in 1970 and then again in 1985, they will listen to the people and come back with their recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, as a former Minister of Housing, I am proud of the accomplishment of our government in this particular area. For the first time since 1972—I must emphasize in '72—I think the previous

administration during that process I think had nine ministers in their tenure, and they made no changes to The Landlord and Tenant Act, no changes at all. They made no changes whatsoever in regard to that.

* (2020)

We brought in legislation to change, and challenge, and work with the different housing groups that deal with that particular legislation, unlike the members across the way who always want to come forward with these new ideas. They make that slip and forget once in a while. The critic of Housing over there, his idea, I think, of legislation or to change housing in this Chamber or in this province is to bring in a—I think he mentioned it last session, he was going to bring in a capital gains tax on all homeowner-occupied houses. People work all their lives to build in capital for houses; that person over in Burrows or the member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) wants to tax everybody. He wants to take all their—they have gone and made mortgage payments for 20 to 30 years; he wanted to tax everybody. Oh, yes, he wanted to do all that.

Mr. Speaker, the act that we introduced, once proclaimed, will reorganize the Landlord and Tenant Branch and the Rent Appeal Branch into one identity. The new legislation will eliminate diversified jurisdictions currently in place to deal with the very, very important landlord and tenant issues. The new administrative structure will be able to deal with evictions, small claims, pertaining to landlord and tenant matters and with the enforcement of repairs or work orders by municipal authorities. The act also created a Residential Tenancies Commission, a special tribunal to hear appeals from decisions and orders of the Residential Tenancies Branch. This will decrease the time for decisions regarding appeals tremendously.

Mr. Speaker, the socialist Leader of the Opposition got up today, and he mentioned in regard to housing being down in this particular province. He wants to look at housing across Canada. He will see it is down drastically. Yet, you know, you did not see him talking about suburban sprawl when the houses were being built in parts of St. Boniface and parts of St. Vital throughout the city. He was wanting to take credit for the housing starts, and then he was complaining about suburban sprawl. Continually, he talks from one side of his mouth to the other, flip-flop, flip-flop. He continually does that. Maybe that is what socialists do in this

town. I do not know, but that is what he does anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the government, through the present Core Area Initiative and housing, initiated the CAIGHO grants towards the purchase of homes in the core area. He was just saying we are forgetting about the core area. Although this program was slated to go from December 1990-April of '91, within a month and a half all the monies designated for this program had been allocated to the purchase of the home. A hundred and eighty purchasers had their grants processed thus far, and there are still some grants being processed at the present time. You can go on and on about that particular program.

Mr. Speaker, maybe to give you some ideas on what has happened with a particular program, the average grant, maybe you would like to listen to some details. Here are the people on the other side of the House saying, hey, it did not help the core area. It did not help the core area at all. Maybe you would like to hear what it did for the core area.

The average grant was \$8,464. Mr. Speaker, it worked with singles—42 percent of those that were granted were singles, 25 percent married with children, 22 percent married with no children, 11 percent single-parent families. Household size, 41 percent were one-person households, 26 percent two-person households, 16 percent were three-person households, 9 percent four-person. The average age of the clients, 31 years was the average age of the clients. Purchasers' previous residence—and this is very, very important—42 percent of the people who bought those homes in the CAIGHO Program moving into the core area, 42 percent, 58 percent moving within the core area.

Mr. Speaker, a very, very important thing also was it was tried to imply that the people were not moving into the core area, and they were outside in the fringe areas of the core area. Twenty-seven percent were in the targeted areas, 13 percent in the north end, 27 percent—and the member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) should look at this—of the CAIGHO were in his area, 24 percent in the west end, 3 percent in Wolsley, 5 percent in St. Boniface, and 1 percent in Fort Rouge.

So you can certainly say that it was a good distribution of that particular area, and it was a good program. It is the type of program that you cannot continue it on, complete continue. You would have to bring it in and bring in the amounts, because what

happens—if anyone knows anything about the real estate business—is once a program gets known, then all of a sudden you have an area where all of a sudden the prices of the houses have gone up.

* (2025)

So the member for Elmwood will probably go out in his area. He knows that the price of the houses went up in Elmwood by about \$10,000 after we got this program part way through the year. They did. The housing was affected. When they knew the CAIGHO was out there, the housings were affected by about \$10,000. So you cannot leave the program in. -(interjection)- No, they went up. They went up. Exactly, they went up. I will get you the figures where they went up, to the member for Elmwood.

Mr. Speaker, just recently an announcement was made by my honourable colleague, the new Minister of Housing regarding the formation of the Manitoba Housing Authority. I know the opposition parties are opposed to this initiative, but had they read the Peat Marwick report, they would have realized this consulting group confirmed the existence of inefficiencies and inconsistencies in the existing program.

Mr. Speaker, within the housing authority system, in the assessment the consultants pointed out that a regionalized system can potentially offer the advantages of a more efficient use of property management, manpower and the economics of a more centralized bulk purchasing capability. It was therefore concluded that the establishment of a single housing authority organized around district offices and structured to encourage and facilitate local community and tenant involvement would result in a more effective and efficient property management system. The savings alone that will go back into the housing would be approximately \$3 million.

We are constantly told by the opposition, come up with new innovative ideas on how you save money and how you can put more monies back into the program. Well, we have taken money out of the administration, and we are putting more money into the program. That is exactly what the whole idea is about. It is not new, it has been done in other provinces. We are taking money out of that system.

Under the old system there were 98 housing authorities and communities throughout Manitoba, each being an independent and incorporated body with no share capital. Board members were appointed by the Minister of Housing to serve on a

volunteer basis. Each authority derived its annual operating budget from Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, and within certain limits, operated independently.

The new housing authority is a separately incorporated body with no share capital created under the provisions in the Housing Renewal Corporation, its board of directors to be appointed by the Minister of Housing, and its board to be responsible for the overall management of the Manitoba Housing Authority. This new housing authority will be composed of district offices and one head office in Winnipeg. The district offices throughout the province will be quasi independent with a district manager responsible for the day-to-day operations and reporting directly to the head office at Winnipeg.

The other persons assigned to these district offices will be persons responsible for the tenant-community relations, maintenance and operation.

Now, to the member from across the way, I know the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) wants to know, you have done away with the housing authority. She is completely incorrect. One fundamental issue which was raised by the opposition members like herself was the lack of tenant and community input into the operations such as this. The Manitoba Housing Authority has made provision for social housing advisory groups. They are the ones who will be still carrying out and reporting and discussing the different housing authorities with those particular groups throughout the province, to encourage local community and tenant involvement and management of the social housing portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, these groups will also be able to provide advice to the MHA on a locally sensitive issue. Tenant associations will be encouraged and funding will be increased to these associations if the district manager confirms this association, represents the interests of the majority of the tenants and the project or groups of projects. The funding of these groups is being increased to encourage more effective participation of the tenants and the management of their housing projects. If tenants participated more in the managing of the projects, the vandalism, et cetera, would decrease sufficiently and make everyone happy.

You are still going to have your advisory groups. The only thing is now you are going to be having

people—the management will look after the money and will look after the different projects. You are still going to have your advisory groups. It is nothing new. It is done in B.C., it is done in Alberta, and it is done in Saskatchewan, and they are looking at the larger regional areas in Ontario, and now they are even talking under that administration to even look at more regionals so they can operate more efficiently.

Our government, as one of its priorities has continually supported the women to this end and housing has provided new facility. Throughout the province, this government has continued to provide housing facility, the Westman Women's Shelter, the Osborne House as well, and as well the first Native women's shelter. We have produced, we have not just talked about providing for the abused, we have provided shelters, something the previous administration did not provide.

I know that Housing right now is working on two more women's shelters, one for Dauphin and one for Portage la Prairie. This government will continue to help people, children and seniors in cases of family violence or abuse of any kind. This is one of our many priorities.

* (2030)

Mr. Speaker, another of the government's priorities is the senior population of our province, those citizens who are 55 and over. While I was Minister of Housing, I was gratified by the number of senior citizen projects that our government was able to sponsor.

The majority of the nonprofit housing built in Manitoba during our tenure in government had been senior units to provide affordable and accessible housing for those seniors in the low and middle income bracket, who without our help could not live in these types of accommodations.

The Department of Housing, in conjunction with the Seniors Directorate and the federal government, put on a symposium last year called: Housing Seniors Effectively. This symposium was well attended. The majority of seniors who attended felt that seniors should have more say in their housing, especially when as most of us grow older mobility becomes a factor.

I know this government will be looking at this problem very carefully, and I am sure there will be initiatives that will come forward from this symposium.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Manitoba has a strong commitment to ensuring that the seniors of Manitoba have a safe and healthy living environment. We know that elderly Manitobans want to be independent and remain in their homes. Our government wants to work with them in achieving this goal.

Last session, Mr. Speaker, in the throne speech, a commitment was made to provide an awareness campaign to combat financial abuse of elderly. By the end of this summer the Seniors Directorate will have in place a provincial public awareness campaign to help combat this financial abuse.

The federal government will share costs equally with the province to produce an information package for seniors. This information package, produced by the Seniors Directorate in conjunction with the federal government and the Canadian Bankers' Association, will consist of a video, plan book, posters and brochures. This package will be available nationally to seniors and care providers to assist them in identifying financial abuse.

We also offer advice on preventing various forms of financial abuse, including power of attorney, home repair and maintenance fraud and the care provider abuse.

The directorate, in conjunction with the Emergency Measures Organization in Manitoba—which is an arm of my other portfolio, Government Services—is looking at other safety issues such as what to do in emergencies, disasters, plus how to keep the living environment safe from accidents. As most of you know the majority of accidents occur in the home. For seniors these accidents more often than not have serious consequences.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to ask all members to work together in these difficult economic times that have been laid out in our throne speech. Manitoba can only be strong if her citizens work together and try to be reasonable about their demands for funds.

As the Lieutenant-Governor stated in his address, we do have these financial concerns and financial times ahead of us. I ask the members to be patient. I ask the members to work with the different levels of government in providing the necessary goals that are required through this session.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

We are faced with difficult choices, Mr. Acting Speaker, but these choices cannot be avoided. There is no money, and our challenge is to spend the money we have wisely.

Remember, unlike the socialist we have to plan, Mr. Acting Speaker.

In closing, Mr. Acting Speaker, I would just close with this: I think socialism is a form of government under which too many adults and not enough children believe in Santa Claus.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Acting Speaker, I wanted to begin by congratulating the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) for her appointment to the cabinet and wish her well in that endeavour. I would hope she is able to do some things that we wish to see done in Consumer and Corporate Affairs that her predecessor was unable to do.

However, I do want to at this point give the previous minister some credit for being able to get The Business Practices Act through this cabinet and through the government, which I gather people consider quite amazing, given the ideological bent of the government to have it, in fact after having pulled the act, after having pulled the bill in the session before the election, than to have them come back after winning their supposed majority, have them reintroduce it I thought was quite a feat, in spite of the well-known views of the Chamber of Commerce and others, with respect to the bill.

I am very interested in knowing from the minister, and perhaps I will ask her at a later point, as to when the act will be proclaimed, because it is one thing to pass acts—many of us know such acts as The Treasury Bill Act and others, The Treasury Branch Act, were passed years and years ago and never proclaimed. I am concerned about that.

Another area, before the former Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs moves too far, I did want him to hear this. When the current Minister of Government Services was the opposition critic in the Legislature back in 1986, he did not make a lot of speeches during the two years he was critic. There were one or two speeches, I have the Hansard. In his two speeches in those two years he talked about bringing in a lemon law. I think the new minister would be well-advised to pull out that speech, those two speeches, and perhaps I could give her a copy if she wishes. In opposition, that critic did talk about lemon law and how important it was.

You know the moment they got elected, the moment they became the government, they forgot about lemon law. Where was the former Minister of Urban Affairs in that cabinet, in that caucus when the subject of lemon law came up? I listened earlier to some interjections on the part of the former minister and the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), where the Member for Crescentwood was reminding the minister of something else that he had forgotten while he was in government.

In addition, the minister's speech reminded me of the old days when that government was in opposition, and they were picking on—they had isolated one or two of the NDP ministers. I remember they referred to them as the walking dead. I have been waiting for—you know, history will repeat itself, and I see the signs of it now. Two ministers have been booted out of cabinet. I notice "Jim Walding Day" celebrations were put on hold this year. I found that passing strange. The last two years they had their ritual here. The Conservatives had their party, you know, a big fanfare on "Jim Walding Day" and this Friday, nothing. What happened? I inquired of one of their members and they said, well, you know things are a little sensitive over here these days, very sensitive, no more "Jim Walding Days." I thought it was going to become a statutory holiday the way they were talking before.

Now they can rightly claim to have their own group of walking dead. They have the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery), they have the former Rural Development minister, they have my friend the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld), the former Minister of Housing who is now the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Ducharme)—as a matter of fact he spent his whole 40 out of his 45 minutes talking about what he should have done as the Minister of Urban Affairs. It is too late, those days are gone. It is too late. There is a new minister in charge -(interjection)- and he has had his 15 minutes.

* (2040)

Now before I get into the throne speech, I did want to deal with the previous speech, a couple of more points on the previous speech before I forget, but the minister did make some reference to housing sales being robust in January because of the core area CAIGHO grants. I do not know where the minister gets his understanding of what happened to the real estate market in the month of January, but he is indicating to me that somehow the price of housing in Winnipeg under the CAIGHO grant in the

core area part that it applied to, is saying that the price of housing went up \$10,000. I think that is absolute silliness.

The fact of the matter is that housing sales in the city of Winnipeg actually dropped in the month of January from, I believe around 1,300 sales last year, down to about 1,000 this year, so by anybody's mathematics that has got to be between a 20 and 25 percent drop. The price of housing dropped about \$5,000, so I do not know where the minister can make the argument that the price of housing went up \$10,000. Why would that be important anyway? Why is that important? If they went up \$10,000, that just simply means that a bunch of vendors ate a bunch of public money. That is what happened.

What the minister is telling me is that what happened is that he brought in a government grant, taxpayers' money, and the people increased the price of their home \$10,000 and pocketed the money. That is the kind of thing we are trying to avoid. I thought this government, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is trying to rein in the outflow of public money that is being dissipated through different tax loopholes and tax grabs and freebies and so on, so why is this such a good program? Why is this such a big deal if all that happened, according to him, is that people just increased the price of their houses \$10,000, so the vendors got \$10,000 more than they would have normally?

But that is not what happened. That is not what happened at all. The fact of the matter is the program started December 1, and by the time anybody found out about it was the first of January. The whole program was sold out in about a week, a week and a half at the most. There are 1,200 agents in this city; there are only 200, 225 people who were accepted for this grant. That is what it was; that is what it was all about. So how is this any big initiative? If anything, it is just a bit of a tax grab, a loss of provincial tax revenue.

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, I did want to deal with the overall economic situation that we find ourselves in right now, and make some comments about how things change in reality they really stay the same. This group found themselves in government, because in fact they did not win anything, it was the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) who actually won, who got the gift certificate for 20 seats in the 1988 election. She was the real winner of the '88 election, not the Conservatives. As a matter of

fact, they started the election at 50 points in the polls and almost managed to lose it. But nevertheless give them credit, they held on.

I know the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) really does not like what I am going to say because we have discussed this before, but what in fact happened is they found themselves in a minority situation, and they found themselves simply basically acting out the final two years of the NDP program. They took the Eugene Kostyra budget that defeated the government, and they reintroduced it and improved it a little bit in the area of health and a couple of other areas, and that was the end of it.

They followed through like the NDP government would have, and luckily they were somewhat scandal free. You know they had a little better luck than we did in the last two years of the mandate, and they went into an election following through those final two years of the NDP mandate. They promised that what you see is what you get. Was that not what it was? All right.

You know, vote for us, and we will continue in the same sort of moderate vein that we have over the last couple of years. We will not surprise you. The economy is in fairly good shape. We have given tax breaks and the land is strong. He rode his canoe and did the other things—the Premier did. He managed to win this massive majority, you know, the Jim Wadding majority again. Right, the 30 seats. So that is where they found themselves.

They obviously learned from the federal Conservatives, because in 1988 what did the federal Conservatives do? They changed their strategy in the months preceding the election, because they were hopelessly behind in the polls. They ended up literally buying the by-election wherever it was in Quebec where Mr. Bouchard ran. They basically bought that election. It was a billion dollars, I think, worth of promises in that federal riding.

They promised a whole lot of mega projects. There was the Lloydminster, Saskatchewan, energy projects, heavy-oil projects, and on and on and on, a whole series of these things. Was that not the election where they promised day care? Was that not the election where they promised a universal day care program and all these nice things? When the election was over and the smoke cleared and they had won their majority, within weeks the deficit was a serious problem.

We did not hear a darn thing about the deficit in the run-up to the election, nothing at all. Why should we? I mean the way they were announcing their spending, they put the provincial Liberals to shame in the last two years. We all know what they promised, what \$700 million and rising, and that was not even counting what they promised during the election itself. In any event, they went wild in their spending promises, did not talk about any kind of deficit reduction.

Within weeks of the election there was absolute necessity that the deficit be addressed, and away went all these mega projects. They were all shelved, and they were put on hold. We got into this agenda of restraint. Well, that is exactly what we are doing right now. The only difference is that this group over here learned from Mulroney and realized that they could not announce these spending cuts immediately after the election. I mean, they could not be as crass as Mulroney. They could not do it after only two, three, four or six weeks, so they left it for two or three months.

So what we now see is the culmination of all of the truthfulness that should have been prevalent last fall is now coming out at this time. No one can convince me that the Minister of Finance did not know during the election that revenues were decreasing, that in fact revenues are going to drop 1 percent this year. Do not tell me or tell anybody over here that the Minister of Finance, the Department of Finance, did not know.

The Ontario election is a good example of that, how the Liberals sat on the true financial picture. I am prepared to suggest that perhaps beyond the Finance minister in Ontario and the Premier maybe the ministers and the members did not know. Perhaps, this was a closely guarded secret, but I am suggesting that they knew. They knew that there was going to be a billion dollar deficit while they went blithely campaigning and promising different things. I think that this government—maybe the members here, maybe the ministers were not apprised of the situation, but the Finance minister had to know that the revenues were down, because he gets his monthly reports.

* (2050)

He knows how things are going on a month-to-month basis. He is never going to convince me that this government was not aware, that at least the minister and the Premier were not aware of the true situation. No, they went because

they knew that would not sell. So they went out there, and he paddled his canoe and he ate hot dogs and he did all those different things that he had to do to win the election. Now we have the restrained budget.

What I find interesting, and what I applaud is the independent thinking of some of the members opposite. We will see how they develop as sort of perhaps a serious opposition here in the Legislature. The government is going to have to dance to their tune, because they are in fact a very, very powerful grouping—the two of them—in this Legislature right now.

In some ways they could be viewed as more powerful than even the opposition or the second opposition party, because they are in a position to write their own tickets. The government relies on their votes.

I do not know. I suppose it could be argued that if they do cut the spending by 20 percent or 25 percent, or whatever figure they finally decide on in the budget, they in fact may be able to blame it on those two members. In fact, those two members may relish the idea of cuts, because I know the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) is one who does want to see cuts in government spending. He has never liked this, the increases in government spending. He has always wanted decreases.

I am not sure about the two members that are not in the cabinet right now, as to how they view. What I am saying is that I am not sure where they stand on the deficit reduction side of things.

Regardless of where they stand on that issue, the government has to get their permission on all sorts of other issues. -(interjection)- That is right. The key here is votes. Will they vote with the government?

What I am suggesting to you is, regardless of what they say about the deficit situation and the cutbacks, that they have their own agenda for things they want spent in their constituencies. That runs counter to what the Finance minister wants to do in terms of spending.

What you may see here is the provincial budgeting process feud with cuts across the board of 20 percent throughout the province, except for Emerson and Portage la Prairie. The people of Portage la Prairie and Emerson are going to get their due finally. They are going to re-elect these members forever.

They are going to be thrilled, because Highway 75 is not going to be a toll road. It is going to be a four-lane or a six-lane. Whatever Jack wants, he is going to get. All he has to do is tell them how many. They are going to be asking him, four lanes or six? Do you want blacktop or do you want redtop? I mean he can have anything he wants. He can write his own position.

The member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) is in a great position, and he knows it. I do not know about the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner), whether he clearly understands. I think he does. The member for Portage la Prairie, he knows, and he does not mind letting them know that he knows how powerful he really is.

I am sure he is lying awake at night thinking about all those things that Portage needs. Once again it will be, Ed, how many lanes do you want—right—do you want six or do you want eight? Do you want blacktop or do you want a different type of covering on the road? Whatever they want is what they are going to get—

An Honourable Member: Well, we have to watch Rossmere, too.

Mr. Maloway: And in Rossmere, but I do not know how we could pave any more of Rossmere. There is enough pavement out there, and I would suggest the Premier resist, but the member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) I do not think will ever ask for those sorts of things because he has always told me how he detests public spending of any type, and he would just like to wind this government down so he can get to Florida permanently, and this is a bother being here.

You know, of course, the sooner the free trade deal reaches such logical conclusions that we become one of the states, of course, then he will not have those worries. We will be transferring our jurisdiction over to the central command in Washington, which brings me to the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns). I know normally we have a lot of fun, but he is not within earshot at the moment so maybe I will hang on—I have got a bit of time left—and deal with him later.

The free trade deal, the scenario surrounding free trade and how we suggested it was going to turn out, is in fact unfolding the way we predicted. I had to really smile last year when the current Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst), the member for Charleswood made some statements about how effective the free trade deal had been. I remember

how three years ago when the free trade deal was formulated and signed that the most supportive that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) would be about the free trade deal was more of a defensive reaction. He said, well I can see where this deal is not going to be that great, but what happens if we do not sign it? That is what I am worried about. You know, the fear of the unknown. If we do not sign this thing we are going to be in worse shape, so we had better attach our signature to it. But even he was not suggesting that in fact there was going to be a tremendous amount of benefits.

On the other hand, the member for Charleswood was quite exuberant about the free trade deal and suggesting that it was going to be a big boom for Canadian business, and in fact he mentioned some stats that proved wrong just a few months ago last fall, trying to make the case for free trade. But the fact of the matter is that we outlined this many times during the free trade debate, that any time you look at a free trade deal between any two jurisdictions in past history, it has in the end resulted in the dominance of one over the other. It cannot really be any other way. There can be no level playing field when you have a giant and a little partner.

The fact of the matter is that 100 or so years ago before Hawaii joined the United States, and I believe Puerto Rico as well, both these jurisdictions got into a free trade deal with the United States, and after a period of five or ten years, they were so dependent on the United States that when the time came to possibly get out of it, it was impossible. They had to join up, and that is basically what we are seeing happen here is that we are selling our sovereignty, we are selling our soul supposedly not to gain jobs, but to save what we have got.

I mean, that was the Minister of Finance's line that we are going to try to save what we have got. But that has not been the case. We have actually been losing more, and now they want to get us into a free trade deal with Mexico, and once again that is being viewed as a defensive reaction. How a free trade deal with Mexico is going to in any way benefit Canada is beyond me, but the fact of the matter is that the Conservatives have this overall agenda. The agenda of deregulation, the agenda of privatization, the decentralization, the free trade deal are all part of the overall plan to basically bring us under the American orbit. I mean, as if we are not already under the American orbit. We certainly are and have been for years, but we are going to be a

jurisdiction who, in a few years, will have to ask for membership as one of the United States.

What happens and is happening and will happen with respect to the free trade deal is it basically comes down to the lowest common denominator. What happens is when you take away the tariffs that we have, you get into a competition for businesses. Right now, we are losing the competition for businesses in a big way, because what is happening—(interjection)—We are, because what is happening is Americans are advertising for businesses to set up across the border, tax incentives and tax forgiveness and so on, and free this and free that, convincing them to set up on the other side of the border.

What flows from that—and we are seeing that with CKY and other labour disputes—is a depression in wages in the country. If we have to compete with—I will give you an example. The member for Charleswood, perhaps, would like an example.

* (2100)

There is a fur manufacturing plant in my constituency that employed, I believe, 75 or 80 people a couple of years ago. The person who was negotiating the collective agreement with the Food and Commercial Workers, the management told the workers that if they did not take a 30 percent pay cut that he was going to set up his plant in North Carolina I believe it was, one of the Carolinas.

In actual fact what happened was that they signed the agreement, and he moved some jobs anyway. The result is that after a year and a half, that particular plant in Elmwood is now employing, I believe, 13 to 15 people, down from 75. Now you cannot fault the business, because the business is trying to operate in an environment that gives them the best possible deal. So if they can operate in North Carolina at nonunion wage rates, do not have to pay the benefits and can still sell back up into our markets here without much problem, then they are going to do that kind of thing.

So the free trade deal has had a detrimental effect, and it is an accelerating effect. It starts out at a certain level, but it accelerates as the time goes on, and it will prove to be even more detrimental as the time goes on. In fact—(interjection)—it is very interesting. The member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) makes some comments from his seat, but when the free trade deal was coming in a lot of people mistakenly felt that somehow they were

going to be able to buy American goods now at half price or three-quarters of the price.

They were anxiously looking forward to the day when they would be able to buy all these cheap goods, but they were looking at it in the context of buying these goods with their current salaries. Nobody, at the time, thought of themselves as potentially unemployed or potentially earning half of what they were before. They were not thinking of it in terms of \$8-an-hour jobs and \$6-an-hour jobs. They were thinking of it in terms of \$12- and \$15-an-hour jobs.

Mr. Acting Speaker, you will know that if you look at the list of jobs that have been lost over the last year, you will find that a good chunk of those jobs are the good-paying jobs. A good chunk of those jobs are the unionized jobs that were well-paying and with those jobs people could afford to feed themselves properly, clothe themselves properly and live in a proper lifestyle. Now, if in fact they have to end up living five years from now on \$6- and \$7-an-hour jobs because they have to compete with Louisiana and North Carolina, then where are these benefits going to be from all of the low-priced imports? They are not going to be there.

When you look at the issue of shopping in the United States, people are heading down to the United States to buy cheaper products. A study was done last year which indicated that in fact looking at a basket of items that were bought in the United States, they were not any cheaper. There was some false economy in shopping in the United States because it was a myth. It was really a myth. It was a mind-set that somehow if you went down to the United States everything would be cheaper. What they found was that some of the products were in fact the same price; some were more expensive. There were certain items that were a fair amount cheaper.

What people have to understand is that if you do not patronize your local businesses, you are not going to have them. They are not going to be able to pay the taxes as the member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) is alluding to. They will not be able to pay them, because if people are out shopping in the malls in North Dakota they are not going to be spending their money here, and the malls here are going to be going out of business and will not be able to pay their taxes. It just makes common sense that we should be trying to patronize and support our own local business if we are looking in the long-term

interests of those businesses and that economy surviving.

You look at northern Manitoba, if no effort is made to do something in Swan River, and in the north to keep businesses there—it can always be cheaper. You can always produce something cheaper somewhere else. You cannot find me a product anywhere that cannot be produced cheaper somewhere else but companies do not necessarily do that. They, for a variety of reasons, decide they are going to stay where they are. They do not head down south, but provided that there is not a huge incentive, and when you start looking at the incentives that they have to move then that is something that has to be addressed because we cannot afford to be bled dry of good jobs.

Let us look at some of the job losses and layoffs that we have had here just in Manitoba. I mean it is almost a daily occurrence. Almost every day, every second day there are major layoffs going on and these layoffs have a rippling effect in the economy. They have a domino effect.

Certainly many of you are aware of businesses that have gone bankrupt over the years, that in fact were in decent financial shape themselves. What took them down was not their lack of business acumen or business practices, but the fact that some of their creditors went under. In the case of a certain business they might have \$100,000—a printer might be owed \$100,000 from a business who does go down, and what happens is that because that business went down it cannot pay its creditors, and so it takes down a whole bunch of businesses with it. That is the effect of the domino effect on it.

So when we just give statistics like Paulin-Interbake losing 300 jobs, we have to look beyond just that figure of 300 jobs and look at the lives of the people that are affected by those 300 jobs. In fact if one member of the family, and that is the only person who is working in the family is working at Paulin's, then you can multiply that 300 by many times to get the real true effects. If you have a family of four and one person is working at Paulin's and now they are unemployed, that is four people being negatively affected because of what happened in that particular situation.

Repap, 225 jobs—I mean, we have a serious problem out there. Repap itself has been put on a credit watch by its creditors. A couple of months ago its share prices had fallen—are cut in half over the

last year. We have a very, very serious situation, and to expect that somehow Repap is going to be able to—that the whole economy is going to be able to turn around very quickly is possibly a lot of wishful thinking. For example, let us—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please; order, please. Those honourable members wishing to carry on a conversation you could do it in the loge or outside the door. It is getting a little difficult to hear.

Mr. Maloway: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) last fall suggested that interest rates either were going to come down two points or should come down two points to put the economy in better financial shape. That was interesting because at that time there was a study that came out that suggested that interest rates were going to go up as opposed to come down. The minister at least saw one figure go the right way. The rates have gone down by 2 percent. One could make the argument that the economy is so shellshocked that you could take the rates down to 2 percent and nothing would happen.

It would be very interesting to see if you could drop the interest rate a point a week for a period of time to see how long it would take for the economy to turn around. It is wrong to think that somehow, if you drop the interest rates, the economy is going to start producing. It just will not work that way. People's psychology, the mind-set, the psychology is set in. We are deeply mired in this recession psychologically, and so even if the interest rates were to drop by three or four or five points, would the economy take off or would people still hold back?

There are buildings in this town that people cannot give away. I could take you to a building right now that is worth about \$3 million. It was sold last September for a million and a half. The deal fell through because the people who bought it decided they cannot afford it because they are losing money in other provinces.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Today you could not give the building away. You could not give the building away for a dollar. Why? Because there are no tenants. You cannot find tenants who could sustain that building—the operating cost of the building. That is a related example to the example I just gave about the question of interest rates. If interest rates were to fall today, if they were to fall to 2 percent, would the

economy take off? It is an interesting argument. It is an interesting question as to whether anything would happen.

This is the second biggest depression, perhaps the biggest depression, since the Great Depression of the 1930s. One could make the argument that even if the economic conditions turn around to where they are right for expansion again, in fact, nothing may happen—nothing may happen for a few months, maybe even a year, maybe even longer. We may be into this for a long, long time.

* (2110)

Now the question is, what should the government, what should we as legislators be doing about this? I read a paper, an Ontario paper, the other day in which the government is doing something. There is a government that cares about doing something about the recession. In fact, Shelley Martel, the Northern Development minister, has made five trips now since last August into Northern Ontario. She has gone around and announced a whole series of projects.

These are not the make-work projects that the Conservatives talk about, the green signs that they suggest we had up all over the place, and did not create long-term employment and so on. No, these are projects that are necessary, sewer treatment plants and road construction and other types of—hospital expansion—infrastructure. These are the kinds of things that the government is going to have to do anyway over the next five to 10 years.

The Ontario government has seen fit to prime the pump in a recession in an effort to get us out of the recession earlier. That may be one of the reasons why Ontario is projected to be out of the recession earlier than Manitoba, because Manitoba and the federal government are doing nothing. There are no initiatives at all coming out of the federal government, other than to slash, hack and burn, which is what the Lyon government was all about, the forerunners of this government.

There are some veterans of the Lyon government over there. I see a few of them. They are trying to hide, but they cannot hide. They have to stand up and be counted. They took this province through the period of acute protracted restraint back in 1981-82. The people of this province have not forgotten. They have not forgiven. They will never forgive these people for that period.

This government learned a little bit from that. They knew that in Sterling's case he fired a civil servant

and had a press conference to announce it. He really did not do as much cutting as he was—I mean he did a lot, but not as much as he was suggesting he was doing.

These guys are a little more insidious. They are pretending that they are very moderate and trying to look reasonable, but in fact they are going to slash and hack. They are going to make Sterling Lyon look like a piker, but there are those around who know that the label stuck. They were terrified of the ghost of Sterling Lyon peering over their shoulder during the election, because I know a couple of them were telling me: Oh, God, do not bring out Sterling Lyon. Sterling Lyon has nothing to do with us any more, we do not even know the guy. You know, we are a very moderate group of Conservatives.

That is going to change now. We are going to see them as they really are. Those hackers and slashers and burners over there are going to be coming to the fore in a big major way before too long. That is going to show up the difference between our approach and their approach. Then we are going to smoke the Liberals out as to which way they are going to go, because I predict we are going to have one on one side and one on the other side again.

The member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), maybe he will come over here. The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), he will be over there. That way they will be able to ride the fence, ride both sides, as they tried to do with FOS. We all remember FOS, right? They rode the fence and they ended up losing in a big, big way because of it. They are going to be caught in the squeeze here.

From what I know of the situation right now they are buying in, in a big way, to the Conservative cut, hack, slash and burn. That is what they are doing right now, but we will see how they vote on the budget. We will see what they do over the next period of time on the government.

I did want to talk about the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), and I see he is within earshot now, before my time wraps up. The member spent a lot of time attacking one of our members earlier on the war in the Persian Gulf, and I wanted to put it on the record that the member for Lakeside had that same speech for 25 years. He is the dean of the House now, 25 years, 26 years. It was easy for him being an MLA. He had that cold war speech. He had that one speech, and he came out here and he gave it every year. He did not even need notes. He just went and gave the speech. Then the cold war ended, and

he was at a loss. What was he going to do, half his speech was gone? So I can see that now he is getting back into the swing of things today, but I have to remind him that the cold war is still dead. He should get rid of some of that cold war rhetoric and get into the 1990s, become a little more relevant to the times. I know that he is living back in the '60s at times here. Anyway, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gerry McAlpine (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to stand before the House today and offer my reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to begin by welcoming all the members back to this new session. I also want to welcome back those young people who so ably served us as pages in the last session. I hope the legislative process continues to be an educational and enjoyable experience for all of you.

Mr. Speaker, I do also want to say how extremely pleased I am to see you back as the Speaker for this session and my colleague from Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) as Deputy Speaker. I congratulate you both.

I also congratulate my colleagues, the Honourable Linda McIntosh and the Honourable Eric Stefanson, on their appointments. I wish them both well and good fortune in the new responsibilities.

During my first session as the representative for Sturgeon Creek, I have been afforded a number of unique opportunities, both within and outside the Legislature. I have had the opportunity to meet with businesses, seniors, youth and community groups from within my constituency to discuss their concerns and ideas regarding the future of our province.

People are pleased with the direction this government is taking and look forward to the initiatives we will bring forward during our term in office. It is with pride that I look back upon the accomplishments of this government since my election. Specifically, I would like to touch on three themes, health care, services to people, and business development. I congratulate all the ministers responsible for these departments.

Firstly, Mr. Speaker, an area of interest to both myself and my constituents is health care. I recently had the opportunity and pleasure to serve with some of my colleagues on the War on Drugs Task Force. At this time, I would like to recognize the efforts of our members of our task force, committee chair,

Rosemary Vodrey, MLA for Fort Garry; Louise Dacquay, MLA, Seine River; and Ben Sveinson, MLA for La Verendrye. I commend all of them for their commitment and dedication during these hearings.

Mr. Speaker, it is understood that drug, alcohol and substance abuse are some of the most complex and disturbing problems facing our society today. As a matter of interest, it is probably fair to say that abuse in these areas creates one of the largest and most costly drains on our tax dollars as we may ever see. It is so widespread in affecting all levels of society—rich, poor, labour, executives, housewives, teens, children and even the unborn—yes, even the unborn who is addicted before it leaves the mother's womb. That is a real start for someone coming into this world, is it not?

* (2120)

This drain on our system in government affects most departments, if not all of them, but most notably, Health, Family Services, Education, Justice, Labour. Need I go on? It is so far reaching that the next few months we will be focusing on how we can make Manitoba strong and a better place to live. If that could be free of abuse from alcohol, drug and substance abuse, our plague in society, we would probably be over halfway there in working to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I see the abuse in my constituency, and I can see it in yours. As a matter of fact, I see it in every one of our constituencies of the members who sit in this House. It is very disturbing; it is hard not to become emotional about the problem when we see what it is doing and the devastation it is causing. It is devastating for individuals, for caring families and the entire communities.

Did you realize that a person who uses drugs and other substances not only affects themselves, but on average five other people in society today? Therefore, not only is the individual paying, but at least five other people are paying in some way or another but, ultimately, who pays in the end? Mr. Speaker, it is this government who is paying and let us not lose sight of that.

You know my interest in health care. I have a strong belief and understanding about health. I can see where we are going and ending up if we do not take the right path into the future. It is serious. To reflect on how serious a problem we have to address, I quote an excerpt from an article published in a magazine, "Canadian Centre of Substance

Abuse." It refers to health care of our neighbours to the west, but not unlike what is happening in Manitoba, I am sure.

The heading, "Special Teams Help Chemically Dependent Patients in B.C.," and I quote: Experience in British Columbia hospitals indicates that up to 40 percent of all general admissions to hospital are related directly or indirectly to alcohol or other drug use, but less than 2 percent are identified and treated as such. Approximately 521,000 British Columbians risk health damage due to excessive drinking. At least 50 percent of hospital emergency admissions are alcohol related. The health care costs of managing chemical dependency are staggering. It is estimated that in 1986-87, \$366.4 million of the ministry of Health budget was spent on alcohol-related health care in British Columbia.

I am going to offer an analogy as a better explanation of my beliefs. Mother Nature gave us this life. We have it to live to the full, and we have been given all the amenities that go with it. However, society has come to feel wiser and believes that it can do things better. In some ways, this may be so. In many ways, though, it has been taken too far, and we get out of balance with what is natural.

When we get out of balance, it often becomes abuse. Abuse leads to sickness. Whole-food nutrition is intended to support life. This being the case, why is it that the health care field so often ignores this fact of life by opting in favour of therapy? When I talk to people about health care, I cite the explanation that there are better alternatives to healthy lifestyles than the road we are on today with the use of drugs and chemicals and substitute methods as the means of improving health.

I believe it is important that we know what is happening to us when we take a foreign substance into our body, whether it be medication, alcohol or tobacco. Just as we have told our seniors through the Seniors Directorate to ask their doctors what they are being given, what are the side effects of the prescription and treatment on them, I believe it is important to know that when we take a drug that the drug takes over and affects the control of our systems. It is called substitution in its simplest form. When something takes over the normal function of our bodies or replaces it, the body, being adaptable as it is, withdraws. By this, the body is weakened. After a period of time, the body becomes dependent on the substance it is given, and it reacts violently when it is taken away.

Mr. Speaker, I am telling you this because it leads to another comparison I would like to point out at this time, a concern that is eating our financial resources to nothing to the extent of over half a billion dollars per year in interest. Over the last number of decades, our province and governments have felt reason to do the same with the financial well-being of our society. They have taken over these affairs for communities by pumping money into their problems and by doing so have weakened the communities. Like the body depending on the drug, the community and society become dependent on government money instead of doing for themselves. Like the body going through withdrawal in the next several months and years, the communities are going to have to live through the same pain and uncertainty due to the fact we are running out of money.

We as a government will have to be like the caregivers in helping society grow through these troubled times, by being caring and showing a willingness to help them over that line where dependency is not the one and only. Why do we have to do this? We will do it, because previous governments, provincially and federally, have put us in this dilemma. Now we have no other choice. This today is costing us billions. We need changes. I am proud to be associated with a government and a Leader who sees the urgency to turn this around and look at Manitoba in the whole for the solution out of these troubled times, a government that I see wants to create partnerships with communities and sincerely cares about all of the people, to work with labour and business, to build a strong business base from which all Manitobans can benefit.

Mr. Speaker, since being elected, I have been extremely busy and most thankful for the opportunity to serve my constituents and government in my area of interest, of which I have just talked about. As a member of a committee for war on drugs, we chose to address public concern through a province-wide consultation process which would allow the people directly affected by such abuses to share their ideas and experiences. I was able to travel to many parts of Manitoba and speak directly with people about the importance of prevention and community support in dealing with the problem of abuse. I believe this task force was perhaps one of the most educational and rewarding projects that I have been involved in, and I am proud to have played a part in it.

Awareness is a key component in understanding and dealing with social problems. Just as the War on Drugs Task Force sought awareness of substance abuse, so too are we taking steps towards the awareness of the abuse of the elderly, not the least of which is financial abuse. It is very disheartening to see people who have spent a lifetime striving for financial security lose their savings through abuse. Our public awareness campaign will enable seniors to better protect their life savings and thus allow them to live with the dignity they deserve.

* (2130)

As stated in the throne speech, Manitobans are now living healthier lifestyles due to policies and programs which promote good health. As an ardent supporter of health and wellness, I have long been an advocate of the role of prevention in health care. The Smoke Free Grads 2000 initiative is a perfect example of how education and prevention can promote better health. Smoking is a habit which is detrimental, affects not only the smoker but all those around him as well. It is startling to see that peer pressure has encouraged our children to begin the habit at a younger age than ever before and that experimentation with smoking often does lead to experimentation with other drugs.

This year's Smoke Free Grads: 2000 project was expanded to grade 2 in order to reach young people as early as possible. It is important to help create positive attitudes in our children so that eventually being a nonsmoker is the accepted peer norm, and so that peer pressure will discourage rather than encourage smoking. This government has made a conscious effort to maintain a strong commitment to the family unit.

The family continues to be the one aspect of society which plays a role in each individual's development. This was apparent when I attended Royal School with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) just last week to visit the children who are participating in the Smoke Free Grads: 2000 project.

Mr. Speaker, another area of helping our young people and families was during the past election when we committed to better protect children from accessing restricted video tapes with the introduction of a new video classification system in the province. To this end there were extensive consultations with community groups and video trade representatives. We as a government are responding to a concern by parents that information

was lacking regarding video tape content and its suitability for children.

There can be no arguing that we are raising our children in an age of video. One need only reflect on the proliferation of video shops and outlets on the wide range of available video material to realize how important it is for parents to be aware of the content of their children's videos. Under this new classification system, stickers will be attached to selected videos to inform Manitobans about the video's subject matter.

A new 18 and over classification will designate movies which depict sexual activity and excessively graphic violence. These videos must be kept out of sight, and it will be illegal to sell or rent them to people under 18.

To ensure compliance with this system, retailers and distributors are being licensed. This comprehensive classification system is a positive step toward limiting the accessibility of videos to minors, just as it is important to limit the accessibility and exposure to the use of alcohol, drugs, substance and smoking with our youth. Too often our youth are exposed to situations that make them feel and accept smoking, drinking and abusing drugs and the like are normal. This is serious when it is affecting children 12 years of age and younger.

Family violence is one of the most destructive and painful threats to the family unit. I am pleased to be a part of a government which has undertaken the domestic violence review which will be conducted by Winnipeg lawyer, Dorothy Pedlar. The review will examine and make recommendations on existing law, policies and procedures relating to domestic violence. It is our aim to ensure that victims are adequately protected and treated with sensitivity by the justice system, and that everything possible is being done to protect spouses and children from abuse.

This government has, I am proud to say, made great inroads in providing services to Manitobans. A high level of safety for Manitoba's roads and highways has always been an important issue. As a result, Manitoba has some of the toughest drinking and driving laws in the nation. This year we launched the second initiative aimed at making our roads safer for all Manitobans through the introduction of the new photo drivers identification. These licences are designed to prevent suspended drivers from using borrowed or stolen licences and thus keeping these drivers off our roads and

highways. This will correct a further abuse and one that has been too long in coming.

As some of you may know, I have been actively involved in the local youth justice committee. As an honorary probation officer in my constituency, I am particularly pleased that our government has been able to provide assistance to the Community Legal Education Association of Winnipeg. This association was established in 1984 and publishes pamphlets and booklets about law in addition to providing legal information and operating education programs for Manitobans. This is a valuable service which gets the community involved in a worthwhile cause. It provides alternate measures to young, first-time offenders who do not always have to be reprimanded in the courts. This is an alternative that is usually quicker, more effective and less expensive. It involves the community and the community's resources.

Business development is another theme which is of interest to me and my constituents. Our government continues to believe that creating new and better jobs is important to the economic agenda of this province. We, as Manitobans, can be particularly proud that MacLeod Stedman has chosen Winnipeg for the relocation of its head office. This relocation will bring over 100 new jobs and an additional \$2.2 million in annual payroll to Manitoba.

I am pleased that this government was able to assist in the relocation with a \$1.5 million repayable loan. This is a prime example of how our government continues to work towards building a favourable business climate in Manitoba, building partnerships for a stronger Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, as my constituency businesses will benefit from the spillover of related work, I am extremely pleased with the high priority that continues to be placed on aerospace strategic initiatives. Manitoba will soon be able to boast of a new high technology aerospace electronics facility which will be located in Winnipeg and eventually employ 70 people. GE Aerospace Canada recently announced this \$10 million investment plan which is anticipated will create over 400 total person years of work by the year 2000.

The creation of these jobs will contribute to the provinces high-tech capabilities in aerospace, defence and electronics. This also illustrates business confidence in Manitoba's economic future.

From the larger business to the small, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch for a moment on a

small business in Sturgeon Creek. For example, I recently had the pleasure of meeting the owners of Afanasiev Shoe Ltd., a family-run business specializing in orthopedic and custom footwear. It is especially unique in that it is the only such facility in Manitoba. It has operated since 1969, currently employs six people and adds to the vibrancy of business in Sturgeon Creek. They, too, as many small businesses in Sturgeon Creek, are struggling. Today they must diversify just to make ends meet. A business that was able to survive and grow on making orthopedic specialty footwear from contracts from across Canada are now including all types of shoes as well as shoe repairs for local residents.

We must continue to work towards maintaining such industries which bring opportunities and revenue to our province. Business development and economic issues are going to play a key role in Manitoba's future. Our province is fortunate to have diversified industries. We must work to maintain and expand these industries to protect jobs for Manitobans.

We are all aware of the fiscal realities of our province. Manitoba is facing a deficit which cannot be allowed to grow beyond its current level. Economic forecasts indicate that Manitoba's revenues will not increase much past their present level. At the same time, we are committed to maintain the quality of service to top priorities, namely health, education and family services.

We understand the importance of these priorities to Manitobans and at the same time recognize that Manitobans cannot afford an increased tax burden. We are determined to find new ways to stretch our tax dollars and to employ a policy of fiscal responsibility in order to make Manitoba strong. I have confidence in this government, and I have faith in the people of Manitoba.

Now we must work together, and it starts right here in this Chamber. It is time to work together as a government in selling this province, although I do not see this as the only task. No, I ask the members of the opposition parties and I ask the media: Do you want to continue to be part of the problem, or will you join us and be part of the solution?

* (2140)

Together we can work to achieve our goals and continue to build a strong and prosperous province for today and for the future.

Thank you.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to participate in the Throne Speech Debate, I do so with the needs and aspirations of the people of Burrows constituency in mind. Therefore, I will analyze the throne speech and see how it applies to the people I serve.

It is helpful then to know something about the socioeconomic conditions of the people I represent. There is no doubt that many residents of Burrows are seriously disadvantaged compared to the majority of Manitobans.

For example, it is well known that there is a direct link between education and income. In Winnipeg, 13 percent of adults have less than a Grade 9 education. In four census tracts in Burrows, the best rate is 22 percent with Grade 9 or less, and the worst rate is 37 percent.

In Winnipeg, 31 percent of adults have more than Grade 9, but less than Grade 12. In Burrows, the best rate in four census tracts is 35 percent. The worst is 40 percent.

The labour force participation rate in Burrows is 8 to 19 percent lower than for the whole of Winnipeg. During a relatively low unemployment year, the rate was 5 to 10 percent higher in Burrows than for the city of Winnipeg, and the unemployment rate for 15- to 25-year-olds was 8 to 14 percent higher than the unemployment rate for the entire city.

It is no wonder, then, that there are huge discrepancies in income as well, with many of the poorest of the poor living in Burrows. When the average family income in Winnipeg was \$38,705, in three census tracts in Burrows the average family income varied from \$20,000 to \$24,000.

When the incidence of low income in Winnipeg was 14 percent in three census tracts in Burrows, it was 33, 36 and 45 percent of families living in poverty.

The statistics for low-income, unattached individuals are even more startling. When the rate for Winnipeg was 41 percent, in three census tracts in Burrows the rate was 53, 56 and 71 percent. The figure 56 percent is significant, because it is the same rate as for single women in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence speaks for itself. The levels of education and income are much lower than for the city of Winnipeg, but the rate of unemployment, especially for people 15 to 25 is significantly higher. This means that the people of Burrows have tremendous needs. In particular, they

need improved educational opportunities. They need increased job opportunities and improvements to income-supplement programs so that their income can improve greatly in order to rise to levels or at least close to Winnipeg averages.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to go through this throne speech and see if it meets the tremendous needs especially of low-income people who probably constitute the majority of people in Burrows. The Tory government points out in the throne speech that the Manitoba economy is diversified and therefore is protected from the boom and bust economies of other provinces. While I agree that diversity is good, the people of Burrows and the people of Manitoba know that with the number of unemployed way up, that Tory times are tough times.

The throne speech says that "we have an unequaled quality of life in this province." While that is true for many Manitobans it rings hollow for many people in Burrows. What about the tenant who spends 50 percent of his income on rent? What about the people who every week go to food bank outlets in order to supplement their food allowance? What about the university graduates who cannot find a job? What about their quality of life? Is it unequaled? No, it is only equal to the poorest of the poor in Point Douglas and Broadway and Wolseley and other inner city constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech promised to get Manitoba moving in the right direction again. The problem with the direction is that there is no direction and no plan. The direction that is present but unspoken and unwritten is cut, cut, cut, slash, slash, slash. The direction is to downsize government. The direction is to privatize. The direction is to contract out. The direction is to do anything and everything possible to reduce expenses including offloading responsibility and finances to municipalities, school boards, nonprofit organizations and churches. That is the direction this Tory government is heading in, but they lack the courage and the moral conviction to be honest and to tell the public and to put it in their throne speech.

The government brags that Manitoba was last into the recession and quotes January statistics. The throne speech does not say that the current rate of unemployment is 9.5 percent. The government says that they will work with business to bring about recovery. Will this government listen to suggestions

from business? Will they listen to the Chamber of Commerce as they usually do and its suggestions?

The Province of Manitoba gave \$1.3 million to 134 Manitoba companies in 1989-90. According to the Free Press article of March 6, 1991, business tax expenditures—that is money the government could have collected but chose not to—amounted to \$90.5 million. This figure was provided to the Free Press by the Department of Finance. What does the Chamber of Commerce say about this? The Chamber president, Buddy Brownstone said in effect, stop giving grants to business. Brownstone says governments have not been too responsive to the no-aid call. Why is this? Could it be because the Tories accept political donations from corporations, and in fact raise the majority of their campaign funds this way? In 1989, corporate donations to political parties amounted to \$11 million according to Elections Canada.

While my party has been in favour of economic stimulus for business, we believe that it must be tied to job creation and that any tax concessions or grants must have provable results. The difference, Mr. Speaker, is that Tories favour grants to business and lost revenue through tax expenditures because these people are the same people who are their friends at election time. Let us hope they wake up and listen to the Chamber of Commerce and take their advice. Start with us, we will get by without grants, they said.

The throne speech says the government will work with the private sector to create long-term jobs. The people of Burrows hope they will, but they also hope that they will not do it by giving tax concessions to corporations and not telling the public which corporations are not providing evidence that jobs were created as a result.

The throne speech claims that Manitoba will monitor the Canada-U.S.-Mexico Free Trade Agreement. This reminds me of the former Minister of Consumer Affairs in the last session, who said he would monitor gas prices. For this, he earned the nickname Exxon Eddie. This Tory government will monitor free trade talks with Mexico the same way and stand idly by while Manitoba manufacturing jobs leave Manitoba and Canada and go to Mexico.

My constituents in Burrows, where the rate of unemployment is already too high, will see their rate of unemployment increase.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech claims that the Tory government will fight federal decisions that

adversely affect Manitoba. The problem is that their silence is deafening. Yes, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) whines and complains from time to time about Ottawa and cutbacks in finance and transfer payments, but do they speak up loudly and often and in public and use tough language? No, of course, not. Do the people of Burrows perceive that the Tory government is tough and speaking up loud and often? No, of course, not. The throne speech indicates that they will move to result-based government. What does this mean? I wish they had spelled it out.

My worst fear is that their only guiding principle is the bottom line instead of people. As a result, I believe their government will downgrade programs and services which are preventative and eventually will try to eliminate preventative programs and services. The people of Burrows will be poorly served by that misguided priority, whether it is funding for Pritchard Place drop-in centre for youth or the Elizabeth Fry Society or parent-child centres.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear that the government plans a child health development strategy. The government is on the right track if they actually do something about the link between poverty and child health.

In Burrows constituency and in many homes in Winnipeg, a direct link between poor health and income can be proven. Last year, I received a letter from a doctor at the Hope Centre medical clinic asking me to make a home visit to one of his patients. I did and helped the tenant fill out a repair order form which included requests to fix a leaking ceiling and requesting the landlord to eliminate rats from the house. The leaking ceiling was so bad that the family were forced to move to a motel for the weekend, and the children were sick.

I believe this is a direct result of poverty and the inability of that family to afford decent housing. If the government is serious about a new child health strategy, they will help families and children by increasing rental allowances for families on social assistance so that they are not forced to live in unsanitary and unhealthy living conditions.

* (2150)

I commend the government for their promise of a strong commitment to families and to income assistance programs. If the government is serious about their commitment, there are specific things they can do which will help and be of benefit to

families who are recipients of income support programs.

For example, the government says that they believe in helping Manitobans to help themselves. One way that people on social assistance can help themselves is through the work incentive program. Through the work incentive, social assistance recipients can augment their income by working and are allowed to keep \$50 per month. By contrast, City of Winnipeg social assistance recipients can earn and keep \$115 per month.

If the government is serious, and I hope they are serious, they could maintain a commitment to families and help Manitobans help themselves if they were to increase the work incentive from \$50 a month to at least \$115 a month to match the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, the throne speech referred to the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry and its pending report. Thousands of aboriginal people in Manitoba and in Burrows are looking forward to the inquiry report with the hope that its recommendations will improve their lives. I believe that many people are hoping that there will be a fundamental change in the relationship between aboriginal people and the judicial system.

What has the government done though in this throne speech? I believe they are trying to lower expectations. The throne speech promises to "overcome the problems in the justice system." This is a most disappointing commitment. What is needed is a complete turnaround, a conversion, a transformation of the existing system. The government could have at least promised to reform the system. Instead they are lowering public expectations and offering only to overcome problems. Let us hope that in these areas they exceed all their own expectations.

The government has promised to amend The City of Winnipeg Act to make City Council more efficient and effective. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in civic politics we must decide between the need for efficiency on the one hand and the need for responsive, democratic and adequate representation for people, neighbourhoods and areas of the city on the other hand.

The most efficient system, one could argue, would be a council of one, but this would not be democratic, it would be a dictatorship. By contrast, the best civic representation is that which is closest to people and most responsive to people. I believe

that that council would look most like the one we have now.

I and my party will oppose major reductions in the size of council or attempts to create pie-shaped wards, both of which will disenfranchise voters in the inner city and in older neighbourhoods like Burrows.

Reducing the size of council will de-democratize civic politics. It will prevent low-income people from running modest election campaigns and getting elected. Instead, it will help the Tories friends, the business people and lawyers and friends of the developers, to keep control in the hands of the "Gang" and its successors. We will stand up though for all residents of the inner city, all residents of older neighbourhoods and all Winnipeggers who want to keep property taxes down by stopping suburban sprawl.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the throne speech the government repeats over and over that much of their financial difficulty derives from reduced transfer payments from the federal government, but what did this government do about it when they had the opportunity? Did the Premier (Mr. Filmon) convey the views of Manitobans in opposition to the pending Gulf War last fall? No, he supported the Prime Minister.

There is no money for Pritchard Place, but the federal government found \$3 million a day for war. There is insufficient money for Child and Family Services, but there was magically money for bombs. There is no money for parent-child centres, but the \$12 billion defence budget has been increased because the Gulf War was so popular.

If the Tory government really wanted to provide leadership, they would have said no to the Prime Minister's slavish deference to American foreign policy and said yes to Manitoba's children, yes to Manitoba's educators, yes to Manitoba's nurses, and yes to Family Service agencies.

Finally, the throne speech is significant for what it does not say. There is almost nothing about enhancing or improving environmental protection. If the government was really concerned for the environment, it would have put the same kind of refundable deposits on all soft drink containers as they recently did for aluminum beer cans.

Another omission, and I believe a deliberate omission, was to say absolutely nothing on a major change in housing policy which they announced by way of press release. What did they do? They abolished 98 Housing Authority boards—98 local

Housing Authority boards. They abolished tenant representation on boards. They abolished local control and local input, and why did they do it? They did it because not only do they believe in centralization as a Tory philosophy, but they said ostensibly that they wanted to save money.

Well, are they going to save money by abolishing local housing authorities? No, they are not. They are going to save some short-term dollars by abolishing 50 jobs in order to save some money in the short term. In the long term, I predict that with the lack of local autonomy, a lack of tenant input, a lack of local control, their costs are going to escalate and the proof for that exists right in the city of Winnipeg.

If you examine two small housing authority boards, you can see that there are major differences, including an operating cost. Logan community committee, for example, has a board of directors that includes tenants. It has a housing manager who has a pro-tenant attitude toward tenants. It has tenants on the tenant selection committee. Last year they had a zero percent turnover in tenants. You can be sure that their cost on a per unit basis are the lowest in Winnipeg. By contrast, Winnipeg Housing Authority, with 1,000 units, had a turnover rate of 60 percent, and everyone in the housing business, from the Housing minister down to the janitor, knows that your costs are greatest when tenants move out because that is when you go in and do repairs. That is when you paint, and that is when you renovate suites, so a big contrast between a 60 percent turnover and a zero percent turnover.

But what was happening? Good things were happening, Mr. Speaker. Tenants were being appointed to the board of directors. Other tenants were being elected to the board of directors. Tenants' associations were finally recognized. After not having a recognized association for 20 years,

they finally had a tenants' group recognized. They were starting to have some meaningful and significant input into the day-to-day operation of the housing authority, and what did the government do? They abolished those local housing authorities. In the long term, I believe it is going to cost them much more money than their short-term goal of chopping 50 Civil Service jobs in order to save money.

In addition, they misled the public of Manitoba because in the press release it said that they were going to save \$3 million dollars. In fact, in the package that was sent to the board of directors with their termination notice, it said they would save \$1.5 million. They knew that when they issued the press release—and they did not say it—that \$1.5 million in savings were from the federal government through CMHC and \$1.5 million would be from the provincial government, but they misled the public by saying that they are going to save \$3 million when they knew themselves that was not true.

Mr. Speaker, I and we in this party are going to support a nonconfidence motion in this government, because we believe that the government does not deserve the confidence of the people in Burrows, it does not deserve the confidence of the people in Manitoba. For that reason, we are going to vote against their throne speech, against this government and for our amendments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House to call it ten o'clock?

Some Honourable Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: By leave, this matter will remain standing in the name of the honourable member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie).

The hour being 10 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Monday, March 11, 1991

CONTENTS

Throne Speech Debate

Ducharme	78
Maloway	85
McAlpine	92
Martindale	96