



**Fifth Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**of the**

**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS**

**(Hansard)**

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



**Vol. XLIII No. 13B - 8 p.m., Monday, April 25, 1994**

ISSN 0542-5492

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

---

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
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
DOWNEY, 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
GRAY, Avis	Crescentwood	Liberal
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
KOWALSKI, Gary	The Maples	Liberal
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MACKINTOSH, Gord	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCORMICK, Norma	Osborne	Liberal
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda, Hon.	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PALLISTER, Brian	Portage la Prairie	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
ROBINSON, Eric	Rupertsland	NDP
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary, Hon.	Fort Garry	PC
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 25, 1994

**The House met at 8 p.m.**

### Introduction of Guests

**Mr. Speaker:** Just prior to recognizing the honourable minister, who has 16 minutes remaining, I would like to take this opportunity and welcome the 11 young ladies who form a part of the 124th Brownie Pack in Elmwood. They are guests of the honourable member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg).

On behalf of all honourable members, I would like to welcome you here this evening.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

(continued)

#### BUDGET DEBATE (Fourth Day of Debate)

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Natural Resources):** At the beginning of my remarks I made sort of reference to the luck of the draw, when you get interrupted in the middle of your speech by the supper hour or whatever the case may be.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that during the supper hour you travelled safely.

Mr. Speaker, you just announced some of the visitors we have in the gallery, and I want to maybe just make a comment about that. Groups like we have up there, whether it is Boy Scouts, brigades, things of that nature, I think they are very important in terms of the training of our young people. If everybody joined groups of that nature, possibly we would not be discussing youth crime and things of that nature at the level we do.

I just want to say that on May 7, which is Forest Week, the boys brigades and various groups, Scouts, et cetera, are doing some planting with the groups. We have hundreds and thousands of trees that we are basically having the groups plant in the

Hadashville area. For those of you who have people involved there, I wish them well. I will be out there with them on that day doing it.

When I became interrupted by the supper hour at six o'clock, I was touching on the issue of sustainable development and the environmental issues. I just want to at this time—I will not table them now, but ultimately they are available anyway, but two documents that have taken a long time in getting prepared, one basically being the water policies of Manitoba. This is now basically the bible, if I could use that expression, that is going to dictate all activities related to water, and I am going to make some more comments about that. It took four years, Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson):** Tell them who started the land and water study.

**Mr. Driedger:** Was that you? My colleague on my left here, the member for Emerson, said that when he was the Minister of Natural Resources he started that program.

It has been in the mix for a long time, but ultimately we have a policy that will dictate exactly how water issues are going to be dealt with in the future. So I would suggest to members that are interested that they make themselves available of that. We are sending it to all municipalities so that they know how to deal with the issues.

**An Honourable Member:** It is water management?

\* (2005)

**Mr. Driedger:** It is water policies for Manitoba.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we also have the forest policies, which will also interest certain of the rural members in terms of how we deal with forest issues. So those, you know, they are pretty extensive, and I will not necessarily go into that, but these copies are available. I will check to see whether I should table them or not, but regardless,

if anybody wants these, I would suggest that you get in touch with my office. I have them in my office, and probably during the course of the Estimates process, we will be making them available anyway or maybe even sooner.

I understand one of the new members is my critic from the Liberal Party—[interjection] Well, I will probably be able to do it at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Speaker, I have always sort of prided myself on the fact that information from the department that I represent, I would try and make that available to opposition members. So I will continue to do that. I want to assure the new member that if there are issues or questions that she can certainly come and raise them with myself.

Mr. Speaker, within the Department of Natural Resources, many exciting things have happened, and I look forward to many exciting things happening in there. I think I made reference to some of my staff before. I think it is a very proud department, and we have very, very qualified and professional people within the department. I have found that it has made my job easier. There was a lot of reorganization that took place within the Department of Natural Resources under my predecessor, the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), but I think we have a department that is looking inward and doing a job and looking after the interests of Manitobans and doing it in a way that the people of Manitoba find thoughtful, respectful. So I thank my colleague from Lakeside for many of the initiatives that he basically started and that I have the privilege of basically taking advantage of.

In fact, the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the member for Morris (Mr. Manness) and myself, as well as the federal M.P., had the privilege of doing an opening of the Ste. Agathe water system. I want to take a minute and just say that this was a real unique project, because in the R.M. of Hanover which I represent we have had ongoing problems with overflowing wells which basically flowed all winter, froze up the drainage ditches, caused a lot of flooding. For years we tried to cope with it and never came to a proper resolution. When the then Minister of Natural Resources, the member for Lakeside, looked at this, he had a problem in Ste.

Agathe. The quality of the water was so marginal already that the Health people were prepared to serve notice on them, so the member for Lakeside says, well, it is only a matter of so-and-so many miles, why do we not solve both problems at the same time? A pipeline has been put in from New Bothwell to Ste. Agathe providing them with great water, and we have solved both problems at the same time—very simple solution. For years this thing has sort of been in the mix. So it goes to show that—and we had PFRA as involved as well, water services, two municipalities. Everybody is win-win. Those are the positive things that you like to see happen in this department.

I want to touch on a few other little issues, and I will raise this as a caution and a bit of a criticism towards the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli). Many of you probably remember the debate on Oak Hammock. Remember the debate on Oak Hammock? I wonder how many of my colleagues, how many MLAs have gone to see Oak Hammock. I would suggest for those people, especially those who have been so critical of it, that they go out and just have a look. Do you remember the concern it would disrupt the wildlife, the geese, the ducks? It would disrupt everything. Well, you go out there and you have to watch where you step, because the geese are right at the front door.

It is a great project. We have the Ducks Unlimited capital of Canada located at Oak Hammock, set in an environment that is just great. It is a showpiece, not only for Canada, but for North America. I remember the questions and criticisms that the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the then-Minister of Natural Resources, had to take on behalf of that project. Now all of a sudden everything is quiet—just a great project.

**An Honourable Member:** We are in the process of building another Oak Hammock.

**Mr. Driedger:** Yes. Just about a month ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of doing the announcement, again inherited because it was initiated by my predecessor, of announcing the Rat River Swamp project. For 17 years being in this Legislature and even before that when I was reeve for five years, we had a megaproblem out there

with the Rat River because years ago the swamp burned out, the banks burned out, and every time the water came in the spring, it flowed out of the Rat, across the country, across farm country, flooding people, and into the Joubert Creek and ultimately back into the Rat River.

We did a feasibility study for agriculture purposes, could not make it fly. This went on and on and on, and actually the member for Emerson (Mr. Penner), when he was the Minister of Natural Resources, started some very positive actions, and it was moved forward by the member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns). Ultimately, I had the privilege of making the announcement just that short time ago, but in this particular case it was not like Oak Hammock because we had all the wildlife associations, municipalities that basically were there supporting it, wrote in their support. The few that dared to really oppose it for environmental reasons never really surfaced. It is a great project as well. So it is these kinds of things that the Department of Natural Resources can do.

The member for—what is your riding now?

**An Honourable Member:** Oh, it does not matter, Pembina.

\* (2010)

**Mr. Driedger:** In his area the department, before my time, has done a whole bunch of these little control structures, little control structures that basically keep water back from flooding problems. There are so many positive things that could happen. That is when I get a little nervous when we have this critical questioning and attitude by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) who seems to oppose anything that has to do with economic development.

I want to caution members opposite. Do not fall into that trap because there are always two sides to a story. You have got to look at both sides before you make critical decisions in terms of opposing that, because the things that the member for Radisson has done related to Louisiana Pacific, related to the PMU industry, are things that are going to hurt that party. They are going to hurt that party in rural areas because, in general, people out

there know. Comments have been made about it many, many times.

There is a very sort of common type of approach to this thing where you talk of, you know, we should not do this economically. We should not let the mining industry move forward, we should not allow Louisiana Pacific to come in. These are the comments we hear. I am not faulting the member for Swan, because she is caught in a little bit of a dilemma there because she has one of her colleagues sitting behind her who is trying everything she can to gerrymander this project. I am not talking about the member for Swan River, I am talking about the member for Radisson trying to gerrymander these things, and these things will come back to haunt you. These things will come back to haunt you as a party, because once we get into this stretch of the election, we know what goes on. So I suggest that as a party you better control yourself because what goes around comes around.

Today, during Question Period, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) made reference to what our Leader at that time had said many years ago. So things that have been said come back to haunt you a long time later.

I am not afraid to say that from time to time comments that I made early on in my political life, that I have changed my position. I changed it on seatbelts. I think there is nothing wrong with ultimately reversing a decision, but you have to be careful the things that you put on.

The member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) I caution again, to put on the record. The member for Radisson ultimately has a mindset that makes me very nervous, and it should make her colleagues very nervous. It should make the member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) nervous. It should make the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) nervous. It certainly should make the member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) nervous. Mind you, I do not really know what makes him nervous or does not make him nervous because—anyway, we will leave it at that there.

I am just saying these are the kind of issues that it is important that people get the information, and

part of the biggest problem that happens with any of these things is that people do not get all the information. They get biased information. Before a person starts voicing opposition and speaking about these things, get the full story.

The member for Lakeside time and time again put on the record, as well as the Minister of Environment, about Oak Hammock, giving the information, the positive side of it. It was never accepted. Now, ultimately, we have the product there, and everybody thinks it is a great project. I am elated with it. The department is working together with Ducks Unlimited. People are critical of Ducks Unlimited. Who are the biggest and longest conservationists in this province? Ducks Unlimited.

**An Honourable Member: Conservatives.**

\* (2015)

**Mr. Driedger: Conservatives as well, yes.**

Mr. Speaker, time goes by quickly when you are having fun. I just want to—many things are happening. We have The Parks Act that was passed last year. We are in the process of consultation where we will be talking with the people affected to do classes and categories. It is a very important move that we are making, it affects a lot of people. I feel very strongly we should make provision, providing we do it properly, to allow Manitobans to enjoy our outdoors, to enjoy our lakes, and The Parks Act, I think, will do that in the long run.

The thing that I want to—remember the concern about the Pembina application for withdrawing water out of the Assiniboine, the hue and cry? I think we have that resolved, and at the same time we have established an advisory committee that is going to deal with the whole industry and all the people involved in it—a positive thing happening. That is why I say to my critics, if you have issues, ask me. If you do not like it, you know, do your political thing, but at least get the information. I am prepared to give you the information.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to going through the Estimates process, because one of the most potentially controversial and sensitive issues

that we will be facing in the future is the water issue. My staff prepared notes for me the other day when I spoke at the Ste. Agathe thing, and do you know that of all the water in the world, 1 percent of all the water in the world is fresh water. Just think about that—1 percent is fresh water.

We have an abundance of it in this province. Ultimately, in the future, pure, clean water is going to be as precious as gold or oil, because you can replace gold and oil. You can never have a substitute for clear water, and this is getting to be very sensitive. That is why this water policy that we have is going to be a very instrumental part. I want members to make themselves aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity and look forward to going into my Estimates and going into details with all the good things that are happening in my department with my good people.

**Ms. Norma McCormick (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be following the honourable Minister of Natural Resources. I was told when I was first elected that he was one of the gentlemen in the House and to date have no reason to believe otherwise.

**Mr. Driedger: What's that?**

**Ms. McCormick:** I was told that you were one of the gentlemen in the House and to date I have no reason to believe otherwise.

It was interesting to listen as the minister talked earlier about the preconceptions we have about one another, what kind of things that we presume we stand for when we come and speak. I am sure that this minister and others have preconceived ideas about who I am and where I have come from. In fact, you spoke of me as a city MLA. I was raised in Wawanesa.

**An Honourable Member: Hear, hear. Good place.**

**Ms. McCormick:** Yes, you are right. I grew up and spent all of my childhood in Wawanesa and came to university at the end of my graduation from Wawanesa Collegiate Institute. I also have an intention to return there. It is my plan after I retire to go back and live in this community, so my rural roots are deep.

As well, I wanted to talk about—I am sure that there are those of you who think I am a tree hugger because I am interested in environmental issues. In fact, I consider myself to be a practical environmentalist. I am a small-business person. I own my own consulting company in the area of occupational safety and health and environmental consulting. To this end, I am an employer. I have worked very hard to set up a practice to earn the respect of my clients, and I am working on buying a little building that houses my office. I also have a tenant who is another small-business person, and we have worked hard as self-employed people to make a contribution to our community. I have tried to make a contribution both as a volunteer and as a business person, and I was for many, many years a member of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce Task Force on Workplace Safety and Health.

I want also to put on the record that this is the first time I have ever had a job in which there was a previous incumbent. I have never been hired into a job where there was someone there before, so I consider myself to be a bit of an innovator. In fact, when I went back over the years and began to add up the number of people who have worked in the programs and services that I started, I came up to a number which exceeded 400; in fact, I consider myself to be a lean, mean job-creation machine. In fact, some may dispute the lean part, but, interestingly enough, over 380 of those jobs still exist today.

\* (2020)

So this is what I have as a background that I bring to this job, and I have every intention of hopefully not reinforcing the stereotypes you may hold but expanding on them.

Mr. Speaker, my caucus colleagues have labelled me as the kiss-of-death critic. The budgets for my critic portfolios have been whacked and whacked badly. In the Environment portfolio, the Environment budget is down 11.4 percent; Status of Women, down 7.5 percent; Labour, down 4.6 percent; Natural Resources, down 2.2 percent; and Family Services, down .2 percent.

So, in addressing the budget tonight, I want to begin by putting forward what I see as the context within which this budget document has evolved. I believe that this government budget document reaffirms this government's commitment to four agendas. The first is to keep personal and corporate taxes down; the second is to keep wages low, justified by controlling inflation; the third is to get the deficit down and do it at the cost of social programs; and the fourth is, of course, to cut social spending.

What I would like to do is to talk about the context in which you have your limited maneuverability. The first, of course, is that of higher unemployment. The unemployment rate is now the highest we have had since the Depression. We appear to have accepted an unemployment rate of over 10 percent as the new norm. This rate does not reflect the people who have given up looking for work or those who cannot find their way into the labour market for the first time. For many people, unemployment is no longer a short-term, transitory situation. People are out of work for a longer period of time. What jobs are available to many people are not good jobs with decent wages and benefits or with the potential for training or advancement.

While those who believe that an emphasis on full employment is a red herring, the real issue is not full employment but how we provide a basic income to all people.

We also have to recognize the changes in the social structure. The two-parent, father-employed family, with mother at home raising the kids, is no longer the typical family. With changes in family structure we have a higher number of single-parent families. More than 80 percent of single-parent families are headed by women, and more than half of them are poor.

We also have demographic pressures. In the beginning of the next century, one in five Canadians will be on a pension. We must be thinking now about what kind of community-based services will be necessary to keep these people out of institutions.

As we move forward, I think that one of the things we need to do is plan in the context of our present and future policies. We have been taking a lot of heat and criticism in this House for some of the initiatives that are going on at the federal level. I am personally quite troubled by the sabotage of some of these plans coming not just from the right where you expect but from the left. I am extremely troubled that the opportunity to do social policy review and to have an alternative to our historic ways of providing people with a living wage or an income—[interjection] Anyway, what I want to do here is talk about the framework within which we must examine what is going on at the federal level.

The first is the labour market policy. I am concerned that the government at the provincial level does not display any commitment to a high-wage economy. There appears to be a belief that by keeping wage rates low more jobs will be created. Unless jobs are created, social programs will be the only things available to people on the margins.

Priority one must be to ensure that people have adequate employment. Providing people with a living wage is the best way to combat poverty and its social consequence, but the jobs available to many people now are nonstandard jobs with poor wages, often hourly paid, with no benefits and no potential for training or advancement.

We need to think about work readjustment as large numbers of people will never have work as we know it now. This will involve rethinking the extent to which we will continue to tie people's societal and personal value to work.

With respect to income support programs, unemployment insurance and welfare reform are on the table. The federal government has basically two alternatives. One is to collapse all the programs that are in existence now into a guaranteed annual income system. The other is to return the two programs, unemployment insurance and welfare programs, to their original purpose.

\* (2025)

Unemployment insurance should provide short-term income for people who are between jobs and at rates of benefit tied to percentage of

income earned by the individual as an employed person.

Welfare should be the last resort of assistance for people who have no or inadequate employment income or inadequate income from other social benefit programs.

The problem we now have is we have a melding of people on both systems. Of course, the first option is the simpler of the two. If we want people to have an adequate income, then this would be difficult to do without a universal program. The problem we now have is that we cannot determine the true cost of this approach.

The Department of Finance produces only gross estimates on spending. It would look much better if net expenditures could be calculated.

There are some who believe that the guaranteed annual income system has the best potential for working in an era of full employment where anyone who wanted a job could have a job. The problem with this is factoring in the support costs for people who have special physical and social needs, for example, people with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, we need to provide income support. Are we now moving in a direction of tying benefits to some form of education and training? The question must be asked, training for what? We must do everything we can to ensure that there is a real job at the end of the training.

There are those who fear the devil's dilemma whereby we ask people to sign away future entitlements to income support programs in exchange for income opportunities. This will only work if employment opportunities are there at the end of the training phase.

We know for sure that there is a link between education and poverty. Low educational levels are a passport to poverty. The problem is that the converse is now no longer true. The societal policy failures of this government and its federal clone in the Mulroney era has resulted in another sad reality. Higher levels of education are no longer as they once were, the passport out of poverty.

We need to be clear about who is the intended target of income support programs and to ensure



that programs and services which are targeted to people do what they are intended to do and meet the needs of the targeted group.

There are three primary target groups of people. People who cannot work because of permanent or temporary barriers, such as disability, age or family responsibility. People who can and want to work but do not have the requisite skills, and people who have the requisite skills to do a job but no work is available.

We must also examine our child benefits. These are very important aspects of any income support program and at this time are the only national form of income supplementation for low income families.

We must ask whether these programs are delivered effectively. These programs have been severely eroded and child benefits need to be restored. It is important to figure out a way that we can do this in a nonstigmatizing way.

Canada is the worst among OECD countries in the area of creating equity through our tax system, and we still exempt wealthy Canadians and corporations from paying their fair share. Reform of the tax system must be on the agenda if we are to have a meaningful social reform.

\* (2030)

It is our best hope to reform the tax system to create equity and achieve efficiency.

Benefits can be delivered through the tax system without stigmatization. We spend a great deal of money through the tax system to give tax breaks to high-income Canadians, for example, \$20 million including RSP deductions. Tax reform is necessary to stop the transfer of society's resources to upper-income Canadians. We must also examine what we believe with respect to the inter-generational transfer of wealth.

What must be done to get a more equal distribution of resources and wealth through a fair taxation system? We must look at the extent to which the existing taxation system fairly treats individuals and corporations and achieves the objective of redistribution of wealth. We should move toward the 20-20 rule.

The tax system kicks in at very low levels of earning. We need to examine the welfare wall, the relationship between the welfare system and the tax system. The present system allows for the taxing back of training allowances, the taxing back of earned income from people on welfare. Low-income people are taxed at prohibitive rates. A more equitable way is to use the tax system for an income levelling through the use of tax credits and not tax deduction.

As Liberals we do not accept that social programming is left over after we have done all the economic stuff. We cannot address social policy reform without addressing reform of the tax system. The tax system has the capability of creating, redistributing and levelling wealth and delivering social programs to the benefit of disadvantaged people.

Economic management is an issue. If we do not reform our approach to create economic stimulation, we leave the social safety net to trap and catch more casualties and to hang on to them longer. It is important to recognize that raising income raises spending.

Fundamental changes have been made to our social programs. Some changes have been made very quietly, and the consequence of them have crept up on us. What is scary about the review of our income security system is that the review of our social services could be left off. Our social programs include child care and child development. Child care is one of the most important components of child development. Is the role and the effectiveness of the Canada Assistance Plan on the table in the process of social policy reform?

With respect to personal support, these supports include attendant services and homemaker services and are critical services for people with disabilities and the elderly. Decisions which are being made about services to the elderly are critically important and must be planned carefully as our population ages.

With respect to income in kind, these programs include medical aid, our Pharmacare program, which can often represent hundreds or thousands

of dollars to people who have a need for drug therapy and medical aid.

Mr. Speaker, our social programs are positive, not negative. They are not a drain on the economy but a way in which we define ourselves as a humane and compassionate society.

It is important that we educate our population about the concept of social equity. We must be careful not to tinker around in the sandbox but to look at the bigger picture as we move toward the distribution of work and wealth. We need to declare a national vision of what we are and what we hope and expect to achieve. We need to articulate a social charter which would enunciate the principles of what we value as a society and toward the accomplishment of which we intend to redirect our societal resources.

Canada is not yet a signatory to the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights. The new-right agenda of the Mulroney years has undermined our social fabric and what it means to be a Canadian.

What do we value as a society? Human services should be delivered on a not-for-profit basis but not necessarily government delivered. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong role for non-governmental organizations. We must work to reduce the stigmatization that comes from our present ways of redirecting income security. People who are targets or the consumers of our services should not be precluded from participation in their development and delivery.

As a government we must regain control of our debt. The whole exercise is academic until we gain control of our off-shore debt. Until we control our debt we cannot control our destiny. We must do it.

The first important step is for communities to take back the agenda. What are the values we hold as Canadians and what are the things we are prepared to pay for?

Mr. Speaker, these ideas are not new. We need to find a way of getting them into policy. A safe and healthy society benefits people, business and the government and we must look at changing the value base of society to reflect the importance of

community contribution through work and voluntarism.

As a business person, I want to address the role of the business community. There is a very important role for business to play in supporting the objectives of society. Business needs to be held accountable for investing its profits in research and development and in the training and continual upgrading of its labour force.

Businesses are an integral part of any community and support community and family values. Business has an important role to play in social and community development. Business has some or full responsibility for providing social benefits including training and advancement opportunities, family support services such as daycare, pensions and security of employment.

Businesses have lost, or perhaps some never had, the habit of reinvesting in redevelopment. Nowhere else in the world is business so dependent on government for funding of its innovation. Many businesses do not see it as their responsibility to train their own workers.

(Mrs. Louise Dacquay, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair)

This government, too, is guilty of this. It does not invest in its own brain trust nor train its own civil service. Rather, it chooses to hire rent-a-brains and pour amazing amounts of public money into national management consulting companies through untendered contracts.

We must seek co-operative partnerships between people, the programs that serve them, their community, their businesses, the corporate community and their government. Our social programs need to target people with special needs, to empower but not to control them. We must place a high priority on the strategy which evokes the participation of stakeholders—labour, the employing community and government—and mobilize all towards the objective of full and meaningful employment.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like now to go through the departments for which I have accepted critic responsibility and begin with some concerns

about the Department of Environment. Indeed, of all my portfolios which were targeted for reductions in the budget the one that troubles me most is the area of environment and sustainable development where my expectations were the highest and my disappointment the greatest.

In recent years expectations were high from the environmental and business community. We have seen the development of a co-operative climate in which we have adopted a comprehensive and progressive environmental act and regulations. The Environment Act embodies a mechanism which allows for the participation of regulators, scientists, environmentalists, citizens and others in the review of proposals and plans put forward by proponents where these developments have the potential for a negative impact on the environment. If this process were supported to work as intended, many of our contentious environmental issues we face today would not be causing dissension in this province but could be effectively addressed and resolved.

It has become apparent that the Conservative commitment to development at all cost, particularly in the rural areas, has motivated the government to discredit as antidevelopment anyone who promotes or insists on the environmental review process. This is neither healthy nor right.

It is neither healthy nor right for environmentalists and concerned citizens to be lined up against their own government in a jobs versus the economy debate. This is particularly ironic when this is the government that struts on the international stage pretending to be a leader in sustainable development. There is no commitment to the enforcement of environmental law in Manitoba. The last four major environmental disasters in Manitoba were cleaned up at public expense, and none of the companies involved were prosecuted.

We in the Liberal caucus do not see it as our role to take a stand for or against these developments. We see it as our primary responsibility to promote and protect the process whereby good decisions can be made in the interest of all Manitobans.

\* (2040)

I want to move now on to the Status of Women portfolio, which as well, has been subject to a reduction of 7.5 percent. The Status of Women department, through its advisory council, has as its objective the advancing of the goal of equal participation of women in society and promoting changes in social, legal and economic structures to that end.

Madam Deputy Speaker, \$74,600 has been stripped out of the department's budget—\$34,100 from the advisory council and another \$40,500 from the Women's Directorate. The Women's Directorate exists to influence government decision making through research, support, policy development and evaluation of government services and programs.

What justifies these cuts? Certainly not any claim which can be made by this government that it has moved Manitoba women any closer to equal participation or equal status.

Here are the realities. Much work remains to be done, especially for older women. Canada has made great strides in reducing poverty among older Canadians, thanks to programs like the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security, but young people and their families, however, face a higher risk of poverty than any ever before.

In 1980, 18 percent of families headed by someone under 25 years of age lived in poverty. By 1990 the figure was 32.5 percent. Although the majority of children living in poverty in Manitoba live in two-parent families, a substantial portion of them live in single-parent families.

Single-parent families are the fastest growing group among families with children and continue to face very high odds of being poor, odds which are the highest in Canada.

Children raised in one-parent families led by women, which comprised about nine in 10 one-parent households in Manitoba, face a poverty rate of 66 percent in 1991, roughly the same figure as in 1970.

Children living in father-headed, one-parent families are less likely to be poor than families

headed by single mothers, but are still more likely to be poor than children in two-parent families, who have a poverty rate of 21.5 percent.

It is important to acknowledge the depth of poverty. In 1991, the average income of poor, single-parent mothers was 40.4 percent below the poverty line while the average income of poor, two-parent families was 30.5 percent below.

I want also to talk tonight with respect to the maintenance enforcement program. I recognize that this department is administered under the Department of Justice, which in fact is not my critic portfolio area, but I do want to raise some issues with respect to maintenance enforcement, because it is a matter with which I have some personal experience.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the maintenance enforcement system is overloaded, and services are deteriorating. The impact of Filmon Fridays has meant that even the money that is paid is not processed expediently, so that families waiting for it can meet their obligations of shelter, food and recreation.

Earlier today the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) told us a touching story about a couple stranded in Florida who could not get onto a cruise ship to continue on their Caribbean holiday. He would have us cheer wildly as we learned of the efforts of his department to get this problem resolved and the couple on the ship. I just wish we could hear other heartwarming stories from the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Vodrey) about the heroic efforts of the members of her department to get money to women who cannot pay their rent and feed their kids.

The maintenance enforcement budget is hidden in the Family Law line, in which salaries and benefits have been reduced. My hope is that the reality does not apply to this section, because the present complement of 24 staff handles a caseload of 800 to 900 each. The total outstanding arrears payable to the children of Manitoba exceeds \$27 million.

I next want to talk about the Department of Labour. This budget is down 4.6 percent. First, the

Workplace Safety and Health budget has been cut; the Fire Prevention branch has been cut; the Worker Advisor Office has been cut.

The good news is that the mechanical and electrical engineering branch has had its budget increased. Mining activity is up; new mines are opening, according to the throne speech; and the potential for a number of sites is encouraging. But the Mines Inspection Branch has had its budget cut. The Payment of Wages Fund has been cut by \$75,000 to those who are victims of bankruptcies, receiverships, closures, walkaways, and non-payment. I will be questioning this line very closely in the Estimates to determine how this can be and at whose expense.

We learned in the Budget Address about the creation of an advisory panel on business regulations. I will be very interested to know whether the health and safety and environmental regulations will be on the table for advice.

You know, Madam Deputy Speaker, the collective wisdom in the employing community is that there is not very much wrong with our laws and regulations in the area of health and safety and environmental protection. What is wrong is that these laws are not being enforced at all. We will be watching carefully when the membership of this advisory panel is named to ensure that it is representative and that the selection of its members does not predetermine the outcome of the advice.

During my tenure as chair of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce workplace safety and health advisory committee, I, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce, chaired a task group representative of major employing sectors in Manitoba.

Their report is worth mentioning. What the employing community wants is a level playing field. The regulations and laws should be easy to understand, be subject to consultation prior to enactment, be applied universally across the regulated sector. There is no argument against the content of the law or regulations as they existed.

I note that the Occupational Health unit has also been increased. I sat for many years as a member

of the minister's advisory council on workplace safety and health, beginning under the era of Gerard Lecuyer through Gerry Hammond and subsequently the present minister, Mr. Praznik. We have looked to the department for leadership in bringing Manitoba's regulations into line with respect to occupational exposures. For years we have been promised that there will be a blue-ribbon committee to review the designated substances list, which is a schedule of the Workplace Health Hazard Regulation, Manitoba Regulation 5388.

\* (2050)

We were also promised, Madam Deputy Speaker, that there would be a review of the American Conference of Government Industrial Hygienist TLV levels, as the 1988 levels, which have been updated three times since, are still in existence. New updated regulations with respect to TLVs have been issued but not adopted.

On both of these aspects, Madam Deputy Speaker, we are hopelessly out of date. I will be pursuing in Estimates how this increase is to be appropriated and sincerely hope that these important activities, necessary to give clear guidance to employers and to protect the health and safety of Manitoba's workforce, are a priority.

I hope to speak now about the Natural Resources department, again, down 2.2 percent. This is good news and bad news. The Sustainable Development Co-ordination Unit and the Snowmobile Network Opportunities Fund—hurray for opportunities for snowmobiles—are the big winners.

What went down? The Endangered Species Management, Habitat and Land Management, Game and Fur Management took a big hit, Wildlife management down, Sport and Commercial Fishing Management down, Fisheries Habitat Management down, Fish Culture, Fisheries, Forest Protection, Forest Management down, Parks and Natural Areas cut, and Water Resources cut.

I had intended to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that in a province with no land-use plan, no water-use plan and no forestry plan—but fortunately we

understand that the water policy is being delivered and the forestry policy is to be developed compliments of Peat Marwick.

In the remaining minutes I have left in my time, Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to address the Family Services budget. Again, the big winners in the Family Services budget are the Minister's Salary and Executive Support, which went up big time. The budget resulting from family breakdown, taking kids into care and locking them up has in fact received an increase. Maintenance of Children and External Agencies budgets are up, but why? These are the visible victims of this government's social policy planning failure.

Despite increases in private agencies and regions, they are being squeezed. Low priority has been given to 16- and 17-year-olds.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I drive here through Osborne Village, and I see youngsters the ages of my own children living on the street, begging for money for food. They are there in the morning when I come before 8:30. They are still there at suppertime when I go home to feed my kids, and they will still be there when I leave at ten o'clock tonight.

In Manitoba we have the highest child poverty rate, the highest teenage pregnancy rate, the highest rate of female-headed, single-parent families. Do we ever wonder why?

We have heard from the member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger) about his impoverished beginning, and I believe that it is possible for young people to conquer adversity, but this is the first generation that we have not eradicated in part by war. We have a surplus of young people, and I believe that it is time to plan a better future for our young people than we are now doing.

My time is up, Madam Deputy Speaker. I thank you for your attention, and I look forward to speaking to you again.

**Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa):** It is a great pleasure to stand here and talk on the 1994 budget highlights that were brought forth by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) on April 20 and try to bring some more semblance of sense to this debate

that has been going on in the last while here in the House.

Prior to speaking on the Budget Debate I would like to just digress a bit to last week, in which we celebrated here in Manitoba the Volunteer Week. At the time I had the privilege of addressing the whole House in a nonpolitical statement regarding Volunteer Week and the appointments of all the volunteers in the community.

I would just like to say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that in my constituency of Niakwa, volunteerism and the sense of volunteer help is one of the paramount resources and the golden links, if you want to call it, that permeate my community and the people that are involved. I have a very strong volunteer base involved with the community centres, the churches, the volunteer groups, like the Cub Scouts, seniors groups, which contribute a tremendous amount of time and effort to the quality of life in my constituency of Niakwa.

I would just like to spend time and relate to the goodness that they brought forth in their relationships with everybody in the community. I would like to point out too a very strong volunteer and point out one individual. I mentioned volunteers in general in my community, but there is one person that I had the opportunity to present the Canada 125 award to. In fact, I only chose one person in my whole constituency to get it, and that was a fellow by the name of Bill Powell. The reason I chose Bill Powell was because of his strong involvement with Winakwa Community centre and his strong involvement with amateur hockey and amateur sports of all kinds in the constituency of Niakwa.

Bill was involved a lot with Winakwa Community centre. He was involved with what they call the Gold Cup Hockey Tournament. He was involved very strongly with not only the Winakwa Community Centre, but he also was a strong supporter of all community clubs. I had the great fortune of sitting on the community centre board with him for quite a few years as a mentor and as a great person to use as a resource. I rose up through the ranks of the community centre board, and Bill was there as the second sober thought, if

you want to call it, whenever we got into discussion of the community centres.

Unfortunately, Bill passed away very suddenly just a while back, and it brought forth a tremendous loss, not only in Winakwa Community Centre but in all the community centres in District No. 5. So I just wanted to pay respects to a very good friend and a very strong volunteer in our community centre who really exemplified what volunteerism is and what it can contribute to the well-being of our community.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to just now talk about my government and the path that they have brought forth, which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) brought forth with his budget last week on April 20. It is a budget for growth, it is a budget for opportunity, and it is a budget that recognizes the fact that Winnipeg and, in fact, Manitoba is the place to be in this century that we are now into. It is a budget that addresses the problems, and at the same time, it shows priorities as to where there is effort that should be brought forth.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would just like to point out a few of the things that are in the budget that I feel are of a pertinent nature, in particular, I guess, to my constituency, which is an urban constituency, but at the same time outlining the broader parameters for all of Manitoba.

I would like to just point out that one of the highlights of the budget was the fact that there was the signing of a five-year, \$75-million Winnipeg Development Agreement which focuses on the key economic and labour forces' development priorities here in Winnipeg.

\* (2100)

In doing this, it gives a planning emphasis, it gives a direction as to what should and what can come about with the co-operation between the provincial government and the City of Winnipeg. We talk a lot of times about Winnipeg being the hub of Manitoba, but in a sense, I guess, because of the geographics and the make-up of Manitoba, we cannot get away from the fact that almost over 60

percent of the population live within the Perimeter Highway.

So there is a certain awareness that this government has of the expectations within this city while, at the same time, trying to balance it with all of Manitoba and the priorities for every Manitoban. There is the awareness of the needs of the city of Winnipeg in which the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh) has so rightly taken upon herself to be totally aware of.

I would also like to point out a five-year pilot program for the Small Business Expansion program for the capital for small businesses and the service in the manufacturing sectors so that we can—the recognition that small business and manufacturing is the backbone and is the key to Manitoba's growth.

Eighty percent of the jobs that are provided here in Manitoba are small business, so small business is really the engine that makes Manitoba go. When jobs are created we are not talking about the large industrial megaprojects that we are witness to from time to time, but we are now talking about small business growth, jobs and businesses that appoint and will come forth with small amounts of jobs for 15 or 20 or 30 or 50 or 100 jobs. These are the things that Manitoba builds upon—small business.

It is interesting to note, Madam Deputy Speaker, that in looking at some of the magazines that we look at, they are published right across Manitoba. I would just like to point out one magazine and the title is Why National League Companies Come to Manitoba. I would like to point out a very interesting statistic that is in this article in this magazine, and it says, and I am just quoting: A long list of 544 national or international corporations moved into the Manitoba economy in 1992-93, a substantial increase over 480 registered in 1991-1992.

Madam Deputy Speaker, 544 national or international corporations moved into Manitoba in 1992-93. Those figures are tremendously encouraging by the fact that these are companies that are relocating to Manitoba. They are bringing jobs, they are creating employment, they are

creating wealth, they are creating a tax base where we can continue to provide the services and the amenities that people expect from this government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would also like to point out in the budget the fact that lottery funding is also going to be directed towards rural libraries in the setup of funding for them during the next year, so there is awareness that the funding for programs is well recognized by this government and the people that are here to serve as the elected representatives.

There is also the introduction that has been mentioned by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) regarding a sales tax rebate for your first-time home buyers of new homes purchased before March 31, 1995. This is a rebate to a maximum of \$2,500. An emphasis like that is going to create a pent-up release of energy for new home owners and the fact that this has a spin-off effect throughout all of the industry, of home making and home owning and for the construction industry, as my honourable friend for St. Boniface mentioned. Construction has its spin-off effect. It has the ability for newlywed people to move into a home, a dream that a lot of people have, which they can embellish. So it has a very positive effect, Madam Deputy Speaker.

At the same time, there was mention of the \$10-million program to assist Manitobans in renovating and upgrading their home which gives the renovation industry a timely boost. It is interesting that the Leader of the Second Opposition came out so strongly against this program because of the fact that he felt, the member for St. James felt that there should be more regulations involved with this. Well, it would seem that you have an industry that has regulated itself to death already, and here is the member for St. James critical of this government for the fact that they need more regulations.

In talking to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mrs. McIntosh), she has informed me that within the first two days there were over a thousand phone calls into the office wanting to find out some information about this program, giving forth their

opinions as to when it can start, how they can get involved with it, how they can take advantage of it. At the same time, we have the member for St. James, the second opposition, coming in so vehemently encouraging regulations for this program. The member for St. James thrives on regulations, and maybe it is just because of his background that he feels that regulations are the way of keeping things more in line with more work for certain sectors of the economy.

There was a mention also of bringing forth market-driven training, I believe was what the member for St. James was talking about—market-driven training. This government, through the Minister of Education, recognized this by the funding increase to community colleges which will go up by 3.3 percent, recognizing the fact that this was a vital sector of our economy and the fact that we do have to provide some sort of training and skills, recognizing the fact that the economy does not just revolve around secondary education through universities but also through the training and the training program in the apprenticeship program which has also been injected with an additional \$300,000 through this government. So the Minister of Education is not only—sorry, I got distracted there for a moment, Madam Deputy Speaker.

There are also incentives that were brought forth through the K to 12 program, which will also receive \$2.25 million in additional funding. Commitments like this in tight economic times show fiscal planning and prudent management of the funding through the various departments.

The Minister of Education has shown that there is a willingness to redirect and shift the priorities and, at the same time, recognize the richness that we have to look after in the sense of trying to achieve the goals regarding our education with our young people.

At the same time, there is a curriculum development program that is being enhanced through the funding of an additional \$650,000. So the words that are being bandied across from the opposition regarding the funding or lack of funding do not seem to come to fruition. They ring

hollow in a sense that, as my friend the member for Lakeside has often said, these are nothing but wind and rabbit tracks that come from across the way. The member for Virden and the member for Turtle Mountain have also told me about these.

So it is coming to fruition, Madam Deputy Speaker. A very important aspect of the education that the Minister of Education has brought about is in opportunities for Distance Education, which has been expanded with the inclusion of a \$750,000 pilot project.

So there is a recognition, there is a willingness by this government to not only be prudent with its financial resources but, at the same time, recognizing where the needs and where the direction of funding should be more accountable. It is not so much a reform of the program but a recognition of the priorities of where best we can serve the people and, at the same time, get the money that is available for the use of these projects.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in the area of health care there has been a fair amount of banter and a fair amount of criticism from the other parties in regard to what and how things are happening here with the government.

I would like to just point out the fact that there is an additional \$2.6 million for Home Care here that is coming through with this government in this budget and over half a million dollars more for support for seniors through the Seniors Directorate. The minister is also looking after the seniors of this province.

\* (2110)

There is the introduction of regulated midwifery. There is the enhancement of the breast cancer and cervical cancer screening program. These are all programs that this government is proud to bring forth. These are programs that there is initiative because of the consultation process through our meetings with people, getting out and talking to the people. There are town hall meetings; there are meetings through our constituencies. There are coffee-and-conversation parties. These are all initiatives that were brought forth by the people of



Manitoba to the ministers involved so that they could be incorporated into this budget.

There has been a comment made by the Leader of the second party that there is no consultation, that the people should get out and do surveys and things like that. We are very familiar with one of the surveys that was brought forth by the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Edwards). In fact, I was watching the news clip on that, when they had the table in front of the TV camera, and they were proud to say that they had sent out over 80,000 questionnaires. They got back 25,000 answers on that, so the calculation would be about 105,000 questionnaires at 43 cents a questionnaire. I think that is over \$45,000 for questionnaires that the Liberals sent out just to find out, and what did they find out? They came back, the Leader of the Liberal Party sat at the end of the table with the great announcement that people want jobs—a tremendous revelation, \$45,000 to find out that the people wanted jobs. It was incredibly mind boggling that the Liberals could do that.

So we as the party went out and talked to the people; we had town hall meetings. The Liberals sent out a questionnaire, spending \$45,000 for a questionnaire just to come up with a program saying that the people want jobs—a very, very revealing questionnaire that they sent out.

**An Honourable Member:** What else did they find out?

**Mr. Reimer:** Well, they found that they came out with some new directions, some new directions that they were going to come forth with their program. I believe they said there were three directions that they figured that this was the way to look at the Manitoba economy. One was to raise the minimum wage, and I believe it was from \$5 to \$5.50. It is amazing how the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Edwards) here in Manitoba can make a great priority of raising the minimum wage, and yet one of the former Ministers of Finance with the Liberal government, Donald Macdonald, came out dead against raising the minimum wage by saying, for every 10 percent raise of the minimum wage, you raise the unemployment rate by 1 percent.

So in a sense you have the Liberals saying that they want to make jobs, you raise the minimum rate. At the same time, the Finance minister says, you raise that, you are raising the unemployment rate. They have it both ways, but that is the way they like it. They can go this way; they can go that way. That is usually that way. So they have the real opportunity to do what they want, what they think.

I would like to just point out, the other day, when I had the opportunity to—I like to read the morning paper when I wake up in the morning. The other day I picked up the paper, and it was just before breakfast, but before I could get into the paper, I could, for some reason, smell bacon, the smell of bacon coming out of the paper. I was not sure whether it was bacon or whether it was just pork that I could smell coming out of the paper. It started to just permeate out of the paper. I could not figure out what it was, you see, until I opened it up, and, my gosh, here we have the old pork barrelling coming from the East out of the old, the new Liberals, this new sense of Liberals, new Liberals.

I had a chance to read a little bit of the red book that the federal Liberals had when they were doing their campaigning, and I remember the red book said in glowing terms, and I will quote from the red book. The Liberals said that they would alter the practice and make sure all appointments are made on the basis of competence. They would stop the practice that the Tory government had of choosing political friends when making thousands of appointments to boards and commission—a noble statement by the federal Liberals.

However, as I say, the smell of pork started to permeate out of this paper, and there it was. There it was. The first appointment. Who was appointed as the new Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan? John Wiebe, the former chairman of the Saskatchewan election committee for the Liberals—purposely unbiased appointment. Also, who was appointed director of the Quebec Ports Corporation? [interjection] Yeah, the pork society in Quebec—Marbeau Bourassa [phonetic], unsuccessful candidate for the federal riding of Louis Hebert in the last federal election, another

pork barrel. Also, how about for the Public Works Minister David Dingwall, named Michael MacDonald [phonetic], a lawyer, who was Mr. Dingwall's official agent in the fall election, another pork barrel for these sanctimonious Liberals sitting there, saying, we will not do what the Tories did.

Speaking about the Port Authority, the campaign manager for the candidate who won in Vancouver, that beat Kim Campbell—we all remember Kim Campbell—[interjection] Yes, she got a job. She is selling at a car dealership in Vancouver. She is selling those two-seater Miatas. However, the campaign manager for the winning Liberal candidate in Vancouver at that time, he got the job at the Port Authority in Vancouver for \$65,000 a year.

So where do all these jobs—this is the sanctimonious Liberals. Then we even have Mr. Chretien's chief of staff, his old friend, his chief of staff, Mr. Moroski [phonetic], will serve as the vice-president of the port authority in Quebec City. They just love these appointments. So we can find these appointments going on and on. Here are the sanctimonious Liberals there telling us how they have this new government—but, however, even this morning, when I picked up the paper, I got another pork sandwich in the mail. Yes, this has got to be another one. This is the one where we are now forming a theme park for aluminum cans in Shawinigan, the industrial park in Shawinigan, in the federal riding of Prime Minister Chretien's riding—will get a grant \$4.5 million for a theme park. Now, originally, this was going to be a grab of \$10.3 million. So I guess we could say that it is a saving. We can say this is a saving because it is only \$4.5 million, but they saved it. This goes along with the study which was prepared to see whether this museum in Shawinigan is going to be of any great—

**An Honourable Member:** What did Chretien's barber get?

\* (2120)

**Mr. Reimer:** I have not seen him yet. The study was prepared—which was prepared at the request

of the federal Bureau of Regional Development, of Trois-Rivières, also said that the project is badly organized, will lose money and will close within a year of opening unless it is bailed out by more government money. So, Mr. Chretien, he is going to get his money anyway. He is going to get it all in there. At the same time, there is another \$4.5 million, but this is \$4.8 million, a little bit more, and this is for the Montreal Botanical Gardens. Is that not nice? Now we have the trained seals over there clapping for the Liberals, so they feel that this is all good money.

All the money is going down east. This is where their priority is. Give the money down east. Do not stand up for Manitoba. Get, step, in line behind Lloyd. You know what they call this down in Montreal? In Quebec they call this the Shawinigan waltz, one step forward, two steps back. Here in Manitoba, it is Lloyd Axworthy's line dance, with Lloyd in the front and seven other Liberals behind him, lining up behind him, all coming up behind him. Then they sit here and they clap. They think this is great that eastern Canada gets all this. They are not standing up for Manitoba. They are not going after Manitoba to get these jobs. When the environmental building goes down to Montreal, that is only 10 jobs. We have bigger fish to fry. They have bigger fish to fry all right. They have got nothing happening here in Manitoba. The only thing that they have is, whenever Axworthy jumps, they say, how high?

I have had dealings with Lloyd. I had dealings with Lloyd Axworthy back in the election of 1984, I guess it was, with Bob Bockstael and Gil Molgat, where Bob Bockstael was running against Leo Duguay, and I will not get into that. That is where Lloyd did some fancy footwork and left us short on the community centre for \$100,000, so after the election he took it out. And where did it go? It went into Lloyd's constituency. They can verify that by just talking to Bob Bockstael or Gil Molgat about what happened to that money. They needed my riding. It left us afterwards; it is gone.

But I have to comment on one of the things that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) talked about when he talked about we should be bringing

the money into Manitoba through venture capital because—I will just get the right quotation on it here—he was talking about the RRSPs and the money should stay in Manitoba, \$640 million, I believe he was quoting because it goes out of Manitoba and the fact that this goes out. And he says, we should start a Manitoba—I am not too sure if he knows how much money has actually gone through the Manitoba—there is a Manitoba stock exchange; there is a stock exchange here in Winnipeg. There is a commodity exchange here in Winnipeg, and I am not too sure whether he knows how much money goes through here, but it is interesting to note that the Winnipeg Stock Exchange and Commodity Exchange last year traded \$7.2 billion out of Manitoba, so there is a tremendous amount of commodity expending and contracts being let forth. When you talk almost \$7.3 billion, the Winnipeg Stock Exchange and Commodity Exchange does do a tremendous amount of business.

There is the Alberta Stock Exchange, which does over \$2.1 billion in stock movements, so there is tremendous growth of monies already being utilized here in the West. For some reason, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), with his \$640 million, feels that this is a big amount, but there is the opportunity to invest in the Winnipeg Stock Exchange. In fact, one of the first companies that was listed on the Winnipeg Stock Exchange is the business right across the street, Great-West Life, which was actually listed, I believe, back in 1909. On February 1, 1909, Great-West Life was listed here on the Winnipeg Stock Exchange.

There is a tremendous difference between what he calls venture capital and money that has gone into RRSPs and registered retirement. Venture capital is just that—venture capital. It is money that goes into a stock exchange. Money that goes into a stock exchange is theoretically in there for speculative purposes, so the fact that the appeal to put this money in as if this is automatically all of a sudden a new emphasis and a new impetus of monies that is going to make Manitoba grow, there has to be some sort of co-ordination of thinking as to where the realities are. The member for St.

James feels that this is some sort of newfound wealth. The money is there. It goes into the investments. In all likelihood, a lot of it even goes down to the end of the street into Investors Syndicate, or across the street, as I mention into Great-West Life and into the banks.

He seems to feel that there is a loss of this money. The money stays. In fact, as was mentioned by the minister earlier today in the announcement of the Builder Bonds, and when we look at the success of the Builder Bonds in raising \$341 million for this province, we are talking about a lot of money that stays right here in the province of Manitoba. In excess of \$1.5 billion has already been raised through HydroBonds and Builder Bonds.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitobans are investing in Manitoba. They are spending the money in Manitoba and over \$180 million was just paid out in interest and this is primarily exclusively to Manitobans. Manitobans see the value of investing in Manitoba. They see the value of their money being utilized here in Manitoba, so the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) either has not been aware of this or is totally in a fog in not realizing where there is opportunity. Manitobans recognize this opportunity, recognize it through the Builder Bonds and through the other emphasis that we have brought forth.

Madam Deputy Speaker, people see Winnipeg, they see Manitoba as a place to invest. I have to mention a report in *The Globe and Mail* in which it shows off Winnipeg, they call it Team Manitoba, and they talk about why people come to Manitoba, why do they invest in Winnipeg.

I would just like to quote the attributes that are important to business at the moment here in Manitoba: our flexible work forces, international connections, infrastructure of such knowledge-based industries as telecommunications, software engineering and pharmaceuticals, research resources from universities with growing business parks and pro-business consolidation.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Winnipeg is a major transportation hub. It is the home of nine of

Canada's major trucking firm headquarters and is served not only by the CN and CP, but it also runs a 24-hour airport. Tremendous advantages, tremendous opportunities for growth here in Winnipeg and Manitoba. Light manufacturing, Winnipeg is the second-least expensive of 45 metropolitan areas in the United States and Canada.

Madam Deputy Speaker, statistics like that just mind-boggle companies that are looking for expansion here, when you have the second-least expensive of 45 metropolitans. Its hydroelectric rates are half of Toronto and are among the lowest in Canada.

**An Honourable Member:** The Manitoba advantage.

**Mr. Reimer:** It is a Manitoba advantage is right, as my colleague for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) has said.

Madam Deputy Speaker, Manitoba is a very rich and unique province. We have the advantage of a strong workforce. We have the advantage of a very diverse culture here in Manitoba. In fact, I would just like to mention that here in Manitoba and in particular Winnipeg, Winnipeg is one of the most cosmopolitan cities in Canada. Manitoba, because of its multicultural background and its mosaic, is in a sense a snapshot of all of Canada, because I believe there are over 60 languages that can be spoken here in Manitoba from various countries all across the world.

We have a tremendous advantage not only in our appeal to the economic growth but to people of various nations from all over the world to do business. We have the pride of accomplishment. We have the sense of achievement that the people bring forth. The immigrants, the settlers, that came here to Manitoba years ago and the people that are still coming to Manitoba bring forth strong work ethics. It is a work ethic that we enjoy, because we cannot only benefit from it, but we can learn from it, and it is to an understanding and acceptance of these differences that make Manitoba such a great province.

It is a difference that we should be proud of. It is a difference that we should highlight, and in fact in this International Year of the Family, it is odd that we have the Leader of the Second Opposition (Mr. Edwards) coming out so strongly against the fact that we are celebrating this International Year of the Family.

These are significant events, Madam Deputy Speaker, in the fact that Manitoba is a family. The people of Manitoba and the families involved all have a strong work ethic. They believe in the work ethic, so it is this type of family environment that we should be celebrating. This government is proud to celebrate it. This government is proud to have a secretary appointed for the co-ordination of events, the highlighting of events, the showcasing of Manitoba not only here in Winnipeg but all throughout Manitoba. So the Year of the Family is a very significant point.

\* (2130)

Madam Deputy Speaker, it is interesting that we have the speakers from the Liberals speaking. In fact, the previous speaker for Osborne, first, I thought I was listening to an NDP member speak. I thought maybe this was a new member from the NDP party speaking with her strong socialist leanings. I could see that maybe it is because she is so close to the NDP that there is an osmosis coming too close to her, and she is absorbing too much of that NDP philosophy, but I would think that it is close to what I might call a Liberal Social Democrat instead of a Liberal. We have this new LSD party. It is just like the clouding of the mind, in a sense, hallucinogenic, that is coming through because of the closeness of it. So we not only have the New Democratic Party, the NDP, we have the LSD party, the new Liberal Social Democratic party, that is trying to take into all accounts their leanings from the left and the right, and we have people in that caucus there, they can lean every way they want, so they can take on any type of colour they want. It is like a chameleon. One day they are going to be this way, next day, this way, but I really enjoyed, in fact, the member for Osborne (Ms. McCormick) giving a speech.

In fact, I thought for a moment there it was the member for Thompson speaking. I had to look twice, but then I realized, no, it was the member for Osborne speaking because the rhetoric that comes from the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), I can accept that. I know where he comes from. I believe the member for Thompson is true in his convictions. The member for Osborne, I was surprised that this was part of the Liberal Party. It was incredible. It was just like, as I mentioned, an LSD party. There was this osmosis in my mind, I was not too sure where it was coming from. It came at me at different directions. But then again, I could see the philosophy of the Liberals, you know, they are going to go with the windsock. Whatever the wind is blowing there, they are going to fill up, but I have to allude back to the Lloyd's line dance because I think that is not only a line dance—usually people line up beside each other, this is the line dance they line up in behind him. It is a line dance that uses just left feet. So it is something that we will look forward to seeing in the future from the Liberals.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I see that I am very, very close to the end of my time, but I would like to say that the Manitoba budget that was brought forth by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) is a budget that Manitobans can be proud of. This government is committed to a course of bringing Manitoba to a balanced budget. It gives me great pleasure to endorse this budget, and I know that it is going to be interesting to see how the parties on the other side will finally make their choices.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank you very much for the time. Thank you very much.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Deputy Speaker, the third paragraph of the budget speech presented on the 20th of this month by the Minister of Finance is a paragraph that I as a member of the Legislative Assembly, and I think that all members of the Legislative Assembly, can agree with. It is virtually the only paragraph in the budget speech that we can agree on, and it is in almost every other page of the Budget Address denounced. So, on the one hand, the Minister of Finance makes a very good preamble to his budget speech and then

carries on with a denunciation of those fine high-sounding words in the rest of the speech.

I want to read into the record that paragraph that we could agree with and for which we are very sorry that the minister did not carry on in the rest of the speech. "Manitobans have a clearly defined set of goals and objectives for their lives and for their children's future. They want secure jobs. They want their children to have an education that will enable them to be successful in a highly competitive labour market. They want to be confident that our health care system and social safety net will be accessible and effective far into the future. They want a balanced budget free from mounting deficits which threaten vital human services. They want to be able to walk on their streets and in their neighbourhoods in safety and without fear."

That is true.

I would like, Madam Deputy Speaker, to ask the government members to acknowledge that a member of the opposition agreed with something that the government said, one something. But, as I said earlier, the rest of the budget speech, the Speech from the Throne, the Estimates of the various departments, show that this paragraph is honoured in the exception rather than the rule. I would like to spend my address talking about a few of the examples where the government has failed to follow through on its commitment in the first page of the Budget Address.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in Family Services there are several areas that have caused us some concern. One in particular is in child daycare. Now, I know that the Minister of Family Services, both the current Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Mitchelson) and her predecessor, have made a great deal out of the fact that more money is going into child daycare than went into child daycare under the previous government, and the bottom line figure, that is accurate. But what the money is spent on has caused untold harm to countless families and children in this province and the child care workers that are working with these families.

We have a reduction of over \$300,000 in the Child Day Care line. Now, Madam Deputy Speaker, this may not seem like a lot of money when you take into account the fact that there is over \$47 million being spent under Child Day Care. As a percentage it is not a huge amount of money, but it is \$300,000 less in Child Day Care than was spent in the previous year, and we cannot always count on all of that money actually being spent. The Child Day Care program, and I do not ever tire of saying this because it is the truth and I think it is something that we on this side of the House can be very proud of, the child daycare system that was in place in 1988, on April 26, 1988, when the general election was held that brought the Tories to power in a minority government, that child daycare system was a model for not only all of Canada but for all of North America.

The reason that it was a model is that it recognized some basic fundamental truths about child daycare—not perfectly. There were changes that needed to be made. There were improvements that needed to be made, but in five years we produced a model child care system. In six years this government has devastated that child care system, and they have done it knowing exactly what they were doing. They have made decisions. As the ministers keep talking about the tough decisions that have to be made, they have made decision after decision after decision that have had the cumulative effect of destroying that model child care system.

\* (2140)

Madam Deputy Speaker, when the next government of the Province of Manitoba is elected, soon we hope, and it is a New Democrat government in the Province of Manitoba, we have our work cut out for us in child daycare. We have an enormous task facing us. I am here to say that we will meet that challenge, and we will return the child daycare system to the days when it was a model that the rest of the continent could look towards.

We will ensure that children have access to child daycare spaces that are publicly funded, that are

publicly operated. We will put money back into nonprofit child daycare, and we will not put money into the for-profit child daycare system, as this government has done. I might add, I understand that the Liberal Party of Manitoba has as well a policy that approves of that.

One small example that this government has undertaken is that they decreased the amount of time that a parent could have their child in daycare while they were looking for a job from two months to two weeks. Now this is the most callous example of a heartless decision by a government when the unemployment rate at the time that the Minister of Family Services, the member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), made that decision, that difficult choice that he had to make—at that time the unemployment rate for single parents was 17 percent, 18 percent. Double digits at least. There were no jobs in the province of Manitoba. There still are no jobs in the province of Manitoba. Parents who had their children in the child daycare system while they were going to university or while they had a job knew that they had two months to make changes and to try to either find another job or get a situation so that they could afford to keep their child in the daycare system. Now it is two weeks or they lose their spot.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Mr. Speaker, one of the other situations that the member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), when he was Minister of Family Services, undertook was to cap the subsidized daycare spaces at 9,600. Now this has had the effect of making a two-tier system in child daycare, much as the Ontario system was coming under the Liberal government, where there were a limited number of subsidized spaces, far less than the demand and the need, and there were lots of unsubsidized spaces going vacant because parents could not afford the \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000 it would cost to put two children through child daycare.

This is what this government's actions have led us to. They have led us in the child daycare system to a two-tier system where if you can afford to pay the full price, you have a spot, and if you cannot afford it, too bad.

Mr. Speaker, also in Family Services, the government talks about Family Services expenditures, and they have increased exponentially, but it is not due to any thought-out, planned programming to assist families in crisis. No, virtually the entire increase in the Department of Family Services over the last six years, the vast majority of that increase has come as a result of increased social assistance payments. The vast majority of those increases have not been because of increases in support, although there have been some programs that have done that. The vast majority of the amount of that increase has been due to an increase in social assistance rolls.

That should not be considered a success. That is a direct admission of failure on the part of this government to provide any meaningful job creation programs, education retraining programs, programs to enable people to, No. 1, not get on social assistance and, No. 2, if they do need to have social assistance, to enable them to get off it as quickly as possible. They have failed in this regard as well.

Even so, the welfare estimate, the Income Maintenance estimate for the government this year is down from \$236 million to \$228 million. Mr. Speaker, we would say that is a good thing, because that would mean there would be fewer people on social assistance. There is nothing else in this budget that leads us to believe that there will, in fact, be fewer people on the social assistance rolls.

We think this is another case of the government deliberately underestimating an expenditure that they are, by statute, obliged to provide. We are convinced when the end of this fiscal year approaches that number will have increased, because there will be more people on social assistance. There will be more poverty in this province because there is nothing in this budget to alleviate that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask and I will ask—or have the critic ask, in the Family Services Estimates, what the impact of the federal government's changes to the Unemployment Insurance system will have on the Income

Maintenance Programs in the Province of Manitoba. We think they will be very heavy, and we are very concerned about that. We do not see that reflected anywhere in the Family Services Income Maintenance Estimates.

There is another area I am very concerned about, and that is—or a question I have again on social assistance—again, this will be a question for Estimates. I would like to flag it for the minister's attention. The \$3 million for, I believe it is the Welfare to Work program, my understanding is that it is not cost-shared with the federal government. Now this is a program that will have to be paid for completely 100 percent by the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there have been programs in the Department of Family Services in the past three years that have been cut by this government, programs that were designed to give social assistance recipients the needed skills to get off social assistance that were completely cost-shared by the provincial government and the federal government. So those programs were 50-cent dollars from the province that enabled people to get off social assistance, particularly single mothers and people with physical and mental disabilities. Those programs have been cut completely in some cases, or have been seriously cut back.

So what the government has done is they have cut millions of dollars of cost-shared programming and they have added \$3 million in noncost-shared programming in this Welfare to Work program. That does not, to me, Mr. Speaker, seem like a very efficient use of provincial funds, and I think that the minister should be prepared to discuss that in great detail.

In Education, again the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) has this as one of his cornerstones of a healthy Manitoba and, of course, we agree with that as well. I would like to again quote from the budget document: "... we will continue to refocus education and training to meet our most important objective—equipping our citizens with the skills necessary to compete successfully in today's world."

Well, Mr. Speaker, we could and I could quite easily get into a lengthy discussion with the Minister of Finance and the government about what those skills necessary to compete successfully in today's world are. I think our definition of that would be perhaps broader and deeper than the government's definition, but that we will leave for another time.

But, again, this statement on the surface, admirable statement, is given the lie to by what is stated in the rest of the budget. As my colleague the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) has stated day after day after day in this House, programs that have in the past been very successful in training people, giving them the skills they need to compete in today's world, are being totally eliminated or cut back so much that they are almost nonfunctional.

\* (2150)

The ACCESS program, which has again a reputation throughout North America for being one of the best programs for enabling students and young people and mature students to go back to school to get the skills they need to be able to function in our society, has been reduced. Now why, Mr. Speaker, would a government that claims to be fiscally responsible, that claims to want to have an education system that prepares all of its citizens for the next century cut a program that has proved to be so effective? Those programs were cut 20 percent and last year 11 percent.

Student Financial Assistance is cut by a third almost. However, the Workforce 2000, which the Minister of Finance says is a successful program, is being continued. Again, the member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) has raised in the House on numerous occasions the major problems with the whole concept of Workforce 2000. I will not go into it in any detail here tonight, other than to say that it is passing strange that this government would cut ACCESS, while they maintain the corporate tax giveaway that is Workforce 2000.

As well, the university system has been faced with an almost 3 percent cut in their overall funding, a cut that is being seen as a real hit on

post-secondary education, but not all of the departments at the University of Manitoba, the University of Winnipeg, Brandon University or St. Boniface College have faced that same kind of cut. No, while the government has said there is going to be an overall cut to the university grant, there is one faculty that has seen an increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could guess what faculty that might be. Certainly not the Faculty of Social Work, certainly not the Faculty of Nursing, certainly not the Faculty of Education, certainly not the Faculty of Architecture, not the Faculty of Arts or Engineering. The Faculty of Management has had a 12.3 percent increase, while the ACCESS fund that helps kids and young people who are disadvantaged has had an 18.9 percent decrease in funding.

Now, what I find very interesting also about the increase to the Faculty of Management, Mr. Speaker, is that I have heard that the Faculty of Management is having a difficult time getting students. So here is a faculty that is having trouble attracting students that gets a 12.3 percent increase, while the rest of the university system is having to make do with less money, while the public school system is having to make do with a 2.6 percent, I believe, across-the-board decrease, which is far higher in some school divisions, such as Transcona-Springfield.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must make sure that people understand, this is the public school system that is forced to take a cut. The private school system has in effect an 8 percent increase.

Now, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) and the Minister of Education (Mr. Manness) would certainly rise in their seats, if they could, to explain to me that it really is not an increase because it is the same amount of money per pupil, and that it is a larger amount of money because there are more students in private schools.

Mr. Speaker, even a freeze in the per capita grant to private schools is too much when the public school system has had to take cut after cut after cut.



The current Minister of Education (Mr. Manness), the Minister of Education before him, the Premier (Mr. Filmon), every government member says that Child and Family Services agencies, school divisions, universities, the health care system, gets an amount of money, and they have to manage more efficiently within the resources they are given, but the Faculty of Management and the private school system, they are rewarded with increases in funding. Now, I would like to know where the double standard is here.

I think when you put that together with the grants made to large corporations under Workforce 2000, you begin to get the picture. This is not a budget nor is it a government that cares about the vast majority of the citizens of Manitoba. It is a government that is reflective of a very narrow group of interests.

In the Department of Health, for example, the government in its, quote, reform package, its reform document, has talked about the need to put programs into prevention. It has talked about a number of community-based initiatives, none of which they have undertaken.

In fact, this government, when it comes to its health care budget, also shows its callousness in a couple of areas, the whole area of Healthy Public Policy Programs. Those programs that are designed to promote healthy lifestyles, to promote healthy families, to promote healthy babies, women's health, all of those programs have been cut.

In the case of the Women's Health program, there was a 9 percent decrease in 1993-94 and an additional 10.4 percent decrease this year. This is for the whole area of women's health. I tend to think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to focus on the health of all Manitobans, no question about it, but we do have particular health issues that relate to women that do not relate to men. For this government to say that they are responsive to women's health needs and then cut the Women's Health department and programs, I find unacceptable.

Another division that has been cut is the Healthy Child Development division. The member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard), who used to be the Minister of Health, and I am not sure what it is he does now, but the Healthy Child Development line in the budget has been reduced by \$700,000.

Again, these are programs that are designed to prevent illness. They are designed to promote health and healthy children. The government members, including the member for Pembina and the member for Portage (Mr. Pallister), can laugh. They can laugh in the face of the worst child poverty rate in the country.

And what are they doing? They are cutting social assistance programs. They are cutting programs to help single parents. They are cutting the Healthy Child program, and they are laughing.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the areas where this government has shown that it has no heart. It has no plan except to cut programs from those who least can afford it. The concept of fairness does not enter into this budget as it has not entered into any of the other budgets that this government has undertaken. "Fair" is not a word that could be used to describe anything in this budget. I think it is quite unfortunate that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Stefanson) could make these pronouncements at the beginning of his Budget Address and then not deal with those issues at all in his budget in any proactive, positive manner.

\* (2200)

When I am able to continue my comments tomorrow, I will carry on with a few other items that I believe show that this government is not being fair to the citizens of Manitoba. It is not being fair to any of us. While I pointed out some specific areas that impact most on the most vulnerable Manitobans, this is a budget that is not good for any Manitoban, with the possible exception of those large corporations that can take advantage of Workforce 2000 or the \$23 million in tax giveaways to businesses. For the majority of Manitobans this budget is not good news. It is not good news for them. It is not good news for

northerners. It is not good news for rural Manitobans. It is not good news for the people in the city of Winnipeg. It certainly is not going to be good news for the government of Manitoba. This is the budget they are going to have to go to the people on, and the people of Manitoba will—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Would it be the will of the House to allow the honourable member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett) to continue her remarks, that the Speaker not see the clock? The honourable member has 13 minutes remaining. Would it be agreeable to everybody? There are 13 minutes remaining. Order, please. Just very quickly.

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. The honourable member for Wellington, carry on your remarks.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about just a couple more issues. A couple of the programs that the government has put into place that have had a fair bit of response, and positive response, are in the areas of Housing, the Home Renovation Program and the sales tax rebate program.

I would like to say that the concept of the Home Renovation Program and also the sales tax rebate program are not in and of themselves bad. I do think that they could have been implemented in a far fairer manner. We have on this side of the House actually given the government a couple of suggestions, particularly with the Home Renovation Program. One of them was the concern that the qualifying floor for the Home Renovation Program is \$5,000, that you must spend \$5,000 before you are eligible to have up to a thousand of that refunded.

Mr. Speaker, we know of many people in the province of Manitoba for whom \$5,000 is a prohibitive amount of money. We also know, I believe, that even the Saskatchewan program upon which this was based—the 20 percent rebate started from zero. So if you spent a hundred dollars or a thousand dollars, you got 20 percent of that back which allowed people with a smaller amount of money or access to a smaller amount of money to make some renovations to their homes. We

think that this would be a change that would allow more people to take advantage of this program, would not cost the government any more money and actually would be a much fairer process. Again, basically, the program has some positives.

Another change that we would like to see in this Home Renovation Program is a focus on environmental energy efficiency outlays of expenditures, as well as the renovations that would increase the bases of the homes. We feel that the government could have made some more narrow restrictions on the things that could be eligible or given a higher priority to the home renovations that would be energy efficient. But with those couple of suggestions, we think that this is a reasonable program but wish that the government would look at making some of these changes.

The other sales tax rebate program that the government is talking about, this one is one I think is going to be a little more difficult to accomplish. The rebate will be up to \$2,500 for a home which is worth up to \$100,000. Now the problem with this program as it is laid out is that it has to be a new home, and it has to be a first-time home buyer. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing (Mrs. McIntosh) in her answer—[interjection] Well, the vast majority of people who are first-time home buyers do not buy new homes. They cannot afford new homes. So this program has narrowed the number of people who can access it quite substantially. There are very few people comparatively who will be able to buy a new home for up to \$100,000.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, and I have been talking with a person who was in real estate who says that there are, comparatively speaking, very few new homes being built in the province of Manitoba that are \$100,000 or less. So, again, in a second way, you are narrowing the group of people who can have access to this.

I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to comment on something that the Minister of Housing said in her answer to the question from the member for Point Douglas (Mr. Hickey) yesterday when she said that this program will create hundreds of jobs—which we will take when we find that out—and provide

opportunities for young, married couples who are just getting started to fix their homes and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh) does not like it and has chastised me in the House, rightly so, when I say things like, or did say once, that St. James was a new suburb. She told me that was inaccurate, it was an old suburb and that I ought not to lump everybody into one category, for which she was correct. I would like to suggest, in the spirit of co-operation, to the Minister of Housing that not all people who buy homes for the first time are young married couples.

**An Honourable Member:** I did not say they were. You made the assumption.

**Ms. Barrett:** No, it was right here in black and white.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is an indication of the narrowness of perspective of the government in setting up these programs. As I said earlier, they are not in and of themselves bad programs, it is just that their implementation is not as fair or as broadly based as it should be.

I know I have not very much more time, but I would like to talk one little bit about something that is perhaps not directly related to the budget, although it will mean money that goes out of the coffers of the people of the province of Manitoba. That is the decision on the part of I believe it is the city but definitely the province and the federal government to go ahead and spend \$29 million on the Linden Woods underpass.

I think this is a horrendous example of mismanagement and bad financial decisions. This money, up to \$37 million, to make Kenaston a multilane route does not make any sense. It is going to mean enormous problems for the people who live in that part of the city, and it is also going to mean that the trucks and the heavy machinery

and things that go through that underpass and that expansion are going to have a very negative impact on the quality of life in that part of the city.

The second thing, and more importantly I think, is that \$37 million, or that \$29 million, whatever that money is going to be for Linden Woods, that money is money that should have been spent on true infrastructure renewal. That means things like sewers, roads that are not four-lane highways, the residential roads, back lanes, all the kinds of things that Winnipeg, particularly in the older parts of the city, has had enormous difficulty in funding. If there were \$37 million more in the infrastructure program for those kinds of things, then the people of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba would be much better served.

I just think this is another example of where this government has been unfair, it has been uncaring, and it has not done the best that it could for the people of Manitoba. It has been a very narrow, self-serving budget like all of the other budgets that this government has brought down.

As I said earlier, this is a budget that this government is going to most likely go to the people and ask for their support on this budget. And do you know what, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are going to give them a resounding no. Thank you.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, I adjourn debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, seconded by the honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that debate be adjourned. [agreed]

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, April 25, 1994

## CONTENTS

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Budget Debate

(Fourth Day of Debate)

Driedger	600
McCormick	603
Reimer	610
Barrett	618