

Fourth Session - Thirty-Ninth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable George Hickes
Speaker*

Vol. LXII No. 31A - 10 a.m., Tuesday, April 20, 2010

ISSN 0542-5492

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Ninth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BLADY, Sharon	Kirkfield Park	N.D.P.
BLAIKIE, Bill, Hon.	Elmwood	N.D.P.
BOROTSIK, Rick	Brandon West	P.C.
BRAUN, Erna	Rossmere	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
BRIESE, Stuart	Ste. Rose	P.C.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSSEN, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Wellington	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McFADYEN, Hugh	Fort Whyte	P.C.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Carman	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELBY, Erin	Southdale	N.D.P.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WHITEHEAD, Frank	The Pas	N.D.P.
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	N.D.P.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 20, 2010

The House met at 10 a.m.

Mr. Speaker: O Eternal and Almighty God, from Whom all power and wisdom come, we are assembled here before Thee to frame such laws as may tend to the welfare and prosperity of our province. Grant, O merciful God, we pray Thee, that we may desire only that which is in accordance with Thy will, that we may seek it with wisdom, know it with certainty and accomplish it perfectly for the glory and honour of Thy name and for the welfare of all our people. Amen.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I suspect if you were to canvass the House, you would find that there would be leave to be able to go directly to Bill 216 this morning.

Mr. Speaker: Is there agreement to go directly to Bill 216, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets). Is there agreement? [*Agreed*]

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 216—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member from River Heights, that Bill 216, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets), be now read a second time and be referred to a committee of this House.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, this is one of those issues in which I believe that the government should be taking action on. It's not the first time we've had this bill brought before the Legislature, but I want to emphasize very strongly that the government is making a huge mistake by not acting on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I've taken into consideration other comments that have been made in regards to why some people are uncomfortable with this bill, and as a result I did make a change to it so that it would only apply to those individuals that are 16 years of age and under, even though I do believe there is a valid argument to be said that all Manitobans should be subjected to mandatory bicycle helmets.

I do believe, ultimately, that this is a compromise in hopes that the government will see the merit of supporting this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

And I would appeal to all members of this Chamber to acknowledge the need for the legislation. This bill is all about protecting our children. Other jurisdictions across Canada have already done so, Mr. Speaker. The provinces that have province-wide mandatory bike helmet legislation include, for all ages, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Speaker, the under the-age-of-18 provinces include Alberta and Ontario. In regards to cities with legislation that go beyond the provinces that I just finished stated would include cities such as Yorkton, Saskatchewan; Whitehorse, Yukon; Inuvik, Northwest Territories; Mount Pearl, Newfoundland; St. John's, Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that Manitoba is falling behind on such important legislation and would highly recommend that members of this Legislature see the merit and acknowledge the need to pass mandatory legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the—and I've pointed it out before, that the government's argument tends to be, well, we'll give everyone free helmets in expectation that they will, in fact, start wearing those helmets. Over the years it has clearly been demonstrated that that policy is not having the impact, the desired impact that I believe that the public would like to see. And to constantly, year after year, ignore the issue I believe is morally wrong, that the government has—and this issue has been brought to the attention of the government. The bill will, in fact, have a real impact. Today's bill will protect hundreds if not thousands of children and that's where this bill is focussed.

You know, there was a dated survey that was done a couple of years back from a good organization, IMPACT, which is an organization that was very much concerned with the children, in fact all Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. And in dealing with this specific issue they conducted a survey, and I just want to highlight one part of the survey, and it's in regards to bicycle helmet use by age group.

Between the ages of 12 and 15 years of age, of a sample size of 219, 20 percent—19.8 percent,

actually, indicated that they were using bicycle helmets, Mr. Speaker. That is not acceptable. And, yes, it might have gone up somewhat since then, since the sample survey was conducted, but let there be no doubt that the best way to protect our children is indeed to have mandatory use of bicycle helmets.

Mr. Speaker, we—many of us can reflect in the—I guess it would've been in the '80s when there was a big push to have mandatory seatbelts. Well, if you look back then, there were free seatbelts. In all the vehicles there were seatbelts, yet people were not wearing the seatbelts. The government of the day saw merit in terms of making it mandatory to wear seatbelts, and as a result seatbelt usage climbed dramatically, well into the 90-plus percent.

And if you ask Manitobans today, they will clearly say that seatbelts save lives, minimize injuries. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we could be saving lives and minimizing the most dramatic type of injuries that society has, and that is head injuries.

*(10:10)

And even though I had to concede in terms of not having it mandatory for all ages, by reducing it just to our children, I believe that this is a bill that the government cannot say no to, that this is a bill that the government needs to act upon. If they care at all about our children in this province, they will allow this bill to go to committee.

Mr. Speaker, some, including myself, suspect that this could be potentially my last session and I can tell the government that this bill will be very symbolic to myself in terms of the way in which the NDP view the children of our province. They have a decision to make here and that decision is, do they care enough about our children in order to bring in legislation that is going to save lives and save the health in terms of brain injury and so forth? If they really and truly care, they will see the merit of this bill and have this bill passed. If, in fact, they do not see the merit and they continue to stonewall the bill and adjourn debate on the bill, I suspect well into the years ahead, this is the type of legislation that I'm going to refer to in showing and demonstrating that the NDP really don't care. If they do not pass this legislation, I plan on taking this as an example of a political party that does not care about the children of the province of Manitoba, and I will make it very loud and I will make it very clear to every Manitoban that I come across, that the NDP do not care about children, if they continue to stonewall on this bill.

I have been bringing forward legislation that would have had a serious—and I, on behalf of the Manitoba Liberal Party, have brought forward legislation that would have gone far and wide in terms of protecting the interests and the health of our children in the province of Manitoba. Time and time again the government has resisted acting on such proposed legislation, like what we have before us this morning, and have chosen to ignore it at the cost of our children. This is something in which is totally and absolutely unacceptable and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the government chooses once again to ignore this legislation, there will be a cost. And I will ensure, to the best of my ability, that people are, in fact, aware of the negligence of this government on such an important issue.

So, therefore, I would ask the government, Mr. Speaker, that they seriously look at allowing this bill to go to committee. They've had the opportunity through past years to be able to put many comments on the record. I am prepared, and the Liberal Party, and I'm sure the Conservatives would be in support of allowing whatever leave necessary, if there were, in fact, more members that were wanting to see this bill debated.

But the reality is, if this bill does not go to committee this morning, it will be because the government has made the decision that they do not want to protect children in this province by making it mandatory in terms of taking a legislative action. And, Mr. Speaker, I think that would be very sad.

I appeal to each and every member of the New Democratic caucus to do the right thing, to do the honourable thing, and to allow this bill to go to committee and join more than 50 percent of the other provinces in Canada that have already done likewise. Mr. Speaker, for the children, let's see this bill passed today. Thank you.

Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East): It's a pleasure to get up after the member. I've been listening to the member for 10 years now. He's got a long and distinguished career in this Chamber, which is apparently about to reach an end, which is—certainly all of us in this Chamber will wish him well as he leaves here and hopes he has a long, extinguished career away from here.

Mr. Speaker, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, proposed by the member opposite, is part of an ongoing discussion that we've been having in this House. And, in fact, this ongoing discussion that's

been—having—been—[*interjection*] I don't know if *Hansard* picked that up or not.

And it's ongoing—an ongoing bill that's before us, an ongoing proposal that the member brings before us, which is part of a larger discussion, not only in Canada, in Western Europe, in the United States, in individual jurisdictions, as well as at the municipal level where, most precisely, this debate has taken most of its salient form around the world.

So perhaps the member—I know he's running for an MP right now. He's already—

An Honourable Member: He could run for mayor.

Mr. Caldwell: He could run for mayor. Indeed, he could run for City Council. You know, I think, both of those positions would suit him well vis-à-vis his presence in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Our government obviously believes that public safety, community safety, the safety of our citizens, the health and welfare of our citizens, is at the highest priority. And, Mr. Speaker, one needs only look at our record in health care as a government and the development of our health-care infrastructure.

In my own community, Mr. Speaker, when members opposite were in office, seven times they promised to build the Brandon Regional Health Centre; over 11 years, seven times. That health centre was not built. Not a scrap of work was done throughout that whole 11 years that members opposite were promising that health-care centre.

We, of course, one of the first actions we took in terms of forming government, was to build the Brandon Regional Health Centre, to move health-care services in Brandon and western Manitoba into the 20th century, and, Mr. Speaker, we continue to move forward and build that health infrastructure. Right now, in fact, the CancerCare—Westman CancerCare treatment centre is under full development in Brandon to provide western Manitobans with radiation and chemotherapy treatment, the first time in history that western Manitobans will have the ability to get cancer treatment in western Manitoba, as opposed to travelling to Winnipeg. [*interjection*]

So, Mr. Speaker, the member is talking from his seat, although I don't think the *Hansard* is picking it up, but he is heckling from his seat. And I will remind the member that when you're building health-care infrastructure, when you're voting for something in fact that's capital funding for which the member

voted—has voted against consistently ten times in this House, has voted against investment in health-care infrastructure, not only in Brandon, but right across the province.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we debate this bill about providing for greater safety in health protection, I would remind the member that he consistently opposes every single initiative that would build health-care infrastructure, not only in his own constituency or my constituency in Brandon but throughout Manitoba for every Manitoban. So he can—I think that the member's record and his integrity on these matters is well known throughout the province.

An Honourable Member: His record speaks for itself.

Mr. Caldwell: Indeed it does. His record, indeed, does speak for itself.

Mr. Speaker, health-care safety, matters of community development, this is—this bill that the member brings forth, and has brought forth in various forms a number of times, speaks to the matter of the development of same in this province.

Bicycle cycling—bicycle riding is something I very much enjoy. I know, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans know and recognize that the Premier (Mr. Selinger) often cycles to work. In fact, he probably is doing it today, because it's a beautiful, beautiful Manitoba morning, as we are in the House today. So cycling is something that, obviously, we want to encourage.

In building our communities, I made reference to health care and building important infrastructure to make our communities healthier for families, and our province a better place to live. We've also been investing very heavily, in fact, with partners in developing further cycling opportunities for Manitobans and Winnipeggers.

* (10:20)

Mr. Speaker, in Winnipeg, the Dunkirk-Dakota pathway, phase 1 of a bicycle path trail through the City of Winnipeg has received \$1.4 million from this government, to enhance cycling opportunities. Phase 2 will be a \$900,000 investment in that Dakota-Dunkirk pathway. I know that my colleagues in south St. Vital, in the south end of Winnipeg, where families are such a vital part of that area of Winnipeg, appreciate those investments in their communities and their neighbourhoods to make, in

fact, a better quality of life for their children and themselves when they partake of cycling.

Ms. Marilyn Brick, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

In Transcona, the Transcona Trails—my colleague from—the MLA for Transcona (Mr. Reid) is here nodding his head. He's been central to the development of this work in building the—*[interjection]* Pardon me? He was attending meetings for the further development of this last week, he advises me.

The Trans Canada Trail, phase 1, is a \$1.2-million initiative. Phase two, a \$1.3-million initiative.

These are very, very important infrastructure investments in creating a better quality of life for people in, in the first instance, south St. Vital, in the second instance, in Transcona.

We're not confined particularly to the city of Winnipeg as a government. We do represent Manitobans north, south, east, west of the full panoply of peoples that inhabit this province. I'm privileged to have colleagues of Philippine descent. I'm pleased to have colleagues of Scots descent—a couple of which are to my right, here—French-Canadian. So, the Dugald area, the Dugald pathways, a \$900,000 investment in bicycle paths, leading out of the city of Winnipeg and into the surrounding rural communities.

In my home community of Brandon, we're very, very proud of the ring of bike paths that currently surrounds the city, the inner city. We've got a ring road of bike paths in the city of Brandon, which, again, speaks to creating and enhancing a better quality of life for people who live in our communities, as well as providing an environment for people to learn about better safety. And, frankly, in my community, we do encourage bike helmets.

And I would encourage the member, perhaps instead of running for federal office, he should run for city council of Winnipeg and do us all a favour. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I want to put a few words on the record about the—members brought forward by Inkster, and certainly, I, too, want to congratulate the member from Inkster on a job well done. I know anybody in the House that puts his name on the ballot and serves as a member of this wonderful—this building and this province certainly has to be congratulated and I know that he's worked

very passionately about a number of issues that he's brought forward. I certainly do, on behalf of all our caucus, wish you all the best in your future endeavours and wherever that might take you.

As mentioned previously, the legislation, if passed, would require cyclists under the age of 16 to wear a protective helmet if operating a bicycle or power-assisted bicycle on a highway or bike path. I would like to recognize the tenacity of the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) for trying to move this bill forward through the legislative and passage of this bill, to protect young cyclists. Cyclists have become an increasingly popular activity, be it for recreational purposes or a mode of active transportation.

As the member from Brandon East had just mentioned, a number of paths have been built, not only in urban areas, and also some of the other cities in the province. I know that cycling has become very popular, which is a great thing. It's an activity that brings a potential for accidents, as we know, and injuries can be life changing.

I know on the weekend there was a—or last weekend, there was an incident where a fellow was hit and fell to the floor and whether or not that was a repercussion of the hit or the fall to the floor—and hit it on a marble floor—whether that was part of that accident, if he—obviously, it was not a cycle accident, but it's certainly something that we have to be cognizant of the fact that somebody may be hurt, with a head injury, whether it be going in a slow speed or a high speed.

And I know, on a personal issue, I know my father and myself are both motorcyclists, and he had an accident—

An Honourable Member: Bikers.

Mr. Eichler: He is a biker and I'm a biker—

An Honourable Member: Harley.

Mr. Eichler: —and he rides a Honda and I ride a Harley, and we're both very proud of that fact.

But I can tell you the story. He had a tire that was not quite had enough tread on it, and he got in the rain and it fishtailed on him. The bike went out from underneath him. He slid down the pavement. I can tell you that the helmet actually wore down to his forehead and left a small scratch on his forehead, but the helmet was completely totalled out. If it wouldn't have been for the helmet, my father wouldn't be here today as a result of that accident.

So helmets do save lives. They do make a difference, and we know that anybody that's a parent in this House, or an aunt and uncle that has to consider their children or grandchildren, or nieces or nephews to wear a helmet, they should do so. We know that—how easy it is that people can get distracted from one thing or another, where they stop to look at a puppy, or a good-looking girl walking down the street or a good-looking guy walking down the street. I know we get distracted from one reason to another, and we veer off and easily hit our head, and we wonder what happened.

So we have to be very careful about riding these bicycles as we go down the street so that we don't get distracted, and whatever protections we can put into place, certainly, would be an issue that we should be able to try to overcome.

Also, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have to make sure that whenever we're talking about bicycle safety, a number of Canadian jurisdictions have already enacted legislation regarding bicycle helmets. Four provinces—British Columbia, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia—passed legislation mandating either all age or under age of 18 helmet use in a period from 1995 to 1997. In November of 2001, Alberta passed a private member's bill that makes helmets mandatory for cyclists under the age of 18. All-age mandatory helmet law was introduced in Prince Edward Island in 2003. There is currently in Québec a National Assembly bill to make helmets mandatory for children 12 and under. In Québec, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland, some municipalities have enacted by-laws requiring helmets to be worn.

There is no doubt that the use of bicycle helmets has introduced injuries in the hospitalization related to bicycle accidents.

It's just common sense that we have an extreme amount of reluctance from the NDP to support this legislation.

I'd like to take a couple of minutes to cite some of the opinions from some local and national experts about the importance of wearing bicycle helmets when it comes to reducing rider injuries.

In July of 2009, interviewed by the *Winnipeg Sun*, Greg Dueck, Director of Operation with Safety Services Manitoba, stated, and I quote: What people don't realize is it doesn't take a lot of speed to create a bad head injury. End of quote.

Dr. Patrick McDonald, a pediatric neurosurgeon at Children's Hospital in Winnipeg, also cited in a

CBC story in July 2009 about the importance of cyclists wearing helmets. Dr. McDonald wrote to the former premier Gary Doer about the matter, stating, and I quote: There is no question that those provinces that have helmet legislation, be it for children or adults, have demonstrated reduction in all head injuries, but especially serious head injuries among cyclists. End of quote.

A study conducted by researchers for the Hospital for Sick Children, published in the *Journal of Pediatrics* looked at cycling-related accidents resulting in death before and after the introduction of mandatory helmet law in the province of Ontario. The findings showed that the number of deaths was cut in half, at least for children age 15 and younger.

Each time this bill is debated, I have heard a number of excuses from the government's members as to why they can't support the bill. During the debate, the mandatory bicycle helmet—back in June of 2009, the Minister of Healthy Living talked extensively about the investments her government made in injury prevention strategies, like taking into account the injuries that can happen from homes and vehicles.

Need I remind the minister that we are still waiting for enforcement to begin with respect to the government's legislation regarding the ban of cell phones while driving. Other jurisdictions have moved quickly to implement similar legislation aimed at reducing driver distraction and improving road safety. It has taken months and months to bring that type of law into effect into Manitoba. One has to ask: Why is it taking so long?

* (10:30)

Also, during June 2009 debate on mandatory bike helmets, the member from Interlake talked about his content with the following advice for healthy kids, healthy future task force that as more education was needed with respect to the use of bike helmets.

I appreciate the efforts that the government has made in respect to education in terms of making low-cost bike helmets available to those who need it. These are important measures but I have to ask: Why was the member of Interlake content to stand by, refusing support the use of mandatory helmets that could prevent a young person from sustaining a devastating head injury?

As the member from Interlake today will likely move from his content to, some might suggest,

comfortable position to one that is more acted orientated, one that aims to take more aggressive approach preventing injuries to our young people.

In closing, I would like to say, I support the intent of the legislation which aims to reduce injuries, deaths and costs associated with our health-care system when cyclists are involved in accidents. I strongly encourage members across the way to revisit their position on this legislation, as the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has brought forward this private member bill several times, but the governing NDP has repeatedly refused to allow it to come to a vote. I will be curious to see if the DP members talk this bill out today, if they finally demonstrate the willingness to put it to a vote.

Thank you for the opportunity to put a few things in the record in regards to this very important legislation, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Tom Nevakshonoff (Interlake): Madam Deputy Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise today to speak to this bill, once again brought forward by the member for Inkster. He is persistent; I give him that.

And I'd like to begin my remarks in addressing comments of the member of Lakeside who just spoke a moment ago and made reference to comments that I made. And I would remind him of comments that the former member for Lakeside made many times in this House and to the effect that he said that every day the Legislature sits, the people of Manitoba become a little less free.

And I think that's the essence of my objections to this, that we have a tendency to legislate here. Every year 50, 60 different bills come forward and there is some truth to that, that ultimately our freedom is further and further curtailed.

And, you know, the right of free choice and personal responsibility, those types of concepts go by the wayside in government's endeavour to idiot-proof the world, basically, to, you know, strive toward that utopia, that perfect world where nobody is injured. And this is just one of the tools to move in that direction.

And I was a member of the Healthy Kids, Healthy Futures task force and, just to give you an example, we learned that the leading cause of death amongst young people was—well, suicide was, I believe, the No. 1 cause—but swimming was the cause of death for many young people, as well. So would the member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler), or the member for Inkster for that matter, would they

suggest that everybody be required to wear life jackets when they go swimming? You have to ask yourself: Does that make sense? I don't think so.

If you want to talk about highways, well, you know, our speed limit is 100 kilometres of hour—100 kilometres per hour. You know, people die every year on our highways, and maybe it's because of the fact that we're going too fast. Maybe we should reduce our speed limits to 80 kilometres an hour or 60 kilometres on our highways. Nobody would get killed then. Everybody would be safe, but there's a point in society where you have to draw the line. There's a point where common sense has to kick in and personal responsibility, and any parent, I would hope, would encourage their children to wear helmets.

I have a three-year-old granddaughter and I certainly encourage her to wear a helmet. She comes to visit us on the farm and I have a bike there for her and a helmet there for her, and make sure that she wears it not only on the bicycle but when she rides on the quad with me, as well. And that's because I want her to be safe. I don't think the government should have to pass laws to make sure that I think in that regard.

And I look to the words of our former premier, Gary Doer, also a good quote here, where he said that the ultimate goal isn't to pass laws; the ultimate goal is to prevent head injuries, with more people wearing helmets. And the Healthy Kids, Healthy Futures task force studied this issue and made a recommendation basically that reflected this mindset, and we set off on a public awareness campaign that's been ongoing for a number of years; and we have supplied free helmets, we have supplied low-cost helmets, so that, you know, people who are not as affluent in our society also have the opportunity to go this path. But we haven't imposed it upon them.

This is a tendency that Liberals are prone toward, and I look to one of the greatest boondoggles of all time—and maybe the member for—current member for Lakeside (Mr. Eichler) might agree with me in this regard, and I look to—*[interjection]* Well, he asks what is that, and I was referring to one of the greatest political boondoggles of all time, and that is the Firearms Act, and I'm sure he would agree with me that you can't completely idiot-proof the world, pass laws that are so restrictive, hoping that you're going to prevent one out of 100,000 people from going postal and misusing firearms. The rest of us across the country, because of Liberal zeal to idiot-

proof the world, now have to bear the consequences of the Firearms Act.

And I'm not saying that I'm against safe storage and so forth of firearms. Obviously I'm not. Again, I have a grandchild and young people, nephews come to my home and the last thing I would want is for them to, you know, be injured as a result of that. Therefore, I keep my firearms locked up and hidden so that that doesn't happen. But, you know, their law goes so much further than that and that's the tendency, the—that attempt to achieve a utopia, to idiot-proof the world, to put everybody in their little glass boxes and to watch everybody and to make sure that nothing can go wrong in that way, and that is just not a good way to live, as far as I'm concerned.

I have to look to police resources. This is a very valid point. Our police are stretched to the limit. We're always challenged here from a budget's perspective to cover off all bases and the prevention of crime is of major importance to us, and we have only so many police officers and they are enforcing serious laws. Do we want them chasing 13- and 14-year-olds down the street? Do we want people tied up in the court system over something like this? Obviously not. So I would think that approaching this from an education as opposed to a Big Brother-style enforcement policy is preferable.

If we're going to go to bicycles, there's a wide range of other things that you could apply the same type of law to. Skiing is dangerous. Why don't we enforce helmets, or elbow pads and kneepads, for that matter, on skiers or skateboarders or as the member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) told me, curling, on occasion, can be dangerous. You're standing on ice, very slippery, big rocks that you can hit your heads on. Why don't we pass a law stating that people who curl in this province should be forced to wear helmets as well, because, on occasion, there is an injury. Somebody slips; somebody went, you know, to the lounge a couple of times before he got on the ice, for example, and slipped and hit his head. So, you know, as I said, again, there is a limit to how far we can go with this.

And I don't mean to cast aspersions on the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) but, you know, I think he has an ulterior motive here too. Right after the member for Brandon East (Mr. Caldwell) spoke—and he also spoke in favour of education and free helmets and so forth—the member for Inkster was

yelling across the way at him that there would be a letter to the *Brandon Sun* in short order.

* (10:40)

So we can see what this is. This is an attempt to create a wedge issue, to start a little brush fire here and then go out and cast aspersions on other members on that basis.

So, you know, I acknowledge the member's zeal. We know he's quite active in this House, and we will sincerely miss him when he rides off into the sunset on his bicycle with his helmet on, I'm sure.

But, for today, I would just close my remarks by saying that the Healthy Kids, Healthy Futures task force dealt with it, recommended an education program, recommended that we supply low-cost helmets and free helmets to impoverished families, that we would get further ahead with that course of action as opposed to the heavy hand of government, yet another law imposed upon our people.

Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to talk about this bill to improve the health and well-being of our children.

As the Canadian Pediatric Society has pointed out in their analysis, the health of children which is fundamentally important to all of us is not being addressed adequately in Manitoba. Whereas other provinces are, by and large, doing much better than us, when it comes to the health of the children, we rank second-last in the measures that we are taking to improve the health of our children.

And among the measures which the Canadian Pediatric Society has recommended and has recommended for several years is mandatory bike helmets for children as a way of reducing injuries, particularly head injuries, among children.

I have listened, not only in this debate but in previous debates, to NDP members who get up time and time again and say that this measure is not needed. I have listened to the member for the Interlake (Mr. Nevakshonoff) and the member for Brandon East (Mr. Caldwell) today. I have seen all the members of the NDP applauding and nodding in support of the comments of the member from the Interlake. I have not heard a single member of the NDP rise in support of mandatory bike helmets in this bill, and it is sad when we have an entire caucus, an entire government, strongly opposed to having mandatory bike helmets.

Now, we may have and I think the member from the Interlake has put it—you know, let's prevent head injuries and let's have more people wearing helmets. Well, let's look at the reason, the fundamental reason, why we make this mandatory, and that is because in jurisdiction after jurisdiction, it's quite clear that when you make bike helmets mandatory, the use of bike helmets goes up dramatically.

You know in Alberta, for example, before legislation, the helmet use was 28 percent; after legislation, it was 83 percent. In British Columbia, there was a 52 percent increase in helmet use, and in province after province, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of helmets being worn after legislation making it mandatory. B.C., the rate before helmet use was 46 percent. It went up right after to 70 percent. In Nova Scotia, the rate of helmet use was 35 percent. It went up right after to 80 percent. In Ontario, helmet use went from 46 percent to 65 percent after the mandatory legislation was introduced and passed.

So mandatory legislation is very clearly the most effective measure we have to ensure a considerable increase in the number of children wearing helmets.

Now, we can compare this to the role of education, and the fact is that after the education campaign was undertaken in Manitoba, that, in fact, helmet use has gone up but only marginally. It is still below 40 percent overall, 36.6 percent at the latest number.

And the fact is that bicyclists who are aged 12 to 15, only 20 percent of children in the latest study were actually wearing helmets. And when we take the examples of what's happened elsewhere and how effective mandatory helmet use and legislation has been, then it's the single most effective way of increasing helmet use and of protecting children.

And the members of the NDP caucus, in my view, are making a big mistake. They are putting our children at risk by not using safety measures like mandatory bike helmets, as has been suggested and supported by the Canadian Pediatric Society and many, many other bodies as a tool to increase helmet use and make sure that we have more people wearing helmets and fewer children injured and dying.

Brain injuries, which is one of the problems in terms of those who are injured without wearing helmets, is very serious. It is very lifelong in many circumstances, and it is very costly to our health-care system. It is—the NDP, as they have shown, they are

the party of handouts, the party of freebies, and they believe by throwing money around and throwing helmets around, that they're going to solve the problem.

Well, I don't know if there's been any studies which look at how many of the children who got free helmets actually wear them. But, you know, the—what we're interested in is not whether a child has a helmet but whether a child is actually wearing a helmet. And, clearly, legislation, as we are proposing here, is the most effective single measure that can be taken to increase helmet use and to increase safety of children and to decrease head injuries and decrease deaths among children.

And that's why I stand up today to support this legislation very strongly, and I'm rather surprised and, indeed, shocked by the approach being taken by the NDP members of this House, of the Legislature.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Deputy Speaker, I'm disappointed that the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is not listening to me as I speak this morning. Usually he is listening very attentively and chirping from his chair and heckling and offering advice. But it seems that his—either his ears are stopped or he's just very, very quiet this morning and not listening to me even though he sponsored the bill. I think that's kind of strange that he wouldn't listen to the people who are speaking—*[interjection]* I know the rules—who are speaking to his bill which he thinks is so important. And I would like to talk about the process before I talk about the content because, you know, the member for Inkster put a lot of remarks on the record encouraging us to pass it today so that it can go to committee and then to third reading and then royal assent and then become the law.

But the practice here is that this very seldom happens with opposition members' bills, regardless of which party is in opposition. And I've been here in opposition—I spent nine long years in opposition—and I think, during that time, I can recall two opposition bills that were adopted, not by the opposition member but by the government because they took the idea and amended their own legislation.

I believe one had to do with cooking wine. It was a bill by the member for Point Douglas. And I think another one might have been Aboriginal Day. I'm just going by memory but I think those were actually adopted by the government of the day. And so things continue to be the same with a change in government.

* (10:50)

And, in fact, I can remember a very important bill proposed by an opposition member, by a private member, and that was the member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), who, I think, every session for maybe nine years, introduced a bill regarding presumptive legislation for firefighters.

And the government, in spite of the fact that it was supported by firefighters, would not let that bill go to committee, which turned out to be a big tactical mistake on the part of the Filmon government, because when we became government, we did implement legislation, presumptive legislation for firefighters, and that was very popular with firefighters. And I believe it was the first jurisdiction in North America to do that, and now many, many jurisdictions in United States and Canada have followed that. And the firefighters in Winnipeg and elsewhere in Manitoba have been very supportive of the government because of that. And, in fact, they come as delegates to our annual convention, and they knock on doors for us during the election, particularly in our target seats, and they appreciate what this NDP government has done for them, in terms of presumptive legislation.

Now, had the previous government do that—done that, they might have reaped similar benefits from having the firefighters support them. But, no, they didn't want to give the member for Transcona any credit for having a good idea or even borrow the idea and amend legislation themselves, and so we did it when we became government.

So the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) shouldn't, you know, put so many comments on the record about why we're holding this up, that this is kind of the normal practice. And that's not to say that the government isn't examining it, and the government may borrow a good idea. And someday, the government may act on this, just not the kind of timetable that the member for Inkster wants; maybe on the government's timetable.

Now, regarding the remarks of the member for Inkster, I guess there's just one that I want to comment on before I talk a little bit more about the content, and that is his question: Do we care about children? And the answer is yes. Many of us on this side have children. In fact, I can remember when our children were young, and we required them to wear helmets when they were cycling. I always have worn a helmet when cycling, and I know that when they were at a certain age, it wasn't the in thing for

teenagers to wear helmets. And I suspect that at least one of my children wore a helmet until they got out of sight of our yard, and then they took the helmet off. However, eventually they grew up and wore helmets as adults.

In fact, our daughter Tanissa had what she called her dream job last year, because she worked for a cycling touring company called Freewheeling, out of Hubbards, Nova Scotia, and conducted cycling tours all over the Maritimes and Québec and had a wonderful summer. And she's going back to Freewheeling this summer to do the same thing again. And I've seen pictures on their Web site and all the cyclists, all these adults, are wearing helmets, as they should. And when I cycle to the Legislative Building or around the North End, I always wear a helmet, because we need to be good role models for children, because we care about them.

And the government has tried to encourage the use of helmets, and I think has been very successful, because we have been distributing low-cost and free helmets. In fact, we have a low-cost bicycle helmet program, which has a variety of certified bicycle helmets which have been purchased in bulk and available to children and their families in all schools and early learning child-care centres in Manitoba. And this program, which is in its fourth year, complements ongoing bicycle safety education within the Manitoba education curriculum.

And as of 2009, we've distributed 8,477 helmets—that may actually just be in one year, but I'm not sure. It might be a cumulative—*[interjection]*

In one year we have distributed 8,477 helmets, and we will continue doing that. And we know that the need is actually increasing, because now there's a budget of \$20 million, I believe, contributed by the City and the Province for active transportation. And this is something that the member for St. Norbert (Ms. Brick) has been very interested and involved in. And the members opposite voted against our budget, so I guess they voted against \$20 million for active transportation.

And this year the money is going to be spent—it's actually a huge increase. I believe the previous budget was about 400,000; it's gone to 20 million. And so we have all these bikeways and bike paths, and I'm very pleased that one of the routes in the North End is the Machray bikeway, and I happen to live on Machray.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Now, I had nothing to do with choosing the route; I had no influence on the choice of routes, but it, just by coincidence, Machray is the east-west bike route in—one of them—in the North End. And so—and it hooks up with, I believe, Powers, and goes to Sutherland and then to Main Street.

I take the Salter Bridge. I'm not a very courageous cyclist so I don't actually go over the car portion of the bridge. I go on the sidewalk, which is probably illegal. However, I am courteous. When I come across a pedestrian I get off my bike until the pedestrian has passed.

And I must say that I feel much safer cycling downtown because of the bike lanes, with the symbols of bicycles. And I find that most motorists are very respectful of the bike lanes and so it is a safe practice to commute to work now. And it's only going to get better as we spend the \$20 million.

For example, the Dakota-Dunkirk pathway phase 1, 1.4 million; phase 2, 900,000; Transcona trail, phase 1, 1.2 million; phase 2, 1.3 million; Dugald pathway, 900,000; Grosvenor bikeway, 525,000; Lagimodiere pathway, 700,000; Kildare Avenue bikeway, 675,000; Alexander-Pacific bikeway, 425,000; Machray bikeway, 900,000; Moray Street pathway, 400,000; Bison Drive pathway, 240,000. So we are encouraging cycling. We are encouraging helmet use and we want to see all Manitobans using helmets.

Our government is facilitating that by handing out low-cost helmets and we will continue to do that and we will continue to study this bill.

Mr. Daryl Reid (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to rise to add my comments to the private member's Bill 216, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I know this private member's bill was brought forward by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in the last session of the Legislature. And I believe at that time I had an opportunity to comment, as well, and I'd like to add some more comments because there's been some progress and some improvements that our provincial government has made with respect to the active transportation system, not only in the city of Winnipeg here, Mr. Speaker, but also across the province in other communities like Brandon, and others, with regard to our investment in trails and in bike paths for the residents of our province.

I know, Mr. Speaker, I want to start first by congratulating the Transcona Trails organization, Gail Kauk, Val Cousineau, Liz Beazley, and others, who are actively involved in the trails project in the community of Transcona, and have, of course, lobbied quite effectively with the City of Winnipeg and with our provincial government, and have achieved investments into the Transcona Trails phase 1 project, \$1.2 million and, of course, an additional amount of \$1.3 million into phase 2 of the Transcona Trails project.

And, of course, this summer, Mr. Speaker, and having just attended public meetings in my community just two weeks ago, the Transcona Trails project was asking and inviting the community of Transcona residents to come out and to see first-hand the projects that are being proposed for the community of Transcona that will be under construction this year.

And, of course, Mr. Speaker, the additional bikeway that will be constructed along Kildare Avenue, just under three-quarters of a million dollars will go further into the trails initiative in the community of Transcona. But I also want to mention that our provincial government has also invested in helmets for children for families that are in need. And we have made significant investment in that regard, as there were some nearly 8,500 helmets were distributed 2009 alone, which is a significant investment to help families that are of low-income, perhaps, and that have been identified that would need some assistance in that regard.

That is in keeping with the program that we have, Mr. Speaker, in past years where we have made investments into the low-cost bicycle helmet program in previous years. There were several thousands, in fact some—over 52,000 helmets that have been distributed to Manitoba families as a result of that particular program.

Now, that program was identified by the Healthy Kids, Healthy Futures task force that was an all-party task force in the past, Mr. Speaker, that had made recommendations with respect to bicycle helmets, not mandatory bicycle helmets—

* (11:00)

Mr. Speaker: Order. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member will have seven minutes remaining.

RESOLUTIONS

Res. 2—Expansion of Neighbourhoods Alive!

Mr. Speaker: The hour now being 11 a.m., we will now move on to resolutions, and we'll deal with Resolution, Expansion of Neighbourhoods Alive!, Resolution No. 2.

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Brandon East (Mr. Caldwell),

WHEREAS in 2000 the provincial government launched Neighbourhoods Alive!, a long-term community revitalization project in Brandon Centre, Thompson and targeted areas throughout the city of Winnipeg; and

WHEREAS the goal of Neighbourhoods Alive! is to support communities in rebuilding local neighbourhoods through funding and planning assistance; and

WHEREAS the 2005 Neighbourhoods Alive! expanded to encompass projects in additional communities in Winnipeg; and

WHEREAS in 2007 the program was further expanded to neighbourhoods in Portage la Prairie, Selkirk, Dauphin, The Pas and Flin Flon; and

WHEREAS in this way, Neighbourhoods Alive! builds on the existing strengths of rural, urban and northern communities, allowing them to flourish socially and economically.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Legislative Assembly recognize the work of the provincial government in revitalizing our community through Neighbourhoods Alive! and continue to support the government as the project expands into new communities.

Mr. Speaker: It's been moved by the honourable member for Selkirk, seconded by the honourable member for Brandon East,

WHEREAS in 2000—dispense?

Some Honourable Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Mr. Dewar: It's my great thrill to rise to speak about the Neighbourhoods Alive! program and the expansion of this program into communities outside of the original three or four communities, and I introduce this resolution and speak to it in a non-

partisan way, and I hope and, quite frankly, expect all-party support and passage of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal I'm putting forward recognizes the work of the provincial government in revitalizing our communities through the Neighbourhoods Alive! program. And, as well, to—of course, continues to support the government as the project expands into new communities.

Mr. Speaker, the—recently, as I said in the—in my opening comments that the government expanded this program from the first number of communities which, of course, was the city of Winnipeg, Thompson and Brandon. They then expanded it into Portage la Prairie, Selkirk, Dauphin, The Pas, Flin Flon.

In 2000, the—this government, under the leadership of then-Intergovernmental Affairs Minister, Jean Friesen, launched the program entitled Neighbourhoods Alive! It's a long-term, community-based social and economic development strategy to support community-driven revitalization in the high-needs neighbourhoods in Brandon, Thompson and Winnipeg.

And I know that my colleagues from Brandon East and Wolseley will be adding their comments on what this program has meant to their own communities, Mr. Speaker, and I'm expecting some of my other colleague—I'm sure the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Jennissen) is also eager to jump up and talk about all the great things that are happening in Flin Flon because of the Neighbourhoods Alive! expansion into his community—as well, as I said, into Dauphin, The Pas and in Portage la Prairie.

Mr. Speaker, it's—Neighbourhoods Alive! is an initiative that provides a toolbox of programs to assist communities to identify neighbourhood renewal priorities and then implement projects that address these priorities. It's comprehensive in scope, supporting community-based projects that build capacity and improve the physical environment, revitalize housing, increase economic development and enhance safety and well-being of those communities.

And, to date—and this is, I think, quite an accomplishment—to date, \$55.8 million has been committed to the programs under the Neighbourhoods Alive! project, Mr. Speaker. And it was originally designed for specific neighbourhoods and community: Brandon city centre, Thompson and five inner-city areas in the city of Winnipeg. As I

said, it's expanded now throughout into seven inner-city neighbourhoods in Winnipeg, and, of course, as I said, to five more urban centres with populations over 5,000 in the rural area.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), when he was the minister, for his leadership to support this expansion into these additional five communities.

Neighbourhoods Alive! supports community renewal by providing funding and planning assistance to community-based organizations for community-identified priorities in a number of areas. I mentioned housing, employment and training, education, and safety and crime prevention. Mr. Speaker, the budget that was voted on just last week allocated new funding for this program, to allow the expansion of Neighbourhoods Alive! into the Elmwood area, here in the city of Winnipeg. And, again, this will provide funding in the Elmwood area to help them with housing, education, safety and crime prevention.

The unique thing about Neighbourhoods Alive!—one of the most important aspects of it—is that it collaborates with residents, community groups, schools, businesses and other provincial departments—other provincial government departments, and seeks input from community partners. In our community, the—there was an interim board and now there is, pleased to report, there is a neighbourhood renewal corporation and the renewal corporation has consulted with area residents. They've come up with now a five-year neighbourhood renewal plan, and they're very actively working on implementing that plan.

And there's a number of great things that are happening within Selkirk, and I just want to highlight a few of them in my brief time I have this morning. One of the—there was \$50,000 to the Selkirk Friendship Centre to implement the Breaking New Ground project, which is a five-year neighbourhood renewal plan, and it's a structure for providing ongoing co-ordination of revitalization activities in Selkirk.

One of the grants was provided to the Selkirk and District Community Learning Centre—15,000 to help them come up with a feasibility study to repair and replace their roof on that community or, excuse me, on that centre.

Another important project in Selkirk is the Rotary Club's effort to build a skateboard park in

Selkirk, and I was pleased to report to the House that Neighbourhoods Alive! provided the Rotary Club with a grant of \$35,000. Now this is a project that the Rotary Club's been working on a number of years—between 500 and \$600,000 is their budget. They receive money from the City of Selkirk. They receive money from the federal government, and they receive money from the provincial government through Community Places and through Building Manitoba funds. And I am pleased to report that groundbreaking of that skateboard park will happen shortly, and the young people in Selkirk will be able to benefit from the hard work of the Rotary Club, the hard work of the individuals that are involved with the Neighbourhoods Alive! project in Selkirk.

Mr. Speaker, there was the—over \$10,000 for the Nova House, which are using their—using the funds to do an employment needs assessment project in the Selkirk area. I know, as well, the—there is additional funds given for a farmers' market in Selkirk. The Canoe Club received \$8,000 for their upgrades of that facility. The Nova House received the money for a Dolly Parton Imagination Library.

And one that I'm quite proud of is the—I've worked with all these groups—and that is the Manitoba Selkirk Local of the Manitoba Métis Federation which advocated for this project. They worked—they partnered with the City of Selkirk. They partnered with Neighbourhoods Alive!, and they're rebuilding one of the aging playground structures in the north end of Selkirk which has long been overlooked.

And, you know, these playground structures originally were sponsored by community groups, the Kiwanis, the Kinsmen, and, unfortunately, they no longer have the capacity or the membership to continue on with these—to upgrade these playground structures. But I'm glad to see that there are groups like the Manitoba Métis Federation, which I'm a proud member of, that they're taking up the mantle and they're filling in the gap, and they are working to rebuild this structure. And I'll be pleased to be involved with that as the summer progresses.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the Neighbourhoods Alive! has expanded into Portage la Prairie, and I'm—we—eagerly waiting for the member from Portage la Prairie to speak to this, as well, and to offer his support to this because he knows all the great things that are happening in Portage. They've—I said, they've done \$10,000 or provided a grant of \$10,000 to conduct community

consultations there. The Portage Potato Festival Youth Project received \$5,000. They received over \$30,000 in grants to—for homeowners to repair exterior home repairs, including painting and cleaning of exteriors in the Portage la Prairie area.

* (11:10)

And I'm—the Canadian Mental Health Association received over \$7,000 for a first-aid training project there. We know that the—
[interjection] We know—[interjection]

Mr. Speaker, can you call the House to order, please? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm eagerly waiting for you to call the House to order so I can continue on with my speech.
[interjection]

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was speaking about all the great things that are happening in Portage and I'm—as I said, I'm eagerly awaiting the member for Portage (Mr. Faurschou) to get up to speak to this as well.

So Mr. Speaker, I'm—I will—I see my time is about up. As I said, I'm waiting for the government—or excuse me, the opposition to support me in this. I know that they will because I do so in a non-partisan way, and we support, you know, we—I know that they support good things that are happening in Selkirk, good things that are happening in Portage la Prairie, good things that are happening in Winnipeg, good things that are happening in Brandon. Thank you very much.

Mr. Ron Schuler (Springfield): Indeed, it is a pleasure to get up and talk a little about the kinds of things that are taking place in the city of Winnipeg.

Of course, one of those that are near and dear to my heart, the whole issue of youth sport, and how we can revitalize communities and get people involved and get a passion and a love for their community and where they live is by getting them involved in sport, getting them to have a buy-in into their community.

And one of those wonderful centres, the Garden City community club—or as we like to call it, the Seven Oaks soccer complex—great facility run by amazing people, just really always impressive when you meet the volunteers on the board and be able to have a opportunity to talk to them. And I know that they have, over the years, developed an amazing community club.

Just recently, the federal government, under the guidance of Member of Parliament Joy Smith, did a

great thing by getting 80-some thousand dollars for a new field in the soccer pitch, which I know is going to be greatly appreciated. And this new sod that they're going to put down, it's about an inch and a half grass and then in there they put a mulch-stuffed rubber, and when the children—and even when adults play, it's just amazing. Even if you go down on a knee or you fall down, it is basically like falling on sod; there's no injuries.

We've also then been putting a lot of pressure on—and I know this House has noticed the kind of efforts that have been going on to remove the boards from the soccer pitch at the Seven Oaks soccer complex. I've spoken to the member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), who's constituency, the Garden City community club comes under, and I've talked to him about this. There's an application in right now to remove the boards from the Seven Oaks soccer pitch.

I just want to just point out to the House, that there's actually a real health issue and a concern in the community about soccer being played with boards. And I think, initially, it was one of those—it was a pseudo hockey kind of a pinball soccer game that was being played. But as the game has progressed and has gotten better—and certainly the calibre is raised.

Since I got involved with my kids, some—I keep calling it 10 years ago, I think it's almost 12 years ago. You know, you get stuck on the 10-years thing. And you know, when we started, I remember going to the East St. Paul Community Club, and there were 600 kids that summer that applied for soccer. And the convenor came and said to us, you don't coach, you don't get. And that was it. So, out we went, and I was a coach. I coached my 4-year-old daughter's soccer team and Brigitta was a star at 4 years old and amazing, amazing little athlete. You know, as much as I knew from what I had played in the playground, but anyway, since then, it's amazing how this sport has advanced.

So the boards now that are being used, because our players are not padded like we have in hockey, so you're actually not protected the way you should be, the way you are in hockey, if you hit a board. And we are finding that there are constantly injuries.

Like I mentioned, I raised it with the member for Kildonan and he's going to look into it. There's an application in to take the boards down that Joy Smith, member for Parliament for Kildonan-St. Paul, got \$80,000 to have new turf put down. They're going to do some drop netting, and what they're

going to do is they're going to revitalize a wonderful community club. I think you're going to find that kids are going to enjoy it a lot more. And these are the kinds of ways that we get our youth interested in their communities. I raised the issue with the Minister of Sport and I know that he's taken this issue seriously. There's one other soccer pitch and that's at Gateway community club. I know there's going to be some discussion about getting the boards down there as well.

And what we want to do is we want to make sports fun. We want to talk about facilities. We've seen the report that came out from the City of Winnipeg, which shows our arenas are starting to get old and dated. And, there again, it's going to be a great opportunity for—whether it's community alive or Neighbourhoods Alive! or any—other programs to start investing back in our communities, because what we want to do is have facilities that our young people are excited about, that they want to get involved with.

If you notice, it's actually derelict buildings and buildings that are neglected that attract garbage. They attract weeds. They attract graffiti. They then attract gangs. They then attract trouble and problems, and it just moves that way. The best thing we can do is have new and renovated and nice facilities for our young people to go into. Any of us who own a home know full well that, within 15 years, you really do have to start putting money into your facilities to keep them upgraded. Well, that goes for our sports facilities as well, and I think that's important as we move along.

And one of the things that I've heard from older people—they've said, well, you know, the facilities, they were great for us when we were involved in them. Well, yes, that was 40-some years ago. Those facilities now need upgrading, and we're going to have to look at that seriously.

The other thing is, as we get more into the core area, there are not the kinds of facilities that we need to get young people involved in sports. And, I would comment, you know, we have a lot of immigration taking place over the last 12 to 14 years with the Nominee Program under the—created by the honourable member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) and her vision and her foresight in being able to see that this is where we had to go. And, you know, the current government realized that this was a good program and we're—you know, should be commended for not trashing that program, in fact, have allowed

that program to grow. And what we're doing is bringing a lot of peoples from all over the world, and they do come to our city. But their youth also needs to have a venue.

And I would suggest to this House, we have to look very seriously at putting some kind of a proper soccer pitch—the magnitude of the U of M—perhaps at the University of Winnipeg, where students then could go, where children could go. It would be a very safe—it would be a clean—it would be a wonderful place to go and participate in sports. Most of these children play soccer and it would be a venue and a place for them to go. They don't have to drive or take a bus. It's not unreasonable distances and I think we're going to have to start involving them.

So my suggestion is when we look at Neighbourhoods Alive!, when we look at revitalizing neighbourhoods and getting our children out of gangs—in fact, we should go to these young people and say, listen, walk away from your gang, get out of your gang and join our gang. It's called a team, and we don't do things with guns and knives. We do things with skill. We do things with—whether it's in hockey or whether it's in soccer or it's volleyball or basketball or football—you know, our gang does things differently. We're smarter, and, at the end, you're much better for it.

And we know full well that young people who are involved in sports tend to get better marks in school. So I think there's a lot of things that can get—that come together, there's a real synergy, if you will, when we involve young people in sports.

And I know full well that my children—I've got—we've got them all involved in soccer, and I probably have neglected to mention to this House how wonderful they're doing and, in fact, I—probably isn't the right place to say—but my son played on Sunday and was awarded the most valuable player of the game and—you know, not that I'm bragging about Stefan, I wouldn't do that—but these are the kinds of things that lift up our communities. They lift up our citizens.

And we want to make sure that we have places for young people to go, whether it be in the suburbs, whether it be in Thompson, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Cooks Creek or the inner city. We've got to make sure that we have good facilities for our young people to go to play sports, to be active, burn off that energy and learn good lessons and learn good citizenship. And I believe that organized team sports is one of the ways that they can do that.

As my time has run out, I look forward to hearing the rest of the debate continuing this morning. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* (11:20)

Mr. Rob Altemeyer (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to stand here today in support of my colleague's proposal on the expansion of Neighbourhoods Alive! brought forward by the MLA for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar), and want to mention, first of all, the origins, of course, for this project came from my predecessor, the Honourable Jean Friesen, who was the MLA for Wolseley and also served as Intergovernmental Affairs in our fine government for the years 1999 to 2003.

And it was under her leadership that this program was brought into place in the first place. And after, you know, a decade of absolutely nothing positive happening in the downtown of Winnipeg or in the shoulder communities, as Wolseley is referred to, we suddenly had this spectacular program which didn't just provide resources, Mr. Speaker, to these communities which had long been neglected, but which also made a very important policy change in giving control over the decision-making process to the local communities themselves. It's a fundamentally different way of approaching community relations. It fits very well with our government's emphasis on community economic development, and the results speak for themselves.

This program, after starting in seven pilot communities, five of them neighbourhoods in Winnipeg and then also in Brandon and Thompson, the program was first expanded to include pretty much all of the inner city of Winnipeg, and from there it has expanded to a number of northern and rural communities, most recently including Selkirk, as I mentioned, this motion brought forward by the hardworking MLA for that fine constituency, and also in the areas such as The Pas and Thompson and Dauphin and Flin Flon. And I'm sure other MLAs would be very pleased to see this program expand into their areas as well.

And, of course, our government has expanded the funding for Community Places which is a complementary program focussing exclusively on capital projects, whereas Neighbourhoods Alive! right now has the flexibility to do both that and also some very, very interesting human development and neighbourhood building.

And, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, one of its true strengths is that it does provide the decision-making power to people living at the local level. Using some small, baseline funding from our government, each neighbourhood is able to set up a small renewal corporation or a community association, and these people then go out and it's their job to consult with their neighbours and with local residents and to find out what their local priorities are. And then that community association can send in applications to the Neighbourhoods Alive! staff, reviewed by our government and, more often than not, approved for that community's immense benefit.

And it's been so interesting to see, Mr. Speaker, because, in the Wolseley constituency, I'm very fortunate. I now have three different neighbourhoods which are all able to access the Neighbourhoods Alive! program. The Spence neighbourhood and the West Broadway neighbourhood were two of the original ones, to the original seven, and then more recently, the St. Matthews neighbourhood as part of the Daniel Mac-St. Matthews Community Association joined the Neighbourhoods Alive! family as well.

And in each of these communities it's been so interesting to see both the subtle differences between the priorities but also the very strong similarities. In every community, housing has been a huge priority that local residents have mentioned, and there's been such excellent work done on providing additional affordable housing in these neighbourhoods; it was desperately needing.

Just yesterday, I had the privilege to be the emcee for yet another government announcement on housing—building on our fantastic budget this year. It was our sixth budget announcement related to housing since we brought the budget in, Mr. Speaker, and pledging an additional 150 units of affordable housing. We held the announcement right outside of the new student residence at the University of Winnipeg which also has an affordable housing component to it.

The type of housing that we're doing is very innovative, typically combining several different needs at the same time, so students with families able to come back live in an affordable place right on campus while they attend classes.

The brand-new and equally spectacular child-care centre right behind the new student residence, a very convenient place for people to be able to take their kids when they need child care, and I was

happy to host a pancake and fresh fruit breakfast there recently, a wonderful child-care centre.

And Neighbourhoods Alive!, of course, has also supported child-care centres all over the province when that's been identified as a local priority by the neighbourhoods.

Green initiatives has also, very interestingly, been highlighted in just about every community, and sometimes that involves co-ordinating a community spring cleanup every year. Other times it relates to tree banding and the community gardens have just taken off in such a spectacular way. We have compost bins now scattered all over the neighbourhood that didn't use to exist. We have way more gardeners than we have garden plots which is a lovely problem to have. The garden plots are filled every single summer and they look absolutely gorgeous whether it's in Spirit Park or Boulder Park or other locations around the neighbourhood in the downtown.

We really are greening our city and it's beautiful to watch, and then we have exceptionally innovative programs like the Good Food Club which operates out of the west Broadway neighbourhood, and some of the participants in that program, Mr. Speaker, previously were living very, very solitary lives, sometimes referred to as shut-ins, people who for whatever reason just were not going outside anymore at all. They were not interacting with anyone, leading an exceptionally lonely existence. And this program has managed to connect with them and with other people who may be struggling with mental health issues and gets them out onto the land with a wonderful partnership with the Wiens family farm just south on St. Mary's, just south of the Perimeter Highway.

Folks—they'll head out there in a group, in the veggie van as they call it, and they'll put in a hard day's labour, weeding, watering, transplanting, learning the process of being an urban gardener, and, in doing so, they earn sweat equity points which they can then use to purchase the food that they've helped grow. And they bring that back into the city and there's now kitchen facilities available in a number of churches and recreation facilities, again funded by Neighbourhoods Alive! to make that service available. People are able to have a community meal and save their leftovers and take it home so that they have good, healthy, nutritious food afterwards.

It's just one of many examples of the innovation that people will come up with if you just simply ask

the question: What would you like to see improved in your neighbourhood? And they had more answers than you would ever have anticipated, and Neighbourhoods Alive! is tapping into that in a very, very special way.

So I want to thank the honourable member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) for bring this resolution forward. I really want to thank all of the staff in the Neighbourhoods Alive! department and all of my colleagues who take the time to sit on the steering committee to help keep that program on the cutting edge of community economic development. It's a wonderful success story for Manitoba that's being copied across Canada now, as well it should be, and lots of more good news to come.

So, with those few words, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much and I hope we see this resolution passed.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): Mr. Speaker, it's my honour to be able to speak to this particular bill that the minister's—that the member has brought forward, and it's certainly, I think, a great opportunity to put on the record some of the shortfalls and lack of priorities that the government has put forward with trying to bring a bill like this forward. *[interjection]* The resolution, pardon me. The situation has—as I—that arises today is the—a lack of priorities. It's the best way that I can describe it.

* (11:30)

While it's laudable to be able to look at trying to help improve the sectors that have been talked about by the member from Selkirk today, it's certainly a situation where it's say one thing, do another. And, Mr. Speaker, under the NDP the need is growing even greater for the opportunities to have revitalization in our core communities, and I applaud the fact that it is available in cities across Manitoba. But I am critical as well that it doesn't go further in the fact that there may be needs in other areas.

And the government hasn't looked at how to partner with those organizations in our rural communities and in some of the other communities, and those even just out in the outskirts of Winnipeg in relation to being able to provide greater opportunities for not just housing, but for other projects, if you will, and whether it's recreation or making our neighbourhoods more safe, Mr. Speaker.

A prime example of the oxymoron involved in bringing this type of a resolution forward is the fact that while the government has brought in a bill to—

you know, The Community Revitalization and Tax Increment Financing Act, tax increment finance funding, referred to as the acronym TIF, they brought that bill in. We discussed it at great length in the Legislature as to what it was going to be used for and a number of other areas, and the only, you know, one of the key areas that they stated publicly was the need for this was to use it as a development tool for CentrePort. And yet in this House they never once referred to CentrePort or, pardon me—they did refer to it in the House as CentrePort but they never once put it in the bills to say that that's what they were going to use that act for, Mr. Speaker.

And, of course, it's an opportunity to use the increased education taxes off of those areas to fund developments in that particular part of the city, Mr. Speaker, and we're all in favour of CentrePort. I brought forward a private member's resolution myself here to provide for a foreign trade zone in that particular venue, and it was passed unanimously in this House. But the tax increment financing that has been brought forward by the government today is not being used for what tax increment financing was meant to be.

It was meant to be used in core areas to develop downtrodden areas, to enhance our facilities and parks in those areas, so that our young people can be—can have places to play and places to congregate in a friendly, open manner without feeling that they may be in harm's way. And I commend any group or organization that comes forward and applies for these types of programs to be able to use them in their neighbourhoods, Mr. Speaker, to provide safety.

And I think it's in those core areas that—where the need is the greatest, I know that there's some work going on. There could certainly be more, Mr. Speaker. And, you know, when you've got a situation of, as I said earlier, the concern in the core areas as mentioned by my colleague from Springfield is that perhaps, the first thing to be able to do in some of these areas, before you can bring tax increment financing in to enhance the viability of the homes, is to provide safety in those homes, in those areas, in those regions of the city that the member referred to, from Springfield, as unsafe areas. People will not locate if they have a choice in the areas that they consider to be most unsafe in the city, in any city or in any town. And I, you know—so this is a situation where we've got an NDP government that has let the need grow in the situations because they have not dealt with the crime situations in Manitoba.

They have not brought in and enforced tougher crime legislation, Mr. Speaker, tougher results for being unlawful in this province, and I think that that's a concern to all of those people in those areas of the city that need to have tax increment financing to improve their areas, whether it's through Neighbourhoods Alive! or other areas, but certainly not to be used for something like building a football stadium. And I guess I would say that the government, the Premier (Mr. Selinger), has signed a deal that we really don't know how it's going to be paid back.

And we certainly want to see a development go ahead from this side of the House, perhaps not a scaled back one in the way the Premier has said he'll do here. Looks like a knee-jerk reaction and a photo op, Mr. Speaker, on the Premier's behalf. But everybody else is delighted because they don't have to put any money into it. It's a—and it's even backed by the tax increment finance funding in the memorandum of understanding that they signed, which is a concern.

And our role here, as opposition, is to speak out and keep the government honest in regards to, not just the financing, the social programming, and those sorts of things in the province, but also on issues like this where it's involved in the appropriation of money being used, not in a mismanaged way, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps not in the most accountable means that it could be used.

And, Mr. Speaker, the—I guess it's, you know, it's sort of the same thing that you're looking at with the greenhouse gas emissions. The government is saying one thing. They're saying that the greenhouse gases, we've got them all under control, and yet as we've seen this week, the greenhouse gas emissions in the province of Manitoba have increased since this government came into power.

I don't even know if the environmentalists can figure out how this government is going to reduce the greenhouse gases to 25 percent below the 1999 levels, the way that the Premier—the former premier, that is, now the ambassador to the United States, Mr. Doer—indicated that he would do, Mr. Speaker. And this Premier (Mr. Selinger) has not reassured members of the population of Manitoba with his answers on how he's going to reduce it. He can say one thing, do another.

So, Mr. Speaker, I guess it's the same with the need to develop housing in some of these areas. The government is saying, well, we want to do it. We

could do it. We should do it through Neighbourhoods Alive! We will use tax increment finance funding to do it.

But it's not happening. The situation's getting worse. It's sort of like the way that they dealt with the debt or the increased use of personal exemptions.

They always said, well, we're increasing the personal exemptions. Well, yes, they were. In every budget they increased the personal exemptions. But, Mr. Speaker, they increased them so—in such a small manner that they never even kept up with inflation. So they're not getting ahead. Manitobans are falling further behind in those areas and they're falling further behind in regards to development of core housing that's needed in our cities for the low-income situations and in regards to cleaning those areas up.

And if more funds were used in the areas of crime prevention in those parts of our cities, then, perhaps, there would be more pride in ownership in those particular locations. And the government would be then able to come in and be able to—at least, our recommendation would be to use those funds then to clean up some of those homes and not only clean them up but to make the area safer, Mr. Speaker.

I guess there is a whole, you know—I've already indicated that the government voices a support for urban revitalization, but the—and while I—and I will commend that there are a number of areas in different cities that I'm pleased to see low housing—low-rental housing being developed in, but, as I said, it's not keeping up with the demand for what is there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are sport complexes that need to be developed further. There are areas of playgrounds, arenas, soccer pitches, sports fields, all over the province of Manitoba that could use this type of funding. While this government indicates that everything's fine, that we're doing a great job, they are not directing the use of funds in this area to really get at the core issues of providing housing for persons in our cities that—

Mr. Speaker: The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. Drew Caldwell (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate listening to the member from Arthur-Virden. We shared time together in Virden the other morning where we turned sod on a major seniors complex in Virden, and I know that the member was

present with MP Merv Tweed and myself at that sod turning.

And I think he's got a very good community in Virden. I certainly always enjoy visiting my friends in Virden and seeing that community grow. And it won't be the first time. I know that there's other projects that our government is investing in in the town of Virden, the rec centre that is currently underway and moving forward, as well as other projects of a nature similar to Neighbourhoods Alive!

* (11:40)

This program, Neighbourhoods Alive!, has been very, very successful in communities throughout Manitoba. I think a little bit of a history lesson might be in order for members opposite because they have voted against every single nickel that was invested in Neighbourhoods Alive! and every single nickel, in fact, that was invested in seniors housing complexes and rec centres as well.

But, nonetheless, Neighbourhoods Alive! is a program to assist urban communities, provide a better quality of life for people in those urban communities. It really is a program probably second to none in Canada.

When we were elected in 1999, as a newly minted Cabinet minister at that time, I was privileged to sit on the steering committee that developed the criteria for Neighbourhoods Alive! and, at that time, the communities of Brandon, Thompson and Winnipeg were the three urban communities where Neighbourhoods Alive! was to be undertaken in.

In that time, Mr. Speaker, in Brandon, certainly, Neighbourhoods Alive! has worked to transform parks and playgrounds in the city of Brandon. We've funded spray parks, recreational equipment, street lighting, greening, the development of green space in the core area of the city of Brandon and Brandon East, specifically. Every park, every urban park in Brandon, Rideau Park in the east end, Stanley Park in the park area around the university, the Princess Park right in the core of downtown Brandon, in the south end of the city, spray parks around the area of—parks around—children's parks around the area of Maryland and 9th Street in a very, very actively growing part of the Brandon East constituency with a lot of young families and first-time homeowners purchasing and building new homes.

Neighbourhoods Alive! has helped build parks and playgrounds in Brandon and helped create better opportunities, recreational opportunities, for young people and families at a rate and at a pace and to a degree really unprecedented in my time, in my home city of Brandon.

Neighbourhoods Alive!, more excitingly, in terms of our green credentials as a government, which I'm fond of saying, quite accurately, in fact, Manitoba is the government in Canada that is providing the most leadership on green and environmental initiatives and is recognized in that capacity recently in Copenhagen when we led Canadian delegations to that climate change conference. But, more broadly, Dr. David Suzuki and other commentators internationally recognizing what we are doing as a province on the green front.

And Neighbourhoods Alive! in Brandon, and where it exists elsewhere in the province, has a significant role in bringing that reality home to the parks and playgrounds and recreation and community centres in the Neighbourhoods Alive! communities.

In Brandon, on that note, we have also undertaken the BEEP program which is completely transforming in an environmentally sustainable way, low-income housing by providing insulation, new water heaters—environmental savings that not only cut down on the footprint, environmental footprint of those low income housing units, but also saves the tenants and owners of those units the costs—increasing costs—of power, of electricity, gas and so forth, Mr. Speaker.

So Neighbourhoods Alive!, at a very local level, is thinking globally. The program has now expanded and my colleague from the—from Selkirk, my friend and colleague is quite right in introducing a resolution that calls for a greater expansion and—of Neighbourhoods Alive! into new communities.

We have expanded significantly since 1999-2000 when Brandon, Thompson and Winnipeg were the sole communities that were participating in Neighbourhoods Alive!, and we want to continue to expand successful programs that benefit Manitobans to more Manitobans when the opportunity arises, Mr. Speaker.

So I am, you know, very pleased to support the member in this resolution. I'm very pleased to be part of a government that believes in investing in our

communities and walks the walk as well as talks the talk, Mr. Speaker.

I know members opposite—I mean, it's got to be difficult because they have not voted for a single nickel that has been invested in Manitoba over the last 10 years, and, Mr. Speaker, that is a record that will carry them into the next election. And I am proud of the investment that we have made in our health-care infrastructure, and our educational infrastructure, and our road and bridge infrastructure, in our community infrastructure through programs such as Neighbourhoods Alive! And I'm proud that we will continue to invest in a way that benefits all Manitobans for as long as the people of the province give us the privilege of governing. And I—that's what Manitobans also want. They want a government that's engaged in making this province a better place to live for all people, and do it with integrity, and do it consistently.

So while the members opposite haven't supported a single nickel of the investment in this province over the last 10 years, while this government hasn't been investing in Manitoba over the last 10 years, I think that the member from Selkirk's resolution calling for an expansion of this successful program is very timely. And I, again, Mr. Speaker, would like to thank the member for putting this motion forward. It is very much worthy of support. All of the communities that can benefit from Neighbourhoods Alive! will thank you in the future, and will thank those of us in Manitoba who believed in investing in this province and in creating here at home a better world in which to live.

Mr. Blaine Pedersen (Carman): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution on Neighbourhoods Alive! and the concept of Neighbourhoods Alive!, certainly bears merit of looking at, but typical of this NDP government is that they've turned the Neighbourhoods Alive! program into a press release machine to announce dollars and always the question of what the results of those dollars are. And even the resolution itself, in the BE IT RESOLVED part, it recognized the work of the provincial government in revitalizing our communities. I thought it was the volunteers that were supposed to be running Neighbourhoods Alive!, and shouldn't we be recognizing the volunteers in Neighbourhoods Alive!?

And yet this government, they want to take all the credit for everything. They're—and continue to support the government. It's not the government that

makes Neighbourhoods Alive! programs work, or should work. It's the people who are involved, and I was at the announcement of the Neighbourhoods Alive! program in Portage la Prairie when it was announced a couple of years ago, and there was some very sincere people there that wanted to make this program work.

But, unfortunately, the press releases continue. The member from Selkirk talks about all the money that they've handed out to various organizations, but I think a much better resolution would have been coming back and saying, for that money that we've spent, this is the result. And we don't see that. All we see in this resolution as the result of this is that the provincial government wants to pat themselves on the back for handing out money with no results. So we would like to see where the results are.

There is a need in—to rebuild our communities that are facing some tough times. And, unfortunately, again, this government is—passed a tax increment financing act—The Community Revitalization Tax Increment Financing Act—TIF legislation as we know it around in this building. And instead of using TIF for blighted areas, we're now going to use TIF for the old stadium, the Polo Park area. And that's—it's—you're going to take future education tax revenues in and take them out of the schools and put them into an area that is—has nothing to do with community revitalization in blighted areas. And it's unfortunate that this government has—it's going to take away from schools to do this. They could work in harmony with projects like Neighbourhoods Alive! if the program was really set up to work as it is supposed to work.

But this resolution does not speak to any of the successes that they claim have happened in Neighbourhoods Alive!. So we would certainly like to see—we would like to see some of the results from there, and that's where this resolution should have—what that resolution should have addressed.

* (11:50)

However, we know that that's not a priority with—results are never a priority with this government. It's always about the press release and handing out taxpayers' money to their various projects. We think that this government is very lax at coming through—following to see what the results are of these announcements. Maybe it's, perhaps, they don't want to see the results. I don't know. But we know that the crime situation in many of these neighbourhoods has been getting worse, and rather

than focussing on just small-scale projects, if you could address—if you would address the crime situation in many of these neighbourhoods, you would—the neighbourhoods themselves would prosper and citizens would feel safe, and they would be able to help themselves a lot when—because this crime is out of control and it's beyond their control to be able to address this themselves. And that's where you have to look at a much bigger picture than just throwing money into a Neighbourhoods Alive! and hoping for results. You need to look at it much more so. We need to address crime. We need to address jobs—meaningful jobs.

There is—this province is facing a huge debt, and that is going to affect our ability to help our communities that need help in years to come. Even today and in years to come we know that this government has no plan to—other than to just continue spending more money, and they are totally not results oriented on this.

So there is some lack of clarity in the Neighbourhoods Alive! program. We don't know which departments are involved in putting money in. We've—we understand that funding has often come from different departments, and that raises questions about the origin of the funds. Again, it's about accountability. What are you getting for the money that you're putting in? You're taking it out of different departments and throwing it into a program, and it's—are we able to track for the best use of this money? Are we getting the best use of this money that is being spent? And so, you know, the program could be good, but it's—I think it could be much better if it was managed properly. And that's a bit of an oxymoron calling this NDP government to manage a program properly, because it just doesn't seem to happen, and, again, we go back into this resolution that they're talking about where it's expanded, and yet there's no results to post in here.

So the question becomes, well, do they not have any results or is there—do they not want the results or what is the real position of this program? If it was working properly, this—they would be able to bring a resolution forward saying, in Neighbourhoods Alive! this is what's happened in this community. But they're not addressing that in here, and, instead, all they're talking about is patting themselves on the back for handing out this money, and that's, you know, perhaps it's normal for this government. That's the way they see. They just spend more money and don't worry about the results.

They could do a lot of things in terms of urban revitalization, and Neighbourhoods Alive! would be part of that, and we would like to see—I think the communities themselves would like to see a much clearer plan as to what—as to how they're going to do. The—as I've mentioned, just throwing money in where there's could be a lot of criminal activity and violent crime and gang-related crime, throwing more money in on a Neighbourhoods Alive! program is not going to solve the root causes of this issue. And, unfortunately, they've—I think this Neighbourhoods Alive! program has become just another press—part of the press-release machine for this government.

They have certainly run out of ideas. If they ever had any ideas, they've run out of ideas in how to address poverty within the province.

We know that the child poverty has risen astronomically in the last 12 years in this province, and it's unfortunate, and if a program like Neighbourhoods Alive! was really working, it would actually address the core issues, and a resolution like this does absolutely nothing except try to pat themselves on the back. I hope they don't hurt their arm doing it because nobody else is patting themselves on the back when you don't see results out of funding that's put into programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would—I guess I would urge the member from Selkirk, that if he's that proud of Neighbourhoods Alive! and the results, he would bring back a resolution outlining the results that's happened and not just trying to praise themselves for this. I think they'll probably have a hard time finding real results so that's probably why he didn't do that on this.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps next time they can do a little bit better and talk about actual community results. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, it's for the children, in part, why it is that I talk about this particular resolution.

When we talk about urban revitalization, we recognize the value in terms of our communities, and I've had opportunity in the past to be directly involved in revitalization of programs as a volunteer, Mr. Speaker. This is something in which I ultimately believe we need to get done, and that is more volunteers involved in a process that recaptures, in some ways, or reinvigorates in other ways, opportunities to see revitalization in some of our communities occur.

I know first-hand that it's not going to be one project in itself that will carry the day, that often it is a mixture of different government programs that will ultimately assist in the local residents in being able to turn a community around or to add that much more character to a community.

As I indicated, I was actually quite involved in the Weston revitalization program, which took into consideration participation from the private sector, from government, from volunteers that live in the community to try to improve the quality of life, the quality of housing and businesses in that wonderful community of Weston. And we were able to achieve significant results in that, Mr. Speaker, and I believe, in good part, it was because of the fact that we had the community buying in to what was being proposed.

The difficulty that I have with this particular resolution, is more for—more so the therefore be it resolved. In essence, what the government is really looking at doing is just saying that here we have a program and we want the Legislature to applaud this program without providing any sort of details as to what it has actually been able to accomplish, no sense in terms of the volunteers, no sense in terms of the actual costs and the results, the actual value of the program.

In principle, it is a program that could potentially, if managed properly, be very effective in assisting our communities, Mr. Speaker, and we recognize that. I think that with a little bit more thought maybe it could have been a better resolution, and, who knows, maybe the member from Selkirk, who I know can be very aggressive at times, will look at ways in which he can maybe make it a better resolution and bring it back into the Chamber or maybe allow for some sort of amendments to the resolution that would make it a more acceptable resolution, because I, like the member from Selkirk, recognize the value of revitalization and the importance of contributing.

However, we might be able to, in terms of improving the quality of life for all people that live in many communities throughout the province, communities that need to have—

Mr. Speaker: When this matter is again before the House, the honourable member for Inkster will have six minutes remaining.

The hour being called noon, we will recess and reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 20, 2010

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Resolutions	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Res. 2—Expansion of Neighbourhoods Alive!	
Second Readings—Public Bills			
Bill 216—The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Bicycle Helmets)		Dewar	1041
Lamoureux	1031	Schuler	1043
Caldwell	1032	Altemeyer	1045
Eichler	1034	Maguire	1046
Nevakshonoff	1036	Caldwell	1048
Gerrard	1037	Pedersen	1049
Martindale	1038	Lamoureux	1051
Reid	1040		

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/index.html>