

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, March 8, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** It is my pleasure to table the Annual Report for 1988-89 for the CCFM.

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for the Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a Statement of Government Policy on the Status of Women in Manitoba, and an action plan in response to the Government Policy on the Status of Women in Manitoba.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister responsible for the Status of Women):** I have a ministerial statement as well. I rise to acknowledge the 80th anniversary of International Women's Day. This event has been celebrated by millions of women worldwide every March 8 since 1910. On that auspicious day, women from 17 countries meeting in Copenhagen declared the day to mark women's struggles for sisterhood, workers' rights, international solidarity, and peace.

The International Women's Day Committee has chosen to reflect these original goals in this year's theme. "Honour our mothers, honour the earth," is a plea to stop the violence—economic, cultural, social, and emotional—against women and the earth. March 8, 1990, will be remembered as a landmark for women's equality in Manitoba.

Today, as Minister responsible for the Status of Women, I am tabling in this House a Statement of Government Policy on the Status of Women in Manitoba. This policy document and accompanying action plan is the result of 17 months of intensive consultations with the women of Manitoba. They have shared their concerns, opinions and ideas. This Government has listened and responded.

Many individuals deserve credit for bringing this document to fruition. In particular I want to thank the individual women and women's organizations who participated in the Women's Initiative. During this five-month consultation process ending in March 1989, the committee heard from over 1,000 women in 24 Manitoba communities. The advice and direction they provided are captured in the eight fundamental principles that comprise this policy. These principles that I will outline for you now will form the basis of all Government programs and activities affecting the status of women in Manitoba.

Abuse of women is unacceptable in Manitoba. Family violence is a crime. Discrimination against women on

the basis of their sex is unacceptable in Manitoba. Government and the community share a responsibility to provide protections and security for those who in the past were denied the opportunity to become secure and independent. Terms and conditions of employment and of participation in education should recognize the responsibilities for child-rearing that parents share in Manitoba.

\* (1335)

Women should enjoy equal access to a full range of career options and choices within the Manitoba economy. Women ought, as a matter of right, to enjoy equal access to and equal treatment within, education at all levels. Women should have access to enhanced participation in decision-making, both to ensure that women's viewpoints are taken into account and to ensure that the community as a whole can benefit from the abilities, wisdom, and insight that women can contribute at a decision-making level.

Government efforts to achieve the goals of this policy will be most effective if they are carried out in partnership with individual women and women's groups throughout Manitoba. The policy reflects the belief shared by the people of Manitoba. Our entire community benefits when men and women enjoy equal access to safety, security, and opportunities to excel. No person should be discriminated against or disadvantaged as a result of his or her sex.

The policies set forth in this document and the action plan initiatives have the potential to affect almost 410,000 adult women and almost 92,000 school-age girls. Many of them will be your mothers, wives, daughters, sisters and colleagues. Successive Governments of Manitoba have reacted to women's demands for rights, freedoms and opportunities by undertaking a wide range of initiatives.

This Government was the first to pro-actively seek change through a plan that emphasizes action, responsiveness and partnership. Sound fiscal management has allowed dollars to be channeled where they are needed most, public awareness campaign on family violence, wife abuse shelters and per diem rates for victims, day care, Business Start Program, women's resource centres. By the end of the 1990 fiscal year, this Government will have acted upon 54 of the 94 recommendations outlined in the Women's Initiative Report.

The remaining recommendations will form part of our long-term objectives. However, our continuing consultations and responsiveness of departments mean that the action plan which I am also tabling contains 130 initiatives. The Women's Directorate will continue to co-ordinate the Government's interdepartmental committee on women's issues. It has a strengthened mandate and by monitoring progress of the policy and action plan we can assure the women of Manitoba that

---

Thursday, March 8, 1990

---

Government departments will continue to respond to their needs.

I am proud to have consulted with many Manitoba women in the development of this very important policy and action plan. I am proud to be Minister responsible for its successful implementation. Finally, I am proud to work for a Government that is truly committed to the women of Manitoba and is prepared to back their commitment in writing.

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** We too in the Liberal Opposition would certainly like to pay tribute to all the women throughout the world on this International Women's Day.

When I think about International Women's Day, Mr. Speaker, I think about the Women's Institute in Manitoba, where a few weeks ago we had the opportunity to celebrate Women's Institute Day, and I think of those rural women who have forged ahead and who have struggled in this province and in other areas of this country to bring about equality and to bring about a better life for families and for individuals.

When we think of International Women's Day, we think about those women who have struggled in Central and South America, those women who have struggled in China and in eastern Europe and in Russia and in South Africa, women who have struggled for equality and who have struggled for a better way of life for all individuals, for men, women and children. I think about our aboriginal women, Mr. Speaker, and I think about just yesterday or a few days ago when I had the opportunity to meet with women at the Payuk Co-op, a group of dedicated, determined aboriginal women who are truly making a difference in their own community. It is those women whom we should look to and we should pay tribute to as we celebrate International Women's Day.

\* (1340)

The Minister in her ministerial statement has outlined a policy direction as set forth by her Government. As we have an opportunity to look through that, Mr. Speaker, I think about the needs of women in rural Manitoba, and I am not sure that they have been addressed in this particular policy statement.

We have asked questions in the House and we have talked about needs for rape counselling, needs for family counselling in rural areas outside the City of Winnipeg, horrendous waiting lists for services for women and for families, and those needs that need to be addressed. We have talked about and we have questioned the needs for family based community support services for families, such as services the West Broadway Centre provides, services such as parent-child centres where families—and most of them are women-led families—have an opportunity to learn and to grow in their own community.

We hope that this Government, in looking at their policy in regard to women, will also look at the grass-roots organizations and some of the community-based services that can provide and will provide opportunities for families right in the community. We think as well about Child and Family Services, Mr. Speaker, where

it is very, very important that there be comprehensive child and family services because this affects women and children in our society as well.

As we celebrate International Women's Day and as we look toward the courage of women across this country, across this world, now and in the past and certainly in the future, we will look forward to hearing from the Government, not just the policy statement, but we will be very interested to see the action that accompanies that statement in providing services for women in this particular province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns):** Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the New Democratic Party want to stand today and pay tribute with me to the women who have over the years and the decades worked so hard to try and achieve greater equality between women and men. Today is a day for paying tribute. It is also a day for rededicating ourselves to the work that lies ahead.

That is a difficult task to do when the Governments of the Day, whether provincial or federal, are working in direct contradiction of that objective and are setting the women's movement back in time and are moving us away from the goal of true equality between women and men.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement today by the Minister responsible for the Status of Women (Mrs. Hammond) flies in direct face of the actions of this Government today, flies in direct face of the real meaning of March 8. Let us remind Members in this House that March 8 dates back to March 8 of 1857, of 1860, of 1908, when women workers took to the streets with strike action and with loud voices to demand fair wages, decent working conditions and representation through the trade union movement. I think that everything we have seen to date by the Government of the Day tends to fly in the face of the objectives of working women back in 1857 and 1908 to achieve that goal.

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, first and foremost at the decision by this Government and supported by the Liberal Opposition to repeal final offer selection, an initiative that flies in the face of the demands and interests of working women and women everywhere who have called upon this Government to end this nonsense with respect to repeal of final offer selection. Do it in the interests of equality, do it in the name of keeping our families together, do it—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** Do it so that we can stay off social assistance, do it because it is important to our needs and do it to build a co-operative consultative society. That is but one example of the inaction and regressive action of this Government.

Let me mention very briefly three other areas that point to the regressive moves on the part of this Government and how they appear, in my view at least,

Mr. Speaker, fairly hypocritical on a day of such significance as March 8. Let us remind ourselves that it is this Government that has decided not to advance with respect to pay equity, decided not to ensure that women are paid for doing work of equal value, to ensure that the gap between the wages of men and women is closed to ensure that women are able to enjoy economic security. This Government has decided to abandon any plan of extension pay equity into the other sectors in our economy.

\* (1345)

Let me mention the importance of child care and the fact that this Government has recently taken us one step further away from accessible, affordable child care and recognition of the important work of child care professionals.

Finally, let me refer to the situation of poor women in our society and the conditions facing single parent women who are among the poorest members of our society. It is this Government, Mr. Speaker, that has decided not to move on one very fundamental program, important initiative for women in those circumstances, and that is housing, decent housing, protection against slum landlords, decent conditions for themselves and their children. I think if this Government is serious about equality for women and truly representing the significance of March 8, it must address those areas of inaction or regressive action.

Let me close, Mr. Speaker, by simply leaving with this House the words of the Manitoba Action Committee on the Status of Women in remembrance of today: Your sisters are reaching out community to community, country to country, continent to continent, only one struggle, one celebration, take a moment, close your eyes, imagine your sisters reaching out to you.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

#### BILL NO. 102—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 102, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990; Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives.

#### BILL NO. 103—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT, 1990

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 103, The Statute Law Amendment (Re-Enacted Statutes) Act, 1990; Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (Lois réadoptées).

#### BILL NO. 104—THE PROFESSIONAL HOME ECONOMISTS ACT

**Mr. Harold Gilleshammer (Minnedosa)** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 104, The Professional Home Economists Act; Loi sur les conseillers en économie domestique.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** If we can get Bill 104 distributed between now and Orders of the Day, we would be asking for leave to move that Bill be read a second time when we do get to Orders of the Day.

**Mr. Speaker:** We will attempt to accommodate that.

\* (1350)

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have, from the Pinawa Secondary High School, thirty-five Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Harold Vellie and Bryan McKenzie. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### East-West Packers Ltd. Closure

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked another sad day as far as Manitoba's meat industry is concerned. East-West Packers went out of business, leaving 105 people unemployed. The concept of this being the Chicago of the North now becomes simply a myth.

My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst). Can the Minister indicate exactly what factors were responsible for the demise of East-West Packers?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** As a matter of fact, I can. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, generally low operating margins which have been prevalent in the industry across western Canada for some time; secondly, the facilities at East-West Packers are quite old, rather inefficient and quite antiquated, and that caused some problem with respect to the operations itself; thirdly, there was a significant debilitating labour strike in 1988 that left the East-West Packers company with a labour rate higher than most of their competitors in western Canada, which caused them again some additional difficulties; lastly, somewhat of a shortage of both cattle and hogs over the past few months.

**Mr. Laurie Evans:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the shortage of animals is interesting, and I will address that a bit later.

### Government Consultations

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism. What effective action, or what they thought was effective action, did this Government take to try and forestall the closure of this plant? Is anything now being negotiated that would permit the continuing operation of that plant?

Thursday, March 8, 1990

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, this problem is not something that has been new to East-West Packers. They have in fact been experiencing operating losses for the past two years. We have met with them on two, three, four occasions perhaps, to review their situation, to see ways and means by which we can assist them.

Staff from my department and the Department of Agriculture have been working with East-West Packers to assist them wherever we can to resolve some of their problems. One of those things involved the potential purchase of the plant by an outside meat packer who would be interested in coming in, modernizing and expanding the plant. That matter, at the present, is ongoing.

### **East-West Packers Ltd. Labour Adjustment Strategy**

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, obviously the closure of a plant is very significant as far as the industry is concerned, but there are also a lot of people that are left out of work.

My supplementary is to the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). Can she indicate when she was first aware of the problems associated with East-West Packers? What exactly has been done to date to attempt to accommodate the labourers who will be out of the work force?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, a work force adjustment committee has been in place and has set March 15 for an information session for the workers.

**Mr. Laurie Evans:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the workers would find this very reassuring.

### **Hog Industry Production Figures**

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** I have a new question related, Mr. Speaker. Last week the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) tried to convince me that the shortage of hogs for the various plants in Manitoba was due to the so-called hog production cycle.

\* (1355)

My question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Ernst). Does the fact that this Government has committed 11,000 hogs on a weekly basis to the plant in Quebec not have some influence on the availability of hogs to other plants in this province?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** The Liberal Party should get up on the facts. The Government had nothing to do with the allocation of some 11,000 hogs. That is a duly-elected producer hog marketing board that made that agreement.

**Mr. Laurie Evans:** Well, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious this Government had nothing to do with it, because this Government does virtually nothing.

### **Cattle Feed Industry Government Support**

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** My question is to the Acting Minister of Agriculture. Two months ago, the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association provided a brief to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) asking for some support to the cattle feeding industry and to the cattle packing industry, and the Minister of Agriculture accused me of wanting to throw money at it.

I wonder if the Acting Minister has changed his views, and is there any legitimate reason for supporting the beef packing and the beef feeding industry in this province at this time, or is it still, in his opinion, a waste of money?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** I would be remiss if I did not remind this House, and the Liberal Party, of the lack of support to the feedlot industry by the New Democratic Party back in 1982. The feedlot industry in this province was shut out, was ignored, in fact encouraged to go out of business and shift to other provinces.

We have recently put in place through our Ministry of Agriculture and the support of this Government of some \$9 a ton for barley subsidy to encourage the feedlot industry in this province, Mr. Speaker, to get back on its feet.

I believe that the Liberal Party would do better to get on side with some positive initiatives rather than continuing to tear down the positive action of this Government. It was the lack of support by the New Democratic Party of the farm community that has left the packing house industry in the situation that it is today.

**Mr. Laurie Evans:** I am sure that the livestock producers in this province are not anxious to hear a history lesson from the Acting Minister.

### **Hog Industry Feed Supplement**

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** I would ask the Acting Minister whether he will use his influence on the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) to include the hog producers in the feed supplement that is now only available to the cattle and the sheep producers?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would recommend first of all that the Liberal Critic read his comments in indicating that there was not in fact any support for the beef industry. There is a major support program for our beef industry.

As well, let it be very straightforward and plain that this Government is very anxious to see packing house industries in this province, and diversification in this province.

I will assure the producers of this province that we will support the actions that they see are in their best interest, such as the sale of some 11,000 hogs that

create jobs, that create a market for our producers.—  
(interjection)— The Member, from his seat, said how many jobs were lost? —(interjection)—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Downey:** There were many jobs saved, Mr. Speaker, by the producers and by this Government.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

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

### **Bill No. 42 Winnipeg Real Estate Board**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Throughout the last number of months, and especially this week, the Government has been maintaining a public position that it withdrew Bill 42, or it plans on not proceeding with Bill 42, because of, quote, drafting errors, not because of pressure from the real estate developers and the mortgage lenders, as we have alleged over the last couple of months.

My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is, in light of the fact that the Winnipeg Real Estate Board asked this Government on February 19 to review the Bill because it will have a negative impact, in their opinion, on their investments, would the Premier now admit that the pressure to remove this Bill was not based on drafting, as he has maintained in the House, but rather because of the pressure from the groups that we have alleged?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that people on all sides of the Bill, those who are in the category of tenants, those who are in the category of landlords, those who are in the category of investors and so on, have expressed concern. The letter that he refers to, I have not had any discussions whatsoever with the Real Estate Board, so I can honestly say that they have put no pressure on us or on me to —(interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, if the Member who is crying out in pain from Thompson believes that, because somebody writes a letter and legitimately expresses a concern, that is pressure, that happened to the New Democrats when they were in Government throughout their six and a half years. People wrote letters; people expressed concerns. The difference is they ignored them, and we are considering the views of those people on all sides of the issue. We are going to listen to them, and we are going to fix up the problems with Bill 42 and reintroduce it immediately in the next Session of the Legislature.

### **Lobby Groups**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a letter from the Winnipeg Real Estate Board to the Government, to the Minister, and also a memo from the Professional Property Managers' Association.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is, in light of the fact that his Government in the Lyon years was the one that gutted rent controls and got rid of rent controls in this province, which we had to reintroduce, my question to the Premier is, what other group has asked the Premier to reconsider its action in terms of Bill 42 in the Province of Manitoba? Will he now admit it was only the developers, the mortgage lenders and the real estate people, not tenants, that asked them to stop proceeding with this Bill?

\* (1400)

**Mr. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I will say to the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), as I will say to anyone in this province, rent controls are here to stay. That is what I have said before, and we are committed to maintain fair and reasonable rent controls in this province. They have been at 3 percent increase for the past two years under our administration. They will continue to be in place to protect the interests of the tenants and to ensure that we have a fair and reasonable rental market in this province. That is the case and that will remain the case under this administration.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows that the proposed Bill would indeed deal with some of the rent control units and apply more of the rent control application on other units. That is what he has been advised by the developers.

My question to the Premier is very clear. Who else, beside developers, mortgage lenders and the Real Estate Board asked this Government to hold this Bill? Were the tenant groups asking the Government to hold this Bill? Will he please come clean for Manitobans?

**Mr. Filmon:** The Member should know that there are people who have concerns about the effects—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, we as a Government, in the interests of bringing in a Bill that was not flawed, a Bill that did not require dozens of amendments to be made on an ad hoc basis at committee, because the Opposition Parties have constantly come forward and said we brought in too many amendments to Bills in the past. They said we brought in too many amendments to the drunk driving legislation. They said we brought in too many amendments to the assessment reform legislation. We are following their advice and we are not going to bring in a Bill that requires too many amendments. We are going to go back, carry out the consultations on a more thorough basis, correct the flaws, and reintroduce the Bill immediately in the next Session of the Legislature.

**Mr. Doer:** The Premier has just confirmed that the housing groups did not ask him to hold this Bill, only the Real Estate Board and the mortgage lenders. Mr. Speaker, even on February 19, the Winnipeg Real Estate

Board only identifies about four areas mostly dealing with their profit margins, not drafting issues, that are affected. Even the strongest critics of the Bill, the Professional Property Managers, identify only 10 issues.

Will the Premier (Mr. Filmon) now admit that they have had enough time to deal with the issues raised by these groups, that it is not an error in drafting? It is indeed an error on whose side they are on. Would the Premier now admit he is on the side of developers only on this issue in terms of not proceeding with this Bill?

**Mr. Filmon:** If I were on the side of developers, I would not be saying firmly and unequivocally to the renters of this province that rent controls are here to stay, that this administration will continue to protect their best interest, that we maintained rent control increases at 3 percent a year for the two years that we have been in Government, and we are continuing to make fair rent controls work in this province for the benefit of the tenants despite the nonsense that is put on the record by the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

### Forest Fires Federal Compensation

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). This morning on CJOB the Minister indicated that the Prime Minister and the federal Tory Government have reneged on its promised forest fire payment as a result of the devastation of our forests in this province last summer.

Can the Minister tell the House the amount that was requested of the federal Government and the reasons that they have given for ignoring their responsibilities to this province?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for River Heights will know full well that we as a province faced a devastating maelstrom in the summer of 1989 that burned a tremendous amount of our forests, that was a civil disaster of unheard of proportions heretofore in this province.

We responded to the needs and we spent the money that was required to fight the fires, to move people out of their homes, to relocate them, to provide for equipment, to provide for food and social services and financial needs for those people. We did everything possible, despite the fact that Liberal critics from Selkirk and from Springfield said we should not be fighting the fires, we should be doing something else. We went and did everything necessary to address those fires. That raised a bill that was in excess of \$70 million of total cost; again, unheard of proportions in terms of this province.

That disaster produced a phone call directly from the Prime Minister, indicating his concern for the needs of Manitoba and his commitment to resolve those needs. We have written to the federal Government after a number of discussions, follow-up discussions that I had with the Prime Minister, to ask them to resolve this issue and to treat us generously in our time of

need. We have received a response from Minister McKnight, who is the Minister responsible for disaster assistance, who has told us what, under the formula, we are entitled to get, a formula that does not address the needs and concerns of Manitobans, and we are continuing to press the federal Government for more than the formula response.

### Total Costs

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** To the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), since his department obviously submitted the bill, what was the bill and why will they not pay it?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable First Minister.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I know that the Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) would like to be corrected when she is not in possession of the facts. The bills that accrued were bills that came from so many different departments. They were not only Natural Resources, but certainly Northern Affairs had many of the expenditures, certainly Family Services had many of the expenditures, certainly Government Services under the Disaster Assistance Program and the Disaster Assistance Board had many of the expenditures; so did Health, and so on. Because this crossed all departmental lines—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**Mr. Filmon:** —the information was assembled by Government Services into a review of all of the expenditures, which amounted to some \$72 million, and I submitted that bill directly to the Prime Minister in recognition of his— (interjection)— I said \$72 million. How many times do I have to repeat it? The Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs) does not listen. \$72 million dollars was the total expenditure. That is the bill that we submitted to the Government of Canada.

\* (1410)

### Progressive Conservatives - Federal Premier's Disassociation

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the federal Government has reneged to this province on issues over and over and over again. Will the Premier (Mr. Filmon) now take the good advice once offered to him by the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), stand up in this House and totally disassociate himself with the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order. The Honourable the First Minister.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** It is quite apropos that I am wearing this tie today. As a matter of fact, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would listen to some of my federal colleagues, they would believe that we have done that a long time ago, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that this administration, with no help from the Liberal Party has done things entirely opposite to what the federal Government has done. While they have been raising taxes, we have been lowering taxes. While they have continued on with unacceptably high deficits, we have gotten our deficits under control. While they have proceeded with increases in expenditures that go beyond levels that we would support, we have kept our increase in expenditures in our budget to the lowest level of any administration in this country at 4.5 percent this past year, no thanks to the Liberal Party. We have disagreed with our feds on Meech Lake, we have disagreed with our feds on a myriad of other issues, and we will continue to disagree when the best interests of the Province of Manitoba dictate that is what we do.

### **Infill Housing Program Statistics**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** My question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). This Government now has—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). This Government has now been in office for 22 months. The Minister of Housing—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I would remind the Honourable Members that we are going to be adding on an extra 30 seconds for that outburst in the Chamber, so Question Period will get extended. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Government should wait for it. I would hope that they are now prepared to boo the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme).

The Minister of Housing talks very highly about the infill housing program. In fact we have hundreds of Manitobans that are on the waiting list to get into an infill home.

My question to the Minister of Housing is: Talk is cheap, how many infill homes have been built by this Government since they have been in office?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** I remember the last time the Member asked me a direct question in this Chamber. It was at Christmastime in '89. He asked me at that time to play Santa Claus, to bring in infill housing. I thought maybe the Member was going to get up and thank me for the 10 infill houses that

have been directed to his constituency of Westman, Mr. Speaker.

As he is quite aware, he is wrong in one direction; there is not a drastic waiting list for infill housing in this province. As he knows, there has been a problem of the allocation to obtain the infill lots. Because it has been a very popular program, the infill lots have not come very easy under this particular mandate. We will work in 1990 to provide those infill housing that are necessary in Manitoba.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** The answer is quite simple. There have been zero infill houses built by this administration in the last 22 months.

### **Co-operative Housing Loan Approvals**

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing has replaced the Co-op HomeStart grants program with a loans program. The policy change, I said then, would hurt potential housing co-ops from ever coming into being.

My question to the Minister of Housing is: How many private, non-profit housing co-op applications has this Government approved?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, the Member from across the way was quite aware of what went on during the Estimate procedures. He asked those questions. We gave him the answers on the co-op housing. He knows the numbers that were provided.

In 1990 we are hearing from the proposals and we will deal with them as soon as we get out of this House to deal with our budget for 1990-91.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing is not even corresponding, sending out any type of correspondence to those that have put in the application back in September. The answer is quite easy—zero, once again—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. Question Period is a time to get answers to your questions.

### **Meadows West Proposals**

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** With my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1989 the Government entered into an agreement with Ladco which ignored the needs of low-income Manitobans. They said, no, to the St. Boniface and Meadows West development in favour of the Ladco MHRC Conservative friends. My question to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) is quite simple once again. Has the Minister of Housing received any proposal calls for the Meadows West development which would have ensured low-income housing?

Thursday, March 8, 1990

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, under the proposal that we hear from people—for instance the other day we heard from Cairns in regard to Fort Garry. We are constantly hearing from people in regard to Meadows West. When we decide that a proposal call be carried out in Meadows West and Fort Garry, I will make the Member very aware of those proposals. When we hear them, we will make sure, and we hope they are as good as the one that was done in South St. Boniface.

### Feedlot Enhancement Program Implementation

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Two years ago we were promised new and prosperous directions for agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and we are just starting to witness some of those directions. We have had the stem of cattle not stemmed, the movement out of the province has not stopped, and the cancellation of the Manitoba Beef Program. We have had closings at Campbell's Soup, and we have had closings in Brandon, periodic closings in Brandon. We have lost 100 jobs in Neepawa in processing, and now we have lost 105 jobs in Manitoba with the closure of East-West Packers.

I ask the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), why did his Government not institute the Feedlot Enhancement Program that was left in the budget that they defeated in 1988, which certainly would have been a good attempt to level the playing field that they talked about as between Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, this Member, when he was the Minister, absolutely gutted the cattle industry of this province. In 1982 he brought in a Beef Support Program that excluded the feedlot operators of this province.

Between 1983 and 1989 the beef cattle that were being finished in this province went down from over 8,000 a week to 4,400 a week, as a result of his conscious decision to exclude feedlot operations from the beef support program in this province. That, more than anything, devastated the industry. It resulted in 850 jobs going down the tube with the closure of Canada Packers.

How he could stand up with a straight face in this Chamber and suggest that the problem has occurred now is beyond me. I call that sheer hypocrisy.

\* (1420)

### Hog Industry Supply

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), his Minister indicated that one of the causes of the closure of East-West Packers was the shortage of hogs and cattle.

I ask the First Minister why his Government approved the most fundamental change in orderly marketing by leaving out one company, one out-of-province company, from the bidding system on the Dutch clock auction

and allowing the by-passing of that system in Manitoba? Why did he approve that?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** The Hog Producers Marketing Board entered into that agreement which they believed was in the best interests of preserving another hog processing plant, another hog kill plant in Manitoba.

They have indicated to East-West and to any other packing house that they are prepared to enter into similar agreements to guarantee supply to those plants.

You know what is interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that at the same time as East-West Packers was in difficulty in 1987, and they came to the former administration because they were in difficulty, and they asked for support, they received \$77,000 worth of support while that same administration contributed and committed \$2 million to Springhill; \$2 million to Springhill and \$77,000 to East-West Packers.

That is the kind of priority choices that administration made, and now he is suggesting that somehow Springhill is the cause of East-West Packers. What about when he had the decision to make in 1987 and he gave \$77,000 to East-West as opposed to \$2 million to Springhill—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. Uruski:** Mr. Speaker, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) may want to put \$2 million into sewer and water into the rest of rural Manitoba that is crying for sewer and water programs because that is what went into Neepawa.

### East-West Packers Ltd. Closure

**Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake):** I ask the First Minister: What is his Government prepared to do, not only for the workers of those plants who have lost their jobs, but also for the farmers who have not been paid for livestock that has been delivered over the last two weeks?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) has indicated there is a process for the workers, and they will be looked after as the Act and the law reads.

Mr. Speaker, this Government took pro-active action and put in place regulation and a bonding program that in fact protected the farmer, something that was neglected for years by his administration. There is a bonding program in place and producers, to a maximum I think of \$25,000, will be protected. We did take action on behalf of the producers.

### Forks Renewal Corporation Environment Act Violation

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** Last Friday, we had the spectacle of a group of citizens having to use the courts



Thursday, March 8, 1990

to compel another Tory Environment Minister (Mr. Cummings) to comply with his own Act so as to protect the environment.

Now we have the spectacle of The Forks Renewal Corporation flaunting the interim court injunction by the resumption of the construction of the infamous and costly boat basin.

Mr. Speaker, why is the Environment Minister tolerating this renewed construction of the boat basin under the guise of building the eastern end of the Assiniboine River walkway?

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**An Honourable Member:** Get it straight.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order. The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, if the Member will listen carefully, or would have followed the process carefully, he would understand that no construction will be allowed that is within the orders of The Environment Act, i.e., the marina.

The construction that is taking place is work that is outside of The Environment Act. They have been deemed to be outside of The Environment Act and therefore they may proceed with construction.

**Mr. Taylor:** Is that not interesting, Mr. Speaker? The construction that is being done is the same construction that was stopped last week. The walls of the boat basin are the footings of the walkway. The drawings have just been relabeled. That is all that has happened. There has been no environment work, no archaeological work.

### Court Injunction - Construction

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** The question, Mr. Speaker, is: When will the Urban Affairs Minister (Mr. Ducharme) insist, as a one-third partner, that The Forks Corporation operate within the laws and comply with that interim court injunction?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I think that the laws of this land will ensure that if there is a violation of the injunction, that will be taken care of.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a violation in The Environment Act, I will take the responsibility. At this time, I have had no indication there is a violation.

**Mr. Taylor:** With that last sad statement, I would advise the Minister he better look at those construction plans, because it is a gross flaunting of that court order.

I would like to know who the heck is in control over there. The Urban Affairs Minister (Mr. Ducharme) will not do anything, and this Minister sits on his hands.

The question, Mr. Speaker, who in that Government is actually going to ensure that the environmental laws

and the court orders of this land are followed? Let us see some action for a change—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Order. The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of confidence and support from the NDP Caucus that I am in charge of the environment. I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, essentially that question was a repeat of the previous one, and the answer shall be a repeat of the previous one. I will ensure that The Environment Act is enforced.

### Forks Renewal Corporation Board of Directors Review

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, we have a serious problem in this province. We have a Government now that is building a parking lot and a building in Oak Hammock Marsh. We have citizens in severe conflict with a Forks Board of Directors, and the strong perception that we are absolutely without any vision of what we are going to do with one of Manitoba's great historic sites, The Forks site, something that this Party had a lot to do with in redeveloping in terms of the walkway and the return of land from the CNR.

My question to the Premier is: Will he look at the board of directors that his Government has appointed to The Forks Board and replace them with some individuals who have planning experience and environmental experience as we had with people like Allan Artibise and Jean Friesen when we were in Government, so we do not have these colossal conflicts between citizens and the board of directors?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The Honourable First Minister.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, whenever there are initiatives proposed that are major works within a provincial or a federal Government, or municipal Government authority, there are those who oppose them. There are people who oppose bridges; there are people who oppose four-lane highways; there are people who oppose sidewalks—people oppose sidewalks. When I was a student engineer and I was in what was then the rural municipality of Assiniboia, and we had Portage Avenue with ditches, and we attempted to put in a sidewalk alongside the property line, people came out in droves to say, we should not have sidewalks here; this is the way it should be. So there are those who oppose progress all the time.

Thursday, March 8, 1990

What you have to have in place is a proper means of evaluating these major endeavours. An Environment Act was passed by the former Government that provides for an evaluation and a public hearing process, and provides for certain environmental standards to be kept. Those are the things that are taking place. We are committed to that in the case of the proposal at Oak Hammock Marsh; we are committed to that in terms of what is happening at The Forks, that the proper review of those proposals will take place.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between orderly development and a bricks-and-mortar mentality to our vital and needed resources. I suggest strongly that this Government is demonstrating a vision of bricks and mortar and concrete, not a vision that is consistent with the environmental and visionary concerns of Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: How can he allow his board of directors, his three members of his board of directors, to manage a system which is ad hoc, in and out of court, in and out of conflict with citizens, in and out of public consultations? Will he look at his board of directors and have some people that have planning experience, as we did, so we can get away from this ad hoc, concrete decision-making that the citizens of this province legitimately fear?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, the Member may know that in the course of what was being proposed at The Forks, there was on site an archeologist, Mr. Kroker, who was a qualified individual, who was satisfied that the fill being removed was basically fill that had been refuse. He was satisfied that there were not works there of archeological value, and he was there at all times when the construction was taking place.

The dispute that arose was over whether or not a boat basin was a "marina" in the definition of The Environment Act, and the Member knows full well that when you bring in a new Act that has not been tested for matters of this nature, you have to have then an evaluation of what is the definition and what is intended in the Act. That resulted in a court order that is not an earth-shattering thing. Acts are there to be challenged, and when they are challenged—

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

\* (1430)

**Mr. Doer:** My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) deals with the vision and management of that very major historic site. When we were developing the site, through the ARC park and through the other development, we dug for artifacts first and had the development second. You are doing it all simultaneously. This person is running around with a shovel trying to look for artifacts, and surely that is not the way we deal with archeological sites.

My question to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is: What is included in the vision of the Government as articulated by his board members? Does it include the tourism site? Does it include the bricks and mortar proposals

that are coming forward, or do they have a vision, and is that being carried out by a board of directors that they appoint, the three members of the board of directors, and will he appoint some urban—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, we were way ahead of the process that the Member is talking about. The fact is that there was an archeological heritage assessment done before any of these plans began, taken by the Culture and Heritage Department of my colleague to the right.

Now the Members opposite are thinking that they did it when they were there. I am not interested in who should get credit for it. It was done ahead of time to be able to identify those areas that were of archeological interest. That matter was done before any work commenced. That assessment took place so that people could identify, and in fact they rerouted and relocated part of the construction to avoid a concern about the archeological significance of the site.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

#### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** May I have leave to make a non-political statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? (Leave) The Honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**Mr. Connery:** If Members opposite would look amongst their Order Papers, they would find a brochure with a pin on it. For some reason they got mixed in.

Mr. Speaker, between March 17 and March 25, Portage la Prairie will host the Uniroyal Goodrich World Junior Curling Championships. This event is being co-hosted by Lauree Clifford and Cliff Bagrie. We will have 100 athletes and 20 coaches representing 11 countries. The countries involved are Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, Scotland, U.S.A. and Canada. Canada is represented by the ladies by Kathy Overton of Winnipeg, and the men's rink—Dean Joanise of Victoria, B.C.

As I mentioned already, the corporate sponsor is the Uniroyal Goodrich Company. The Portage curling rink made their bid in February of 1988 to the International Curling Federation and was selected to host the World Junior Championships. This was basically because of the excellent way they performed for the men's and women's seniors curling championship in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, 40 committees are involved, and there will be a total of 400 volunteers to put on this event. This is a very prestigious event for Portage la Prairie. I know that the people will be very well hosted. I would like to have you look at the pin if you have your pins

Thursday, March 8, 1990

in front of you. It is a very unique pin. The pin is a picture of a strawberry in the shape of a world, and Portage is the strawberry capital of Canada. On the bottom of the pin you see part of a curling rink.- (interjection)- It would be nice if the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) would for one minute be quiet.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Members of the Legislature to join with me in congratulating the organizing committee for their hard work and wish all of the curlers a warm welcome to Manitoba and wish them good luck in their curling endeavours at the championship.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member for Transcona have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Transcona.

**Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) is well-known in this House for his pride in his community. Today he certainly has good reason. The Uniroyal Goodrich World Junior Curling Championships are no small event.

Fitness, amateur sport and volunteerism, as I stated just yesterday in this House, are very high priorities for our province. I feel that the championships unfolding shortly in the Member's own riding are a tribute to Manitoba's commitment to these values. I wish the Member my compliments on bringing this matter to the House. I assure him that my colleagues and I in the Liberal Opposition offer him, the athletes and the volunteers the heartiest success in their efforts. We are very proud of these very fine Manitobans.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member for Flin Flon have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) for that ringing endorsement.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that any time a community holds an event of this importance, a world junior championship, it is something that is noteworthy. I would just like to say as well on behalf of our caucus, congratulations to the community of Portage, congratulations to the hundreds of volunteers, the hundreds of people who have involved themselves in the sponsoring and the putting on of this important event.

Curling is one of the most important sports, recreational sports, in the Province of Manitoba. Many, many thousands of people take advantage of the friendship and the fellowship that curling has to offer. It is also, Mr. Speaker, a game of finesse and of great skill, and it is a privilege to have the World Junior Championships here. Let us hope that the Canadian rink has a good deal of success as Canadian rinks have had in the past in the World Juniors.

So good luck to Portage, good luck to the curlers, and congratulations to the city and the volunteers.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member for St. Vital have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** Mr. Speaker, as we meet here 120 of Canada's top biathletes are meeting in Falcon Lake today to take part in the first seniors championship of skiing that has ever been held in Manitoba, and that covers six disciplines. Along with those 120 athletes will be 60 coaches also from every province of Canada, Northwest Territories and the Yukon. This was done to their credit with little or no help from Government sources, a program on their own.

For those who are not quite familiar with biathlons, that is where they do cross-country skiing as well as target shooting with a small bore rifle.

I would like at this time, on behalf of Manitoba, to wish all those athletes from across Canada and the Territories good luck in their wishes and their competitions, and hopefully some Members will be able to get out and cheer them on and show their appreciation for them having the championships in Manitoba. Thank you.

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, just before Orders of the Day, I would like to announce the following committees for next week. On Monday at 10 a.m., the Municipal Affairs Committee to consider Bill No. 62. Also Monday at 10 a.m., the Law Amendments Committee to consider Bills 73 and 74. At three o'clock on Monday, with the leave of the House, Law Amendments to consider Bills 56, 72, 75 and 78; also with leave, at three o'clock Monday, Public Utilities and Natural Resources to consider Bills referred. Also I require leave for those two, if you would like to ask Honourable Members. There are other committees as well.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House? Leave.

**Mr. McCrae:** Also with leave, Mr. Speaker, Monday at 8 p.m., Law Amendments to consider Bills 59 and 60 and if necessary Bills 56, 72, 75 and 78; also Monday at 8 p.m., with the leave of the House, Public Utilities and Natural Resources to consider Bills referred. I might ask for leave of the House for those two committees as well.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is that agreed? Is there leave for that? It is agreed? Agreed. The Honourable Government House Leader.

\* (1440)

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday at 10 a.m., Private Bills to consider Bills referred and that is in Room 254. It was called to my attention that I have not been announcing the room numbers. Tuesday at 10 a.m., Industrial Relations to consider Bill 31. That is in Room 255. Going back to 10 a.m., Municipal Affairs,

---

Thursday, March 8, 1990

---

Room 255; Law Amendments, 254, 10 a.m. Monday. Monday at 3 p.m., Law Amendments, 255; Public Utilities and Natural Resources, 254. Monday evening, 8 p.m., Law Amendments, Room 255; Public Utilities and Natural Resources, Room 254.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader for that information. That is it for non-political?

### MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion under Rule No. 27. I move, seconded by the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), that under Rule 27 the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions in which many Manitobans are forced to live.

**An Honourable Member:** Come on, Jay. Talk about abuse of the Rules. Come on.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. Before determining whether the motion meets requirements of our Rule 27, the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) will have five minutes to state his case for urgency on debate of this matter. A spokesperson for each of the other two Parties will also have five minutes to state the urgency of debating this matter today. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**Mr. Cowan:** Mr. Speaker, I would have far preferred to have had the opportunity to speak to the needs of tenants and Manitobans during the continuing debate on Bill No. 42. That is not to say that this motion is in any way directly related to the progress or lack of progress of Bill No. 42 entirely through this House, but it certainly is a factor that has to be considered in preparing a motion that would call upon this House to set aside its ordinary business in order to discuss what is happening to tenants in this province today.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the New Democratic Party Caucus and I were looking forward, were anticipating the opportunity to work with the Government to expedite passage of any legislation, not just Bill 42, but any legislation that would protect tenants in this Legislature. Unfortunately, that opportunity for a more normal form of discussion and dialogue about the needs of both tenants and landlords in this Legislature has been denied to all Members of this Legislature because the Government has lost its political willpower and courage to continue on with policy, programs and legislation that would benefit both tenants and landlords by making for a fairer environment in which they must live and work.

We cannot do that with respect to Bill No. 42, because of the political cowardice of the Government and the fact that they have decided to pay back their political debts to their landlords and their moneylender friends and supporters, by not only not continuing with a

specific Bill, but by not bringing forward the type of progressive policy and programs that are required in order to ensure that tenants have the protection that is owing to them, and that both tenants and landlords operate within a fair system.

That is why this emergency debate is required. I make that point again, Mr. Speaker. It is not because entirely of what has happened to Bill 42. It is because there has been a general lack of courage on the part of this Government to implement overall policies and programs that would come to the aid of tenants in need and create a fairer system. It is urgently required because we have all seen in the media recently that there are far too many Manitobans who are living in unsafe, unhealthy and substandard apartments and housing.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to address the question of urgency, we have to ask ourselves, how long should a blind tenant have to live without proper plumbing and have to fill up her lavatory using water from the sink as we saw on TV last night? If we wonder at all about the urgency of the matter before us, let us just place ourselves in the position of that individual. How long should a mother have to walk around holes in her rotting floor and watch her children so that they do not fall through those holes and injure themselves? If we question the urgency of this debate, then we have to put ourselves in the position of that mother.

How long should a young child have to sleep in a bedroom in the middle of winter with a window that will not close? This is an urgent matter to that child. How long should an elderly tenant have to keep his perishable food on a balcony outside because his landlord will not fix his refrigerator? This is certainly an urgent matter to those Manitobans and many more. How long should they have to wait and so many more like them have to suffer every day of their lives because the Conservative Government sells them out to their landlord supporters?

That is not just a matter of Bill No. 42, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate that point again, it is a matter of the policy and the programs of this Government that have seen the Conservative administration turn its back on the needs of tenants, whether it be through the removal of Bill 42, or the fact that they would not incorporate social housing into their land developer projects, or the fact that they will not develop infill housing, or the fact that they will not do all those other things that are required to make living conditions and accommodations for Manitobans at least up to a standard where they can be considered safe and healthy.

Mr. Speaker, I say, and I think that most reasonable Manitobans would say that they should not have to wait one day more. They should not have to spend one moment longer in substandard housing. That is the urgency of this matter.

Under our Rule No. 27, the matter to be debated has to be both urgent and important. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you in this case it is, and there is no other opportunity given the admonitions that were given to one Member yesterday for attempting to discuss Bill 42 under different legislation for us to do so in another manner. Thank you very much.

Thursday, March 8, 1990

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) will also have five minutes to debate the urgency of debating this issue today.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Indeed the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) has brought up a very serious problem in the Province of Manitoba. That is the condition in which unsafe and unhealthy housing in the province is currently at. The direction that this Government seems to be taking us is in the opposite way. We have seen that in some of the actions that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) has acted upon, whether it is Bill 42, whether it is the MHRC Ladco deal, whether it is the housing co-ops, whether it is the Infill Housing Program.

I think we need to look at some of those programs and some of the actions that the Government has taken. If we take a look, Mr. Speaker, at the Infill Housing Program, as I stated earlier during Question Period, this Government has had 22 months to build infill homes. We should have had around 60-70, up to 80 homes built in that 22-month period. We have not seen one infill home built. The Minister has made reference to infill houses in terms of commitments, but he made commitments to me in the fall of '88 to the Infill Housing Program, and there has not been any follow-up. We can look at the MHRC Ladco deal. The Minister said that this particular deal gained Manitoba coffers a lot of profit. The option that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) had at the time is that he could have developed that land along with the Meadows West land. That deal, too, would have guaranteed profit. That would have ensured that we had better housing for all Manitobans. It would help facilitate a much more improved climate.

\* (1450)

If we take a look at the co-op, the development of co-ops—in many cases the Co-op Homestart Program was all about reinvesting monies into houses, rented facilities, to bring them up to a par, to bring them up to a living standard in which you or I would live in that house, but we have seen the Government moving in the opposite direction. They take away that grant and in its place they put a loan. That adds to the unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions in the Province of Manitoba.

We can make reference to Bill 42, and what Bill 42 would have done for the province. We have said on numerous occasions to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) that we in the official Opposition would cooperate, would go through a consensus if necessary. We understood that the Bill itself had major flaws in it. We have consulted for many hours with different landlords and different tenant organizations and their concerns were in part the unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions in the Province of Manitoba. For those reasons, I believe that there is no other opportunity. As you have seen, I had tried to get some of my concerns yesterday, but I was out of place. I do not believe that there is another opportunity for myself as Housing Critic for the official Opposition that is consulting with Manitobans, home owners, tenants, that are living in unacceptable circumstances.

I believe that this particular motion we should be proceeding with today because there is no other opportunity. I would encourage the Government to come on side with the official Opposition and the third Party in this House and vote in favour or, Mr. Speaker, that you would rule in favour of this motion. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing I know of that exceeds the clear incompetence of Members of the Liberal Party is the blatant obstructionism of the Members of the New Democratic Party in this House. Both Parties—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

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

**Mr. McCrae:** Both Parties have repeatedly shown not one iota of respect for you, Sir, for which I feel badly. I sympathize with you. I have no doubt that Honourable Members will move to attempt to overrule you, Mr. Speaker, when you rule in a moment or two that what is being raised today does not at all meet the requirements of our Rules dealing with emergency debates.

The outright audacity of the Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) to talk about urgent public importance when for 15 out of the last 20 years he and his Party have been in power in this province and never got off their duffs and did anything for renters in this province.

I suggest they are embarrassed today, and maybe this is their last stand to try in their own inimitable way to appeal to a certain segment of our society. I must say though, from the standpoint of a Government House Leader and from the standpoint of the Government trying to do the business of the people of the Province of Manitoba, we can only view what is happening today in the dying moments, the dying days of this Session, we can only view what is happening today as more abuse, more abuse of the Rules, more abuse of the time of the people of this province.

For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, every day this House sits costs the taxpayers of this province 6,400 more dollars. This is the way the Honourable Members in the New Democratic Party feel about the taxpayers of this province, willingly aided and abetted by Members of the Liberal Party, who I must say do not know any better. They have proved over and over again they do not know which way is up around this place, including but certainly featuring the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) and his high jinks in this place.

Mr. Speaker, you only have to look in today's newspaper to understand just how embarrassed the Liberal Party is in this House in its performance. The Opposition House Leader (Mr. Alcock) did not even want to be around today to talk about the application being made by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). It was left to good old punching bag, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). I say that is quite a powerful comment.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

Thursday, March 8, 1990

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I would remind the Honourable Government House Leader that all Members in this Chamber are Honourable Members. I will ask the Honourable Minister to withdraw that last comment. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**Mr. McCrae:** I did, Mr. Speaker, refer to the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) as the Honourable Member for Inkster. I did also refer to him as a punching bag used by his colleagues. I withdraw the fact that I referred to the Honourable Member for Inkster as a punching bag, but if he—

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Government House Leader to withdraw? Withdraw.

**Mr. McCrae:** Yes, I have done that, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) has been given five minutes to address the position of his Party respecting the urgency of debating this matter today. The Honourable Government House Leader.

**Mr. McCrae:** I really wonder about some of the language being used by Honourable Members opposite from their seats, Mr. Speaker, and how that contributes to an intelligent discussion of the matter before us. Having withdrawn what I said about the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) I will continue with my remarks.

The Honourable Members in both Parties in this House are rapidly losing credibility. We know that about the Liberals. They are also losing support and so are the New Democrats with their antics in this place after all of this time.

After all, this is March 8, 1990. This Session started in May of last year. I believe today we are at day No. 141. Are they trying to break a record or something? They are obviously moving in that direction.

Well, I am telling you, the public is fed up with this kind of abuse of you, Mr. Speaker, and of the people of this province. They show no respect whatsoever for the people and the hard-earned tax dollars that they pay to finance the operations of this House so Honourable Members in the Liberal and New Democratic Parties can abuse this place and abuse the trust and the respect of the people of this fine province.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) has said that Bill 42 will be reintroduced first thing at the next Session. The Honourable Premier of this province has also referred to the ongoing support of this Government for rent controls and how we have, in a real way, held rent increases —(interjection)—

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

## SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) did provide me with the notice required by our Subrule 27(1). I have listened with care to the advice offered by Honourable Members, and I want to thank Honourable Members for their advice.

I have reviewed our Rules and precedents relating to matters of urgent public importance and have also examined the authorities to which we refer in these matters. Beauchesne's Citation 389 advises that in order for debate to proceed, the matter raised "must be so pressing that the public interest will suffer if it is not given immediate attention."

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The operative portions of the Honourable Member's motion refers to "the unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions in which many Manitobans are forced to live." This is an unfortunate and regrettable situation which unquestionably needs to be addressed; however, it is not an emergency which has just arisen, nor is it one which is going to be corrected by setting aside the business schedule for today to allow an emergency debate. It is an ongoing situation.

Beauchesne's Citation 390 states that, " 'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself, but means 'urgency of debate', when the ordinary opportunities provided by the Rules of the House do not permit the subject to be brought on early enough and the public interest demands that discussion take place immediately." As stated earlier in this ruling, the situation being addressed by the operative portions of the Honourable Member's motion is not an emergency which has just arisen. It existed earlier in the Session when the Honourable Member could have used a number of opportunities to address it, such as the Estimates consideration, the grievance process and others.

For the reasons stated, I must rule the Honourable Member's motion out of order as a matter of urgent public importance. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

\* (1500)

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader):** With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

All those in favour, please say aye; all those opposed will please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

**Mr. Ashton:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Call in the Members.

Order, please. The question before the House is shall the rule of the Chair be sustained.

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

### YEAS

Burrell, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger (Emerson), Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Gilleshammer, Hammond, Helwer, Manness, McCrae, Oleson, Pankratz, Penner, Praznik.

### NAYS

Alcock, Angus, Ashton, Carr, Carstairs, Charles, Cheema, Cowan, Doer, Driedger (Niakwa), Evans (Fort Garry), Gaudry, Gray, Hemphill, Kozak, Lamoureux, Maloway, Minenko, Patterson, Plohman, Roch, Rose, Storie, Uruski, Wasylycia-Leis, Yeo.

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):** Yeas, 19; Nays, 26.

**Mr. Speaker:** The ruling of the Chair having been overturned, the question before the House is shall the debate proceed. Agreed? Agreed. Therefore, the question before the House is that under Rule 27, the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions in which many Manitobans are forced to live.

## HOUSE BUSINESS

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of House Business, in the Industrial Relations Committee, Bills 80 and 57 stand referred to that committee. After conclusion of deliberations on Bill 31 those Bills would be before the committee—that is Bills 80 and 57.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I announced the Private Bills Committee would sit, by leave, on Tuesday at—I am sorry. I announced that committee would sit on Tuesday at 10 a.m., and I would ask that that committee meet, by leave, at 3 p.m. on Tuesday.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for that? That is agreed.

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Thompson, with his committee change.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), that the composition of Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be amended as follows: the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

\* (1600)

I further move, seconded by the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), the composition of Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for eight o'clock, March 8, be amended as follows: the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) for the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill).

I further move, seconded by the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), that the composition of Standing

Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) for the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) for the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). That is for the eight o'clock, Thursday, March 8 sitting.

I further move, seconded by the Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for ten o'clock, March 12, be amended as follows: the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) for the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer); and the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) for the Member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Gimli, with committee changes.

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations for the Thursday evening sitting be amended as follows, Helwer for Praznik.

I move, seconded by the Member for Lac Du Bonnet (Mr. Praznik), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for Thursday evening's session be amended as follows: McCrae for Connery; Ducharme for Driedger (Emerson); Downey for Gilleshammer; and Ernst for Derkach.

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) that the composition of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs for the Monday, 10 a.m. session be amended as follows: Burrell for Gilleshammer; and Oleson for Penner.

I move, seconded by the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments for the Monday, March 12, 10 a.m. session be amended as follows: Driedger (Emerson) for McCrae; Gilleshammer for Ducharme; Praznik for Downey; and Connery for Ernst.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed. The Honourable Government House Leader.

## HOUSE BUSINESS (Cont'd)

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, a reminder for Honourable Members, I understand that by previous agreement the House's time of adjournment today is 4:30, and a reminder also that there is Royal Assent at 4:25.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, we were not informed of the Royal Assents, but if the Government would like to have Royal Assent, we are prepared to give leave to do it, but we would ask that one speaker from each side be allowed to speak the full period of time in this debate, and then we would not see the clock in time to do the Royal Assents.

**Mr. McCrae:** Mr. Speaker, the idea is to ensure that each Party is allowed at least 10 minutes in the debate.

---

Thursday, March 8, 1990

---

### MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (Cont'd)

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** It is indeed a pleasure, our caucus having moved this emergency resolution, to be able to rise today on behalf of the tenants of Manitoba on this very, very important resolution, Mr. Speaker, and this very important emergency debate.

Mr. Speaker, let us go back to October of this year. Let us go back to the press release.-(interjection)- The Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) perhaps should listen to this, because it is the Government's own press release on October 2. It was great for a front page headline, but when push came to shove, this Tory Government is right back where Tory Governments have always been, only subject to a few of the vested interest groups in our society and not available and balanced for the tenants of this province.

(Mr. Neil Gaudry, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

Manitoba's tenants will soon be among the best protected in Canada, Mr. Acting Speaker. Highlights of the proposed Residential Tenancies Act include a new independent body to hear appeals, tougher measures to ensure rental property meets standards and greater protection for security deposits.

Mr. Acting Speaker, the Government said this overhaul will reform the system to ensure it is more responsive in meeting the needs of both landlords and tenants. He indicated that this proposed legislation incorporates more than 100 recommendations made by landlords and tenants during an extensive 18-month review.

Mr. Acting Speaker, what has happened in the legacy of Bill 42 in terms of the Government? Yes, indeed, this Bill had one of the most extensive sets of consultations in the province. It has probably been one of the most studied Bills ever. It was done in a most balanced way. I refer Members of this House to this document, about a 10-pound document, called the Landlord and Tenant Review Committee issued in February of 1987. It had recommendation after recommendation. It had all kinds of explanations and detailed analysis of what this would mean for both landlords and tenants.

This was introduced four or five years after the New Democratic Party brought in the best rent control legislation in the country, to plug up the loopholes that the Tories had passed under the Sterling Lyon regime. Who was the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs when the Tories went down to defeat in 1980-81? It was the former Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the Lyon Government, who is the now Premier of the province.

When you look at the smoking gun of tenants versus landlords you have to go right directly to the Premier of this province in terms of who he represents. In 1980 and '81, the Lyon Government and some of the Members of the front benches were part of that group, that nefarious group of Ministers that passed loophole after loophole and gutted and totally ruined the protection for renters in this province.

You do not have to ask the New Democratic Party about that. Ask John Robertson who was a Tory candidate in the 1981 election. When he came back after the election and after he got shellacked, he said, when I went into apartments it was like going into North Vietnam, and that was the Tory legislation dealing with rent controls.

Remember during the election, even the Tory friends, the landlords, were raising rents 18 percent, 15 percent, 16 percent, and Members here know that. They remember those days. They know what happened in those constituencies because the Tories only were in bed with the landlords.

\* (1610)

Even in 1980-81 we found the Tories censoring needed information. The monetary report in 1980-81 dealing with the deregulation period was censored by the Honourable Jorgenson and a report was prepared for this House that I recall, which would gerrymander the numbers and did not analyze what was happening in a decontrolled period under rent controls.

Even the very decision that they made originally was only based on a few developers and a few supporters of the Conservative Party providing advice to the Tories. Of course the New Democrats plugged those holes up, Mr. Acting Speaker, in the early '80s when we came to office. In 1986 we knew that we had to bring our rent control legislation into the 1990s because even though we provided the greatest leadership on rent controls in the early '80s there was a number of weaknesses in the legislation that became apparent to anybody. Therefore we entertained one of the greatest consultation processes in the history of landlords and tenants in this country.

Out of this report came a piece of legislation that was sitting on the Minister's desk when he was sworn into office and then he had another 18 months, as he said in his press release, to consult about the needed changes before he provided this legislation to this Chamber.

After this legislation was passed on second reading in December we found out a deal was in the works between the Conservatives, the land developers and the mortgage lenders of this province. Our sources told us clearly that the Tories had met in the back rooms with their developer friends, and no, it was not a drafting error, it was an error on how far they had gone and whose side they were on and what this legislation meant to the people that best supports the Conservative Party. There is no question that the issue here before us is not a question of drafting, it is a question of whose side you are on. The people who are on the side of the Conservatives said, you have gone too far, you are going to affect our profit margins too much, and you must not proceed with this Bill. Something we proved again today in the House with the letters we tabled. The landlords, the developers -(interjection)-

Well, I remember the way the Member voted, in terms of the Member for Wolseley when she was in the Chair. How soon they forget.

There is no question that this is not a drafting issue because the Minister has had 18 months. There is no



Thursday, March 8, 1990

question the Minister has had over six weeks to meet with housing groups, landlord groups and the Real Estate Board to strongly correct this Bill.

It is clearly a retreat and a surrender made to the same group of people this Government always dances to, and that is the owners of companies under the Chamber of Commerce, something we are seeing in final offer selection—very disappointed with the Liberals, Mr. Acting Speaker—something we are seeing with the public schools financing, and now again we see it in landlord and tenant legislation.

They can say it is wrong all you want, but we have their press releases, we have the documents. These people have surrendered to the tenants of this province. They have totally surrendered their vested interest and left tenants high and dry.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this document and the great number of presentations by the housing coalitions of this province clearly illustrate the need to proceed with Bill 42.

Yes, if there are errors in some of the proposals we can correct it at committee stage. We believe that our rights as parliamentarians and legislators have been grossly sold out by this Government in their effort to gerrymander this Bill and cover up behind closed doors the presentations being made to this Bill.

We feel this Government has an obligation to take this Bill to second reading and public hearings. We believe at minimum the people should have a right to speak. We should not have to table letters in this Chamber illustrating the back-room wheeling and dealing between the Conservatives, the landlords, the Real Estate Board and other vested interests that meet with the Conservative Party on a regular basis.

Mr. Acting Speaker, if we supported the Government when it was time to amend the drunk driving Bill, and if there were mistakes in the drafting of that legislation, we stood by the Government to amend that Bill. We did not ridicule the Government because we believe getting drunk drivers off the streets is more important than petty little politics about changing amendments.

We too believe in a very consistent way that we will stand up for tenants, and if we need to make some amendments or improvements, which we failed to see demonstrated, we will be able to do that at committee. We are prepared to work 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to deal with this Bill.

We are not in any panic to get out of this Chamber if it means going another couple of days to correct this Bill. What is the Government afraid of? Why is he kowtowing to only one special interest group? We want the Government to reverse its position. We want the Government to bring this Bill forward to let the public hearings go on. Let us spend the time. Let us spend the energy, because we have had three years now of study. It is time for action, and the action is in second reading of this Bill not press releases of this Government. Thank you very much, Mr. Acting Speaker.

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Neil Gaudry):** The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), on a committee change.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose), that the composition of Industrial Relations be amended as follows: Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

I also move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: St. James (Mr. Edwards) for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), Radisson (Mr. Patterson) for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo).

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry):** Is that agreed for the committee change? Agreed and so ordered.

## MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE (Cont'd)

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I think it is very important to get several things clear for the record regarding Bill 42.

Firstly, I would like to state categorically that the delay in bringing forward this Act in no way represents an abandonment of this Government's commitment to improving the lot of tenants and particularly low-income tenants in this province. It is and will remain our intention to implement the much strengthened provisions of the Act concerning repair and maintenance, which are the very heart of this particular Bill. I take great pride in those proposals as they stem from both my own experience and my research and consideration of the problems they are designed to address, Mr. Acting Speaker.

In my own personal business experience, Mr. Acting Speaker, I have had the occasion to see rental properties of the worst kind, run by the worst kind of landlords, properties that I consider unfit for habitation by neither man let alone human beings. While certainly in a lot of situations these problems could be attributed to the acts of irresponsible tenants, as often as not, they were the result and attitudes of landlords whose only interest was to squeeze revenue out of properties with no sense of obligation to their tenants.

I felt that the proposal to deal with these situations, as left by the previous Government, was in fact not strong enough. The proposals regarding the redirection of the rent, the creation of a housing fund, the consolidation of housing by-law, enforcement powers and the creation of receivership powers, in part stemming from my own investigation of the operation of the housing court system in Boston, combined to make this legislation the most progressive of its kind in Canada.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Thursday, March 8, 1990

I can tell the Honourable Members that in the deliberations regarding these sections of the new Act there was thorough discussion with me and my Cabinet colleagues and most certainly there is always and were reservations. After all, we are a free enterprise Government, which believes that the rights and opportunities of individuals in our society are of a paramount concern. Mr. Speaker, that includes the right to enjoy private property and the exercise of the right with a minimum of Government regulation.

Fundamentally, I guess that is how we differ from other Parties in this Legislature. Beyond the philosophical matter of personal freedoms we also believe that this is the best way to create a healthy economic environment for all. I am glad to say, judging by events in the rest of the world where people's burden by generations of socialist regulation are rushing to achieve market economies, that our philosophy is winning.

However, we also recognize that the market system is not always going to be 100 percent perfect. While we believe that Government intervention should be highly selective, Mr. Speaker, where it is needed it should be optimally effective. I can certainly tell Members of this House that in the end it was the Cabinet's consensus to fall on higher duty to achieve decent habitation standards for all Manitobans. I am very proud of my colleagues for their endorsement of these policy objectives as set out in Bill 42.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, since he was in recent days borne the brunt of the Opposition's attack, I want to cite the Premier (Mr. Filmon) for a strong and steadfast leadership in those discussions. I think it is often not appreciated that our Premier has not forgotten his roots in the poorer part of north end Winnipeg and has carried with him always a sense of obligation to those less fortunate than himself.

I think he is committed and has already been proven in substantial increases well above inflation that have been given to keeping our social programs viable. It stands no less to the important principles of this particular Residential Tenancies Act.

I make no mistake about it, those objectives will continue to be supported in this legislation when this legislation is brought back in the next Session.

Mr. Speaker, I alluded earlier to the fact that the more innovative provisions of this Act were based on the Boston Housing model. In addition, Members should recollect that it was primary recommendation of the Landlord Tenant Review Committee that a housing court system be created. Within our own Canadian constitutional framework, as opposed to the American one, we are unable to fully achieve those types of recommendations that the previous Government had considered. It showed that way when it was tried to be undertaken in Ontario in the 1970s. Thus it became necessary to maintain an administrative, a bureaucratic structure, while creating a more judicial type of system called Residential Tenancies Act Commission. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Landlord Tenant Review Committee and indeed by the City of Winnipeg the scope and powers representative of this Act had to be considerably expanded over its predecessor.

\* (1620)

The irony of it all is that in order to achieve the stated policy objectives within a housing court system, it was necessary to strengthen, not weaken, the administration's power. I can tell Members that in order to achieve this, it was frankly in this concern, the matter of exercising powers on this legislation, that our particular committee did look at all the concerns in regard to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, how much time? I can advise Members that many of those concerns result from basic misunderstanding of parts of this Bill. At the same time others appear to have some legitimate basis.

Mr. Speaker, regardless that these concerns brought forward are so numerous, numbered in total of 100 from landlords and tenants alike, that they require far more detailed scrutiny and discussion than we initially had thought. To have brought them forward in a rushed fashion for consideration of Law Amendments Committee in the waning days of this Session would have done a disservice to all concerned. At the same time, it has also become evident that not all of the consensus recommendations contained in the original Landlord Tenant Review Committee Report were properly reflected in the Act as currently drafted.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind Members that the report which we have recognized as the basis for most of this legislation stipulated specifically it was a result of trade-offs made between landlords' and tenants' interests and was to be faithfully reflected in the legislation as possible and that the wording or form of the legislation should be properly balanced. This is something we also must look over closely prior to submission of the Bill next Session. Finally, I must address the head-on issues of allegations raised regarding the circumstances, the introduction of this legislation and its deferral to the next Session.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Bill was introduced in October and passed second reading in late December. However, I must emphasize that the flurry of submissions and concerns regarding the Bill were by large not received until January, and thus despite the fact that copies of this Bill were sent specifically to all interested parties on introduction and each group was called in for a briefing as to its contents at the time.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that prior to the Bill's introduction in vetting it may have focused too closely on the major elements of the Bill in respect to the repair and maintenance of the strengthened security deposit provisions and the structures of the Residential Tenancies Commission itself and not closely enough on the less significant elements enclosed in the Bill. I want to stress that we remain committed to those major changes and have no intentions of materially weakening them in the future redraft. However, the Bill must be dealt with in a whole, much it would be our desire to give comfort to the affected groups respecting those major changes. We cannot deal with them in isolation of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I must also mention that this situation be put in proper perspective. The landlord-tenant aspect

of this Bill has not been changed in 20 years. The major changes affected as a result of this Bill will govern landlord-tenant relations likely for longer than another 20 years. It is imperative that such a Bill, that a Bill such as this that expands such regulatory powers must to the greatest extent possible be seen to be fair and even-handed by those who are affected by it. Unfortunately, at this point in time, that is not the case with the wording and the tone of this Bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I will remind all Members that the essence of our democratic system of laws is the principle of informed consent, that is the recognition by all parties affected by a law that is fair and does not confer on its administrator's unduly arbitrary authority.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want this legislation to succeed. We want it as unflawed as possible. We want it to get off to the best possible start, and I repeat, we stand fully committed to all the major new elements of the existing Bill. I would close only by requesting Members opposite, whose basically non-partisan support on this matter I have highly valued, to reconsider if it is not worthwhile to accept the necessary few months delay to properly achieve these very important objectives.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that we look at the reasoning why we are at the situation that we currently are. In 1985, we had a review committee established and we had members from tenant organizations or tenant representatives. We had landlord representatives, and we had some bureaucrats also on that review committee. They spent hundreds of hours going over The Landlord and Tenant Act along with The Rent Regulations Act. At the end of that hundred hours they got together and they put forward a very comprehensive review, something that includes some 139 recommendations that were based on a general consensus.

This legislation is for the tenants and the landlords, and the tenants and the landlords are not being served properly by the indefinite or the continuous delays that have been put on this particular Bill. If we take a look in terms of the events that have occurred since the review committee when it initially reported back in January or February of 1987, the previous administration had an opportunity to bring in the legislation but failed to do that.

I bring that up because I want the Government to be aware that they now are in a situation in which they can bring in legislation that is in need in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, by continuously putting it back, putting it on the back burner, they are taking a chance that they will not have the opportunity to bring in the legislation.

If we take a look back in June of 1988, shortly after the election, the Premier of the province said that it was a low priority to him. Shortly after that the official Opposition put out a press release demanding that the legislation be taken off the back burner back then and put on the front burner.

Mr. Speaker, in the Estimates of the fall of '88, I encouraged the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) to bring forward the legislation. I suggested to him at that time that we would be very co-operative in terms of assisting to ensure that this legislation be brought in in a fast fashion.

On June 2, Mr. Speaker, of 1989 we introduced Bill No. 2. Bill No. 2 was a relatively minor amendment, but the purpose of the amendment was to give the Government some initiative, give the Government some initiative to bring in the legislation that was needed. In fact I believe it worked to some degree, because when September came along we had the Minister of Housing introduce Bill No. 42.

A week after the Minister introduced Bill No. 42, I, representing the Liberal Party, spoke on the Bill. I was concerned that we should be passing this Bill out of second reading and getting it into committee back in September. I had encouraged the third Party in the Chamber actually to put up a speaker, speak on it, sit down and allow it to go into committee so there would be plenty of time.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it was held in second reading until late December. It was the official Opposition once again on December 22 that stood up just before we recessed and asked through leave that this Bill be allowed to go to committee. We were successful. The Bill was allowed to go to committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the question, what are the reasons why the Government is backing off? On the surface it appears that the official Opposition is the one that wants to proceed with this Bill. It was the Government that brought in this legislation, but according to the speeches that are given in this Chamber, you would never think that.

When the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) stood up to speak on Bill No. 42, he gave it all praise. He talked about how it was going to harmonize landlord and tenant affairs, Mr. Speaker. He was 100 percent behind that Bill. At the time, we said that in general we supported the Bill, we believed that it was going to require amendments, but we would be willing to co-operate in those amendments. In the last month, last three to four weeks, we started to get the impression that the Minister of Housing was not fully behind his Bill.

\* (1630)

Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), I believe he believes that this Bill should have proceeded to committee. I believe it was his Cabinet colleagues, in particular the Premier (Mr. Fillion), that have changed his mind. I believe the Minister of Housing, if it was up to him, would have brought it to the committee. In fact it was the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues that changed their mind.

Why did they change their mind, Mr. Speaker? Because they had too much pressure from landlords. They had too much pressure from money lending institutes. As a result, they bowed to that pressure. I believe that was a mistake. That was a mistake, because

Thursday, March 8, 1990

hundreds of thousands of tenants and landlords, as a direct result of what the Premier has said, the Bill has been retracted.

Mr. Speaker, I did not just want to comment on Bill No. 42, because Bill No. 42 addresses a part of the motion, a part of the emergency debate. I brought up today in Question Period other concerns that we have in the Liberal Party, what the Government is doing to other programs. If we take a look at the infill housing program, what is the Government doing? There has not been one infill house since this Government has taken office. I think that is a shame.- (interjection)- The Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) says, does anyone want one? I can assure the Minister of Environment that there is a waiting list. There are many Manitobans that want to have an infill house, that many Manitobans would like to have the opportunity to get into an infill house.

Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the housing co-ops, what has this Government done to housing co-ops in this province? There has not been one application approved under the new program that this Government has created in replacing the housing co-op grants that were offered previously. That was a policy change of this Government. As a result, we are not seeing co-ops flourish in the way, in the manner in which they should be.

Mr. Speaker, the third part of the question addressed the Ladco-MHRC deal. The Government had a bad deal. They did not take the better of the two deals and I have to ask the question, why? They had an opportunity in which they could have developed more non-profit or low-income housing, but they gave up that opportunity. They still could have made profit. Maybe Genstar did not have Conservatives or did not make campaign contributions. Whatever the reasons, this Government had an opportunity in which they could have brought forward a much better deal than the Ladco-MHRC deal, and there is no one on the Government side that should be able to defend what the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) is doing to the Department of Housing and the impact it is having on housing in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the Premier (Mr. Filmon), how much longer is he going to let the Department of Housing slip? How much longer is he going to allow the Department of Housing to go down? We have seen what his feelings are in regard to Bill No. 42. Maybe the Premier can clarify what the Government's intentions are, tell us what Phase 2 is all about when it comes to the infill housing program, tell us what it is all about when it comes to our housing co-ops in the province, tell us what it is all about when it comes to the development of low-income housing in this province. This Government should be ashamed of the action that they have been doing when it comes to housing in the Province of Manitoba. That is the reason why I believed it was important that we stand up here today and ensure that the Government is well aware of the actions that the Minister of Housing, who is supported by the Premier, is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my light is flashing, and I do not think they will give me leave, so -(interjection)- Oh,

I hear the word "leave." In conclusion, at the next Cabinet meeting I would hope that they put under priority one the housing conditions in the Province of Manitoba. The Ministers say that is what they are doing. They are not doing that. They are letting the Department of Housing go down the drain.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am advised that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor is about to arrive to grant Royal Assent.

## ROYAL ASSENT

**Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms (Mr. A. Roy MacGillivray):** His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour, George Johnson, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne, Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour in the following words:

**Mr. Speaker:** May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed Bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent:

**Mr. Clerk (William Remnant):**

Bill No. 6, The Law Reform Commission Act; Loi sur la Commission de réforme du droit;

Bill No. 19, The Ground Water and Water Well Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les eaux souterraines et les puits;

Bill No. 35, The Wildlife Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la conservation de la faune;

Bill No. 39, The Human Tissue Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les tissus humains;

Bill No. 40, The Land Surveyors Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les arpenteurs-géomètres;

Bill No. 65, The Fatality Inquiries Act; Loi sur les enquêtes médico-légales;

Bill No. 66, The Summary Convictions Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les poursuites sommaires;

Bill No. 68, The Court of Appeal Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour d'appel;

Bill No. 69, The Law Society Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau;

Bill No. 70, The Provincial Court Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la Cour provinciale;

Bill No. 71, The Law Society Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau;

Bill No. 81, The Environment Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement;

Bill No. 82, The Dangerous Goods Handling and

**Thursday, March 8, 1990**

---

Transportation Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la manutention et le transport des marchandises dangereuses;

Bill No. 83, The Ozone Depleting Substances Act; Loi sur les substances appauvrissant la couche d'ozone;

Bill No. 89, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate United Health Services Corporation;

Loi modifiant la Loi constituant la "United Health Services Corporation."

in Her Majesty's Name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these Bills.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

**Mr. Speaker:** As previously agreed, the hour being 4:30, this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday.