



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

39 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXXIX No. 21 - 1:30 p. m., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1990



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, November 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): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for the 1990-1991 Estimates of the Department of Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Recreation, and also the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for Community Support Programs under the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement. I wonder if I could have leave to revert to Ministerial Statements.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable First Minister have leave to revert to Ministerial Statements? Leave? Agreed.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, on Monday during consideration of the Estimates of expenditure for Executive Council, I provided information in response to questions from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer). I refer specifically to his questions relating to the International Institute for Sustainable Development. I attempted to answer it without complete information, since the expenditures are contained within the Estimates of the Department of Environment. Unfortunately, the numbers I provided were not correct and underestimated the total financial contributions from the Government of Canada to the institute.

To set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, I have a document, copies of which are attached, to provide for the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Second Opposition Party (Mrs. Carstairs). This one-page fact sheet summarizes the contributions from the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada to the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

The Province of Manitoba is providing a total of \$800,000 in the first year of operation and will be providing \$1.375 million in each of the next four years for a total five-year provincial contribution of \$6.3 million.

In this current fiscal year, Environment Canada is providing \$1.75 million and will provide in each of the next four years \$3 million for a total five-year Environment Canada contribution of \$13.75 million.

The Canadian International Development Agency, CIDA, will be providing a total five-year contribution of \$5 million. The Western Diversification office in Winnipeg has provided a first-year, start-up grant of \$149,925.00.

In total, the Province of Manitoba is contributing \$6.3 million over five years. The Government of Canada is contributing \$18.9 million for a total funding commitment to the International Institute for Sustainable Development of \$25.2 million. The federal contribution is three dollars for every one dollar the Manitoba Government provides. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not having provided as complete information as I might have to the Leader of the Opposition when he asked the question on Monday.

International Institute for Sustainable Development

**Comparison of \$ contributions to date:

- Province of Manitoba	\$ 327,500.00
- Western Diversification	\$ 149,925.00
- Environment Canada	<u>\$1,166,666.66</u>
(8/12 of 1st yr. contrib)	
Total to date:	\$1,644,091.66

**Contributions over the next 5 years:

Province of Manitoba - 90/91	\$ 750,000.00
One time start-up	<u>50,000.00</u>
	800,000.00

In each of the next four years - \$1,375,000.00	<u>5,500,000.00</u>
Total 5 yr.	
<u>Provincial Contribution:</u>	<u>\$6,300,000.00</u>
- Environment Canada - 90/91	\$1,750,000.00
- In each of the next four years - \$3,000,000.00	<u>\$12,000,000.00</u>
Total 5 yr.	
<u>Env. Can/Fed. Contribution:</u>	<u>\$13,750,000.00</u>
- C.I.D.A.	
<u>Total 5 yr. Contribution</u>	<u>\$ 5,000,000.00</u>
- Western Diversification Office	
<u>Total Contribution</u>	<u>\$ 149,925.00</u>

TOTAL COMMITMENT OVER 5 YEARS:
\$25,199,925.00)

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): We are pleased for the Premier's information today, and we are pleased to have on the record the contribution from the federal Government.

As the Premier will well understand, it has been very difficult to ferret out the information dealing with the federal Government. We were told initially it was \$100 million from the federal Government. Then we were told it was \$50 million by Mr. Epp. Then we were told it may be somewhat less than that, so we have always wondered what the real contribution from the federal Government would be when we considered the pre-federal election announcement of the Prime Minister at the United Nations in New York in September of 1988.

We note that there are some funds coming from CIDA, and although we are happy that money is forthcoming to Manitoba, I am somewhat worried, Mr. Speaker, that cutbacks to third world countries that have been in the last two federal Conservative budgets would now be used.

Although it is a worthy project in Manitoba for sustainable development, I somewhat worry, in light of the plight of third world countries and Canada's shrinking contributions to people in the world who really need it, investment to get opportunities that we are so accustomed to in our society.

We look forward to the Sustainable Development Centre. We truly hope that it is a world-class operation. We truly hope that it is consistent with the recommendations from President Brundtland on the Brundtland Commission as Canada's response. We

truly hope that the aspirations contained within the Brundtland Commission that we will have a balance between economic development and environmental development. We truly hope that this will be the prototype model for the world and that Manitoba will not only have the centre here but lead by example on the very, very important environmental projects and challenges it faces. Thank you very, very much.
* (1335)

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): I too thank the First Minister for providing the accurate information. However, I think we should take note that it is unfortunate for Canada and indeed the world that the original commitment of the federal Government has been reduced to some 18.9 percent of what they had originally indicated they would be prepared to do.

I also, with the Leader of the Opposition, have some concern about the funding that will come via CIDA. It has unfortunately been all too often that First World nations have destroyed the environment for those nations in the Third World, and they are now contributing, because of their own purchasing practices, to the further erosion of the environment in those Third World nations.

I hope that the Centre for Sustainable Development will be able to place a focus not just on the activities of First World nations, but in somehow helping Third World nations to alleviate some of their economic problems which will prevent them, particularly in places like the Amazon, from further destruction of our environment. In order to do that, we are going to have to be prepared to contribute some additional funding to those nations so affected.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery, where we have with us this afternoon from the Dalhousie Elementary School eleven Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Barbara Juskow. This school is located in constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau).

Also, this afternoon we have from the Dauphin branch of the Assiniboine Community College sixteen business admin students. They are under the direction of Gregg Anderson. This school is

located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

Also, we have from The Maples Collegiate twenty-five Grade 12 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Boyko. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

ACRE Group Proposal Hazardous Waste Storage

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, following on the announcement of the Premier's today on sustainable development, perhaps we have a sustainable development challenge in our own province. We have become aware that the ACRE operation, which was established by the Government dealing with the contaminated pesticide containers, has asked the Government to be able to store 500,000 pounds of material in an old wooden hangar near Rivers which is directly located above the aquifer for the City of Brandon.

I would ask the Premier, does he feel this to be a safe location for those containers? Will he ask his officials in the Department of Environment to stop this proposal from the ACRE group that was established by the provincial Government?

* (1340)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as the Member knows, the funding for ACRE comes through a levy, a surtax, that is put on each container of new chemicals sold in this province, that it is a board that is made up of people from both the farm sector, the various groups, the municipal representatives. I believe the Chair is Reeve Bill Galloway from the Swan River area.

This group is certainly not an arm of Government but would indeed come under all of our restrictions. We would be very, very careful to ensure that any proposal from them would meet our regulatory requirements, our standards and our assurances of protection for the environment in all respects. They would not be treated any differently than any component for a proposed storage of chemicals or even spent chemical containers.

So I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that that proposal, if indeed it exists, will be reviewed very, very carefully and will have to meet the most stringent requirements that are set forth in our Environmental Act and regulations.

Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation Pesticide Disposal

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the Premier is aware, another storage site from ACRE just recently, in fact October 6, had a major fire at the Grosse Isle location of the Province of Manitoba and forced the evacuation of a number of citizens. We have raised this issue before with the Premier in terms of the policy issues between having these pesticides dealt with by the Hazardous Waste Corporation, a Crown corporation, or having it delegated as the Government has done to this other group.

My question to the Premier is: Will he not review the disposal of pesticides as a major hazardous waste challenge and return the pesticide disposals in this province to the Hazardous Waste Corporation, that has the expertise, which has the mandate and which has the ability to deal with this issue as they are in other sites in the province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition is aware that the Hazardous Waste Corporation still does not have a site for storage or treatment of waste facilities. So in fact they would be choosing to store these containers in some location in this province which would be the subject of potential hazards and be the subject of potential accidents.

The fact that it would come under a Crown corporation and be stored makes it no less susceptible to hazards or to other forms of concern. Our standards would still apply. We would not change the standards because they were a Crown corporation. We would not change the standards because they were subject to a corporation that has representatives from the farm community, from municipal jurisdictions and so on. The standards prevail. The Act prevails. All of the restrictions prevail regardless of who the proponent is.

Indeed, if it is a Government proponent, I think the people have every just right to have assurance that they are not going to be treated specially because they are a Crown corporation. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Member does not recognize that

when Manfor was under the Crown ownership under the NDP, they were one of the worst polluters in the province, and that gives absolutely no assurance or guarantee of environmental protection to the people of Manitoba.

Government Policy

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Premier should get in touch with officials in his own department that are coming to us and saying that this thing is out of control. The Premier has already issued licences to places like—(interjection)— yes, I would name them, all right. It would be a one-way ticket with this bunch over there. We have already seen the standards that this Government uses with the Solvit licensing.

I would ask the Premier, given the fact the Hazardous Waste Corporation is working with Hamiota and Prairie Environmental Services and operating a decontamination storage and recycling operation, Mr. Speaker, which is dealing with these pesticides in an orderly way, and given that officials in his own department are saying that this other site is dangerous, it is susceptible to fires, it is susceptible to potentially contaminating the water supply of the City of Brandon, would the Premier please look at the whole issue of toxic waste and contamination issues and get an overall policy that allows the Hazardous Waste Corporation to lead the issue rather than being forgotten as the Government is doing?

* (1345)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the allegation that the Leader of the Opposition is making is a spurious one and wrongly based in terms of logic. The fact that Crown corporations are put in charge of waste does not give any assurance that they as proponents are going to be any differently treated than is indeed a non-profit group that is arm's length that involves farmers, municipal officials on the board. The best proof of that of course is the way in which the NDP handled Manfor as a Crown corporation, gave them no licence and allowed them to pollute indiscriminately. That is what ought to be compared when we take a look at how they deal with it. I will review the matter that he has put forward with the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), and if there is cause for concern, I will have his officials investigate the matter and give us recommendations on the issue.

Acting Minister of Culture Removal and Apology Request

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Since the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) put his comments on record regarding multiculturalism and Government funding policies, which imply that one group, the WASPs as he said, support all other groups, a number of organizations within the ethnocultural community have spoken out against those sentiments. In spite of the wide reaction against the Minister's comments, however, the Premier has refused to remove his Cabinet status as the acting Minister for Culture, Heritage and Recreation, nor has any public apology review of the divisive effects of this Minister's comments been initiated.

I have a letter written and signed by members of the Manitoba—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the Honourable Member have a question? Kindly put your question now, please.

Ms. Cerlill: It is obvious from this that members of our community are outraged. In light of this letter from members of the Intercultural Council and the Premier's own comments, will the Premier now finally agree to take some action and remove this Minister from his acting status as Minister responsible for Culture, Heritage and Recreation? Will he ask for a full apology?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Yes, my response is the same as it was last week and the same as it was the week before, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Cabinet Committee Meeting

Ms. Marianne Cerlill (Radlsson): Besides the letter from MIC, I have another letter from the Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties, which echoes many of the concerns which have been raised from both these within this Chamber and outside. In light of these concerns—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the Honourable Member was just going to get to her question.

Ms. Cerlill: —will the Premier now instruct the Ethnocultural Committee of Cabinet to meet with the Intercultural Council, as was promised last November, and deal with the lack of confidence in this Government's policies toward multiculturalism?

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this Government, our Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), our Members, myself, have met time and time and time again with members of the ethnocultural community. We have been open to their views. We have consulted. We have listened to much of their advice. We have appeared on public forums with them. We have done many things to ensure that there were open lines of communication.

We are the first administration in the history of this province to develop and publish a multicultural policy. We have gone further and indicated to them that we will develop a multicultural Act, the first for this province.

I believe that our record indicates where we stand with respect to those policies. We have done a very good show and a very good job with respect to our relationship with the multicultural community.

Ms. Cerilli: It has been over a year since their committee has met with MIC—

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

Point of Order

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, it seems like the new Member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) is learning quickly from the old Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) with respect to supplementaries.

It is one thing for Members to flaunt the rules, but it is another thing for Members to deliberately flaunt you when you stand up and ask them to come to order. I ask you to take action, because the Members are berating you and indeed the rules of this House.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, it is quite in order for the Government House Leader to bring to the attention of the House items which he feels diverts from our rules.

It is not in order for him to talk about Members deliberately flaunting your authority. That is a very improper statement on behalf of the Government House Leader. I would ask him to withdraw that.

If the Government House Leader would care to reflect he would note that on many occasions many people on his side who have been called to order, including the Premier (Mr. Filmon) on many occasions, have adjusted to those comments and

have attempted to follow the Speaker. No one has suggested that the Members have deliberately flaunted the authority of the Speaker. I would really ask the Government House Leader to withdraw that charge.

Mr. Speaker: Our Rule 38(1): "a member addressing the House, if called to order by either the Speaker or on a point of order raised by another member, shall sit down while the point is being stated, after which he may explain."

I would also like to remind the Honourable Member that a supplementary question should not require a preamble.

I would ask the Honourable Member to put her question now, please.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Anti-Racism Report

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is for the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation. Will the Minister tell the House when she will table and implement the much needed Intercultural Council action plan to address racism that she has been hanging onto since September?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I would like the Member for Radisson to get her facts straight before she puts a question on the table.

As a matter of fact, I have a copy of an interim report presented to me on October 30, 1990, from the Manitoba Intercultural Council, a report that is not going to go to the full council until January of next year for ratification.

I have had that copy of that interim report for approximately one week. We will be looking at that report and moving on recommendations and making a full response when we get the final, adopted, approved report from the total MIC in January of 1991.

Minister of Energy and Mines Community Concerns

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there are some Ministers and indeed Members of the Chamber on all sides who occasionally make a statement that they regret having made. It is quite common in this

House to stand up and apologize for that kind of statement.

Then we have the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). In this case not only does he not make an apology, day after day after day he makes even more outrageous statements. Can the First Minister tell the House, is it a new policy of his Government that they do not listen to members of the community who represent thousands of Manitobans when they speak out on an issue of deep concern to them?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Carstairs : Well, then can the First Minister explain to this House why the Minister of Energy and Mines was not even prepared to read a letter from people representing thousands of interested Manitobans, because he has so deeply offended them, and will the First Minister demand that he at least read it and pay some attention to it?

* (1355)

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated time and time again the same response to the issues concerned. So has the Minister of Energy and Mines. He has put on the record time and again what he has indicated and where he stands on the issue. I cannot do anything further to satisfy the Leader of the Liberal Party. She will not be satisfied. She wants to continue to make a major political issue out of this, and she is entitled to do it, but my views are on the record and so are those of the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Government Apology

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to satisfy the Leader of the Liberal Party, and that is for the Premier to now stand in the House and apologize for the remarks of his Minister yesterday and two weeks ago. I want to know why the Premier will not give an apology to thousands and thousands of Manitobans on behalf of this Minister.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will not apologize for all of the positive things that we have done for the multicultural community in Manitoba. We are the first Government to develop a multicultural policy. We are the first Government to commit to a multicultural Act. We have opened up consultation. We are opening up a multicultural outreach office. We are doing many, many, many things that have never been done with the

multicultural community for the multicultural community.

Winnipeg Police Department Minority Representation

Mr. George Hckes (Point Douglas): The question is to the Premier. It is becoming clear to the public in general what minority groups in Winnipeg have known for years, that minorities are not welcome on the Winnipeg Police Force. Even with special programs in place to prepare minority candidates, senior officials are now openly admitting that the police are putting up artificial barriers in the hiring of minority recruits to prevent qualified minority recruits from being hired.

I would like to ask the Premier, since the Attorney General, city councillors and community representatives have for years been meeting with the chief of the Winnipeg Police to try and get him to start accepting minorities in the force and it obviously has not worked, when will the Premier direct the Attorney General to use the full weight of his office to make it happen?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): The policies of the City of Winnipeg are within the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg and not within the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba. They have an Act.

Mr. Hckes: Mr. Speaker, if my 11-year-old son is at some point interested in becoming a police officer in his own city, it is most likely he will not be able to do so unless the attitudes and practices of the police force change.

Is the Premier still willing to accept a situation where 30 percent of the residents of this city cannot be part of law enforcement in their own community?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, I neither agree with it nor support it, but it is the policy of the City of Winnipeg.

If the Member is interested in changing it, then he ought to be doing what is necessary, and that is to attempt to change the policy of the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Hckes: Mr. Speaker, I hear that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) will not do much about it.

I want to ask the First Minister, how much more evidence will it take to remove the artificial barriers erected to stop qualified minority candidates and to ensure that community protection reflects the community it is protecting?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member's question seeks an opinion and is therefore out of order.

Would the Honourable Member kindly rephrase his question, please?

Mr. Hickes: I would like to ask the Minister what his Government is doing to remove the artificial barriers erected to stop qualified minority candidates and ensure that community protection reflects the community it is protecting.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, our multicultural policy speaks very clearly. Our affirmative action policy is being carried out and carried out better than it was under the former New Democratic administration.

The City of Winnipeg's policies are the City of Winnipeg's policies. I neither agree with nor support them on this issue. The fact of the matter is that it is their policies that have to change. The Member for Point Douglas, I know he is new in this Chamber, I know he may be new to public life, but he should have that explained to him by Members on his side who have been around.

* (1400)

MPIC Investment Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. The MPIC Annual Report indicates that the corporation has investments with Ontario Hydro, Ontario, Quebec and the Government of Canada.

Given that Ontario Hydro has a history of involvement in nuclear power, Quebec Hydro is disrupting the lifestyle and the livelihood of many Native communities across that province, and the federal Government is bringing in the hugely unpopular GST, will the Minister now consider the removal of the \$45 million invested with the federal Government by MPIC in response to public protests against the federal gouge and screw tax?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, seeing that this same question was posed in committee this morning, I am trying to determine the priorities as to how my Treasury Division tries to help the investment of MPIC surplus funding.

I can indicate to the Member though that one has to be very cautious as to how they direct funding for the sake of short-term investing, because ultimately if you do not seek the highest return from the market

what will happen is that your motorists will pay more. I guess that therefore is what the Member is advocating.

Department of Finance Investment Policy

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, the Member should know that investment vehicles are available that can provide an equal to or better than return in ethical investments.

Now I wanted to ask the Minister, will he tell this House whether the Department of Finance has an investment policy which provides for the ethical and environmentally sound investment of Government and Crown corporation funds? Does he have such a policy?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Division of the Department of Finance is very, very careful in where it could invest the funds of the ratepayers of MPIC, the ratepayers of Manitoba Hydro, the ratepayers of Manitoba Telephone System. They are very, very particular. I can indicate to the Member opposite, if they were not and if those funds were put at risk, for instance, if the Treasury Division were to lend them to the NDP, they might be put at a horrible risk and ultimately there would be a tremendous loss. That would be reflected in the rates that we would pay in our Manitoba Telephone bills, our Autopac statements and indeed on Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, I will let the public judge as to whether the Treasury Division of the ministry of Finance has done an adequate job up to this point over the years in investing surplus cash.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, every private investment house has a policy. I am very surprised that the Minister has admitted that his department does not have one.

I would like to know whether the Minister will now develop some sort of policy that will provide guidelines for ethical investments giving special considerations to the elimination of investments in companies involved in liquor, military, tobacco or environmental infractions, which he well knows can provide returns at least as great as other investments.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I defy the Member to stand and indicate an area of unethical investment of surplus funds of the Crowns by the Treasury Division of the Department of Finance. If he has

cases which he thinks are unethical, then I ask him to state his case.

I can indicate to him that if more investment were to go into short term—and I think he must be saying short-term paper—then ultimately the return we would receive from that type of investment would seriously begin to fall. Therefore, what he is advocating obviously then is that the ratepayers of the Crowns which we are talking about should pay a higher rate.

National Energy Board Trans Pipeline Ruling

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, the National Energy Board has ruled that all people who are on the trans pipeline will have to pay a portion of the cost of extending that pipeline into the United States. This means in effect that consumers of Manitoba natural gas will have to subsidize users in the northeastern part of the United States.

My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Since Consumers Gas of Ontario estimates that each Ontario consumer will have to pay \$10 to \$12 a year more as a result of this ruling, what effect will it have on the consumers in Manitoba?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, the National Energy Board has indeed ruled that they will not break with tradition and change the methodology of tolling for the increase in pipelines.

The Industrial Gas Users Association went to the courts and asked them to instruct the National Energy Board to deal with this issue. The National Energy Board delved for 59 days and the day before yesterday came down with the decision that they would indeed not break with tradition and they would continue the methodology of tolling as they had before.

The Member for Crescentwood asked what the price to Manitoba consumers will be. It will be approximately 1 percent of the cost today.

Minister's Intervention

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, so the Minister has told us that there will in fact be a cost to the consuming public in Manitoba. That being the case, why did the Minister, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, not intervene at the meetings of the National Energy Board?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines): Mr. Speaker, two industrial firms from Manitoba intervened at the National Energy Board, Simplot and Seagram's. Our Department, if they wished us to intervene as well it would have taken us 59 days together with consultants, together with lawyers.

We were at the table with the interveners from Manitoba from time to time. We were never too far away from what the National Energy Board was doing. The National Energy Board was ruling on whether or not they should break with tradition in their methodology of tolling. -(interjection)-

Well let me tell the Member then that had we intervened in -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Neufeld: If they wish an answer, Mr. Speaker, let them keep quiet.

Up until 1993 the agreement of Inter-City Gas with the Western Gas Marketing board is for a bundling price of gas at the Alberta border, which saves us approximately 60 cents per—

Mr. Carr: Mr. Speaker, we are not particularly interested in the brief of the industrial users. We are interested in why this Minister did not intervene on behalf of the consumers of Manitoba. The reason is—and the Premier is now reiterating it—it is because it would take 59 days of time. What is more important 59 days of time or the public interests of the people of Manitoba?

Mr. Neufeld: As I started to say, in 1993 our bundling price with the agreement with Western Gas Marketing will cease. At that point in time we must have an arrangement for storage of gas. The arrangement we have made for storage of gas for 1993 is with a storage in Michigan.

If we had intervened and asked the National Energy Board to change its tolling methodology we would probably be paying 60 cents per MCF more in 1993 than we would ordinarily pay.

Emergency Measures Organization Training Payment Policy

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took a question as notice from the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohm) when he tabled a letter indicating that EMO was charging for training courses.

I want to indicate that EMO is not charging for training courses, the normal courses that are being held at Arnprior. However, additional courses had been slated, training courses within the province, one of them at Brandon.

The letter that went out was not factual information. Certainly the costs that were referred to in there and the decisions had nothing to do with the election. I would like to -(interjection)- The letter was not factual, Mr. Speaker.

I want to indicate that due to the confusion that resulted from this I have instructed staff to inform the municipalities that there would be no charge for this course and that for the future we will be consulting with them when we take and slate more training courses within the province.

* (1410)

Multicultural Hiring Government Policy

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. The law enforcement system in this province generally has shown again its negative, stereotype images of cultural minority groups by rejecting seven out of the nine applicants in the criminal justice program, all of the nine having passed the physical and written tests.

Will the First Minister please state to this Legislature and the multiethnic people of Manitoba what the policy of his Government is with respect to multicultural hiring in the recruitment, selection and training of personnel in the law enforcement and justice delivery system in this province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, we in this province do not hire law enforcement officers. We support the continued hiring, on an affirmative action basis, of people of all races, backgrounds, colours and creeds to all elements of public service, including law enforcement.

City of Winnipeg

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Despite the municipal autonomy of the City of Winnipeg, it is a fact that the city is a subsystem of the province. Given that such is the case, will this provincial Government stand idly by and let the elitist, isolationist, inward-looking policy of the city continue on by rejecting all kinds of initiatives to

make a mirror-image representation of the cultural minority groups in this province in the law enforcement and justice delivery system in this province?

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that we neither support nor endorse the actions of the City of Winnipeg in this regard, but I urge the Member, who is a professor of political science, to read The City of Winnipeg Act and to look at the powers and authorities that are vested within the City of Winnipeg and the jurisdiction that it is granted. If the Member expects that we can move in and change what is being done, he is going to have to propose amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act to strip it of its powers and authority, to strip it of its responsibilities and to take those, invest them within the Province of Manitoba to take over the responsibilities that are currently vested there.

If that is his goal, there will be amendments to The City of Winnipeg Act coming forward and he is free to propose such amendments to that Act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Santos: My final supplementary is: Will the province use its financial and amending power to influence this policy and change it so that this becomes a truly representative province representing all kinds of minority groups in law enforcement agencies?

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, what the Member opposite is suggesting is threat, coercion and blackmail. That is exactly what he is suggesting.

Point of Order

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, the words that were used by the Member suggesting that the Member for Broadway was in any way, shape or form suggesting blackmail or threats of any kind are absolutely unparliamentary. If this Premier cannot find the time to get on the phone and talk to the mayor and raise these very legitimate concerns, to use the authority he does have as Premier to fight on behalf of the visible minority people of Winnipeg who are unable to get representation on the City of Winnipeg Police force, that is one thing, but he should not make accusations against the Member for Broadway, who is fighting for them.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader entirely misses the

point. When a questioner asks us to use the financial powers of Government to try and force a junior level of Government to take certain actions, I wonder what other conclusion any logical, thinking person can take. To me it appears like a threat.

Mr. Santos: I think it is against the rules of the House even for the First Minister of this province to impute motives to a humble Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Member did not have a point of order there. On the point of order raised by the Honourable Opposition House Leader, he did not have a point of order.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable First Minister, to finish his response.

Mr. Filmon: Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite are suggesting that we ought to, contrary to The City of Winnipeg Act, force the city by way of removing its funding—that is exactly what he said. I say to him that if he wants to know where the City of Winnipeg mayor is on this issue, or the chairman of the committee that governs the police, take a look at today's paper. Both the mayor and the chair of the committee agree with the position which I have stated, which the Member is stating, yet nothing is being done. It is not by way of threat, coercion or indeed removal of financing that you are going to change this issue, it is by way of influencing the decision making with the City of Winnipeg Police administration.

Child and Family Services Service Cuts

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, on October 17 in the House, the Minister of Family Services, in response to a question asking for a list of mandated services for children that would need to be cut as a result of this Government's inadequate funding, replied, "there should be no reason to cut any services" even though there is an actual budget reduction of 1.6 percent.

Can the Minister of Family Services tell this House why Child and Family Services agencies are being forced to cut services such as residential care programs, services to adolescents, foster care programs and children with special needs programs?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, this Government provides a tremendous amount of money for social services in this province. We have made an overall commitment of taxpayers' dollars of nearly \$48 million, a 15 percent increase to the Child and Family Services agencies. What we are asking the agencies to do is to look at their budgets, to work with our department, to set their priorities, not to cut services.

I would also indicate to the Member that on a per-capita basis, this province spends more on child welfare than any other province in the country. We are asking agencies to set priorities to look at what they are doing with the money that they are allotted.

Funding

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1990, the then Minister of Family Services announced in the House a \$2 million dollar deficit relief fund for immediate help to Child and Family Services agencies.

Can the Minister of Family Services tell the House today if any of this "immediate relief" promised eight months ago has been paid to the Child and Family Services agencies?

Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services): The Minister of the Day did indicate in her words to the House and also in the press release to the agencies back in June that there would be an increase in funding for the Child and Family Services agencies, also that there was a \$3 million dollar special expenditures fund. The department is currently working with the agencies to determine their priorities, and the funds will be flowing in due course.

Ms. Barrett: Mr. Speaker, since this money has not yet been given to Child and Family Services agencies, can the Minister of Family Services tell the House who is responsible for the debt payments on bank loans that Child and Family Services agencies have been forced to take out over the last eight months because these promised funds have not been forthcoming and services have had to be cut as a result?

Mr. Gilleshammer: Mr. Speaker, the agency boards are responsible for making numerous decisions. At the present time they are working with the department to set these priorities, and the

funding will be forthcoming as the service and funding agreements are signed.

* (1420)

Child and Family Services Service Cuts

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, repeatedly in this House this Minister of Family Services said there would be no service cuts. Yet, today we have confirmation of the very issue we have been raising in this House over and over and over again. There are serious cuts to services to teenagers in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table a report from the Health Action Centre that talks a little bit about some of these teenagers on the street. It says that 52 percent of them have attempted suicide; 49 percent were sexually abused; 63 percent are at risk for contracting AIDS. This Minister sits by and says he is satisfied with the priorities that are being set.

Now, will this Minister today commit to taking action to see that these policies are reversed and that these children receive service?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the agencies have a broad mandate. In looking at these services that they provide, we are not talking about a protection issue. The protection of children, the protection of vulnerable families in this province is the highest priority that these agencies put forward. The agencies interpret their mandate very broadly and have a number of services. They are looking at the total package of services that they deliver and are setting their priorities. They are working in concert with the department to set these priorities at this time.

Canada Assistance Plan Payments

Mr. Reg Alcock (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, this Minister spends more on media prevention than he does on prevention of illness in children.

I want to table something, Mr. Speaker. It is an analysis of CAP payments to this province that says that this province gets the same level of support as any other province, not twice the level, as this Minister claims. Once again he is following his Premier—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member kindly put his question now, please.

Mr. Alcock: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister now stand in his place and correct the erroneous information he has placed on the record about the level of support that Child and Family Services receives in this province?

Hon. Harold Gillehammer (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, on the payments eligible from the Canada Assistance Plan, this province ranks No. 1 in spending per capita—

An Honourable Member: That is not true. That is not true—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gillehammer: The Honourable Finance Critic of the Liberal Party is acting out, but I will stand by my figures that the spending from the Canada Assistance Plan, per capita, Manitoba ranks No. 1 one in the country.

Mr. Speaker: Time for Oral Questions has expired.

MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, under Rule 27.(1), I would like to move a motion requesting a debate on a matter of urgent public importance.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs), that, under Rule 27, the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely how this Government is sending conflicting messages to the multicultural community thereby offending all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker: Before determining whether the motion meets the requirements of our Rule 27 the Honourable Member for Inkster will have five minutes to state his case for urgency of debate on this matter.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne's cites two conditions that need to be present for a matter of urgent public importance: 1) that public interest would be best served by debating it today; 2) there is no ordinary opportunity which will allow the matter to be brought on early enough timing.

First the public interest, as Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage, the Honourable Member for

Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld) has offended a great number of Manitobans. The Premier's (Mr. Filmon) inaction on the above matter has compounded the problem.

I have before me—since the Premier and this Government tend not to listen to the Opposition—some letters that I would like to make reference to. I will send you a copy of these letters, Mr. Speaker, so you can peruse them in making your own decision.

The first one is a letter from Art Miki, who is a prominent Canadian. I quote from his letter: Regardless of whether Mr. Neufeld says that he speaks as an individual, he is a Member of your Government and perceived to be speaking in that capacity. I feel that your comments regarding Mr. Neufeld's statements were inadequate, and you missed the opportunity to reassure Manitobans of the Government's commitment towards multicultural policy.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would go to MARL, which is the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties and take a couple of quotes: It seems that the multiculturalism is being attacked even before it becomes reality in our nation and province. One is given the impression that Mr. Neufeld would empathize with the image of stereotype oriental, African, Indian people stomping on the back of the white business person.

Lastly at the end of the letter it requests: Lastly we call on Mr. Neufeld to make a full public apology.

Mr. Speaker, we had sent to us a letter from a number of community leaders such as the president of the Folk Arts Council, members from MIC, president of the Jamaican association, the Portugese community, the black community, the Chinese association, East Indian community and so on. The bottom line on this particular letter—and I quote: We as Manitobans and Canadians strongly urge you, as the Premier of Manitoba and as Leader of the Government, along with your Cabinet colleagues to repudiate Mr. Neufeld's unfortunate and misinformed public statements. We further request that you immediately relieve him of any duties and responsibilities in the area of multiculturalism within your Government.

Mr. Speaker, the main Budget Debate is over. We are past the Throne Speech Debate. There are no relevant Bills or Estimates before us that will allow for the Premier (Mr. Filmon), the Minister of Culture

and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) and the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage to retract or clarify the Government policy.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba have a right to know where the Government is taking multiculturalism. It is in the public's best interest that this matter be dealt with today. I would encourage you to go over the documents that I have sent over to you and come up with a ruling. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: A spokesperson for the other two Parties will also have an opportunity to state their position respecting the urgency of this matter.

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, under the rules, we are given five minutes each to argue the urgency of setting aside the ordinary business of the House to engage ourselves in emergency debate. In all the years I have been here and listening to five-minute rationale as to why we should set aside the business and the arguments around urgency, never in the lifetime that I have been in this House have I heard a weaker argument, a weaker argument with respect to the urgency. -(interjection)-

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, this issue has been discussed on many, many occasions. The First Minister (Mr. Filmon) has, over several occasions, been asked to present and provide the Government's policy with respect to the ethnoculture community. He has stood in his place in response to every one of those questions and indicated the policy of the Government.

* (1430)

Furthermore, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has given a full explanation as to his views on this matter. I say to you, as the individual who will sit in judgment, Mr. Speaker, what is the argument with respect to urgency? What is the argument with respect to the policy of the Government that needs to be changed?

The policy of the Government is profoundly clear in this matter. It has been stated over and over again by the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. What can be clearer than the words from the First Minister? Therefore, what is the urgency?

The Government's record stands. Again, the First Minister has given chapter and verse of the accomplishments and some of the issues that have

been brought forward and the programs with respect to the policies. I say to the Members opposite, stop playing politics with this issue. I say to the Members opposite, they have not established urgency. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to not accept their argument and that we move on to the regular business before us. Thank you.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I am quite surprised at the suggestions by the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) that it would not be an urgent situation when a Minister of the Crown—I am not saying it is a difficulty with him stating his views, but here is a Minister of the Crown who has not withdrawn comments that are unacceptable to the vast majority of Manitobans who now, as of today—the urgency is as of today. That Minister has totally dismissed the very legitimate concerns, even refused to listen to the Government's own advisory committee, the Manitoba Intercultural Council. That is unprecedented. That is absolutely unprecedented.

If the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) would care to consult with our rules, he would see that one of the main criteria for a motion of urgent public importance is that there are no other opportunities for this matter to be discussed. We have completed the Throne Speech Debate which would have allowed this matter to be discussed. We have completed the Budget Debate. Today would normally be a day in which we would consider Estimates for the Departments of Education and Finance where this matter could not be discussed.

I would submit that this matter can only be dealt with in the form of this particular motion and a debate which would allow all Members to debate a very serious situation. This is indeed unprecedented. If the Government House Leader (Mr. Manness) thinks that it is not urgent, he should talk to the many people who were personally offended by the comments made by the Minister, a Minister of the Crown, comments that have not been disowned by the First Minister (Mr. Filmon).

If the Government House Leader talks about the First Minister having made the statements of this Government on multiculturalism clear, I would say perhaps he should listen to those statements, because not once has the First Minister disowned the comments made by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). Not once, even today in Question Period, did he take the opportunity to say that he would direct that Minister to withdraw his

comments and the insulting comments he has made about people who are concerned about the comments that he made, the Manitoba Intercultural Council and many other multicultural groups.

What is at issue here, Mr. Speaker, is whether this Legislature feels that the concerns of our multicultural community are of sufficient urgency that we should have this matter debated. I would say that we as legislators should say nothing other than that this is a very serious matter. It is, under our rules, in order and we should debate it today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are two conditions to be satisfied for this matter to proceed. The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in accordance with Subrule 27.(1) did provide the required notice of this matter of urgent public importance. I thank the Honourable Members for their comments in offering advice on whether the motion is in order.

The 6th Edition of Beauchesne, Citation 389 indicates 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. Also in Beauchesne, Citation 390 states that "urgency of debate" does not apply to the matter itself but means that 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 takes place immediately.

In my opinion, the Honourable Member does have other opportunities available. The Estimates of the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation are scheduled third after the Department of Education and Training which are currently before the Committee of Supply. Also, the Member can raise a grievance any day that the motion is moved for the Committee of Supply or the Committee of Ways and Means to meet and can at that time raise the matter he refers to in this motion. Therefore, I must rule the motion from the honourable Member for Inkster out of order.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with great regret that I have to 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.

Some Honourable Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Honourable Members: Nay.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion, the Yeas have it.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yeas and Nays, please.

Mr. Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House took recess.

After Recess

* (1510)

The House resumed at 3:10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: 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

Connery, Cummings, Dacquay, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Ernst, Filmon, Findlay, Gilleshammer, Helwer, Laurendeau, Manness, McAlpine, McIntosh, Mitchelson, Neufeld, Orchard, Penner, Praznik, Reimer, Render, Rose, Stefanson, Sveinson.

NAYS

Alcock, Ashton, Barrett, Carr, Carstairs, Cerilli, Chœma, Chomiak, Doer, Edwards, Evans (Brandon East), Evans (Interlake), Gaudry, Hickes, Lamoureux, Lathlin, Maloway, Martindale, Reid, Santos, Storie, Wasylycia-Leis, Wowchuk.

Mr. Clerk (William Remnant): Yeas 26, Nays 23.

Mr. Speaker: The ruling of the Chair has been sustained.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I stand today under the rules that provide each Member to state a grievance. Today, I would like to take that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, we gave this Government on numerous occasions ample opportunities to clarify some of the remarks that the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mr. Neufeld) has put on the record. I think we should go back to that Friday, October 26, when Mr. Neufeld said in Hansard, and I will quote—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would like to remind the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that we refer to the Members as Honourable Member or Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

Mr. Lamoureux: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, my apologies—the Honourable Member for Rossmere (Mr. Neufeld)—and I will quote what it is that has really caused so much commotion and so many problems that we have today. I quote: "I am against multicultural funding, yes. Yes, I am against multicultural funding. If you—I am entitled to an opinion. Multicultural funding ends up as—the WASPS, if you like, are funding everybody else. They do not get funded."

Mr. Speaker, this is a statement, whether it was a slip of the tongue or intentional, that has been left on the records through Hansard. To say that it is coming from one person or it is one Honourable Member's opinion does not justify the Government taking the stand that it has taken because this is not just a Minister. This is the Minister that is the Acting Minister for Culture and Heritage (Mr. Neufeld).

If we have for some reasons the Honourable Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) who is ill or is unable to perform her duties, this is the individual who would take the place of the Minister. Mr. Speaker, this is really what has caused a lot of problems, not only in terms of us as the Opposition, but the communities.

That is really where I see a big difference from last week to this week, is the fact that we are not asking the Government to look at what we in the Opposition Party are necessarily saying because we have done that in the past. As I try to point out, we tried to get the Acting Minister to stand up and apologize for his remarks. We then tried to get the Premier (Mr. Filmon) to stand in his place and to retract or at least say where he stands on the issue.

It is not good enough for the Premier to stand in his place and say that we believe in multiculturalism. We believe in grants to the different ethnic communities and culture and heritage

organizations. The First Minister (Mr. Filmon), as the First Minister, has a responsibility and that responsibility, in part, is to ensure that those that he has appointed to Cabinet fulfill the Cabinet decisions that follow the direction that the Government has put Manitoba in terms of being put on course.

There was a lot of deviation from what the Government is saying about multiculturalism and what the Acting Minister is saying for multiculturalism. Even though we provided the opportunity for the Minister to stand up and apologize, the Premier to stand up and apologize, they chose to ignore our request. They chose to ignore what it is that the communities felt was the right thing to ask for, that we asked for, and that was for an apology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is at a point in which we need more than an apology. I think we need more than a public apology. I believe that the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage owes it to Manitobans to resign as the Acting Minister and some would even argue that he should resign as a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Member for Rossmore (Mr. Neufeld) would do his Government a service if he was to seriously think about resigning, at the very least, as the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage. I, for the life of me, cannot see how the Acting Minister can go around to a cultural event, when we have so much opposition to the statements and the comments made by the Acting Minister.

Mr. Speaker, it is just not myself as I have pointed out or the New Democratic Party that is talking about the Minister resigning or requesting an apology. Over the past couple of days, I have received a few letters in particular that have really disturbed myself along with my colleagues in the Liberal Party.

* (1520)

I would like to go through those letters, Mr. Speaker, because these are from prominent individuals in Canada, in Manitoba, who believe in multiculturalism; who believe in Canada, our nation being a mosaic rather than a melting pot; who see that it is necessary to ensure we have grants going out to our communities; who have a good feeling in terms of what direction this Government should be going in terms of a multicultural policy, and have heard and are very disappointed in this Government's reaction to the Acting Minister's comments.

I would like to cite first—and what I will do, Mr. Speaker, is table the three letters if I can get one of the Pages, and this way all of my colleagues throughout the Chamber can maybe go through these letters, because I am only going to point out six or seven quotes from the three letters. I ask you to read over the letters and when you are reading over these letters, I will suggest to you that these are not individuals who are out there for political gain, that many of these individuals who have signed these letters are Conservatives, are Liberals, are New Democrats, are really and truly apolitical.

That is why I think it is important that the Government, especially the backbenchers, because they are not necessarily in the inner Cabinet, that it is important they read these letters, and they look at the people who have signed them. I must say from the onset that these are not the only individuals that I have heard from. There are other individuals who have brought this issue through the telephone, in which I felt they were very serious, and felt that they were slighted by the comments and by the Government not trying to repudiate what the Acting Minister has said.

I do want to go on to the letters themselves. The first one that I would like to quote from is Art Miki, who as I said during my five-minute introduction for the Matter of Urgent Public Importance, was a very prominent Canadian who has fought for Canadian-Japanese rights for a number of years.

I would like to quote just three areas from this letter. It is addressed to the Premier of this province, and it is cc'd to Mr. Neufeld and Bonnie Mitchelson—I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Culture and Heritage and the Manitoba Intercultural Council. So no doubt they have read this letter, and I am sure after hearing my grievance that, at least I hope, other people will read this letter because I believe it says a lot. The three parts, the opening line, addressed again to the Premier is, . . . that I was extremely disappointed in your response to the Honourable Minister's comments regarding multicultural groups and funding. He goes on to say that the Japanese-Canadian community has fifth-generation members and most of us have never thought ourselves to be part of an immigrant group to which Minister Neufeld suggests that if you cannot be Canadian first, damn it, do not come to this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very valid point. Mr. Miki has been here for five generations. I believe he, himself,

has been here for three generations, and whether you have been here for five generations or you have been here for three years, once you have your Canadian citizenship, you are just as much a Canadian as anyone else in the Province of Manitoba or indeed the country.

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

A great many people take a lot of pride, and I would argue all people take a lot of pride in being Canadian. I have been to numerous citizenship courts where I have seen the Honourable Judge Willcock swearing in many new citizens. I say, Madam Deputy Speaker, that they take a great amount of pride of being sworn in as Canadian citizens, and I am sure that they would like to be perceived as Canadians.

The statements that the Acting Minister had put on the record says otherwise. I am sure that to those new Canadians, those who are seeking citizenship, to those who have been here for five years or one generation to five generations, whatever it might be, are all disappointed in the remarks, in that sense, from the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage.

It goes on and I will quote, I made reference to it as I say during the MUPI and that is, and I quote, regardless of whether the Acting Minister says that he speaks as an individual, he is a Member of your Government and perceives to be speaking in that capacity. I feel that your comments regarding Mr. Neufeld's statements were inadequate. You missed the opportunity to reassure Manitobans of the Government's commitment towards a multicultural policy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this points out a very valid point, and that point is that the Acting Minister is a Member of the Cabinet. A Member of the Cabinet does have obligations, and a part of those obligations is to ensure that Government policy is in fact being implemented. To go out and speak against Government policy as a Member of the Cabinet, as some and including myself would argue, is morally wrong.

An Honourable Member: Kevin, is this a full 40, or are you going to recycle the same thing?

Mr. Lamoureux: You know, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has alluded during his own comments in response to my opening arguments that it was not a serious issue. I beg to differ with the Minister of Finance. I think if the Minister of Finance went out and talked to some of the leaders of the

ethnocultural communities, he will find that he is on the wrong side on this issue. If the Minister of Finance wanted to do Manitobans a service, I think he would be best to talk to the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage and ask the Acting Minister to seriously consider resigning his position. Madam Deputy Speaker, it is a very serious issue, and I do not understand why the Minister of Finance seems to treat it so very lightly.

Madam Deputy Speaker, another letter that I have tabled and again encourage the Members to read over is a letter from the Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties. I want to quote from the letter once again, and it reads: "It seems that multiculturalism is being attacked even before it becomes reality in our nation and province."—a very fair assessment if you take a look at what has happened over the past couple of weeks. I can understand where and why they would get that type of an impression. It goes further down: "One is given the impression that the Minister would empathize with the image of stereotyped Oriental, African and Indian people stomping on the back of the white business person."

This does point out once again that the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) has no real understanding of what benefits are derived through immigration through all communities in the province. All communities of this province, Madam Deputy Speaker, pay taxes. If you are going to be giving out grants, all of the communities are deserving of the grants. To make a statement it appears that the WASPs are funding other ethnic groups is unacceptable.

It goes further, Madam Deputy Speaker, to read that: "The comments also suggest that Canada is in his view,"—that of course being the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mr. Neufeld)—"a white anglo-saxon Protestant country and that all other cultures, races and religions should not be publicly supported."

* (1530)

Madam Deputy Speaker, this point here further down in the letter, and it reads: "As a person in a position of public trust there is a responsibility to reduce prejudice and discrimination in society, not to promote it." This is something that all elected officials should be taking very seriously, that as elected officials we represent ridings. Our constituents are from all ethnic backgrounds, and it

is our responsibility to promote tolerance in our society, to discourage discrimination.

I ask you, Madam Deputy Speaker, if this is what the actions of this Government as a whole is doing, I would have a very hard time, if I was in the Government benches, to argue against that particular point. Hopefully during, whether it is the Culture and Heritage Estimates or interim, or whatever it might be, the Minister, the Acting Minister and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and hopefully others, other Members of the governing Party will state what it is that they feel.

Lastly, Madam Deputy Speaker, on this particular letter they request, and I will quote directly from it, lastly we call on the Acting Minister to make a full public apology. I do not believe that the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties is asking for that much. What they are asking for as a bottom line is that the Acting Minister give a public apology. I believe that the Acting Minister owes that to Manitobans and the longer he puts it off, the longer the wrong message is going to be sent to our ethnic communities—I should actually say to all Manitobans because we are all ethnics, of course.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the last letter is one in which the Acting Minister made reference to, and that is a letter in which the different ethnic leaders had circulated amongst themselves to show that in the community, the community that this particular Acting Minister is supposed to be supporting, is saying about the Acting Minister, and it is not positive, Madam Deputy Speaker. I do believe that had the Acting Minister apologized last week, or shortly after making the remarks, that we would never have received any of these letters. The biggest thing about this letter is that it is not coming from an individual, per se; these are people who are leaders in their respective communities. These are people who, in one or two days, got together to sign this letter showing that they support the intent of this letter.

Instead of going through the whole letter, and I am sure of all the letters, all of them I would encourage you to read, but this one is especially important. What I want to do is read the last paragraph because the last paragraph is really what these people are trying to say to the Government of the Day. I will quote from it, and it goes:

"We, as Manitobans and Canadians, strongly urge you as the Premier of Manitoba and as leader

of the Government, along with your Cabinet colleagues, to repudiate the Acting Minister's unfortunate and misinformed public statements. We further request that you immediately relieve him of any duties and responsibilities in the area of multiculturalism within your Government."

This not only asks of the Premier, it also asks of the Cabinet Ministers. So even though the Premier himself does not want to stand up and apologize, maybe some of the Acting Ministers or the Minister of Energy and Mines' other colleagues will stand up and apologize for the lack of comments or the lack of the Premier to address this particular issue. I would encourage the Acting Ministers or the Ministers or the Cabinet to do just that, to do just what it is that these individuals request, and I will name off some of the organizations that signed these letters.

Madam Deputy Speaker—almost 50 percent—the chairperson of MIC signed this letter, the Vietnamese Community Rep signed this letter; the President of the Canadian Polish Congress—I had the pleasure of attending just a short while ago at the Polish Press Community and the Premier was there himself. He had an excellent opportunity at that time.

An Honourable Member: You left in a huff, remember?

Mr. Lamoureux: No, I did not leave. -(interjection)- This is somewhat sensitive to the Government—and it should be sensitive to the Government. The Pakistani Community Representative on MIC signed this. Joseph Yuen, one of the city councillors, signed this letter. The Ukrainian Community Representative, President of the Manitoba Ethnocultural Youth Community, the past chair of MIC, Dauphin Parkland Region Rep from MIC, the Vice-President of the Manitoba Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre or the Japanese Community Rep, the Irish Association of Manitoba, the Treasurer of the Greek Community Rep, the President of the Ghanaian Union of Manitoba, the East Indian Community Rep, Chinese Benevolent Association, the Black Community Rep, the Portuguese Community, the President of the Jamaican Association of Manitoba, President of the Folk Arts Council. -(interjection)- The Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) says, is it going to take long? I am sure with a couple more days we could have had hundreds of thousands of signatures.

An Honourable Member: Millions.

Mr. Lamoureux: Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says millions. I am sure if there was enough time, that we would likely get over a million signatures. There is not much more than a million people in Manitoba, and really, Madam Deputy Speaker, that is who this Government has offended, not only the leaders of these communities, because these are community representatives that represent thousands of people. These are not just normal signatures. If we were wanting to allow time and circulate a petition throughout the province, I am sure we would probably get past that million in signatures, that you would find four year olds or whatever age they might be.

It is very serious that we do have a large number of people who are coming out and condemning what this Government is doing, but it does not necessarily surprise me that the Acting Minister made the comments that he made, and the reason why it does not really surprise me is because in 1988, after the provincial election, what is one of the first things this Tory minority Government does? It decides in its "wisdom" to take away the funding powers of MIC and create a political arm known as the Manitoba Grants Advisory Committee, MGAC.

* (1540)

One has to ask the question, why did they feel it was necessary to do that? I am convinced the reason why they did that is because they do not have trust, that they have to have a hands-on approach to everything. If they cannot get their hands into it, they are scared. They feel they are going to lose out. We have seen that time after time, and that is in part why we introduced Bill 9.

I did get an opportunity to speak to Bill 9, but I should highlight what it is that Bill 9 does. It takes away the funding authority from MGAC or the Manitoba Grants Advisory Committee, and it gives it back to MIC. The reason why that is so important is because MIC is made up of people who are elected from all the different ethnic communities, and who knows better what the community needs than the people who are working in the community? The Government still had input. They could still appoint members to MIC. Mind you, I question why they would make those appointments after the elections through MIC, and I even have to question one of the appointments that they made. Remember the appointment of Grant Russell? -(interjection)-

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) is a fine individual.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we have seen the reason why this Government is neglecting our multicultural fabric in the Province of Manitoba. We have a Government that still chooses to appoint the presiding officer, we have a Government that still chooses to hire the executive directors. Those are two aspects of the Bill. If they disagree entirely, and by the remarks that the Government has put on the record, obviously they disagree, and we will have to wait for a Liberal administration, hopefully in four years or a shorter time, to be able to rectify that particular problem.

If they disagree with us on that, then why not allow MIC to elect their own presiding officer? Why not allow them to do their own hiring? I do not understand why it is that this Government is so scared of MIC. They talk about multicultural policy. The Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) stands up on numerous occasions and points to a book or to a brochure and says this is multicultural policy, Madam Deputy Speaker. The multicultural policy, even though they might have it in writing in such a manner that they can go around and circulate it to all of the communities, is not really what the Government's real and true, and some would say hidden, agenda is when it comes to multiculturalism in this province.

I think that the Acting Minister's (Mr. Neufeld) comments are shared by a large number of the Conservative Caucus. I believe that is the reason why you do not have Ministers or the Premier (Mr. Filmon) standing up to repudiate what it is the Acting Minister is saying.

I did want to make a few comments regarding some of the other aspects of multiculturalism and that, of course, is some of the appointments that we have seen in the last little while. We have seen the appointment of a defeated candidate. I must say, Mr. Langtry is a very competent man. I have no hesitation in saying Mr. Langtry is a very competent individual. I would argue that Mr. Langtry would have done very well under competition.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Government or many of the Conservative Caucus Members have approached me and said, well, patronage is reality, that if we were in the same situation we would do the same type of patronage. Well, I think it is not fair to prejudice. If we take a look at the whole question

of patronage and what this Government is doing in respect to patronage, I think the Government could justify, to some degree, the need to have people who think along the same lines in many different positions in the Government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we are talking about the Department of Multiculturalism, and the size of the multicultural outreach office, and the secretariat's office and the appointments made to those offices. It is not as much to question the credentials of the individuals who have been recently appointed. That is not the point.

What we are trying to get across to this Government is, by making appointments as a policy analyst or making an appointment as the chair of MGAC or the Manitoba Grants Advisory Committee, strictly on being a Conservative—and the Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) says, well, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) should be aware that there are many good Conservatives that are qualified that would do a fine job. No doubt that is probably a fair statement to make.

Madam Deputy Speaker, there is equally, and I would maybe even suggest more Liberals or New Democrats, and I would go further and say that there are many apolitical people that would do a fantastic job.

What is it that this Government is saying to the multicultural committee by making appointments at the level of policy analysis, at the level of a chairperson of MGAC, when they are just appointing people that are PC cardholders. What they are telling many leaders of all different ethnic organizations is that if you do not have a PC card, or if you do not participate in our Party in some capacity, that you are not going to be able to stand a chance in getting an appointment or being hired with this Government.

Madam Deputy Speaker, that is where the tragedy lies, that had the positions, or some of the positions—if the Minister wants to argue that yes we need some that are thinking along the same lines, sure, but you do not have to politicize the whole department. You can open for competition. You can allow for others, whether they are Conservative, Liberal, PC, apolitical, to compete for the position, and let the best person win. In our administration or our policy analysis, or our chairs of organizations, their first qualification should be their credentials,

not if they have a PC card or if they do not have a PC card.

We have a program right here in the Legislature, and that is our Internship Program. When we sit down and we look at the students we do not ask are you a PC or a Liberal or NDP. There are individuals that can serve whether it is as an intern, and interns have access to confidential documents, that if they are not a Liberal, they cannot be an intern for us. What is most important is that these individuals perform the job that they are hired to do. If you start limiting your applications, if you are accepting applications, to one relatively small segment in the Conservative Party of the population, you are not giving the opportunity to many other Manitobans that are just as worthy of being able to compete for those positions.

* (1550)

This is really why we find that the Government is sending mixed messages to the ethnocultural community is on one hand you have a Minister or an Acting Minister saying one thing about funding, one thing about one group or one ethnic group, and you have the Premier (Mr. Filmon)—three minutes left—who is not willing to jump and say, that the Minister or the Acting Minister has made a mistake, that the Acting Minister should apologize.

As I mentioned at the outset, had the Acting Minister stood in his place to apologize—the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) stood in his place and apologized for his comments regarding Northerners in terms of they do not know how to vote—It was very gracious of the Minister to stand up and apologize—

An Honourable Member: Good man.

Mr. Lamoureux: —the Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger) is correct, it was awfully good of him to do it. He was a good man for doing just that. Why will the Acting Minister of Culture and Heritage not stand in his place and apologize? Some Members believe that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I should apologize for listing three individuals. I did not say that these individuals were not worthy of the position, what I said is that the positions should have been open for competition. If they cannot understand that then that is their problem, it is not mine.

Madam Deputy Speaker, to conclude, because my light is flashing, I do want to say that it is somewhat sad to see that the Government has chosen not to retract or apologize or say something

to the ethnic cultural communities that are asking for the Government to say something, respond to the letters, respond to the demands of all Manitobans. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): With a heavy heart, I have to use my grievance privilege in the House at this opportunity. It is Voltaire, I think, who said when speaking about the freedom of the individual person to express his belief, "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend until death your right to say it." To the individual person by the name of Harold Neufeld, I say I will defend until death

Point of Order

Madam Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Native and Northern Affairs, on a point of order.

Hon. James Downey (Deputy Government House Leader): Madam Speaker, it is only appropriate that the Honourable Member should refer to another Honourable Member, not by name, but either by constituency and/or by as "Honourable Member."

Madam Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Minister of Native and Northern Affairs indeed does have a point of order. Would the Honourable Member for Broadway (Mr. Santos) please refer to the Members in the House as "Honourable Members for" and name their constituency? Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Santos: I am trying to distinguish between the individual person and the official who is a Cabinet Minister of the Crown.

To the individual person I say "I will defend until death your right to say your belief," following Voltaire, but to the Crown Minister, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Neufeld), I say it is the height of indiscretion to utter such a statement like that, especially in the forum of this Legislature.

It is especially so as he has been placed in charge, Acting Minister of Multiculturalism, to utter a statement that is taken and perceived by his constituents as an insult to them, rather than supportive of their interests.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let me go to the broader issue of how public service organizations, in the midst of multi-ethnic society, can be representative of and responsive to and become an effective

service fulfilling agency of the people that they serve.

In every society, including a democratic society like ours, there always is a scarcity of material things, of resources and values, so that most people naturally strive to mobilize in order to promote their personal, their group, their organizational collective interests. In this, individual and group, we struggle for private benefits; conflicts necessarily arise. In order to manage and resolve such conflicts, society has evolved certain normative rules and corresponding mechanisms to enforce such rules. The routinization and institutionalization of these rules in our society has transformed the society of human beings into what is now an institutionally structured order of political and bureaucratic authority personified as the Crown, as the State, sustained by a claim to the exclusive illegitimate use of force under a regime of positive loss.

The Crown, the Government, the State has an exclusive agent, and this is the mechanism of public service institutions and positions that tangibly manifests itself as established bureaucracy in our society, whose reason for existence is to serve, never to dominate, the public. However, having a direct access to the exclusive illegitimate use of force, those public functionaries, both elected and appointed, are almost always under the very human temptation and tendency towards lording it over the citizens. People in positions of public authority, both elected and appointed, are human beings that have this very worldly tendency—especially so if they are already established as the majority Government—toward a tendency to be arrogant.

* (1600)

Indeed, one of the foremost problems of our democratic society, not only in this country but in many countries in the world, is how to protect the individual citizens from the boastful egotism of those who are elected or appointed to public positions of power and responsibility. Bureaucratic governmental units are structures institutionalized, created and established. They are designed to be service-fulfilling means to serve the cause of peace and good government, to serve the interests and promote the general well-being of all the people, but at the same time governmental institutions and positions could also be misused as an instrument to oppress or exploit or exclude some disliked segments of the population in society.

To confound and further complicate this continuing political struggle for advantages, benefits among individuals, groups and organizations, we often have, as we now have in many countries of the world including our own, the model of the multiethnic society of different groups of people with national origins of varying nature, different cultures, different languages, different beliefs and different expectations. Each group tends to be different from every other group, but to be different does not imply that one is subordinate or inferior, and yet in many multi-ethnic societies as it has historically emerged, there is a natural domination/subjectation type of relationship that has gradually crystallized and become legitimized between some historically dominant elite core groups which, after taking control of the institutional decisional structures, begin to define and control all influential roles and positions in such a subtle manner, cloaked with legitimacy, as to be able to disadvantage, to exclude, exploit members of some minority groups in society.

The members of such dominant elite core groups, consisting of the inner elites and the outer elites, are simply exchanging roles according to the process of circulation of elites. They become the institutionalized gatekeepers in determining access to the various professions, occupations, positions and roles in the political, social and economic structures of society.

The dominant group members under the veils of traditional, institutionalized legitimacy also begin to lay down certain reasonable and sometimes arbitrary rules for qualification or certification as to who can or who cannot enter into certain professions, occupations or lines of work.

Some of our political, social and economic institutions had emerged certain well-established practices and procedures that unwittingly, unintentionally, but systematically are discriminating in the most subtle way against disorganized minorities who lack in our political, economic and other resources.

Despite our democratic ideals for equality of opportunity, the fact of the matter is that the decisional structures in our society, both in the public and in the private sectors, operate in such a way as to ignore or even superficially ameliorate these institutionally-embedded, subtle discriminatory practices against Native peoples, against visible minorities, against teen-age workers,

against women, against handicapped persons, against senior citizens, against newly-arrived immigrants, even against fully naturalized Canadian citizens.

Such a factual, empirical, observable situation is certainly violative of the provision of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states: All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

(French version)

(Ukrainian spoken)

(Italian spoken)

(English)

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

(Spanish spoken)

(Filipino spoken)

(English)

If there is one important distinction of the individual as distinguished from other living beings and things, I say that it is human dignity. Human dignity consists of the integrity of the individual person.

Integrity implies that there is an inherent, natural freedom to make a choice. It also includes the legitimate, constitutional recognition of their political and civil rights, the right to express one's opinion, the right to assembly, the right even to run for public position which is guaranteed in our Charter of Rights and Freedom.

In addition, there are also the economic and social rights of citizens, the right to have a decent level of livelihood, the right to food and shelter, the right to health care, the right to education.

It is for the purpose that Government is instituted among man in order that we may be able to uphold and sustain this level of dignity of the individual person.

Madam Deputy Speaker, public service organizations exist as some systems of the total human society in order to service human well-being, human welfare, public order, peace and security. Indeed, the established public bureaucracy that we have established in our society consists of two branches: the established bureaucracy that is supposed to provide the necessary and essential public services, as well as the law enforcement

agency that is necessary to protect, to give security and public peace and order.

As the arms of the sovereign, they have direct access, as I have said, to build legitimate use of force. For example, if the taxing authorities would like to collect the tax, they can sequester your property, and they can do it legitimately and legally because that is the legitimate exclusive use of force. But no other private organization can sequester a private person's property because that is the only prerogative exclusively monopolized by the agents of the state or of the Crown.

* (1610)

Public service organizations are just mechanisms either to promote the well-being, peace, order and good Government of all the people, but this institutionalized position of power, authority and responsibility can and sometimes are misused as instruments of coercion to oppress, exploit or exclude some segments of the population.

Madam Deputy Speaker, how can we set a good example of being the true representative—responsible, credible, compassionate, service-fulfilling model of Government?

The only way Governments, including our own, can become a true mirror image of its population is to make its own institutions full of representatives of the population mix of the people in that community. It is the public service representativeness that is a precondition to public service responsiveness.

If the population mix in the community, in the province or in the country or in society has changed as it has obviously changed in the immediate past, the composition of the Government and the personnel in the public service must correspondingly change in order to reflect the type of population that they are supposed to serve.

Unless the public service truly becomes representative of the population mix in the community, the public service can hardly understand or respond to the need of the very segments of its population. It is this lack of representativeness that leads to unresponsiveness, and it is unresponsiveness of Government that leads to the loss of their credibility and the demise of Governments in political power. Credibility is the basis of public confidence in Government.

Public confidence flourishes whenever and wherever there is true equality of opportunity.

Equality of opportunity is not simple empty rhetoric. It is one of the brightest jewels in the crown of Canada. Equality of opportunity is an observable social condition where every individual human being has a right to become what he could possibly become on the basis of his natural talents, abilities and skills without any artificial, attitudinal, institutional or other barriers in society.

The public service needs the confidence of the people. The confidence of the people in their own Government can only be enhanced whenever the public service institutions shall serve them, like the population they serve. Then they become humane agencies appealing to both human reason and sentiments, satisfying the human heart with compassion and understanding, assisting the good and resisting the wrong, and delivering the weak from the impositions of the strong.

How can the public service institutions become service-fulfilling agencies in the midst of our society? Public service institutions can become service-fulfilling agencies of the people that they serve when they are run by people who are morally upright human beings. The spring cannot rise higher than its source. No Governmental agency can do any better than the people who run the Governmental machinery.

It is the seed of moral integrity that is implanted in a person that makes him truthful when even it will be to his own disadvantage. It is moral integrity that gives him the courage to be fair to the adversary and fair even to the opposition. It is moral courage which makes people honest in their private lives, in their business life, most importantly in their public life. It is moral integrity which consists in the courage to do one's public duty with a high sense of responsibility.

Our society is not a perfect society. We are, yet compared to other civilized nations, one of the most advanced societies in terms of freedom, in terms of services, in terms of security and peace, in terms of Government offer to its own people. -(interjection)-

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I am experiencing some difficulty listening to this interesting debate, and I would appreciate the co-operation of the Members of the House.

Mr. Santos: People who want to spend their lives in service of society sometimes face a real moral dilemma. Should they be value neutral or should they express value commitment? If the intellectual academic person seeks the truth he cannot escape

being a critic of the status quo and a constant scrutinizer of public policies.

The academic intellectual is not only creating outputs of knowledge, skills and art and symbols, he must also be applying and generalizing this in terms of the moral and ethical standard of human conduct, always questioning the current institutional arrangement and present practices in our society.

Speaking of intellectuals, Lewis Coser described them as "men who never seem satisfied with things as they are" and "consider themselves special custodians of abstract ideas like reason and justice and truth, jealous guardians of moral standards that are too often ignored in the marketplaces and the houses of power." As Whitelaw Reid, one time Librarian of the U.S. House of Representatives and later Minister of the United States to France, asserted in a speech—he said in 1873: "We may set it down as, within certain needful and obvious limitations, the very foremost function of the scholar in politics is to oppose the established."

Seymour Lipset suggests that the underlying reason for this tendency is that any kind of status quo embodies rigidities and dogmatism which it is the inescapable, inalienable right of the individual to attack, whether from the standpoint of moving back to traditional values, or forward to the achievement of true equalitarian dreams.

Whether within or outside of partisan politics, the appropriate function for the reformer is to be the conscience of society by constantly and constructively criticizing established public policy.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I emphasize the word "constructively". We cannot just try to tear down what society had already built, what we can do is try to improve constructively the established practices, procedures and institutions in our society.

The reformer often plays the role of a severe critic of society of which he is a part, often engaging in the task of political and social reform. Being a critic of established policies and the present practices seems to be a more appropriate or important role for the academic intellectual which Hans Morgenthau terms is "at best a political practitioner and at worst an ideologue of social action."

* (1620)

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Before Henry Kissinger became President Nixon's advisor on foreign policy Kissinger

observed that for "intellectuals outside the administrative machine the protest has often become an end in itself" because the moment an intellectual surrenders his proper role as the scrutinizer of the status quo, he ceases to be an agent of social change, he becomes a mere apologist for the Establishment.

The activist academic intellectual is the vanguard of all reformers. As such, he bears the responsibility of knowledge. In the social context, to bear knowledge is to have the responsibility for social action because it is action that truly reforms society.

As Senator Richard Stanbury pointed out in the Harrison Hot Springs Conference of 1969, "The forces of reform have but a limited time to make themselves relevant or else they face the danger of being summarily swept away by disillusioned and rebellious groups impatient for action in today's unjust society." Unless the established Government, by co-option, absorbs all the elements in society in a systematic, peaceful and orderly way, obviously there would be disruptions in society not to our own liking.

The dominant groups in society, Mr. Speaker, under the veil of traditional and institutional legitimacy are sometimes laying down rules that are discriminatory. Rules for qualifying, or certifying as to who can, or who cannot, do certain lines of profession, occupation or line of work.

Let me be specific. A few years ago, as late as 1981, I was a participant in an annual meeting of the Canadian Congress for the Prevention of Crime, held at the Winnipeg Convention Centre. At the time there was a requirement in the Police Department in the city that you must have a height of 5 ft. 10 in., and this was a mandatory, non-waivable qualification requirement in order that you can become a member of that department. By that year, 1981, we already had a lot of visible minority groups in our society, groups of people who, by reason of their biological, ethnic or racial endowment are almost always less than the required height. It is then obvious to any casual observer that any supposed recruitment for police training for the visible minority groups would be an official exercise in futility, it would be a shallow joke, it would be an empty comedy. Since then that requirement of height has been removed.

I was hoping all along that things will change, that people will qualify; they will not be disqualified by

reason of their biological genetic inheritance, but it is 1990 now, almost 10 years, almost a decade. There is almost no change in this official attitude of the establishment in the law enforcement agency of the City of Winnipeg.

True, they always say they are recruiting; true, they always advertise, they even offer courses. We have witnessed it now, Mr. Speaker, of the nine people who passed all the objective written tests and all the strenuous, rigorous, physical tests, only two were hired; seven of them were rejected. Among the reasons stated was their lack of assertiveness. This could be a cultural value characteristic of certain groups of people. There are certain groups of people who in their own cultural upbringing had never deemed it proper to assert themselves. Is that a ground for rejection when they have passed all the objectives, written, rigorous, physical tests, when they have qualified and maintained all the standards? This is unexplainable to me, Mr. Speaker.

It seems to me that there is no equality of opportunity. It appears to me that it is simply an empty rhetoric. The Premier of this province, as the head of this province, which contains one-half of the total population of the City of Winnipeg, how did he respond? We are powerless. We cannot do anything. This is like a wet noodle. No strength to change what he understands, what he recognizes as a basic inequality in our society.

As a subsystem of society, our public service institutions must reflect the society at large, and all the different groups that came over and became part of our society on the other hand have the obligation to respect the values of this society and adjust themselves accordingly. The public service organization in order to be effective, in order to be understood, in order to be efficient must understand the values and sentiments and beliefs of these different segments of the public at large when they respond to their needs. If they are not aware of these values because these groups are not represented in the force, in the law enforcement agency, how can they properly respond and meet their needs?

A desirable objective then of any public service institution is to make the manpower composition of the public agency a truly mirror image of the population in the community at large as proportionately, as much as possible, with due regard to the standards of excellence of performance. If the public service institution had

achieved and succeeded in maintaining its isolationist, elitist aloof kind of position that it is likely a tower where nobody can enter, then they cannot be truly representative of the people that they serve, and they can only be seen as oppressive by the people whom they do not understand.

All public service institutions should strive to become human in humane agencies. What I am saying is that every public employee, every public official, elected or appointed, has a special moral duty to protect especially the helpless, the weak, the poor and the untutored who are normally found among this new immigrant group. The rich and the affluents, they need no protection from Government because they are already powerful and they are already dominant in our social and economic structure. They already have many friends in high places. They are already in control of sufficient and adequate amounts of resources to immediately take care of themselves. Yet what does this Government do? They give grants to those who already have more than enough of the resources of society and yet ignore the plight of the poor, the people who need help and cut down on social services.

Let me give a specific example. The other day I was—

An Honourable Member: What day was that?

* (1630)

Mr. Santos: In a telephone call—and this individual, the Minister responsible for Seniors (Mr. Downey) said, what day was that? It was November 2, 1989. I had a telephone call from a member of my constituency who lives in Webb Place. He was trying to repeal an old bottle of prescription drug of the same amount. It is an ointment called celestoderm in one of the drugstores locally on Portage Avenue. The weight was about .1 strength. He was charged \$19.49. When you look at this bottle the charge was only \$8.96.

So what he did, he called Unicity. There is another drugstore there in the same branch of the same outfit, and asked what the price of the drug is in that store in Unicity, and it is only \$8.96. He had been overcharged \$10.50. So he complained to me, and he refused to buy the drug. What kind of a system is that where they can raise the price more than 100 percent in the same branch of the same store and yet this Government does nothing about it. So those who already have much are getting more, but those who have none or less are being exploited.

Mr. Speaker, it is only our own self-discipline as individuals that can give us the life that we hold responsible and become a true guardian and trustee of the needful segment of our population. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Honourable Member, during his remarks the Honourable Member spoke a language other than French or English, and I would ask the Honourable Member to kindly give Hansard a copy of those remarks.

HOUSE BUSINESS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, before you call the vote on the motion, I would like to announce some House business if I could.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a disposition of the Members of the House to waive private Members' hour for today. There is not? There is for you?

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that we waive private Members' hour today? No, no leave. Leave denied.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for that, I thought there was.

Secondly, I would like to announce formally that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will be sitting Tuesday morning next at ten o'clock to consider the annual reports of Channel Area Loggers, Moose Lake Loggers, and CEDF.

An Honourable Member: Anything else for next week?

Mr. Manness: I will announce that tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: It is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. Manness), seconded by the Honourable Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Department of Finance; and the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair for the Department of Education and Training.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY—FINANCE

Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau): Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order. This afternoon, we will be resuming consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Finance. We will continue with consideration of item 5. Federal-Provincial Relations and Research Division, (a) Economic and Federal-Provincial Relations Branch: (1) Salaries \$902,800.00. Shall the item pass?

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): There is reference in the budget to multiyear budgeting, and as I said before I did not really consider that full budgeting. There are inclinations, indications as to where we may be in '91-92, '92-93, as well as the current year. There is reference here in '91-92 to anticipated revenue from Manitoba taxes and fees being somewhat below the more moderate growth expected for our economy. We anticipate growth of about 4 percent. Then it goes on to talk about the outlook for federal transfers being sombre and so forth and so on. At any rate it comes out that the bottom line, total revenue growth would be limited to under 3 percent.

My question is: As I read it, this paragraph on page 15, fourth paragraph, third line, the referenced anticipated growth about 4 percent, you are talking about overall economic growth there, are you not? Or are you talking about anticipated revenue growth?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are talking about revenue growth.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I am sorry, I did not hear the answer.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am talking specifically and only about revenue growth. Cash, dollars that come into the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. Leonard Evans: That estimate of growth of revenue would be tied presumably to the rate of growth of the economy as a whole. Now maybe there is not a direct relationship because there are many factors that involve revenue growth, including tax changes and all kinds of variables, changes in habits of drinking, for instance, which may curtail the revenues from liquor, et cetera, liquor sales and so on. But I was wondering what is your projection of

economic growth on which the 4 percent anticipated growth of revenue would be?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, on page 4 of the first appendix, Budget Paper A, headed the economy—

Mr. Leonard Evans: Budget paper, did you say?

Mr. Manness: Budget paper A, page 4, one will see a table there, a heading saying Manitoba Outlook at a Glance, and for 1991 real growth 1 percent.

Mr. Leonard Evans: How does that compare now with the recent forecasts that are coming down? I notice reference was made the other day by the Minister to a Royal Bank of Canada forecast. I had a sheet on that somewhere, and I am just wondering, is there any—not reconciliation, but obviously there are comparisons done, and I was just wondering how does that forecast for '91 compare now with what is coming out of the different forecasting organizations?

* (1640)

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, as of the 22nd of October, 1990, the forecasts for '91 provincial growth, and this is for Manitoba, conference board 1 percent, Informetrica 1.3 percent, Bank of Nova Scotia 0.6 percent, Royal Bank 0.3 percent, Bank of Montreal 1.0 percent, TD Bank 0.8 percent, Bank of Commerce 1.7 percent. The average when one looks at those numbers, and I guess it is a simple average, is 1.0 percent.

Mr. Leonard Evans: What the Minister is doing, or what his staff is doing then is just simply taking all of the forecasts, giving them the same weight and taking a simple average of those forecasts of those agencies. What about the year '92-93? Again that revenue growth has to be related somehow to the growth in the economy. I notice, of course, you do not have a 1992 projection published for real growth, but nevertheless I would imagine somewhere you have a number. Again, do you take the simple average of the various forecasting agencies?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we do have a number. There are about three or four agencies that have forecasted out that far, '92-93. We have chosen to use their numbers and that shows a forecasted growth in real terms of 2.5 percent for '92 and also for '93.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I think the Minister should realize by now, the further you get into the future the less certainty we would have with regard to the

reliability of any of the forecasts no matter who does it.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would never have thought of that, but I thank the Member for bringing that to my understanding, and I am very beholden to him.

Mr. Leonard Evans: You see, the point is that I have gone through the various Hansards and Estimates of years gone by, and I forever read the now Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), then the Finance Critic, urging and requesting a five-year budget process.

Obviously, one has to be very brave indeed, foolhardy as a matter of fact, to come out with a so-called five-year forecast in a budget in terms of where we will be with revenues and expenditures. I think it is virtually impossible.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I agree, just like somebody has to be very foolhardy when they made the expenditure today without taking into account its impact for the years to come. I agree with the Member.

One can be considered foolhardy if they try to forecast the economy and therefore revenue growth, but I say it is just as foolhardy to make a decision around that Treasury Board and/or Cabinet without knowing the fiscal impact of that decision in years to come. To me they are both very foolhardy, and I question how Governments of the past in this province and indeed in this nation, whether or not they have practised the foolhardy approach of not seriously looking at their consequences and making a decision today as far as the impact of that decision on the total expenditure requirements in the years to come.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, I would think and hope that all responsible Governments would at least look at that angle, but there are always other considerations, as the Minister knows. All Governments are subject to a lot of pressure from various groups, various interests, who want a program or another. I can use one example, and maybe the Minister is cognizant of this, the whole social housing program. Say you just take the seniors alone, never mind the families, or you could take both, where the Governments of not only Manitoba but other provincial Governments, the Government of Canada, are locked in on a long-term basis with subsidies to the social housing stock that has been put in place, put in place not

always thinking about financial consequences years ahead, but you put it in place because you are concerned that your seniors should be provided with adequate housing.

While one wants to take a fiscal approach and a responsible approach, yet at the same time we balance off with the challenges of Government, and as I said, one challenge has been historically for this province to provide adequate social housing for seniors, for instance.

Mr. Manness: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you know, what the Member says is fine but let us be blunt about it. I mean, we can talk about building housing stock. All political people and indeed Governments would like to build more public housing, but the fact is we have housing stock in this province right now that is horribly overvalued, that if we put it on the market, I am sure we should reflect the true value to a much greater extent than we have, and that would represent an incredible bottom-line loss. It would be no different than the pension liability. What the Member is saying is, build more—fine—without taking into account that we have not even reflected yet the true value of the stock that we have in place right now, which we are probably still borrowing on. It has not been paid for; it is not properly reflected on the asset sheet. We should probably do a major readjustment to our bottom line to reflect the value, and then he is asking us to build more.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, that is a pure recipe for going broke. That is just the way the NDP did their budgeting over years, and we are trying to change that, with great difficulty.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not think the Minister was listening to me. I was offering this as an example. Historically, where we go back over the years, where there was pressure on Government to put social housing in place, and once you put it in place you get locked in, in some cases with 40-year mortgage periods, and that is the point I was making. I was almost trying to make a case for the Minister. I was not standing here advocating right now that we should run out and build some more housing. I am not against building more housing, but I was not making that point at this juncture. I was simply saying there is an example that years gone by, governments made a decision because they felt that there should be housing provided for seniors, but there was that other angle. There is always that element, whether it is as

prominent in the minds of past Cabinets or present Cabinets—I do not know—as it perhaps should be, but their Governments are locked in to millions of dollars worth of subsidies for social housing, because this social housing is subsidized both federally and provincially on a 50-50 basis.

I simply offer that as an example, but I am saying one does not come to Government simply to look at expenditures in programs from a fiscal point of view. That has to be taken into consideration, but certainly Governments operate on the basis of program needs that are expressed by people, whether they be farmers, or whether they be environmentalists who want certain things done by Government through expenditures, or whether they be multicultural groups—whatever they may be.

* (1650)

To get on, Mr. Deputy Chairman, because discussing this part of the budget document and relating it to the research done in this division, reference has been made time and time again throughout the document about the need to curtail spending, wherever possible, and the need for Government to pull in its reins and not to go further with expansion of spending. I was wondering, while I appreciate that all departments may be given that message, and all departments may be offering up suggestions, will this department, will this Minister be taking a lead in spending cuts or spending squeezes, whatever the term you may want to use—holding the line. Will this Minister be taking the lead in that respect and using research done in his department to take an overall view, but nevertheless to zero in on specific program areas?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Department of Finance does not offer a lot of programming areas. I mean, let us go through the divisions. The divisions are the Comptroller's Division, which again tries to do the accounting and keep the financial management systems in place in Government. We can also look at the Treasury Board. We can look at the Taxation Division, which is responsible for bringing in \$1.4 billion. I can tell you there will be no reduction in staff in the Taxation Division until a reorganization is done, and then I think there could be a slight reduction in staff—very slight. We must remember the Department of Finance now, for many years through many Governments, has tried to show the lead to other departments. The Ministers of Finance have made it very difficult on their own staff in trying to take the

lead. This is one department that has not grown fat over years I can assure you, through several administrations. The ability to reduce staff numbers is very, very limited.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was not suggesting—I am sorry I did not put the question very well—or looking for the Minister to offer up now program cuts within his department. That was not my question. My question was whether with this Research Division, he was going to take an overall look-see at government programming and offer leadership to Government as a whole with regard to program reduction or holding the line or wherever it may be, whatever fields. I appreciate what can happen is you go to Cabinet and you suggest that this is our overall fiscal situation, and therefore to each Minister you throw out the challenge that we want you to come in within this number and come back with suggestions. I guess that is a good way to do it and probably that is what is usually done.

My question is: Is the Minister, because of his concern, a very serious concern expressed in his budget document, prepared to take the lead and can he or will he take the lead based on research done in this branch with regard to areas of program cuts?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are probably in the wrong division. The consideration of Treasury Board probably is a fairer place to ask this question. I will answer it though and say to the Member, of course, I will be very active. I mean, I sit on the Treasury Board. I am the vice-chair. I have an understanding of quite a number of Government programs and hopefully more after a few months. Yes, I will be talking with deputies in all departments. Mike Bessey, the Secretary of the Treasury Board, and I will be very active in trying to find those areas of redundancy and waste in Government and eliminating them.

Unquestionably, there will be some program areas that will come under very close scrutiny and decisions will be made. They will have to be made. Mr. Deputy Chairman, yes, programs will be certainly looked at very closely and if they have run their course, if they have done what they were supposed to do in the first case whenever they were brought in or adopted by Governments in the past and we sense that there is a higher priority somewhere else, then some of them will be wound up.

Mr. Leonard Evans: I guess the Minister is correct, that maybe this is a better discussion—a discussion that best be held under the topic of Treasury Board, but I simply observe that all departments have certain vested interests that they like to protect. There has to be this outside approach to Government spending and I guess you are reminding me that this is essentially done by Treasury Board staff and you do not look for guidance through this division or this branch with regard to where spending may be—

An Honourable Member: This is research.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Well, research into effectiveness of Government programs. Whether there is—maybe the Minister is simply saying, no, he does not expect anything under this division with regard to that particular objective.

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I look for guidance divine and otherwise from everywhere, particularly if there is some difficult decisions to be made over the next several months and I am looking for guidance anywhere. If the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) wants to provide me with some, I will even accept his.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Could the Minister indicate whether he is at all looking at tax credit reductions as one way of reducing spending?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, all options are going to be reviewed. Certainly, no, there is no prior position on any area. I mean the Member is asking me to speculate already to the 1991 budget. We have not even considered the 1990 Estimates. We have not even started the process. I can indicate though that all programs in Government will undergo scrutiny.

Mr. Leonard Evans: My impression is that it seems that we get ready for Estimates forever, year after year.

Just on a little different slant, I would like to know whether the Minister is contracting out any research of any major proportion. Is the Minister retaining outside consultants for economic research in his department?

Mr. Manness: Mr. Deputy Chairman, some. I can think of a contract that I entered into a few months ago with respect to the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Taxation, and I have him doing some research with respect to legislative changes as a result of the reorganization within the Taxation Division.

There is a role there, I do not want to bring on a full-time staffer to do that very important work. Legislative Counsel is bogged down and there is an awful lot of research that has to be done in preparing that legislation. That is one area. From recall, I cannot recall any other contracts that I have entered into, untendered or tendered or otherwise.

Mr. Leonard Evans: So you really only have one outside consultant working at the present time. Are there any plans to engage consultants in the near future? Do you have any specific areas that may be brought under scrutiny?

Mr. Manness: None I can think of at this point. We have no designs to go out and hire. We have the most competent of staff and tremendously productive so we like to do most everything inside.

Mr. Leonard Evans: This particular research that is being done now, will this be made public or do you expect it to be a—this is strictly an internal operating type of study that is being done?

Mr. Manness: Yes, this is not taxation policy. We do all our taxation policy under the lead of Mr. Boschmann. That is done internally. The consulting that I am referring to is purely related to housekeeping and to make sure that our statutes are in order and then cover the reorganization of the Taxation Division.

The Taxation Division has grown on an ad hoc basis now for decades. We are trying to improve the morale and trying to bring a greater degree of efficiency to it. There are good people there, but we just have to do things a little bit differently in my view.

Mr. Leonard Evans: The Manitoba Bureau of Statistics has developed over many years the series of economic accounts. I would like to know whether your department is now in a position to start using those accounts, or maybe you do use them, but I am talking about their own Estimates, the MBS Estimates of real economic growth and so on, all those numbers that are related to provincial accounts.

Mr. Manness: We talk to the bureau several times each day on all of their data bases and every time we do the economic analysis, Mr. Watson, who is at the table with me—that dialogue occurs daily.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: The time is now 5 p.m., and time for private Members' hour. Committee rise. Gentlemen, that is it till Tuesday.

An Honourable Member: Tuesday? Not Monday?

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Till Tuesday, gentlemen. Monday is a holiday.

SUPPLY—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay): Will the Committee of Supply come to order, please. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training. We are on item 1.(c)(1) Administration and Finance, Planning, Research and Policy Co-ordination: Salaries \$469,700.00. Shall the item pass?

* (1640)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Madam Chair, there was a question asked at the close of the last Estimates session with regard to the \$60,000 for the White Paper and what it was going to be used for. I would like to respond to it because I did not have an opportunity at the last Session.

The \$60,000 that has been allocated for the White Paper on The Public Schools Act is going to be used for such items as translation of the paper itself, the printing of the paper and the distribution of the same, the advertising for hearings and meetings for this fiscal year, if hearings and meetings are held, also some professional fees that might be incurred, transportation, accommodation and meals and rental of facilities, if necessary, but we do intend to use school facilities as much as possible for these hearings. So that is the purpose of the allocation of the \$60,000.00.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Notwithstanding that I have not completed my line of questioning in this area, the Leader of the Third Party (Mrs. Carstairs) who was unable to attend for a while last Session because of a medical reason will now continue.

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): I regret if I ask any questions that have already been asked; unfortunately Hansard is not yet available. So I have not been able to review what the Minister may have said on Tuesday after I had left the Session.

However, as I remember what he had to say—and we did not get a copy of his opening remarks—he talked about the strategic plan. The Member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak), in fact, asked him to table that strategic plan and he has refused to do that.

Mr. Derkach: No, I did not. Point of order, Madam Chair.

Point of Order

Madam Chairman: The Honourable Minister of Education and Training, on a point of order.

Mr. Derkach: The Leader of the Third Party is incorrect in her statement that I refused to table the strategic plan. I said as soon that plan is ready, I will be more than happy to table it.

Madam Chairman: The Honourable Minister of Education and Training did not have a point of order. It was a clarification of facts.

* * *

Mrs. Carstairs: According to the document which Planning, Research and Policy Co-ordination has distributed to the two critics, it states very clearly that the strategic plan was ready in March of 1990 for the year of 1990-94, and that it was being revised for '91-95. What we want to know is, why is the plan, which you obviously have been using since the beginning of 1990, not available to us?

Mr. Derkach: Once again, Madam Chair, the document that she is referring to was in an uncompleted form and, therefore, there were many revisions that were required once that document was presented to me as Minister and that is what staff has been working on. We are looking for the completion of that document in the next short while and at that point in time, I will be only too happy to distribute it to Members of the House.

There is nothing secretive about it; it is just a matter of trying to put it into a format. Staff are working very hard to try and put it into a format which is going to be a practical format, if you like, and one that can be understood fairly easily by all.

Mrs. Carstairs: Again I am going by memory because I do not have the Minister's opening remarks in a copy form, but it seems to me that he made reference to the strategic plan when we talked about programs being implemented in a number of ways, one of which were strategies and new thrusts with regard to the high school curriculum.

If that is, in fact, part of that and that program is now being implemented at least in one case by examination form on January 11, what is so difficult to obtain, at least the March 1990 form?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, it almost seems silly that we are getting hung up on some misunderstandings here, but I will ensure that the Leader of the Third Party will get a copy of my opening remarks tomorrow, as soon as the session or—I guess, it will be Tuesday now, but the high school exam, for example, comes from the document called Answering the Challenge: Strategies for Success in Manitoba High Schools.

This document was something that was started back when the former Government was controlling this province if you like, and at that point in time they had commissioned a review of high school education. That report was received by myself and then we sent it back out for responses. The responses came in. We put together a Policy Advisory committee which synthesized those particular responses into a format in conjunction with our planning and research department. Then we came up with a final document that addresses all high school education and the way that we are intending to implement the strategies that have been identified in this document. That is a separate document from the strategies for the department that were referred to.

The strategies that we refer to, Madam Chair, are much broader, they relate not only to the kindergarten to Grade 12 area but indeed relate to all areas that the department is involved in. Therefore, when that document is ready for release and for distribution I will be only too happy to share it with all Members of this House. But I am not going to share a document that is still not in its completed final form.

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, considering that we found, under this administration, very little consultation with the other players, will the Minister tell us what kinds of consultations he has had in the formulation of this strategic plan with MAST, with MTS, and indeed with students who might be affected?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, the strategic plan for the department is an internal plan that is done by the department. It comes from the directions that are set by Government, that are identified by Government. It comes from the many consultations that occur on a regular basis with the various educational institutions and the various players in education. Not only from there, but it also comes from the consultation that we as a department will have with the various players in education, whether they are

from business, whether they are from the labour area, whether they are from parents.

All groups in society have had some input in one way, shape, or form into the formulation of a strategic plan for the department. But it is the department's responsibility as it is in any other department of Government to set for itself a plan in how it intends to carry out the directions that are set for it by Government and by the Minister's office. So it is not simply a short-term kind of document. It is a document that you project into the future where you see education going and you try to address the issues that are out there in education and how we should embark on those.

There are many letters that are received by the department, from time to time, by many organizations that we take into account. There are delegations that we meet with that have something to say. There are resolutions that come to us from a variety of official organizations that have something to do with education or have something to say about education. All of these make up part of the structure that goes into the mix, if you like, to formulate what we will refer to as the strategic plan for our department.

Mrs. Carstairs: Madam Chairperson, the concern is that this Government has acted so unilaterally on so many issues affecting education that now that we are also being denied a strategic plan, which we also assume is being denied to all the other players, it leaves the question open.

I would like to move into another area. That is that along with these projects and report lists one was a gifted policy which apparently has been available within the department since October of 1989. Can the Minister table that report, and if he is not prepared to table it will he explain why?

* (1650)

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, you know in this age where we try to get through to people through direct communication, sometimes you wonder what the barrier is, and especially when we are this close to one another. I have told the Leader of the Third Party (Mrs. Carstairs), and I will say it for the third or fourth time now, that the strategic plan is not being denied. It is not ready. I will repeat it. It is not ready. When it is ready, it will be distributed and the Leader of the Third Party will be one of the first to get a copy of it.

Now, Madam Chair, the Leader, in her opening address and also in some of her statements to

groups outside where she had spoken, has indicated that this department does not consult anymore. Last year she and her critic of Education accused the department of doing nothing but consulting, of doing nothing but studying and never coming up with an action plan. When after consultation, we have come up with an action plan, she says we do not consult. I would like to quote a couple of things. Here is a quote from Monday, June 26, 1989, where her critic for Education says, "The High School Review we waited and waited and waited, got answers and now we have another review. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are elected to make decisions, not to keep passing the buck from committee to committee to committee." This comes from the Liberal's critic of Education quote with regard to our consultation on the High School Review. When we finally implemented the High School Review, she says we do not consult. We really do not know where the Leader of the Third Party (Mrs. Carstairs) is coming from and maybe that is why she is now in the Third Party.

Madam Chair, I have to indicate to you that we are consulting on each and every issue. With regard to the policy on gifted education, we have indeed consulted with the players in education. We have come up with a preliminary plan, but once again, as we come up with a preliminary plan and we are able to consult with more of the organizations, some things emerge that need to be changed. Therefore, this policy is in revision right now, and as soon as it is ready, I will be only too happy to table it as we did with the guidelines for special needs education, the first in the province in its time, and so the same thing will happen with the gifted policy as well.

Mrs. Carstairs: The Minister, Madam Chair, would learn that if he put a policy into place and then with the fine details, asked some of the people who would be subjected to those fine details, what they thought of them, like the students in Grade 12 mathematics, then maybe he would in fact not be accused of lack of consultation.

To move, however, because it is obvious that we are not going to get any of the papers at this point from Planning, Research and Policy Co-ordination. Can the Minister explain when he first learned about the enrollment figures that seem to be inaccurate in the St. James School Division?

Mr. Derkach: Madam Chair, this is really not the section where that particular kind of question. -(interjection)- we are in Planning, Research and

Policy Co-ordination. I will answer those questions when we get to 16.(b), and I would be pleased to do that. Let me say with regard to consulting with students, I have met with many students throughout the province, and there are not very many—very few—who have any serious concerns about writing the examination. Their response to me has been: We write an examination anyway, and therefore whether it is a departmental exam or whether it is a division exam, it does not really affect us.

As a matter of fact, I have found, as I say, very few students on an individual basis, who really object to any kind of an exam because many of them are used to writing exams at that level anyway. So, Madam Chair, the fact that we are moving into an exam area is not going to be changed. We are going to have the exam, and I know the Leader of the Third Party (Mrs. Carstairs) does not like examinations. She is afraid of standards, but we are not afraid of standards and neither are most people in this province. We are moving in that direction.

Madam Chair, yes, there are things that need to be worked out. I have said right from the very beginning that we are going to be flexible and that we are going to have to change things as we move along so that indeed we are not putting people into a difficult situation. That is not what the exam is designed to be or to do. The exam has been set by professionals, by professional teachers who are experts in their field, who know and understand the curriculum so it is not as though we are studying an exam that is outside of the curriculum.

The curriculum is fairly specific and therefore the exams are set according to that curriculum. Now, there was an indication back in June that the exam would be set. Letters went out in June that there would be a math exam. Again in September we advised superintendents and schools that the exams would be set, and then the dates were set. The exam has now been set. The guidelines now, with respect to the exams, are going out.

With regard to the High School Review, the details of it, the implementation of it, that will all be done through an implementation co-ordinator and a steering committee, but we are a long way from implementing all the changes for high school. If we expect that within a month after an election we should have implemented many of the recommendations for the High School Review, then I am afraid we are a little bit wrong. It will take some time. We will select a good co-ordinator who will

understand the education process and then the implementation of that and the discussions and consultations around the province will go on. Therefore I am not afraid to address that issue in any way, shape or form.

With regard, Madam Chair, to the other issue on the enrollment counts, I will answer that now and then we can get it out of the way. First of all, we learned of the enrollment difficulties in mid-September. As soon as we learned of those difficulties my Deputy Minister met with the school division to verify whether or not it was just a miscalculation or what the problems were. He met with the school division again early in October. Then he met again with them -(interjection)- I am sorry, did the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) have something to ask? He seems to be chirping from his seat but nothing is coming out.

Madam Chair, I have to tell you that my department has met with the school division regularly since we learned about this situation in mid-September. We have tried to address it in the most practical of ways by ensuring that the division would do the preliminary investigation. That investigation is now at its completion stage. We have now asked our internal audit team to go in and to meet with the school board and verify those figures to ensure whether there has or has not been a mistake, the magnitude of that mistake and to see whether that mistake has occurred, not just in the one year, but whether it is something that has persisted over a number of years.

We have to do a lot of investigation. It is a complex matter because there are not only regular students, there are adult students, part-time students, special needs students. In order to get an accurate count you have to take all of those things into consideration. When that is done and we have all of that information before us, we will be in a position to make some decisions with regard to perhaps the problems that exist in the way that enrollments are reported.

Now, different school divisions reported to their offices in different ways because of the different structures of the schools. Indeed we need to look if there is a problem with the way they are being reported and if it is subject to abuse then we have to make sure that we eliminate any loopholes that might be there or any potential for abuse in the best way we can. In a general sense, over a number of years historically, we have operated on a level of

trust among school divisions and it is the school division's responsibility to accurately report enrollments to the department. It is set out in the Act. If they contravene the Act, then we have to take action and we will.

Mrs. Carstairs: Thank you, but as usual, the Minister likes to misquote a bunch of things. To begin with, I have been on the record as a teacher since I graduated with a Master's degree in Education since 1963 in favour of standards. I have been in favour of testing. I have taught departmental examinations, so you are dead wrong, but that is nothing new.

Secondly, in all my teaching experience—and that goes over 21 years—I have never gone into a school year to teach a course and not know the kind of examination that would be set for my students who would be asked to take that examination some time in that academic year, never have I ever found myself in that situation, yet teachers in this province found themselves in that situation.

* (1700)

At the beginning of September, any teacher worth his or her salt—

Madam Chairman: Order, please; order, please. The hour being five o'clock and time for private Members' hour. Committee rise and call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

COMMITTEE REPORT

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

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker: The hour being 5 p.m., time for private Members' hour.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

BILL 9—MANITOBA INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), Bill 9, Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) who has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to contribute further to this debate. I began the other day in the short time of two minutes available to me prefacing my remarks of today in regard to this Bill.

It is a Bill that was, in essence, on the Order Paper before. It is dealing with a situation that has arisen because of this Government's insensitivity to the Manitoba Intercultural Council and multicultural issues generally. It is appropriate that we are now debating this Bill on a day in which we have seen, once again, just how far this Government is willing to go to allow individual Members of its Cabinet to express some of the most insensitive remarks I have seen in a long time.

We have seen just how far the Premier (Mr. Filmon) seems to be willing to bend over backwards, not to try not to offend our multicultural communities, but to try not to offend the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). It makes me wonder who really is in charge in terms of multicultural issues, whether it be in regard to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, the unilateral move by the Minister of Culture and this Government to take away the granting rights of the Manitoba Intercultural Council in regard to Lotteries funds or whether, Mr. Speaker, and for the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) who obviously does not understand the background of this particular issue, whether it be the statements made repeatedly by the Minister of Energy and Mines who even, today, had the insensitivity to say that he would not read a letter from the Manitoba Intercultural Council and other cultural groups. He said that. He refused to look at the letter when offered a copy, saying he has said enough on the matter. He has said enough on the matter, far too much as a matter of fact. The problem is he has not read enough on the matter. He has not listened

enough on the matter. He has not opened his eyes up to the multicultural reality of this province.

He said, and this is once again from the paper today, he is quoted as saying, that as for the number of people that signed the letter, this is the Minister of Energy and Mines, he stated that, and he claimed that he has received more than 200 phone calls and 100 letters in support of his comments. This is a quote. He said tell them, and this is the Manitoba Intercultural Council and the other groups that signed the letter, tell them to get 300 people and we will talk about it. What is this, Mr. Speaker, go ahead and make my day? Is he trying to be the Clint Eastwood of multicultural policy in Manitoba?

Is this the way the Government wishes to operate? Is this the way it wishes to operate? Let us, for the record, note that it was not just the Manitoba Intercultural Council. It was the Folk Arts Council of Winnipeg, the Jamaican Association of Manitoba, the Irish Association of Manitoba, the Manitoba Japanese Canadian Cultural Centre and the Canadian Polish Congress. I wanted to read that into the record, Mr. Speaker, because once again it is evident that this Government is insensitive to our multicultural communities. It is evident by the fact that we are even debating this particular Bill, which does nothing more, does absolutely nothing more than put back in the granting authority that this Government took away.

I want to say to this Government, and I want to say to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), that his words ring hollow in light of the policies of this Government in regard to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, in light of the statements made by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), Mr. Speaker, they ring hollow.

No matter how much he waves, as he has, a document that states the so-called multicultural policy of this province, how is anyone expected to believe that? In particular, not just the comments we heard about multicultural funding, but the impulsive statements made by the Minister of Energy and Mines that somehow, when he was talking about WASPS if you like paying for everyone else, that was a direct quote, Mr. Speaker. I want it to be on the record, because I think it shows just how blunt the Minister was.

He also insinuated it was somehow the WASPS who were the taxpayers. He said the people. As the Manitoba Intercultural Council and other groups

have pointed out, many people pay taxes in this province from all different ethnic backgrounds, all our cultural communities are contributors to this province. They indeed have the perfect right to ask for nothing more than some support in the preservation of their culture and heritage and language.

I have had the particular honour and privilege of attending many meetings of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. I have indicated previously in this Chamber, my wife was a member of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, elected by the residents of Thompson and the multicultural communities in Thompson to that position. She was on the Intercultural Council for many years and I had the opportunity to attend many events with her. I chose to do so, because I felt that the activities of the Manitoba Intercultural Council were important. It is a unique body. People may not be aware, but even though there are similar bodies in other provinces, on the surface there are very few that have the independent basis that this does.

This is not strictly a body that is appointed at the whim of the Government. The Manitoba Intercultural Council is partly consisting of Government appointments, but also of appointments made by the communities themselves. So it is an independent voice.

That is why I find the actions of this Government in regard to the Manitoba Intercultural Council to be so insulting. They do not trust the Intercultural Council to have the granting authority which they had for a number of years. Did they not trust the Manitoba Intercultural Council to realize that when they take the unprecedented step of issuing the kind of letter that they have to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in regard to the fact that his Minister, his Acting Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, is making statements that are totally in opposition, not just to the current multicultural policy but the kind of ideas that have developed the last 10, 20, 30 years?

I suppose we can credit the Minister for stating his mind, Mr. Speaker. As I have said previously, I wonder how many other Members of the Conservative Caucus and Conservative Party support those same ideas that are being expressed vocally. Perhaps that is why the Premier has been so strangely silent. Perhaps he is afraid of a revolt in his caucus led by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) on multicultural issues.

* (1710)

Perhaps there is something else, Mr. Speaker, behind the kind of agenda we are seeing here. I do know one thing, whether it be in regard to the fact that the granting authority has been taken away or the fact that Ministers of the Crown are contemptuous of letters written in all seriousness—they will not even read them—we have a Premier that will not even insist that his Minister withdraw comments that were absolutely unacceptable—absolutely unacceptable. That really speaks volumes for the opinion of this Conservative Government in regard to our multicultural communities.

I want to say to them that they have very little time left, to my mind, to correct whatever misstatements they feel may have been put on the record, if indeed they were misstatements, or to disown statements if they were made with conscious intent. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that more and more people—and let us not forget that this is a province of minorities. We are all minorities in this province. There is no single majority group. They will soon find that many people will start to realize that this Government does not speak for all the people of the province, that it only speaks for certain people.

That, indeed, is the philosophy espoused by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). That may be, indeed, the philosophy shared by other Members of that caucus. No matter what words the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) places on top of that, what gloss he places, until such time as this Government reverses its stand in regard to this particular move that it made, supports this type of amendment, something they blocked last time in the last Session of the Legislature, until they do that, until they categorically reject the statements made by the Minister of Energy and Mines, there can be no doubt about their true views of multiculturalism in this province. I hope, by the way, that Members of the Conservative Party will take the chance now, Mr. Speaker, now in debate on this Bill.

The silent Members on this issue thus far—I look to the new Members on the back bench. They have an opportunity to disown the comments if they found them to be offensive. They can do it in speaking on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. They can start a process of shifting the Government back toward the mainstream on multiculturalism. They could influence this Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr.

Neufeld), this Premier (Mr. Filmon). They can take control on this issue.

Will they, Mr. Speaker? Well, I will find out as I now sit down, finishing my short time that is available on this Bill. I hope they will speak and I hope that their silence will not indicate in any way, shape or form that they support the kinds of views that have been expressed by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) and the kinds of policies that have been put in place in regard to the Manitoba Intercultural Council by this Government. Thank you.

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay), that debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. 3—EQUIVALENCY OF EDUCATION AND WORK EXPERIENCE OF IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): I move, seconded by the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr),

WHEREAS immigrants arrive in Manitoba with a wide range of technical and professional job skills and experience; and

WHEREAS the employment market in Manitoba requires persons with specialized skills and training; and

WHEREAS the Manitoba economy would benefit by a contribution of new immigrants, of their skills and experience; and

WHEREAS there exists a lack of systematic, consistent and fair methods to assess prior learning of persons trained outside the province; and

WHEREAS learning completed and experience obtained outside Manitoba, and more particularly outside Canada, may not be formally recognized or given credit; and

WHEREAS inadequate information regarding educational programs and experience on the application forms of immigrants may be the cause of denial of licence or certification by regulatory bodies;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urge the Minister of Education and Training to consider establishing

an office to assess formal education and work experience of foreign trained individuals, and to determine their equivalency with the Manitoba standards;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Assembly urge the Minister of Education and Training to contact his counterparts in other provinces to consider establishing a joint data base for shared use in the assessment of formal education and work experience of foreign trained individuals and in determination of their equivalency with the provincial standards.

Motion presented.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I have been given the privilege to introduce this resolution on behalf of the Liberal Party in Manitoba. Many in the Province of Manitoba are of the opinion that immigrants can be job threatening to those that currently live in the province. This resolution deals with recognizing the work and experience and training that many that come into Canada have acquired prior to living here in Manitoba.

I did want to address that misconception, if you will, by many people that it is a cost to society for immigrants to come to Canada. I found it interesting that the Free Press had an article with the title "Immigrants Pay More and Take Less." I just wanted to refer to that article, just very briefly, and that is in regard to a cost of Government services use per person in 1980, transfer payments included, of Health and Education. Pre-1946 immigrants was \$6,746 on average; average in 1980, taxes paid, was \$5,610; post-1946 we had \$3,575 and average of 1980 taxes paid, \$10,537.00. All non-immigrants to compare it to, you are looking at \$3,651, with the average of taxes paid being \$8,896.00.

So, Mr. Speaker, contrary to what many people might say, immigrants and immigration has played a major role in Canada right from our inception. No doubt our future relies on immigration. As the birthrate goes down, the need to have more immigrants come into Canada is going to be that much greater. What is important is that when we open the doors for immigrants to come to Canada, that we allow them to come in for a couple of reasons, in particular, for family or compassionate. There are so many immigrants who are here today that would like their family members to be able to be

with them here in Canada and enjoy the lifestyle that we have and to just have their family around them.

Another aspect is having skilled workers, and really that is what this resolution deals with. There are many people who will come to Canada, whether it is a doctor, teacher, whatever it might be, engineer, accountant, who have spent years back in their homeland through education and actual work experience. They come to Canada in hopes of being able to share with us some of the aspirations that we have, and they should be entitled to have.

What ends up far too often is we have immigrants that will come to Canada that will have been qualified back in their homeland and, as I pointed out, have the experience to be an accountant, if you will—we can cite the accountant for an example—and then they come to Canada and live in Manitoba, and you will find that they are washing dishes, or they are operating a sewing machine, whatever it might be. These people wanted to come to Canada to make Canada a home. They felt in their hearts that they would be able to continue on where they left off in terms of their job occupation.

In many cases they recognize that the standards in some professions might be higher here than they were back in their homeland. They feel that they would have to have some type of upgrading, but really where the problem lies is recognizing what it is that they have earned back in their homeland and have brought to Canada.

* (1720)

If an accountant over in a foreign land, who has been a certified accountant for a number of years, comes here and finds that they are in a situation in which they are not recognized, or what they have been doing for the previous 14 years does not count for anything, it is very frustrating and I can understand why. One of the biggest ones that I hear about is engineers and teachers from other lands that come here, and they are very frustrated because they feel that they are qualified, or they can be qualified, but they are somewhat handicapped in the sense that when they arrive here there is no recognition given to many of the professions.

One of the professions that I was told about was the nursing profession, which in many American states you can come—for example—from the Philippines and work in a hospital in the U.S. with minimal upgrading or, in some cases, no upgrading—so I have been told. In Manitoba, you

virtually have to start fresh, or it is very hard to find out where that particular individual would fit in through our educational institutions. Do they have to start from the beginning or can they be recognized for what they have accomplished back in their homeland?

That, as I say, is really what the resolution is about. What we are talking about is setting up some type of mechanism so that when we have immigrants that come, in particular to Manitoba, I guess in theory I would suggest that the federal Government should have this office and there should be national standards.

Failing what the federal Government refuses to do, for whatever reasons, there is a role for the provincial Government. We have seen some provincial Governments take positive steps at trying to address the problem. The Province of Quebec has done what we are suggesting in part of the resolution. Mr. Speaker, this is really what we are doing, we are suggesting to this Government that they recognize that there is a need to establish some type of a body or an office if they do not necessarily agree with us.

I know the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) will tell you that he is in fact working on it, that he has a working group and so forth, but Mr. Speaker, we do not hear of any type of implementation dates. We do not hear anything coming from the Minister saying what he is doing to rectify that problem.

That is in part why we feel that it is necessary to introduce resolutions of this nature, so that we give the appropriate Minister hopefully some initiative to act, and for those that might have taken some action, but seem to be sitting on the preliminary action that they might have taken, maybe give them that extra little prod to move a little bit faster. We saw that, for example, Mr. Speaker, when in fact, as the official Opposition Party we introduced Bill 2 and lo and behold three months later, we had Bill 42, and that is a debate in itself what happened there.

This is what we are at least attempting to do because I do not know what the Government will do with this particular resolution. I would like to think that they would support at least the intent. They might want to fix it up somewhat, but at least the intent, I believe, is sincere. The Government can support the concept of what it is that we are proposing.

If for some reason this resolution has caused the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) or even possibly the Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) to move a bit faster, I believe then it will have been worth its while in terms of introducing it, because there are so many people that are in a situation in which their first occupation, their dream if you will, of being an accountant, a doctor or whatever it might be, has been put on hold because there is really nothing in place that will see that individual is given the opportunity to go ahead and be put on equal playing field.

That is really what the more recent immigrant communities are asking, and I should not even say more recent. There are people here that have been in Manitoba for 20, 30 years and still never had the opportunity to get back into the line of work that they have wanted to. In large part that is because there was no recognition given to what it is that they were able to accomplish back in their homelands.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) will take note of it and hopefully move a bit faster because there are a large number of people. On that note, I would like to thank you.

Hon. Len Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I would like to acknowledge the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) in presenting this resolution today. It is indeed a pleasure for me to rise and to be able to respond and to indicate that our Government is indeed working towards establishing a criteria for immigrant credentials.

Mr. Speaker, in my short term as Minister of Education and Training I can tell you that I have had many individuals and many groups come to me and express their concern about the fact that they have not been able to be recognized for their training, for their experience, and for the skills that they have brought with them from their homeland.

I can tell you of an incident where a dentist from Europe came to me and indicated that he has worked at a printing press here for 10 years and has attempted, during that period of time, to get his credentials recognized and has accepted to go back to school and get the necessary qualifications, but has been rejected on each and every count, and that is tragic because we see people who have skills, who have abilities, who indeed have gone through laborious training and have invested a great deal in it and then come to this province and, for one reason

or another, have not been able to get adequate recognition. In some cases there are, indeed, reasons why perhaps full credit cannot be allowed, but I think we have to give these individuals every opportunity to be able to enhance the skills that they have so that they can qualify for the diplomas, the certificates, that are necessary to carry on a full life in this province.

* (1730)

I was at a restaurant not that long ago and a young man was waiting on tables and came over to our table. I asked him a few questions and we got chatting about where he had originated from and he told me, and I asked him what his training was in and he indicated that he was an interior designer. So I asked him why he was not working in his field, in his trained field. He said, well, I cannot get recognized in Manitoba for the experience and the training that I have had in my homeland and for that reason I am sort of relegated to serving tables in a restaurant. He was not happy in his situation because he was trained, he had specific skills, he was artistic. He did have abilities and talents that I am sure this province could use and yet, because of the way we approach credentials in this province, he was not able to contribute to his society, contribute to our society, and to become a meaningful member of Manitoba. So, yes there is, indeed, a need to address this issue.

As I have indicated, our Government is working toward establishing a criteria for immigrant credentials. The announcement, by Immigration Minister, Barbara McDougall, on October 25, makes this topic maybe even more pertinent at this time because the announcement stated that immigrant quotas would be increased significantly, to something like 220,000 in 1991 and 250,000 in 1992. So that is why this topic is very current and very important at this time and we, as a province, would hope to be able to receive our fair share of the new wave of immigration and with it we hope that we will get the kinds of skills that are needed to enhance this province economically, socially and in all aspects. For that reason, we are moving ahead with our credentials work.

We established a working group on immigrant credentials almost a year and a half ago, as a press release indicated on December 19, a working group that will recommend ways to recognize the credentials and work experience of immigrants that have come to this province. This working group was

established because, as I said, we recognize the fact that there is no coherent system for assessing the abilities, the credentials and the experience that immigrants have. As a result, many of these, as I have indicated, are working in areas where they have not been trained. They are not working in the professions or the trades that they have been trained in. Many of them have valuable professions and valuable skills in fields where we have shortages many times in this province.

I can relate to another experience. The Member was speaking just a moment ago and said that we are not moving quickly enough, but I have to tell him that his seat mate, the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), came to me with his father-in-law not that long ago, where there was a genuine problem in recognizing the credentials and the experience of this individual in our system.

When we went back and started looking at how this individual was treated, how his credentials were assessed, we found that there was indeed a loophole and a lack in our system of addressing that. I am very happy to say that we were able to address that issue in that particular case. So we have many of these cases coming before us and we try to address them one at a time.

There is presently very little data on the equivalence of immigrant credentials and that is why the working group has had somewhat of a difficult time to this point in time, and they are in the process of gathering all of this information to make sure that they will address it in an appropriate way.

The mandate of this working group is: to explore all aspects of this particular important issue, to establish an inventory of all relevant professional and volunteer organizations and associations, to determine the possible mechanisms for assessing and recognizing immigrant credentials and experience, and to consult with appropriate professional organizations and post-secondary institutions, to assist in identifying the possible mechanisms, to determine the additional training components which may be required as part of the recognition mechanism, and to make appropriate funding recommendations so that these individuals can indeed get their proper and appropriate qualifications.

Those six items may sound very complicated, but in essence they are precisely what this particular resolution calls for, to assess formal education and

work experience of foreign trained individuals and to determine their equivalency with Manitoba standards.

As the Honourable Member can see, our Government is indeed far ahead of his resolution and the committee that was established over a year ago. As to the second part of the Honourable Member's resolution regarding a joint provincial data base for use in assessment of formal education and work experience of foreign trained individuals and in determination of their equivalency with provincial standards, I would like to assure him that I am working constantly in co-operation with my counterparts from across Canada in establishing national standards.

A recent example of this is the National School Achievement Indicators Program, as established by the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada. This program is the first step in comparing students nationwide and determining the goals which we should be setting nationally for our education system because this is not just a problem that we face here in Manitoba, it is a problem that each and every province faces across this land.

I will continue to do my utmost in working together with all of the Ministers from the Council to establish a national standard for immigrants who come to this country. Because, at one time or another, all of our forefathers who came to this land were in that category.

However, they perhaps did not have the kind of training and education that many of the immigrants are coming to this country with today. For that reason, I think, it is long overdue that we recognize the importance of this issue, because I am sure that if we were to take a count in this province we would find many hundreds of people who have been trained in professions in their lands, who cannot gain adequate access to proper jobs and opportunities in our province.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that we as a department, we as a Government are somewhat ahead of this resolution. We have been working on this for a year. I recognized the importance of this when I became Minister of Education and from that point on, we began working at establishing a credentials committee. That meant that we had to consult, and I know that the Member's Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) says that we do not consult enough now—last year she said we consulted too much, this

year we are not consulting enough. I have to assure him that we are consulting. We are talking to individuals from various groups in our society. We are taking their advice and allowing them to become an important part of this entire process. It is not a matter of trying to do this in isolation. It is a matter of trying to do it in co-operation with the many groups of our society.

It is unfortunate that the former Government did not see fit to recognize the important contributions of these people in our society. They were not even able to establish a working group. Although there was much rhetoric about it, that is where it ended. Even at the time of the end of their mandate, they had not moved in any way, shape or form, in any positive, meaningful way to establish any kind of a working group that would look at assessing immigrant credentials.

I am happy to say that our Government, my department have taken the responsible approach and have embarked on a credentials committee, a working group, that will indeed identify the criteria. They have had their mandate spelled out for them, and now they are moving in a positive direction. It is not something that is going to be resolved overnight. It is not something that we are going to see implemented tomorrow but indeed it is a beginning. It is a positive approach and it will continue.

* (1740)

Mr. Speaker, now that I have pointed out to the Honourable Member that this Government is working very hard to solve the problems of immigrants arising from this particular problem, I would like to at this time move an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay),

THAT this resolution be amended by striking all the words after "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED" and replace them with the following:

"... that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba do congratulate the Government of Manitoba for its leadership in establishing the working group on immigrant credentials to establish solutions to the increasing number of foreign trained individuals locating in Manitoba; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Assembly congratulate this Government on its co-operation with other provincial governments on attempting to

establish national standards and guidelines for formal education in Canada."

Motion presented.

Mr. Speaker: I have reviewed the amendment, and I note that our practices with respect to relevancy of amendments in private Members' hour are quite lenient. In examining the amendment, it does address the same subject matters as the original motion, and I therefore find it in order.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): I am glad to have the opportunity to speak on the equivalency of education and work experience for immigrants to Canada. As we are all aware in the constituency of Point Douglas, there are a lot of people who came from other countries and now call Canada home. When I also was travelling during the campaign trails and meeting with various people, I had the pleasure to meet individuals who were from Portugal, India, the Philippines. I also came across many of the stories that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) was referring to.

One individual had stated to me that in his own country, he was a very well-respected individual and treated many of the people from his village. He said, since I came to Canada, the only job I can get is as a painter. When we have individuals coming from all over, and they have worked extremely hard and studied and passed their own standards in their country, and then they come to Canada, especially in Manitoba, and we do not recognize that, I feel that it is a tragedy for them and also for the people of Manitoba. A lot of these immigrants who come from other countries and have expertise in certain areas and we do not necessarily only have to define doctors, dentists. There are many who are qualified carpenters and mechanics and those individuals also are not recognized, and yet these individuals, when you see the work that they perform and compare it to any other tradesperson, will not take second place.

These individuals, because of the standards that we set here in Manitoba, without an equivalency for the individuals, are at a disadvantage as soon as they land on our land. Also on that note, when you look at the equivalency programs there are also equivalency programs that would benefit northern aboriginal people, not only immigrants-

An Honourable Member: Good point, George.

Mr. Hickes:—you know, and a lot of our own first—

An Honourable Member: The Minister of Northern Affairs was here, too.

Mr. Hickes: The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), should be aware of this because a lot of the individuals reside in communities in northern Manitoba. Because of the education systems and the equivalency, you can almost compare where, when we have upgrading programs, upgrading skills and look at the work experience, compared to the skills areas where the equivalency is recognized, these individuals and their families benefit greatly. That has been proven through the last few years under training programs in the North.

Where individuals were brought in they compared their work experience within the last 10 years and gave them accreditation for certain levels. Now, this could be a model that we could view and we could instill into advancing the immigrants that come to Canada. Why reinvent the wheel when we already have processes in place that have proven themselves over time, and yet we want to do another study? A study of what, I ask the Minister of Education. Why do we need more time to study, to look at other programs? Let us look at our own programs. We have some excellent models to compare to—

An Honourable Member: Good old NDP Government programs.

* (1750)

Mr. Hickes: Well, a lot of them were initiated by the NDP Government. When I speak about the advancement of trades people in northern Manitoba, yes, that was initiated and put forth by the previous Government. It paid many dividends to individuals in northern Manitoba. Now there are over 30, over 30 individuals in northern Manitoba who are holding their trade certificate in carpentry. Before that, I knew of three aboriginals, three, Mr. Speaker. So these programs do work.

If this Government is serious—and from what the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) said in his statements, that they are committed to enhancing and advancing immigrants coming to Canada, well, speed things up a little bit because we do not need another study. We do not need to discuss this. Look at our own models. Let us quit just talking about it. Let us get some action. These are valuable people that come from another country and have the skills and expertise to benefit us in Manitoba. If you look at northern Manitoba, and I am sure the Minister

from Northern Affairs would agree with me that we really need additional professionals in northern Manitoba. We have doctors and dentists that are leaving the North. So who suffers? It is the people of the North who suffer.

So I ask the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to talk to his Government, maybe persuade them to start getting immigrants and look at the equivalency program and have a commitment for a place for the immigrants to practise and to help the communities. We have shortages all over.

Even if you look at the nurses in northern Manitoba, you know, that is very, very - (interjection)-like he says, immigrants, him and them. That is fine, but we are talking about immigrants that have studied and worked extremely hard in their own country to become a tradesperson or become a doctor, or a dentist, and they come here, we do not recognize that. Yet if they show that they have the skill levels in order to help Manitobans and also earn a living in an area where they are trained, what is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

When we train for an education in our chosen field, we are happy to participate in that, and we will do our utmost to give the best service to the people that we choose to work with, whether it is in education, nursing, law practice, the dental area. If you want to become a doctor, that is your chosen career. So you will give 100 percent and you will help the advancement of Manitobans. You will give excellent care, whatever you do.

But if you are not recognized for the skills and the certificate that you have, and cannot participate in that area of your chosen field, then when you take other employment opportunities, I doubt if you will give 100 percent. I would not blame an individual for not giving 100 percent when they are only taking employment just to make ends meet, to feed their families and to try and make an existence until they can continue in their chosen field. I encourage the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) to support the advancement, training opportunities, and equivalencies for immigrants because they can only enhance the people of Manitoba.

Also when we talk about a person that is participating and working in their career that they have chosen, that they have trained for and that they have the skills for, 99 percent of the time it will be at a much higher salary than what they have to exist

on now. When we recognize that and we look at the benefits it will have and the standard of living that these individuals, because they chose our country to live in, they should not be penalized. When I say penalized—a lot of them would be in a professional area and make an excellent salary, yet a lot of them are working at minimum wage. Even the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) verified that, and he stated that he knew an individual that worked in a restaurant and was qualified in a much higher skill level area.

If that is the only way that individuals have to start to try and get accreditation in Manitoba and get equivalency, then once we recognize that we have to ensure that adequate funding is in place for the individuals to attend colleges, universities, and to ensure that there are adequate spaces available or it defeats the whole purpose. If we say to someone, well, we recognize your equivalency as a doctor, but you must study say for two or three years more because your equivalency warrants only two years, that individual has to look at trying to save enough money to continue his university at the minimum wage of \$4.70 an hour, which is a shame in Manitoba. Who can honestly state here that they can live a meaningful life and support their family on \$4.70 an hour?

An Honourable Member: For \$3 a bushel per week.

Mr. Hickes: Yes, I agree with you, that is right. That should not be, but \$4.70 an hour, Mr. Speaker, when a person is trying to make a living. On top of that, if we do not have the funding in place in order to advance these individuals, then we are saying, yes, we recognize and we support the equivalency but you have to take three jobs in order to save enough money to pay your tuition fees. Would that be fair? I say, no, because the individuals that come from a different country and choose to make Canada their home, and if they choose to pick Manitoba as their home, that is of even more benefit to us.

Mr. Speaker, once they have achieved their certificate or their doctors degree, they will pay for their own education within five to six years, the investment that we put out. That is a very, very modest investment for the returns we will get. That way we should be able to work into some kind of an agreement to make sure that we continue adequate care, adequate services to some of the remote communities.

A lot of individuals, Mr. Speaker, that I have run across and spoke to, they are really intrigued when I mention the fact that I am from the North. They have so many questions, you know, like what is it like up in the North? What is it like when you see a dog team go by? What is it like when you see a caribou herd? What is like when you see seals? I have to tell you it is an experience that I wish every Member in this House could experience at least once in their lifetime. -(interjection)- I would be glad to, if you are going and if I am going, I would be glad to accompany you. I could guide you and show you some scenes and some experiences that you will

never experience. That is only in Point Douglas. If I took them up north to Churchill—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hickes: —that would be a totally different experience.

Mr. Speaker: I am interrupting the Honourable Member according to the rules. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have one minute remaining.

The hour being 6 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, November 8, 1990

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Tabling of Reports

Supplementary Information
Culture, Heritage and Recreation
Mitchelson 935

Supplementary Information
Community Support Programs
Mitchelson 935

Ministerial Statements

Institute for Sustainable Development
Federal Contribution
Filmon 935

Oral Question Period

ACRE Group Proposal
Doer; Filmon 937

Manitoba Hazardous Waste Corporation
Doer; Filmon 937

Acting Minister of Culture
Cerilli; Filmon 938

Manitoba Intercultural Council
Cerilli; Filmon; Mitchelson 938

Minister of Energy and Mines
Carstairs; Filmon 939

Winnipeg Police Department
Hickes; Filmon 940

MPIC Investment
Maloway; Manness 941

Department of Finance
Maloway; Manness 941

National Energy Board
Carr; Neufeld 942

Emergency Measures Organization
Driedger 942

Multicultural Hiring
Santos; Filmon 943

Child and Family Services
Barrett; Gilleshammer; Alcock 944

Matter of Urgent Public Importance

Multicultural Community
Lamoureux; Manness; Ashton 945

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Matter of Grievance

Multicultural Community
Lamoureux; Santos 948

Concurrent Committees of Supply

Finance 959
Education and Training 963

PRIVATE MEMBERS'S BUSINESS

Debate on Second Readings

Bill 9 - Manitoba Intercultural Council
Amendment Act
Ashton 967

Proposed Resolutions

Res. 3 - Equivalency of Education and Work
Experience of Immigrants
Lamoureux; Derkach; Hickes 969