



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
(HANSARD)**

40 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XL No. 54 - 1:30 p.m., THURSDAY, MAY 30, 1991



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

LIB - Liberal; ND - New Democrat; PC - Progressive Conservative

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 30, 1991

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PRESENTING PETITIONS

Mr. Nell Gaudry (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of E. W. Wallace, M. Paterson, Molly Hollender and others requesting the Government of Manitoba to consider reinstating the indexing of the 55-Plus program.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review of the Department of Finance 1991-92.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 11—The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce and I move that Bill 11, The Residential Tenancies Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la location à usage d'habitation, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time, seconded by the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli).

Motion presented.

Mr. Martindale: The purpose of this amendment and this bill is to amend the new Residential Tenancies Act to prohibit excessive rent increases from being passed on to tenants. I have personally helped people to appeal increases of 20 percent, 30 percent and 35 percent.

At the current time, these rent pass-throughs are legal. My amendment would change it. They would still be legal, but it would limit the amount of rent increase that could be passed on in one year.

Motion agreed to.

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 Prairie View School, thirty Grades 6 to 9 students, and they are under the direction of Mr. Byron Loewen. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Mr. Speaker: I inadvertently did not see the honourable member for Burrows. Reverting back to Introduction of Bills.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for agreeing to revert back.

Bill 37—The Planning Amendment Act

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): I move, seconded by the member for Wellington (Ms. Barrett), that Bill 37, The Planning Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire, be introduced and that the same be now received and read a first time.

Motion presented.

* (1335)

Mr. Martindale: The purpose of this amendment to The Planning Act would be to protect the economic benefits of the Winnipeg International Airport. There is only one province in Canada now, and that is the province of Alberta, that has legislation protecting the vicinity of airports from development encroaching on them. We would like to have this similar kind of legislation in Manitoba. It is needed. It is needed at this time.

It has been requested by the Chamber of Commerce, requested by Winnipeg International Airport. My amendment to The Planning Act would accomplish the purpose that they want of protecting the economic benefits of Winnipeg International Airport.

Motion agreed to.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Goods and Services Tax Impact Cross-Border Shopping

Mr. Jerry Storie (FIn Flon): Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the Minister of Finance and the federal revenue minister held a press conference to talk about a number of issues, including the impact of the GST on cross-border shopping.

Given the fact that Manitoba has experienced a drain of some \$300 million in the last year in lost opportunity of Manitoba business as a result of cross-border shopping, given the fact that we learned only a few days ago that, from January to April, some 220 businesses, a new record for Manitoba, declared bankruptcy in the province of Manitoba, can the Minister of Finance tell us first whether he agrees with the revenue minister that the GST has had no impact on cross-border shopping?

Can the minister tell this House what this government is prepared to do to make sure that more businesses do not go bankrupt and more jobs are not lost as a result of cross-border shopping?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will quarrel with some of the member's preamble at another time.

I want to indicate to the members of the House that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism (Mr. Stefanson) and myself had a very productive meeting with Mr. Jelinek this morning as to whether the GST is the sole or the entire reason as to why cross-border shopping seems to be increasing at such a significant rate. Again, there will be another time to discuss that. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I was impressed in one sense that the federal government is trying to move in some areas, namely that they will be, I expect at least—they took kindly to the representation made by this government—looking at service lanes.

I understand that there may be an announcement made later on this afternoon from the federal minister as to how certain lanes will be configured so as to allow Manitobans returning easier entry into the nation. Secondly, I understand that the federal government is going to be employing some additional staff which will, of course, again make the turnaround time shorter.

I am also told that the federal government is going to initiate an awareness program directed towards "buy Canada." That now is not meant to deny the

opportunities to Canadians to shop where they wish, but it is going to point out the values still in buying in Canada and also some of the warranties that are foregone when one buys goods particularly in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very complex problem. It has built up over a period of years. I know governments everywhere, federally and provincially, realize that some solution has to be found very quickly.

* (1340)

Crown Corporations Purchasing Policy

Mr. Jerry Storie (FIn Flon): Mr. Speaker, to many Manitobans, this is going to be viewed as a rather inept way of undoing the free trade deal.

I want to also ask the minister about the new access lanes, easy access, and whether that is just going to make it easier for Manitoba Hydro or the Department of Natural Resources to get down to North Dakota to do business. I hope that is not the intention. The fact of the matter is that the awareness program and the "buy Canadian" program clearly are not going to solve the problem.

I want to know whether this minister, in conjunction with the minister responsible for Crown corporations, will be instructing Manitoba Crown corporations like MPIC, which is purchasing materials across the border, Manitoba Hydro, other government agencies and government-funded agencies to get involved in a "buy Manitoba" program to protect the thousands of businesses that are in jeopardy today and the thousands of jobs that are in jeopardy as well?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, let us face it, I am glad the member finally realizes that we are on the verge if not in the midst of a tax revolt in this province. Most of that problem could be laid at the feet of the members opposite. I am choosing not to engage myself in that type of discussion right now.

For the member to say we should invoke a policy on the provincial Crowns, that they should do business in some certain fashion, would flee exactly opposite to our view that there should be open borders as between provinces and that there should not be preferential buying in a Manitoba context. This nation has enough troubles. Certainly, heaping upon that the fact that we should all build

borders within the nation as to trade, as to purchasing powers, particularly from a government or a Crown position, only makes that matter worse.

What the member is asking, Mr. Speaker, I say to him he should dig deeply into his mind and fully understand the impacts of what he is asking, because I say to him that obviously he has not thought fully his position.

Mr. Storle: It is more than a little ironic that this comes from the Minister of Finance who in effect supported the GST.

Budget Deficit Forecast

Mr. Jerry Storle (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, today Stats Canada released its daily statistics bulletin which indicates that Manitoba is the only province in the country which has lost employees, employment in the last three consecutive years, not perhaps just coincidentally since this government took office.

This government has had to add \$30 million to its welfare budget. Bankruptcies are skyrocketing. Can the Minister of Finance perhaps now indicate to this House whether he will be adjusting the deficit position of the Province of Manitoba in his next statement?

Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the budgetary numbers forecast within my last budget stand today. We took into account exactly where we were in recessionary times. We have taken into account the reality of agriculture, because indeed it has a tremendous impact as to the revenues flowing into this province.

I say to the member opposite, the forecasts that we have applied to all the sectors within the economy stand as they are today. The early indications as to revenues coming in within the various tax fields are on a par with the forecasts that we made during the release of the budget.

* (1345)

Northern Flood Agreement Trust Fund

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Residents of the community of Nelson House and many Manitobans were, I am sure, quite shocked to see the revelations that as much as \$1 million in Northern Flood Agreement payments to Nelson House has apparently been diverted to two individuals,

including a former chief, money that was supposed to go to residents of those communities for the effects of flooding, money that did not reach them.

My question to the minister responsible for the Northern Flood Agreement is how that money ended up not being held in trust as was the original agreement and how this \$1 million has apparently been siphoned off away from residents of that community of Nelson House?

Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the member should be well aware of the fact that the monies that were expended on behalf of the Northern Flood Agreement were expended by Manitoba Hydro. The understanding, as I have it, is that the monies were to go in trust and that was, I understand, supposed to be done by agreement. Further to that, the minister of Hydro may have some further information that may be helpful.

Northern Flood Agreement Trust Fund Audit

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Indeed then, I will refer my second question to the minister and ask not only why the funds were not held in trust but also whether the minister would be willing to provide assistance, provide funds, so that the band can continue the audit, an audit that currently has only taken place in terms of the 1989 year, and look at concerns of the band council and residents of Nelson House where perhaps even more money may have been siphoned away from members of that community?

Will the minister provide those assurances to the Nelson House Band?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act): Mr. Speaker, we must first of all recognize that the agreement entered into by Manitoba Hydro with the Nelson House Band called for a settlement of some \$7.6 million. The payments were made conditional upon \$4.2 million paid to the lawyer for the band, in trust, with conditions of trust attached. The trustees of the trust were the Nelson House Band Council.

Three million dollars was paid to the Government of Canada in trust as Indian monies to be returned to the band as the Government of Canada saw fit. Four hundred thousand dollars that is remaining of the \$7.6 million was deducted from monies that had been advanced previously.

I have to again say that the monies were paid under the terms of an agreement that was agreed to by the arbitrator, and Manitoba Hydro paid those monies in exactly the terms and conditions that was agreed upon by the band and by Manitoba Hydro.

Consultant/Lawyer Fees

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): A further question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister.

We have also seen a significant amount of money from the Northern Flood Agreement in terms of payments go to consultants, lawyers, et cetera. In fact, in this particular case, there have been concerns expressed about the amount that has gone to various consultants and lawyers, including a political associate of the former chief, Jean Chretien.

I would like to ask the Minister of Energy and Mines how much money, in terms of Northern Flood Agreement settlements, has also been diverted to lawyers and consultants?

Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister responsible for The Manitoba Hydro Act): Mr. Speaker, any monies paid to lawyers and consultants by the bands would not be privy to the government of Manitoba. The bands will pay that money. I am as disgusted as he may be with the numbers of dollars that are paid to consultants and lawyers that should be going to the residents of the bands.

We are not privy to that information, Mr. Speaker, and if he is asking how much the government of Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro has paid to consultants, I can get that information for him, but I cannot get information with respect to the monies that are paid by the bands to their consultants and to their lawyers.

Labour Adjustment Strategy Government Initiatives

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have had the announcement of 18,000 full-time jobs lost in the province of Manitoba over the past year. It shows that we do not have an economic strategy in the province of Manitoba. We have nothing to deal with labour adjustment in any substantive way in the province of Manitoba.

My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell this House why, over the last two budgets, his government has chosen to actually reduce the

amount of monies available for worker retraining in the province of Manitoba?

* (1350)

Hon. Gary Fillmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the member for River Heights, of course, has raised the issue which is that we are in the midst of a national recession, a national recession that is affecting provinces right across the country, so much so that, during that period of time that she talks about 18,000 job losses in Manitoba, the number is in excess of 220,000 in the province of Ontario, led by formerly Liberal and now New Democratic administrations who presumably have no industrial strategy for that province.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it has little to do with an industrial strategy. It has much to do with the fact that most of the pressures are national/international on the economy. We, in Manitoba, in particular, if she reads any analysis, are also being hard hit by the low prices to our agriculture producers, primarily as a result of an international grain trade war with subsidies in huge measure being put on exports by the EC and United States, all of these factors, including the terribly damaging high interest rate policy that was followed for far too long by the federal administration and the fact that our dollar continues to be high in relation to the U.S. dollar proportionate to its value.

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, have been problems. Despite that, of course, in the first two years of the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, our exports to the United States have increased by some 12 percent. We have fared relatively well in that. We, too, are seeing some changes with respect to some areas of the economy that continue to show promise for future growth, health care industries, that we are concentrating on, aerospace, food processing, computers and other areas.

Under those circumstances, we are targeting areas that we believe will show future growth. We are also indicating that we are prepared to support, where it is necessary, needs of people. We signed, this administration signed, the program for older worker adjustment and a few other areas that have been there for the support of workers who need it.

Labour Adjustment Strategy Government Initiatives

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition): The Premier refuses to address the

most critical issue, which is the need for labour adjustment strategies, the need to retrain workers who find themselves, because of the recession, because of the free trade agreement, out of work.

Can the First Minister tell the House why his government does not believe that an investment in people meets the needs of those people by making them skilled in new opportunities?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Indeed, if the Leader of the third party has been watching what has been happening with regard to training, she will know very well that in the embarking on the program for Workforce 2000 is indeed bringing in to provide training for people who may be laid off or whose skills may be required to be upgraded brings in the business sector, the manufacturing sector, to invest in training.

Last night I attended the annual banquet of the Association of Canadian Community College instructors. The guest speaker at that dinner was the Honourable Mr. Valcourt, who indicated that in Canada our business community is not contributing as much to training as it should be, and indeed we need to embark on programs on partnerships to encourage more participation by our business sector and our manufacturing sector.

Workforce 2000 is but one program that brings into partnership the business community so that the government does not produce the training by itself, but indeed we bring together the partners in business and labour, partners from manufacturing to ensure that we provide a skilled work force for this province.

Mrs. Carstairs: It is not going to come to much of a surprise to the public to know that the ministers have a lot of gall, but there is no more greater gall than the Minister of Education and Training going to a dinner for the community college instructors when he has just decimated the community college system in the province of Manitoba.

Can the Minister of Education tell this House today how many fewer students, how many fewer people who have lost their jobs will be educated in the province of Manitoba as a result of the fact this government has no labour adjustment strategy and they have cut our community college system?

* (1355)

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I find the member's comments very curious, because yesterday she

stood in this House and condemned the move to college governance in this province.

Last night when I announced to the Association of Canadian Community Colleges that this province was moving to college governance, indeed there was an ovation for the fact that this province was moving into the '90s. There was an applause for that particular initiative, because we are joining the many other provinces who have already made that move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to training in this province, I would indicate to the member that we have refocused and reshaped some of the direction that our colleges are going, something that has been overdue for some time.

I must also indicate that we will be implementing four new programs at the Red River Community College, which will be targeted towards areas where there are specific skill shortages, such as the aerospace industry. We will do more as we move through the '90s.

Pines Project Funding Cancellation

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of this province has tried to create a false impression, since a month ago, that everyone in the community of St. James is behind Rotary Pines. Further evidence that impression is false was provided at a meeting last night, which I attended and addressed, of 75 people who unanimously are opposed to Rotary Pines and voted to hire legal counsel. Concern was expressed about the location and the 17,000 flights a year over the Rotary Pines site, as well as protecting the economic benefits of Winnipeg International Airport.

Will the Minister of Housing either stop funding for Rotary Pines or explore other locations in St. James, as was suggested last night at the meeting?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, we will be, later today I believe or perhaps on Monday, going into the Estimates of the Department of Housing. I would be pleased to discuss these issues with the honourable member in great deal at that time.

Mr. Martindale: The people from St. James are watching and they want an answer today, not on Monday.

Winnipeg Waterways Riverbank Protection

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Will the Minister of Housing stop Rotary Pines and commit his government to protecting Winnipeg riverbanks since, as retired judge Ian Dubiensi said, we are the only city in western Canada which does not protect our riverbanks?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the government of Manitoba advanced to the City of Winnipeg, about a year and a half ago, a proposal for a riverfront corporation. At that time, we put forward capital dollars to assist in developing riverbank strategies for the city of Winnipeg and the surrounding environments.

The City of Winnipeg chose not to participate in that particular situation, so in terms of riverbank protection, the government of Manitoba is certainly interested and, while being rebuffed in the first instance, is now seeking different alternatives that may find some interest with the City of Winnipeg.

Winnipeg International Airport Protection

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): When the general manager of Winnipeg International Airport meets with the Premier or the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), what commitments will the Premier make to protecting the economic benefits of the airport and therefore not allow Rotary Pines to proceed?

* (1400)

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I remind the member, lest he forget, that proposal of which he speaks was approved after extensive public hearings carried out by the City of Winnipeg. They properly zoned the land for the proposal. It was backed by the Rotary Club that has more members than the attendance he spoke of at the event last evening. It was backed by the St. James Chamber of Commerce and obviously by the 104 people who put deposits down on their units.

The fact is, this administration has also contacted the City of Winnipeg to urge it to bring about planning by-laws and planning amendments for the future to protect the airport of the city of Winnipeg. This administration has worked with the general manager of the Winnipeg Airport and various people within the business community to ensure that we attracted industry that would use the airport, that

would use it as a focal point for future development. We are confident that there are some proposals and some projects, and some of it was referred to in an article in today's paper that may indeed welcome here because of the work that this administration has done on behalf of the airport.

Ducks Unlimited Headquarters Proposal Review

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, through the freedom of information procedure, we have obtained a copy of the Ducks Unlimited proposal for Oak Hammock Marsh. After reviewing the proposal, I can understand why the government did not want opponents to the project to have access to it.

The corporate office on the wildlife management area side, this plan makes it very apparent that this project has nothing to do with environmental education. It has nothing to do with natural interpretive centres. This project is a tourist trap, Mr. Speaker. It is Disneyland. It will dramatically change the marsh while it gives management of the marsh over to Ducks Unlimited. The plan also contradicts—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the honourable member for Radisson to put her question now, please.

Ms. Cerilli: The problem is that the plan contradicts a plan by the current management of the marsh.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Was this proposal reviewed by the authorities outlined in Kent Whaley's plan, which was to outline management of the marsh up to 1994?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, we are currently in second reading of Bill 38. It is my hope that bill will move onto committee stage, which is rather unique to our practice and tradition in Manitoba, where we invite members of the public, opponents, and people who feel otherwise, to make recommendations, to make suggestions and make presentations to us. I would urge the honourable member to allow Bill 38 to proceed to committee, at which time that exercise will take place, that very traditional exercise, democracy, that we enjoy in Manitoba, and those answers that she puts forward will have ample opportunity to be answered.

Ms. Cerilli: That bill is another example of the extent that this government is going to push this project through.

Ducks Unlimited Headquarters Sustainable Development Policy

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): I would like to ask the Minister of Environment if he thinks that the proposal for this project is in keeping with the principles of sustainable development, since—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member's question seeks an opinion and is therefore out of order. I would ask the honourable member for Radisson to rephrase her question, please.

Ms. Cerilli: Is it in line with this government's policy to have this project go ahead when it is obvious that it is not in keeping with principles of sustainable development?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, as we have indicated several times in this Legislature, we went through rather extensive public forum in front of the Clean Environment Commission. In reviewing the proposal, all of the environmental concerns could be answered or mitigated, and therefore, we are satisfied that environmental concerns are answered.

Ducks Unlimited Headquarters Funding Reallocation

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Opposition to this project is continuing to grow, since today there was a demonstration at the Ducks Unlimited building, and I am willing to pass a petition to the Minister of Natural Resources, which has some more 300 names on it in opposition to the project.

Will this government now reverse this decision and reallocate the millions of dollars that it is putting into this project?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, firstly, I am sure the honourable member would not want to put false and misleading information on the record. This government is not putting millions of dollars into the project. This project is putting a one-time \$250,000 grant towards this project. The proponents of the project are furthermore agreeing to take and assume full responsibility for the upwards of \$200,000 that my department annually spends in

the interpretive services at Oak Hammock and has spent over the last number of years.

In effect, there is a net savings to the public, with an enhanced interpretive program being offered to the many thousands of Manitobans, many of them school children, who enjoy coming out for an outdoor and environmental experience.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no question that this government views this development with enthusiasm, and we have every intention of carrying it out.

Core Area Initiative Government Policy

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Last night, the City of Winnipeg Council overwhelmingly endorsed a resolution calling for the renewal of the Core Area Agreement, thereby giving the commitment of at least one government of the tripartite arrangement to commit itself to the renewal of the inner city of Winnipeg.

Can the Minister of Urban Affairs tell us what the policy of his government is?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to the honourable member on a number of occasions previously, we are, in fact, in discussions with our federal counterpart to determine how and under what circumstances and at what funding levels we can enter into another agreement to address the concerns of the inner city of Winnipeg.

Whether that will be a Core Area Agreement as we have experienced for the past 10 years or not, Mr. Speaker, is in question, because the federal government does not wish to pursue that particular form of agreement. They have indicated that they are prepared to prioritize funding from within their existing resources to target into inner-city problems.

We are pursuing that avenue at the present time, and when we have come to some conclusions in that regard, I would be happy to inform my honourable friend.

Office Wind-Up

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, since the Government of Canada and the government of Manitoba are not prepared to give commitment to a renewal of the Core, would the minister tell us what the process is for winding down

the Core operation? Have the employees been given notice of termination of their contracts? When will the lights go out in the Core office in downtown Winnipeg?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I explained to my honourable friend the other day in Urban Affairs Estimates to the exact same question he is asking today, the fact of the matter is that the Core office is in a wind-down phase, that the general manager of the Core Agreement has set out his schedule of winding down of the office operations.

While the office operations are in a wind-down phase, the delivery of programs is accomplished 75 percent or 80 percent by the three levels of government, not by the Core office. The functioning of programs, the continuation of existing programs and indeed, Mr. Speaker, ultimately the allocation of some of the remaining monies will, in fact, be continued to be delivered by those people who have been delivering them for the last 10 years.

Renewal

Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, we have had 10 years of co-operation between all three levels of government to revitalize the city of Winnipeg. Now, the Minister of Urban Affairs of the government of Manitoba told us that employees are on notice, the Core office will be shut down by May of 1992 without so much of a hint of a commitment from this government.

Will he save a model of intergovernmental co-operation in North America and save the Core Area Agreement?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Urban Affairs): To have a third Core Area Agreement, Mr. Speaker, requires three partners. We are in the process of negotiation with the third partner, if you will, in order to determine exactly how, given the scarce resources of all levels of government in Manitoba, we can best meet the current urgent needs and those needs priorities of the inner city.

We are in those discussions at the moment, and let not the member suggest anything other than the fact that we are looking and pursuing with great vigour the ultimate conclusion that will see those needs met.

Education System Market-Driven Programs

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education and Training.

I am glad the minister got applause yesterday because he will not get applause from the 52,000 unemployed people in Manitoba. He will not get applause from the thousands of high school students who have had their high school bursaries cut off, and he will not get applause from the hundreds of students who have been affected by the cutbacks in the community colleges.

My question to the minister is: Why is this government blindly following the lead of the federal government in its privatized, market-driven training programs and not catering to the needs of the presently unemployed, the aboriginal people, the inner-city people and all others affected by this devastating unemployment rate?

* (1410)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I would congratulate the member for Kildonan for wrestling back his portfolio of critic for Education from the member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie). Unfortunately, the member has not improved his awareness of what is really happening in the province and, indeed, in Canada as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, we are indeed delivering training and educational programs that are designed to meet the market needs of tomorrow and for students who are going to be graduating into a global society which is going to be a very competitive one.

For that reason, we have embarked on some very new initiatives with regard to training and post-secondary education in this province, programs such as the new programs which were announced for the Portage area with regard to the aerospace industry and five new programs at Red River Community College which will be developed; in addition, six new programs at the Thompson campus which will be delivered next year—all of those programs designed to ensure that the youth of this province, the people of this province are going to be able to get an education which will lead them toward skilled jobs for long-term—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Chomlak: They have also transferred hundreds of programs from Thompson to Winnipeg and other places.

Labour Adjustment Strategy Government Initiatives

Mr. Dave Chomlak (Kildonan): Can the minister specifically outline for us today what his department is going to do to the 18,000 new employed year over year in this province as a result of actions of this government? What specifically are they going to do for these people who are unemployed, the 18,000 new unemployed?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): The member has some confusion as to whether they are employed or unemployed, Mr. Speaker. Let me assure the member that, when the analysis has been done, we have known in this province that we have a shortage of some 3,000 workers in the aerospace industry over the next ten years. For that reason, we are addressing that need by ensuring that we have training programs for individuals in that area.

We are addressing the needs of Manitobans as best we can, but let me assure the member that, if we did not have to pay the \$550 million of interest costs incurred by the former administration, we could do a great deal more for Manitobans in terms of training and retraining programs.

Mr. Chomlak: My final supplementary to the same minister.

I am wondering if the minister has a response to the over 200 students on the waiting list at Red River Community College ESL program, who have nothing to go to and who will not be able to find jobs because they cannot learn the English language. How about the 60 students who are lining up waiting for careers at the Selkirk psychiatric nursing hospital? What will the minister tell these people today, specifically? What can they do to get jobs in this province?

Mr. Derkach: Mr. Speaker, I will tell the students that, indeed, the waiting lists are not new and that we are moving toward ensuring that the programs that are developed will lead to long-term jobs and stable jobs, not like the programs that were developed by the New Democrats, where they spent \$41 million and got 34 journeymen out of the program. Those are not the training programs that we will embark on.

Department of Housing Dauphin Branch Closure

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Housing.

The minister, some three months ago, announced the dismantling of the housing authorities throughout the province of Manitoba and threw many people out of work, who worked for the housing authorities in many communities, contrary to the spirit of decentralization that his government talked about so enthusiastically before the last election.

I ask the Minister of Housing if it is his intention that Dauphin will also lose, not only its housing authority, but also the Department of Housing branch in the community of Dauphin as a result of these changes?

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, nobody has lost their job as a result of the changes that were made on February 27 with the disbandment of the 98 existing housing authorities. Those employees are all still in place.

The plan for the Manitoba Housing Authority is in progress and was not anticipated and still is not anticipated to be in place until this fall some time. In terms of that program, it is still on track. It is anticipated that there will be regional offices throughout rural Manitoba to deal with those issues and that those offices will be appropriately staffed utilizing, where possible, experienced personnel. We are still in the formative stages of the Manitoba Housing Authority, and it is proceeding on track.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the question. I want to ask it another way.

How can he justify closing the Dauphin housing office, in addition to the fact that 11 employees have lost their jobs at the correctional institute in Dauphin as a result of this budget, in addition to closures and cuts in the Natural Resources department, in the Highways department and the cancellation of the Vital Statistics office under decentralization that this government has talked about?

How can he justify closing the Dauphin office in the Department of Housing, as well?

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has indicated a number of times, the legacy of debt left by the NDP in this province has left the government of the day in a current financial difficulty. We had to do some

downsizing within the Department of Housing, as did other departments in this government.

The Manitoba Housing Authority, the ultimate manager of the public housing stock will, in fact, be located in an office within the Parkland region to deal with the people in that area. It will be staffed by people from the Parkland region, I suspect, in the most part and will be able to deal effectively with the housing stock in that particular area.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, the legacy of debt is no different than it was before the election nor after the election. The minister cannot use that excuse.

Regional Housing Authorities Dauphin Office

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): I ask, Mr. —(interjection)— That is right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The honourable member for Dauphin, kindly put your question now, please.

Mr. Plohman: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that CKDM has reported this morning that the community of Roblin is applying for this regional office of the Housing Authority, I ask this Minister of Housing whether he will ensure that, in light of the cuts that have been made to the community of Dauphin by this budget and this government, at least a regional office of the new housing corporation will be located in Dauphin as the major community in the Parkland region?

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

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, firstly, let me say I am pleased that the honourable member for Dauphin has for the first time acknowledged the debt legacy of the NDP—for the first time in this House. I might also tell the honourable member for Dauphin that the honourable member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), his colleague, also has written to me asking that the regional housing office be located in Swan River.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

Introduction of Guests

Mr. Speaker: Prior to recognizing the honourable government House leader, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to the gallery

where we have with us this afternoon from the J. R. Walkof Elementary School, fifty Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Mr. Garry Bueckert. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

On behalf of all honourable members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

House Business

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, before I move the motion to go into Committee of Supply, I would just like to indicate that we expect to be completing the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs and that the committee outside of the Chamber will be considering the Department of Seniors.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), 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.

Nonpolitical Statements

Mr. Speaker: Prior to putting the question of the honourable Minister, I recognize the honourable member for Point Douglas.

Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas): May I have leave to make a nonpolitical statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the honourable member for Point Douglas have leave to make a nonpolitical statement? Leave? That is agreed.

Point of Order

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Today I intend to grieve, and the motion has been moved. I want to make sure that it is clear that I will have my grievance after the member for Point Douglas has been given—

* (1420)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have not put the question to the House yet as proposed by the honourable government House leader. We have granted leave to the honourable member for Point Douglas to make a nonpolitical statement, after which time I will recognize the honourable member for Inkster.

* * *

Mr. Hickes: Today marks the 25th anniversary of the Winnipeg Adult Education Centre. The centre opened its doors in 1966 in what is now Point Douglas School. Over the years, the school has graduated thousands of adult students and given them the academic tools to improve their lives.

The school is located in an area of great need, Mr. Speaker. There are aboriginal people, new immigrants, single-parent families and others who do not always have access to educational opportunities. Whether adults have attended the school to learn English or to receive a high school education, there are many success stories. Graduates have acquired the skills necessary to get themselves out of the cycle of poverty which plague so many in the area. For others, they have the opportunity for post-secondary education, an opportunity that would not be available without the centre.

Just last year, 91 graduates of the centre went on to university and 83 were enrolled at Red River Community College. I would also take this opportunity to commend the dedication of the teaching staff over the years.

The Winnipeg Adult Education Centre has performed a vital service to the residents of Winnipeg's inner city. I congratulate it on its 25th anniversary, and I wish it many more years as a school of second choice. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved by the honourable government House leader (Mr. Manness), seconded by the honourable Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MATTERS OF GRIEVANCE

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity as accorded to us under the rules to grieve. I would like to express some concerns that I have, that I feel that the government has not been addressing. Those concerns can really be put into two parts, and I want to express them in those two parts.

The primary concern that I have is an issue that has been before us now for the past week and that is, of course, the immigration consultants. We, in the opposition and particularly the Liberal Party,

have been calling for an independent investigation into the whole matter. We feel that, in fact, is what is needed. There is exploitation that is occurring, not only in the province of Manitoba but all across Canada. The provincial government has a role to play in ensuring that exploitation is minimized.

I would like to say right from the beginning that this is not a new problem. This is a problem that has been going on for a number of years. It is not a problem that sticks with a political party. This problem has been here through NDP administrations, Liberal administrations, Conservative administrations, but what is different is what the political parties in office at the time are doing. Their actions, I will argue, speak louder than words.

I would like to refer to a study that was done by the then Minister of Employment and Immigration, the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, back in April of 1981, just to highlight the fact that this is not a new concern. I want just to read the very first paragraph where it cites specific cases that we have brought to light. Newer cases, or through the I-Team report, have been brought to light, once again bringing to the surface how serious this problem really is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from it where it gives a bit of a background: On a number of occasions over the past year, newspaper reports have referred to incidents of unscrupulous immigration consultants taking advantage of gullible immigrants. The following incidents were described: the payment of a \$14,000 fee by two sisters after a promise to bring their third sister to Canada; the payment of a \$1,000 fee for representation of a useless nature before the Immigration Appeal Board; the payment of large sums of money to consultants on the understanding that they would be used to bribe immigration officers and police; the payment of a \$1,000 fee for scandalous advice in relation to the applications of refugee status.

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

Madam Deputy Speaker, these are some of the concerns that were brought up back in 1981. If you follow what has been happening with immigration consultants from that point to today and ultimately tomorrow—because neither this government nor the federal counterpart are willing to address the issue—immigration consultants are allowed to do as

they please. I believe that this is to the detriment of Canada's image.

Many immigrants want to immigrate to Canada and will do whatever is necessary in order to try and gain entry to our country. That leaves them somewhat susceptible to people who would take advantage of these would-be immigrants or, in fact, immigrants who are here now.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I had an opportunity to take a trip earlier this year which I had paid for myself—which should be noted—and I had talked to a family which was involved with an immigration consultant. The things that came out of that discussion or that family meeting, if you will, disturbed me.

I was shown and given a copy of a list in which people charge so much money for certain types of work done on their behalf and that list varied. I will give you a couple of examples. If someone wanted to come under one program, let us say the domestics program, they would charge a set fee. That set fee could be from \$5,000 to \$10,000. If someone wanted to come under a working visa, once again there would be a different fee for that particular program. They had brought up a concern to me that that was happening in Winnipeg, and that made it especially interesting.

When I came back to Winnipeg, I did have a meeting with the RCMP regarding some of the information I had heard. Madam Deputy Speaker, the RCMP told me at the time that they were investigating a case in which this particular individual's family was involved. They had asked me not to raise the issue, to be quiet on the issue because they were concerned that if the issue was raised, in fact, what would happen is doors would slam shut. It would limit the investigative capacity of the RCMP. Out of respect for not wanting to limit what was going on with the RCMP investigation—something that they have put in, what I was told, over a year and a half—I had decided, along with my colleague the member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema) to not raise the issue at least until the RCMP had indicated to us that it was safe for us to bring the issue to light.

Since the I-Team report, the issue has been brought to light. We did talk to the RCMP office, and the RCMP office did say there was no sense in myself holding back anything; that, in fact, I could feel free to bring the issue to whomever I felt it was

necessary to bring it to. That is when we brought it to the Chamber.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to cite a specific case that actually has taken place. The I-Team is well aware of this because I believe that they had used this individual in their report. What had happened is this individual who had lived abroad was told that if he came to Canada, in fact, he would have a job working at the Max restaurant which would be preparing food.

* (1430)

This particular would-be immigrant was told that the job would be there. It would be waiting for him; that, in fact, it was shown in no unclear terms that this particular individual had contacts within Immigration who were friends with the government, and there were going to be no problems.

The individual came to Canada, in particular to Winnipeg, and upon arriving at the airport was told that the job was not there; that, in fact, this particular restaurant does not exist. Madam Deputy Speaker, the individual came here feeling that he was going to be given that job. He ultimately ended up pumping gas at a gas station in the city of Winnipeg, and after a while, Immigration had served him deportation papers.

Not wanting to go into too much detail of the investigation, this individual came here, felt that he had a job, that he had done everything legally, that it was legitimate as far as he was concerned, and what ended up happening is, he was served deportation papers for not doing the work that was said on the immigration papers.

Madam Deputy Speaker, this individual then went to the RCMP and some other community leaders. What has resulted is the laying of charges on a certain individual or potentially, I should correct myself, the alleged laying of charges on one individual and the potential of additional charges being laid.

This individual plays a very pivotal role in what might be happening in this whole court or what could be a court process if in fact charges are laid. I have not heard—and it is not from a lack of trying—the other side if you will, and it is not, as I say, that I am not interested in trying to find out what the other side is. I am interested in finding out what the other side is and, ultimately, we will find out exactly what has gone on.

Madam Deputy Speaker, what is going to happen is this individual is still facing a deportation and what ultimately could end up happening is that this individual will be deported.

Some Honourable Members: Highly speculative.

Mr. Lamoureux: Highly speculative, but I am saying that I have talked to this individual and this individual is very concerned about it and justifiably so. The reason why he is so very concerned about it is because he feels that he has done nothing wrong; that, in fact, he came to Canada believing he was going to be working for this restaurant; that it was legitimate.

Through no fault of his own he ends up not working for this restaurant because it never existed and ended up getting a different job. Now that it is up for investigation and there could be a court case and this individual would be a very valuable witness, after the court case we could see this individual being deported.

Madam Deputy Speaker, it concerns me and I hope that the government will be equally concerned in ensuring that consideration be given to this individual. We know that the Minister of Immigration gives out a relatively large number of permits. I believe this is one of the cases that does need to be reviewed, primarily because we have that individual who came here under those circumstances. This individual could prove to be very valuable in trying to highlight the concerns of immigration consultants and some of the problems that we have here.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I wanted to comment on immigration consultants and why we have people who actually use these people. Because in most part of a shared language or cultural background, many would-be immigrants or immigrants will use these immigration consultants because they feel very comfortable, and they can establish a sense of trust especially if it is portrayed that the individual has a great deal of competence in the area of immigration law and procedures.

There is a belief that by doing so that they will have a better chance than others in many cases. Some will say that it will give them that extra inside track, the preparing of the documents, being better able to make presentations and so forth. Those are two reasons that people will go to an immigration consultant. The third reason that I believe that they go to immigration consultants concerns me. That is, it is sometimes believed by many that there is

corruption. Whether it is because they perceive that corruption here or if they perceive that corruption back from their original homeland, there is in some communities a perception that there is some type of corruption, that bribery of some sort can help in facilitating a loved one or potential sponsor to being able to come to Canada.

It is very hard to combat that perception. We inside this Chamber like to believe that, in fact, does not exist. At times we are given reasons to believe that there is some concern in terms of the latter when some immigrants or potential immigrants feel by paying such and such an amount of money that they might be able to get that extra push through by avoiding what would be regular procedures. That is really what concerns us most.

Madam Deputy Speaker, we are concerned about immigration consultants; in short, because anyone can become an immigration consultant, and they can advertise if they want. There is nothing really preventing them from doing that. They do not have to be familiar with the laws and the procedures of immigration. Nothing prevents them from putting a clip inside a newspaper or whatever it might be.

We are concerned when we hear about the high fees for what is perceived, I guess, as a relatively simple service, or even in some cases, what could potentially be a free service. It is very hard to define to a certain degree, Madam Deputy Speaker, a simple service or a free service or a high fee. Really, it would be a very hard thing to regulate, but it is something that does need to be addressed.

* (1440)

We have the federal government and its immigration that has certain fees for certain things. One has to wonder if something can be done in terms of establishing that fee structure so that people who use immigrant consultants—no doubt there are just as many, if not more, immigrant consultants who are first-class individuals who take a lot of pride in what they do and will go to bat. We are most concerned in terms of misrepresentation or any type of fraud. Some might imply this. I know in one family that I had talked to, there were indications that if you want to come to Canada, these are the types of things that you need to say or you should be saying and, as I say, that really concerns us.

We need to understand what I have really tried to point out fully so that, in fact, the province can

actually do something. That is why it is more important that we do have an independent study, so that we can get a better understanding of the whole picture because the Civil Service investigation and the RCMP investigation are limited in terms of what they can do, whereas if we were to enact an independent investigation and give it broader ranges, we might be able to come up with a better understanding of just how serious this issue is.

Madam Deputy Speaker, one should ask, what can the province do following what could be an independent public inquiry? Well, one could think, through the departments and that task force that I had mentioned earlier, a couple of days ago, it implies in the task force report that the province has some jurisdiction over the licensing. I do not think we should be brushing over that too quickly.

I know the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) say they will be doing some follow-up on this issue. I would hope that they would act rather quickly on that, even though I have nothing to say or nothing to prove that they will not act quickly on it. I hope for those immigrants that, in fact, she does act on the remarks she has made out.

Anyone who wants to charge a fee for advertising immigrants or potential immigrants, with the possible exception of lawyers, could be required, for example, to have a licence of sorts or to be registered. There should be and there needs to be some type of standards. By doing this, we can have things such as annual renewals. There could be a thing of code of ethics. You could have something in the nature of conflict of interest guidelines. There can be a background checkup so if someone does have a criminal record in the past or anything of that nature, that before the licence is given out, we know who these individuals are.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I believe that there are many different people in all of the communities who deal, talk or give advice on immigration matters. The ones that concern myself more so are the ones that charge, and those are the ones where I believe there should be some type of licensing. I am not saying that we should ban them because I do believe they serve a very valuable role. Because there are exceptions, there needs to be something put in place to ensure that abuse or potential abuse of these would-be immigrants, or exploitation, is minimized.

If we did have a government that was willing to take the action that is necessary, well, then I believe that we can go a long way in trying to resolve this matter.

At the beginning I had said that there were two aspects that I wanted to touch upon in my grievance. The first one was in regard to the immigration consultants.

The second one is in regard to multiculturalism. The government's actions since it has come into office back in April of '88 is something that I believe is very lacking. We have seen the province, this government take, I believe, the wrong approach to multiculturalism. They talk about how committed they are to multiculturalism, but they do not, in fact, act in a way in which Manitoba's multicultural community would benefit.

I wanted to go over some of those actions that this government has taken. Just a short while ago inside the Estimates process, I had moved a line which would have seen MGAC lose its funding in hopes that this government would recognize the fact that funding through MGAC or funding multicultural groups through MGAC and not MIC is wrong. That was the issue that this government decided that they would go to the multicultural community. In fact, they issued a press release saying that Kevin Lamoureux and the Liberal Party opposed multicultural funding which was an outright—I hesitate to use the word "lie" so I will not use it straight out. The government shortly after that sent out another press release, saying that the government defeated the Liberal motion, that multicultural funding remains with MGAC. Well, I think the Conservatives were very proud of that fact.

* (1450)

Let me tell the government what the different ethnic communities think of the press releases in this particular case, and this government's attitude. When we have a real issue, what does the government do? The government does not do anything. They are not sending any literature out to say or to explain some of the problems. The government is not, I believe, doing what is necessary in order to get the right information out to the ethnic groups.

They are using those ethnic groups, and I wanted to point out just how this government has decided to use ethnic politics, multiculturalism as a way to garner votes.

We have a first with the establishment of MGAC, the political appointments to that board. We have the establishment of the Multicultural Secretariat's office, which I must say from the onset that the Multicultural Secretariat's office is something that is supported from the community, but the way in which this government has filled positions in the Multicultural Secretariat's office is all wrong because under no circumstances can the director, in my opinion, or the minister on the current director's behalf say that this individual was given—the member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) could not tell me that had it not been for the card, the political affiliation of the individual who was appointed to Multicultural Secretariat, if it was not for that card that individual would not have been appointed there.

This was an individual who ran for the Conservative Party, who now goes out to the different ethnic communities, who receives grants from the government to represent the government. I think when people are sitting back, many of the individuals who are sitting back realize just why this individual was appointed. It is not only at that level, we even have policy analysis. One of the positions, which was a political appointment, in which the government the minister has said would open up for open competition, that which still has not happened.

Madam Deputy Speaker, when this happens, I believe in the eyes of many the government is losing support on its multicultural policy because of some of the actions that they are taking. We hear about the Outreach Office—and it was advertised. I am glad to see that it was advertised. I can only hope that, in fact, the individual who is selected there will be done on a political manner, and I trust in fact that is what will happen.

The government has talks about a multicultural policy. We are still waiting for the multicultural act. Madam Deputy Speaker, I would ask if you could indicate to me when I have two minutes remaining? -(interjection)- Thank you.

These are the issues that come up time after time no matter where I go, and I do attend a few events around the province. I do talk to a number of different community leaders regarding multiculturalism and the direction that the province is taking on multiculturalism. The thing that comes up time after time is that this government is more interested in the vote getting of multiculturalism than multiculturalism as it actually should be.

We can cite examples of that time after time. We see what the government does when it comes to the political side of multiculturalism, and we see what the government does when it comes to the real issues. There is no lack of effort from this government when it comes to the political side, but when it comes to the real issues of multiculturalism such as combatting racism, such as employment equity, such as credentials recognition, that is where we see that this government is failing to act.

That is what offends so many individuals in the different ethnic groups because it is all nice for us to talk about multiculturalism, but what members have to realize and in particular what this government has to realize is that multiculturalism is a lot more than song and dance.

Multiculturalism in Manitoba should be based on social, political, economic, integration into society, and this is what the government should be placing as a first priority. Madam Deputy Speaker, that is what the Multicultural Secretariat's office should be putting its primary concern on. That is what the Outreach Office should be putting its primary concern on. That is what MIC does put their primary concern on, but what has the government done to ensure that those organizations have the ability to be able to further the cause of multiculturalism in the province of Manitoba?

Well, when it comes to MIC we see that they have taken the funding capabilities away from them, we see that they have cut the operational costs of MIC funding, we see that they leave them in leased facilities where they are charged over \$3,000 a month, which they just simply cannot afford. When the minister says, let them use up their reserve fund, once they have done that, then they can come back to government. The government does not want MIC.

In terms of the Multicultural Secretariat's office, Madam Deputy Speaker, how can the government say that their primary concern is to further the cause of multiculturalism, when they make the appointments rather than have applicants or leave it open for all individuals. I believe that there would have been many individuals. We saw that on the Outreach Office when the Minister of Immigration and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) put an advertisement into newspapers for the Outreach Office, there were 900 applicants. That is the same process that I would suggest to you that should have been used for the Multicultural Secretariat's office.

This way we would know that the government's primary concern for the Multicultural Secretariat's office is not politics, rather it is to further that multiculturalism which, as I say, includes that economic, social and political integration amongst the other things like preserving and enhancing the culture and heritage of all the different ethnic groups that make Canada what it is.

Madam Deputy Speaker, the Outreach Office—and the jury is still out on the Outreach Office. We are hoping that the Outreach Office is going to be announced in September, that the Outreach Office will be filled by nonpolitical appointments. The minister has indicated that, but I am still concerned for the simple reason she also indicated that the policy analyst individual would be renewed, the term position would be renewed once, possibly twice. Well, it has been renewed more than that now, and the excuse she uses is that she is waiting for the Outreach Office to be established.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, I see my time is, unfortunately, running out. I wanted to close on a letter that I had received from Lakeview Development, and it talks about immigration. As of April 15 more than 600 businesspeople in Hong Kong, Taiwan, the Philippines, Malaysia and Korea have invested in hotel projects developed by Lakeview in Canada. Each investor has applied for Canadian visas for themselves and their families under the investor immigration program. Imagine the impact on the local economy when 600 families, each with an average net worth of \$1.9 million, move to Canada.

Madam Deputy Speaker, let us not just look for immigrants who have the financial resources. Let us keep in mind that we are looking for immigrants for all reasons. Once we recognize that we want immigrations on compassionate, on family reasons, on working and on investments, then let us work on having a real multicultural policy that we have to stop giving lip service to multiculturalism, that we have to stop using multiculturalism in order to get votes, that actions speak louder than words.

* (1500)

The actions of this government, as of to date, have been towards politicizing the multicultural community, and that is a step in the wrong direction. We, in the Liberal Party, believe that you have to take the step in the other direction where we see political, social, economic integration, where we see

that heritage and culture are recognized and enhanced.

On that, Madam Deputy Speaker, I thank the Chamber for listening to what I had to say. Thank you.

* * *

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise under Rule 26.1(1) to use my right to express a grievance.

I would like to include two topics in my grievance today, one of personal concern, namely, the scandalous approval of the Rotary Pines project. Secondly, a matter of concern to my constituents in Burrows, namely, the lack of funding for Pritchard Place Drop-In Centre.

As members know from Question Period, I was at a very interesting meeting in St. James last night. I think a rather significant meeting, organized by people opposed to the Rotary Pines project. I think it was a good meeting, because it was well organized, and these people have many excellent ideas for trying to stop Rotary Pines on its present site.

It was also a significant and an interesting meeting, because they unanimously passed a motion to hire legal counsel to seek an injunction to stop Rotary Pines. I think if I was a former city councillor, especially one sitting in cabinet now, I would be quite concerned about an injunction and the possibility of being subpoenaed, having to go to court and having to testify about things that happened in the rezoning application. I am told by people who were there at the time that there were a number of irregularities in the rezoning application, and that if they go to court, there is a good chance that they are going to win and thereby stop the Rotary Pines.

An Honourable Member: What do you think the lawyer is going to tell you?

Mr. Martindale: The member asked what do I think the lawyer is going to tell us. Well, I do not know what the lawyer is going to tell me, and I am not going to be part of those meetings because I was not asked to be part of those meetings. Whoever they contact as legal counsel I think will be giving very good advice to that group from St. James.

I would like to go over some of the things that were said at the meeting last night to -(interjection)- the member for Ste. Rose should stick around. I

was—oops sorry, the member for Ste. Rose will be interested in some of my comments later on. I was going to refer to him.

The comments that were made at the meeting were very interesting and I would like to share them. It seems that since Rotary Pines was raised in the House, there seems to have been a gag order put on MHRC staff, and so they are less forthcoming with information now than they used to be. It used to be that you could phone them up and they would give you the kind of answers to questions that you wanted, but now they are saying, I am sorry, we cannot give you that information; you will have to use the access to information legislation.

A number of people said that there should be no commercial zoning on the river anywhere south of Portage Avenue in St. James. The people there are quite clear about their impression. They are saying that the Rotary Pines seniors project is a front for the strip mall, that it was the developer who started this. The developer wanted the strip mall, and he knew he would never get it. Even the councillors in St. James would not have agreed—including former members of City Council—to strictly a strip mall or strictly condominiums on the Red.

What did they do? Well, they said, here, we have this developer. He has this idea. Let us put it together with something else. Let us put it together with a Seniors RentalStart program and when the two are together, then we can get it through the community committee and we can get it through council. So a deal was struck. They put it together in the best possible way to get it through council and the only possible way to get it through council. It never would have flown if there had not been a seniors project on the site.

Many people at the meeting last night said there is a need for affordable housing for seniors in St. James. They were opposed to the kind of equity that people have to put up and said they could not afford it and their neighbours could not afford it, but there was a need for affordable seniors housing in St. James. We heard that over and over again.

Somebody said that the Rotary Pines is a fraud right from the start. They said that in 1988 councillors knew about it. It was a behind-closed-doors project. That is what people at the public meeting said last night. Someone said that the city of Winnipeg is one of the worst cities in terms of town planning. He described Rotary Pines

as a little bit immoral and a little bit criminal. I thought that summed it up quite well.

They said this is a great idea, this Seniors RentalStart. You get people to buy an apartment and then they pay rent on top of it. Sounds like a good deal if you are the guy who is selling it. They said this project is wrong. It is wrong for the people of St. James. If it goes in, then more commercial development will follow. In fact, the planner is on record as saying that if this goes ahead, then it will be extremely difficult, maybe even impossible, for City Council to say no to future commercial developments on the south side of Portage Avenue in St. James. The planner is concerned that it is going to set a precedent.

Someone said there is nothing decent about Rotary Pines. Several people talked about the noise effects, and there was someone there who is an expert on the effects of noise who said that there are more effects of noise than just on hearing. Excess of noise affects people's blood pressure; it affects their tolerance to noise.

I finally got some information that I have been looking for for quite a while and that is, what are the decibel levels? Well, on Portage Avenue the traffic alone is 75-80 decibels. The average aircraft noise is 99 decibels and an aircraft, I think a DC-9, going over the site, is 103 decibels.

Someone else said that this is a case of a senior cabinet minister playing catch-up with his friends. A very thoughtful person who was at the meeting, who has made numerous presentations to community committees and City Council on all riverbank developments in the city of Winnipeg because he is very concerned about protecting public access to riverbanks, happens to be a resident of Headingley. He said that riverbanks should belong to the people. There should be no change in the condition and no commercial development. He said he dreads the thought of Portage Avenue looking like Pembina Highway.

Well, Madam Deputy Speaker, we have two different visions of what our city should look like. There are people like the member who is trying to talk over me right now, the member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) who thinks that it is okay to have a highway looking like Pembina Highway which is nothing but a strip mall from one end to the other.

Then there are other people who think that you should preserve the existing character of

neighbourhoods, that there are enough strip malls already, that it is good to have parks on a major thoroughfare like Portage Avenue, that it should be kept that way, and it should not be developed into one strip mall from one end to the other. There are two different visions of what our city should look like, two competing visions.

This same distinguished gentleman who was at the meeting last night said that rivers are the only natural beauty in the city of Winnipeg, that we do not protect riverbank property and that we do not do it nearly as well as other cities in western Canada. This individual travels regularly to Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon and Regina with his job, and he is quite well informed about riverbank property in those cities.

One example that he constantly uses in public is that in Saskatoon, where they have the Meewasin development authority, I think it is called - (interjection) - Yes, based on probably a naboriginal name, they do protect public land on the riverbank, and they have 17 kilometres of public land on the riverbank. As a result, Saskatoon is one of the most beautiful cities in western Canada, and that is what this individual and many other people are saying we need to do in Winnipeg.

* (1510)

We have begun to do that in Winnipeg. The member for Riel (Mr. Ducharme) is very proud of the riverbank development at the Forks and between the Legislature and the Forks, and the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ernst) as well, and those are good developments. They have provided access to the public.

As was pointed out in Estimates the other day, there were something like 50,000 people at the Forks, and the new walkways beside the river were so successful that it was elbow to elbow with people on the weekend and it was hard to walk. We need to take this good model that many members here agree with, on both sides of the House, and extend it up and down the riverbanks as far as we can and as far as we can afford.

It was this same distinguished gentleman who moved that a committee be charged with looking into an injunction and that they seek legal counsel. One of the things that they are going to investigate is suing the City of Winnipeg over irregularities and the rezoning procedure for the Rotary Pines site.

There are some interesting stories that councillors who were there in 1989 have to tell. One is that the developer was passing notes to city councillors while debate was going on. I am informed by current city councillors that this is highly irregular, that it is not allowed. When somebody objected to this happening on the floor of council, the chair of council confiscated the notes. They have been put in a sealed envelope, and they are in a vault.

I think that if they do go to court somebody is going to subpoena those notes, and we are going to find out who wrote them and to whom they were passed. I think there are going to be some people, perhaps in this Chamber, who are going to be embarrassed to be mixed up in the Rotary Pines rezoning, because they were very involved in the rezoning and possibly involved in some of the irregularities.

I am also told that the Free Press took photographs of cheques from a developer that were on the benches of council members. It is alleged that the developer said that if the Free Press published the photographs, they would be sued. So they have never been published, but it would be interesting to have those—

Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health): Oh, but you are alleging that in the House. Why do you not allege it outside the House?

Mr. Martindale: The member for Pembina says why not allege it outside the House? Well, it was alleged in public meetings as far as I know. It would be interesting if a lawyer were to subpoena those pictures in a court case. I think it would be an absolutely fascinating court case.

The Rotary Pines is running into some problems, numerous problems, but one of them is that approval in principle was given on July 12, 1989. There is provision that they must pass third reading within 24 months. So it is possible that the applicant is going to come forward and ask for an extension. I think this is going to be a rather interesting process, because it means that the public would, once again, be allowed to present briefs at community committee and at other levels, perhaps on the floor of council as well. Probably they are going to have a lot of opposition and may not make the deadline.

Last night, the airport sent somebody in the place of the general manager who said, we need provincial legislation to protect the airport. The Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing (Mr. Ernst) and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) keep referring to this.

Probably eventually they are going to get around to doing it, but they are going to grandfather Rotary Pines.

They are going to do it after Rotary Pines is approved or after Rotary Pines is built. They are going to grandstand. They are going to have flowery speeches. They are going to talk about the economic benefits of the airport, the number of jobs that it generates, how the airport economic activity needs to be protected and pass legislation to protect the airport after Rotary Pines, after their favourite project has been approved or has been built.

Last night, someone made a comment that I also wrote down that I thought was rather wise advice for me and other people. They said, we need to look at what is good for the whole city as opposed to what is only good for their political party. I think that is one of the problems here that we have, and that is that people are not looking at the good of the whole city. They are looking at this individual project and getting a 35,000 square foot strip mall approved, rather than looking at what would be good for all of the riverbank land in Winnipeg, or what would be good for all of Portage Avenue, or for all the residents of St. James, rather than a few Tory-developer, commercial interests that are approved on this site.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to talk in a more general way about Seniors RentalStart and more particularly about Rotary Pines. What were the original goals of Seniors RentalStart? One of them was to stimulate the construction of housing for seniors. Has it achieved that goal? Well, probably it has. The result of this and other housing programs in the city of Winnipeg is that there is probably an oversupply of housing, especially in the inner city, but the vacancy rate in Winnipeg last year was something like 7 percent.

So people have choices in the housing market. They can live in this part of the city or that part of the city. They can move into a place that has a move-in incentive or a bonus, and there is lots of choice in the private rental market.

Is there a need for seniors housing in the community of St. James? Yes, there is. Many people referred to that last night. They said there is a need for affordable housing in St. James for seniors. Would Rotary Pines help meet that need? Yes, it would help meet some of that need. Of course, it is not affordable housing. It is housing for

rich seniors, but it would meet the need for a small number of people. It would occupy 86 suites.

Well, if it does meet the needs, then why am I opposed to construction of Rotary Pines? I will spend some time on a couple of reasons. First of all, because it is in the wrong location, and even the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Driedger) agrees with me on that one. He is on record as saying that this project is going in the wrong location. In fact, he tried to oppose it. He even appealed to the federal government to overrule it. On November 1, 1989, he said, quote: there is federal legislation that allows him to protect air space and with that he could override a decision by city council.

So the Minister of Transportation was interested in opposing this project a couple of years ago at the time that the city was carrying out the rezoning. His colleagues in Ottawa, two federal Ministers of Transport, were interested in opposing this. It is still in the paper.

There is an article in today's Free Press about the federal minister using his legislative authority to overrule projects that are detrimental to airports. Unfortunately, there is a technicality that says that they cannot do it after the city has approved the zoning, according to someone who is quoted in today's Free Press.

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

So we are opposed to the construction of Rotary Pines because it is in the wrong location. It is too close to the airport. Airport officials and the noise committee of the airport and many other people are very concerned about the adverse economic impact on the airport, especially the possibility of closing down night flights.

We on this side have expressed concern that this not happen because it would jeopardize night cargo flights out of Winnipeg Airport, but I am also informed by airport officials that it could jeopardize charter flights out of Winnipeg that go out at night to places like Hawaii and Las Vegas. People could be greatly inconvenienced if there was a change. If they could not fly out of Winnipeg at night, they might have to go to Toronto and then go to foreign destinations. Many people could be inconvenienced by that.

I believe that Rotary Pines is the front for a 35,000 square foot strip mall and 10 condominiums and that without Rotary Pines zoning approval would never

have been given. I am told that this is the first time since 1972 that land south of Portage Avenue was rezoned commercial in that part of St. James.

Why am I opposed to Rotary Pines? The second reason is that there is a perception about the manner in which it was approved and that perception is that there was political favouritism. Let us look at what happened. This was not the only applicant. We know that there were at least six applicants. There may have been as many as 12 applicants. What happened to these other applicants? They had their application forms in. Many of them had equity, either in terms of tenant equity or land or, in some cases, cash—in fact, substantial amounts of cash that community organizations had raised.

What happened to them? Some of them were told they had excellent applications. They were told there was no money. We have no money in Seniors RentalStart. Please apply over here, so they did. They sent their technical resource groups back to redo all the paperwork and application forms, and they applied under the private, nonprofit program. Who was in the private, nonprofit program? After these six people reapplied, there were 106 responses to the proposal call on the private nonprofit.

I know the former Minister of Housing was bragging about how successful the private, nonprofit program was. He was saying, we were swamped with applicants. We had 106 applicants. What happened? They had a queue of six people and they were put in a queue with 106, and many of them are extremely disappointed that they did not get funding under the private, nonprofit program as well as the Seniors RentalStart program.

*(1520)

What happened after they applied? They were told there was no money in December, and then in February Rotary Pines applies. The application is dated, I think, February 11, one day after the new minister is sworn in as Minister of Housing. What happened to their application? Were they told there was no money? Of course not. They were fast-tracked. The staff were told to have meetings and help them, and they did help them. They took it to MHRC board, and conditional development funding was approved. They are marketing their units in a lightning period of time.

What is the public perception? The public perception is that the decks were cleared, that the

other four applicants, and maybe as many as 12 applicants, were cleared out of the way. They were put into another program. They were misled; they were told there is no money; and then one applicant, Rotary Pines, comes in in February of this year and they get their conditional project development funding. Why? Could it be because of their connections with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst)? Is it only coincidental that he has good connections with the Rotary Club and with the developer, and that the developer donated \$4,000 to the Conservative Party?

Is it coincidence? I hardly think so. It is more than coincidence that they had a good friend who was in cabinet who was the newly appointed Minister of Housing.

What are those resource groups saying? Well, I phoned them up. They are furious. The minister said they were not aggressive enough. They said, we did contact the minister's office, and he talked to us about the next funding year and said, we do not know what is happening. We know now what happened. After the budget came out, the Seniors RentalStart program was wiped out in the budget, and so they were misled. They were not encouraged to reapply when the money was restored to Seniors RentalStart.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I have a few more questions on this program. For example, will the taxpayers get value for their money? Not likely, because I think their per unit costs are going to be very high. In fact, one of the things we would like to know is their land acquisition cost. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) has promised that he will answer detailed questions in Estimates, and there will be hundreds of detailed questions in Estimates for the minister on Rotary Pines. I can assure him of that.

Was the project tendered? No. Do they have to tender? No, they had a choice. The developer could bring it forward or they could tender, but there are alternatives.

Look at the applicant from Niverville seniors organization. They got 10 tenders. They said they were all too high. They sent them out again. They said, we want the three lowest to bid again and give us lower prices, and they did.

The Premier said, well, Rotary Pines is going to have to tender all the subtrades. In fact, there is a publication that has all the contracts in it. It says, Rotary Pines, they will be tendering the subtrades

in the summer of 1991. So we phone up the contractors and we say, well, are you being invited to tender on Rotary Pines? What do they say? They say, no, we are not being allowed to put in tenders on the subtrades, contrary to what the minister said in this House.

How are they going to do it? Well, maybe they are going to hire a project manager, and he is going to choose the subtrades that they want. What is going to happen? It means their costs are going to be higher. That means the taxpayers of Manitoba are subsidizing higher construction costs than they needed to.

Would the Conservative government like to get out of Rotary Pines? You bet they would. Why would they? Because there are people in cabinet who have had applications from their area of the province, from their constituencies, who got turned down. We know one of them. There are others. We are still doing research finding out the names of the others. One is the minister from Ste. Rose.

I understand how people write letters in support of projects in their constituency. I would not be at all surprised if there is a letter of support from the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger) for the Niverville seniors, because it is an excellent group. I have talked to the gentleman who is in charge of the Niverville seniors. Probably there is a letter on file from the member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) commending the Neepawa Elks and telling them what a good project it is and how he will speak to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst). Niverville is an excellent project. We used them as an example. We are going to be using them as a further example in Estimates, because Niverville, to their credit, came up with a very innovative funding proposal, which I just learned about this morning.

Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation): It is unique.

Mr. Martindale: It is unique, says the Minister of Highways and Transportation. It is good and we commend them.

Unfortunately, it bears no relationship to what happened with Rotary Pines, which is quite a different subject. In fact, in the past we thought there were two applicants under Seniors RentalStart that were funded, now we find out there is only one. -(interjection)- That is right. I agree with the Minister of Highways and Transportation. I stand corrected. We were basing our information

on newspaper stories that had lumped Niverville seniors and Rotary Pines together. Now we find out that Niverville is unique, and it does not follow the normal procedures for Seniors RentalStart. In fact, you could argue that it is better, because there is less risk of the taxpayers' money.

The member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings), he probably wrote a letter commending the Neepawa Elks and telling them what a good project he has. -(interjection)- I am glad to hear that the member for Ste. Rose is listening.

What happened to their application? Well, they got diddled. They got directed to another program. Why did that happen? Did the member for Ste. Rose get a chance to speak on this in cabinet? I will bet he did not. I will bet him and several other members are furious, because they did not even have any input in this decision. They would have loved to, because there was \$10 million there. They could have funded two projects, and they only funded one.

The demand in rural Manitoba is much greater than the city of Winnipeg, where people do not have choices. In rural Manitoba there are many small towns that do not have apartments. There are small towns that do not have an oversupply of apartments. They do not have vacancies. Many people live in their own homes until they die, but they would rather live with their friends and neighbours in a seniors complex. They want the social benefits. -(interjection)- There are small towns with no apartments where there is a demand for programs like the Seniors RentalStart. Those seniors wanted to live together. They wanted the amenities that come with those buildings. They want to live with their friends and neighbours.

I would imagine that there are a number of rural members here today who supported their Seniors RentalStart applications from their communities in rural Manitoba. In fact one of the groups, a group in northern Manitoba, was told that the Winnipeg market was oversaturated, and next year the money was going to go to rural and northern Manitoba. Did the money go to rural and northern Manitoba? No, Mr. Acting Speaker. It went to Rotary Pines in Winnipeg. It could have gone to two, maybe three rural applicants, and it did not go to any of them. So what happened to these applicants from rural Manitoba? They got turned into another program that had 106 applications, and then they got turned down. They got burned by this government. They

got burned by this process, and they are furious because I have talked to some of them. I have talked to their resource groups.

I have talked to one of the sponsoring gentlemen from Neepawa Elks, and I know that as soon as I got off the phone from this gentleman that he phoned his MLA. He phoned his MLA the same day and said, what is the member for Burrows talking about? What is going on here? I am sure that the member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings) said, it is okay. We will look after you. We will look after the member for Burrows. We will see that you get looked after, but I know that they are upset. They are furious because they did not get approval, and one group -(interjection)-

I have probably talked to a lot of Tories in rural Manitoba. Even in Flin Flon I talked to a Tory. I talked to a former candidate for the Conservative Party in the federal election in 1988, and he was very forthcoming. He gave me all kinds of information. You can be sure that when people are sharing information with an NDP Housing critic, and they are Tories, that they have got to be upset, and they have got to be mad, and they believe that they are misled.

They have been misled by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst), and I think they were not only misled by this Minister of Housing, I think they were misled by the former Minister of Housing. I believe he was deep into it, and it is regrettable we cannot find out what his role is because the government does not have to answer any questions on behalf of the former Minister of Housing. I am absolutely convinced that he was deeply involved in this and that he knows what happened to the Rotary Pines applicant. We will never find out, and that is very regrettable.

* (1530)

So these applicants in rural Manitoba, many of them, in fact, all except one that I know of in a Conservative constituency they feel burned and they are angry, and they have been sharing lots of information with me.

Let us look more particularly at the history of Rotary Pines. How did it get started? Who hooked up the developer, Bob Akman, with Rotary Pines? Well, who knows. It might have been the former Minister of Housing. He might have phoned him. He knew that these two gentlemen needed each other. He might have put them in touch with each other, but I do not suppose we will ever know. In

fact, I do not think there is a paper trail on these decisions. I think it is phone calls, and so we will never get pieces of paper because they are not there. They covered their tracks. I do not think it is unusual to make phone calls. I think probably lots of phone calls get made about all kinds of things, and that probably—

An Honourable Member: Table

Mr. Martindale: If we could get the phone calls tabled, that would be wonderful, but we are not going to get it.

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Are you going to table your phone calls?

Mr. Martindale: Sure, Mr. Acting Speaker, the member for Ste. Rose asks if I will table my phone calls. I have already mentioned that I talked to a gentleman in Neepawa. I might as well say that his name is Mr. Small. I talked to a man in Flin Flon. I have talked to people in lots of different communities of rural Manitoba, most of them in Conservative seats, and I would be quite happy to tell the House or to tell the minister in Estimates who I talked to, how often I talked to them. I talked to a gentleman in Niverville. I think I made that a matter of record.

These people are very forthcoming. They tell me what I want to know, unlike Manitoba Housing staff who have had a gag order put on them and will not tell anybody anything since this all started on April 9, I believe, in the House. I do not blame them. The staff of Manitoba Housing do not want to lose their jobs. In fact, some of them are probably in trouble for talking to the Free Press.

There are a lot of unanswered questions about Rotary Pines. Rotary Pines seems to have begun with a letter rather than an application form. It seems that the letter was all it took to keep their place in line until February of this year when they finally submitted an application form.

We would like the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ernst) to table that letter from Mr. Akman. Why? Because four other applicants had excellent credentials and application forms, and they were told there was no money and diverted elsewhere. Why did the developer for Rotary Pines drop the numbered units from 100 to 86? Why did he take off the top two floors? Why did he make these changes when he had approval for 100 units and 11 floors?

Was it because someone said, take off the top two floors because of the airport concerns, the noise concerns and height concerns, and it is a done deal?

We will do it for you. I suspect that somebody said to the developer, take off two floors and you have it—and he did. He got good advice. He was told what to do to get it through.

Now, Mr. Acting Speaker, I am going to change topics now. We will have lots of opportunity in Estimates. I think we have 10 hours. Who knows, we might go 20 hours on Rotary Pines alone. There will be lots more questions, and we will be seeking information. The Minister of Housing has an hour per floor of Rotary Pines. I like that.

The Minister of Housing has promised in the Chamber to go over the Rotary Pines application in detail. We have a blank application form for Seniors RentalStart. You can be sure that the critic for the Liberal Party and myself will be asking lots of detailed questions about Rotary Pines.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I would also like to use my opportunity to grieve to talk about a topic which is of concern to my constituents in Burrows. That has to do with Pritchard Place Drop-In Centre. They now have funding to the end of September. I talked to their director today, and they are very happy that they can stay open during the summer months.

This is an organization that has had funding problems right from Day One and all kinds of other problems like a boiler that broke down and had to be replaced. Most recently, they had a break-and-enter and considerable vandalism was done. Their weightlifting equipment was scattered all over the building and onto the street. Their pool tables were wrecked. They are now negotiating with the insurance company to try and get compensation to replace their equipment.

Today they are having a meeting with three organizations, representatives of the City of Winnipeg, Winnipeg Foundation and Manitoba Lotteries Foundation. They are asking for help. What are they asking for help for? Something that I think is a very simple request, and that is a request to meet with the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer). They are trying to get help from these other organizations just to get a simple meeting with the Minister of Family Services.

Now they wrote to him. The last time they were in touch with him was before Christmas, and the minister said he was too busy. I can understand that a minister is busy with Estimates, with the House being in session, but they have a request,

and that is that after the House adjourns the minister meet with them.

Surely, he will not have the same excuses about Treasury Board, the House, Estimates and legislation, and then he can meet with the board and staff from Pritchard Place. I think that is a reasonable request and look forward to the Minister of Family Services agreeing to that. I see certain cabinet ministers nodding their heads. They also agree that it is reasonable. So I will pass that on to the Minister of Family Services.

Why is it important that Pritchard Place staff and board meet with the Minister of Family Services? Why does Pritchard Place need Core funding? There is a need for drop-in centres in this city. Right now, there is only one large drop-in centre for Native youth in the inner city of Winnipeg, and that is Rossbrook House.

Rossbrook House is about 11 years old. They are doing an excellent job. They have Core funding. They have good staff. They have good training programs, but there is a need for a drop-in centre like Rossbrook House in the north end. Pritchard Place is that place. It is an alternative to the streets.

Now we could be judgmental. We could say, well, why are these kids on the street at all hours of the night? Is it not their families' responsibility to look after these kids? It is true, maybe they should be in the charge of their parents and their families but the fact is the kids are on the streets. They need an alternative to the streets. They need a place to go. They need a place like Pritchard Place. It is the alternative to the streets for many of these kids.

I think the government has a choice. The government can spend money now on Pritchard Place Drop-In Centre by giving them Core funding or the government can spend money in the future on family services and corrections. I think it will cost a lot more to help these children when they are youth and when they are adults and when they are involved in the correctional system. It is going to cost a lot more money than it would now to fund Pritchard Place.

In conclusion, I hope that Pritchard Place is successful in getting a meeting with the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer). Secondly, I hope they are successful in getting Core funding because they need it.

Recently I was at Pritchard Place. It happens to be in Burrows constituency and I thought it was

sad—the kind of equipment they have, the lack of paint. The place is run down. The place does not look like a pleasant place to spend time but there are kids who love going to Pritchard Place because they get attention from the staff, they get fed and they can take part in activities that they enjoy doing. What they need is some good equipment. What they need are some bright surroundings. What they need is money so that the staff can be there when the kids are there and when they are needed.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

We need a place like Rossbrook House which has a philosophy that says that no child need be alone if they do not want to be alone. Consequently, they are open 24 hours a day on weekends. They are open 24 hours on school holidays. They are open 24 hours a day in the summer, so Rossbrook House is there for kids when they need a place to go. We need a place like that in the north end.

We need Pritchard Place to be properly funded, to be properly staffed, to be properly equipped and open when the greatest need is in the evenings and on weekends in the summer. If they had adequate funding, they would probably adopt the same policy as Rossbrook House. They would probably love to stay open 24 hours a day on weekends. They would love to stay open 24 hours a day in the summer when the need is there. Pritchard Place is the alternative to the streets for kids in the north end.

* (1540)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope that Pritchard Place is successful in getting a meeting with the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and successful in getting Core funding, because it is desperately needed and the government can fund it now or they can fund increased costs for these same youth in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to exercise my right to express a grievance before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, since the election of this government in September of last year, one of the major platforms, one of the major things that this government has been talking about is their commitment to the families of Manitoba. They have talked in the last two budgets about the major increases that have taken place in the Department

of Family Services; in particular, have pointed in pride to the percentage increases that the budgets have given to the Family Services department. I have risen on numerous occasions in this House as have my caucus colleagues to burst the bubble of this government in its statements about the major increases that this government has given to the families of Manitoba.

In April of this year, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) had a press conference at which he unveiled the government's new plan for the child care system of the province of Manitoba, just slightly over one month ago today.

Since that time, I have risen in the House to ask numerous questions of the Minister of Family Services. The individuals, families, parents of children in day care, workers in the day care system, executive directors of the day care system, the Manitoba Child Care Association, the Family Day Care Association of Manitoba, unionized workers in the province who work in day cares have all asked the minister and members opposite for responses, for justifications for the incredible change that this government is perpetrating on what was a model child care system in North America.

I am forced today to rise on a grievance, because none of those questions from no matter what area have been answered in any way that gives any sense of comfort to the people who have asked the questions.

The current proposals that will be implemented, unless the government sees the light and makes a change, early in July will have a dreadful, negative impact on the families of Manitoba who use the child care system, the day care centres themselves, and on the entire system as a whole.

I would like to speak to those three issues in my grievance today, to put on record some of the concerns that have been raised with me, that have been raised with the minister, that have been raised with many of the government members of the Legislative Assembly with absolutely no response.

One of the most important changes that this new vision of child care in Manitoba undertakes is the change in who supports the day care system in the province. Under the day care system as established by the previous government, it was agreed to and understood that the government, through the Family Services department, using the taxes of the residents and businesses of the

province of Manitoba was a full partner with the parents using the child care system.

It was understood by all parties that not only did the parents who used the system have a responsibility for helping support in a financial manner that system, but also the government had a major role to play not only in establishing standards and regulations, but also in helping provide the financial resources to enable the day care system to continue to be a model for North America.

Over the past years it has been recognized by the government, both the previous NDP government and a year and a half ago the Conservative government when, I might add, it did not have a majority, but was still in a minority situation and so had to be very careful about hiding its true agenda and its true ideology. At that time, in October of 1989, after a very successful campaign culminating in what we fondly remember as peanut day here in the Legislative Assembly, it was a wonderful example of community action.

The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) tells me that the peanut day did break the rules. I believe it would have broken the current rules as put forward by this government in its narrowing of access of individuals and citizens to the public building that they have a right to attend. However, that is a side issue at this point—important, nonetheless.

After the parents and the children and the professionals in the day care system met with and discussed these issues with the minister at the time, the Honourable Charlotte Oleson, there were changes made. The salary enhancement grants were increased. There was more money made available to the day care system in this province. That was a tacit understanding that the system as a whole was not yet adequately funded.

There is no one on our side of the House who does not agree with the fact that the day care system that was established by the previous government was and should continue to be a model for North America and has been seen as such throughout the professional child care community. We also agree that the resources available to that system, with particular regard to the salaries paid to the child care workers in the field, were not adequate, which was the reason for the institution of the salary enhancement grant in the beginning. The salary enhancement grant was for \$4,300, approximately, each year for each Child Care Worker II and III, each

trained child care worker that a day care had on staff.

Up until the recent announcement made by this minister last month, those salary enhancement grants were provided to all Child Care Worker II and IIIs in each day care centre. I think this is a very important aspect of the legislation that has been changed a great deal by this government. The regulations governing quality standards in relation to training of staff under the child care act require that, as a minimum, each day care centre must have two-thirds of its staff be either Child Care Worker IIs or IIIs. I stress that the regulation states this as a minimum.

Until last month, when the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) made his major changes public, every day care in this province that was eligible for a salary enhancement grant got that grant for each Child Care Worker II and III they had on staff, whether they had only the bare minimum of two-thirds or, as many day cares did, have 100 percent of their workers be trained and qualified IIs and IIIs.

The previous government and the minority Conservative government, through their funding of all Child Care Worker IIs and IIIs, understood and clearly stated that they realized those regulations were minimums, they were floors. What this government has done in its changes as announced last April 18, has made that floor into a ceiling. I will get into that in a brief moment.

The other major change that the government has undertaken is the removal of the salary enhancement grant as an individual discreet grant to each day care. They have now folded it into the general operating grant that each day care will receive. That is another change.

The impact on the families that currently use the day care system and may want to use the day care system in the future is, on one hand, very easily calculated and, on the other hand, almost incalculable. The percentage increase for day care fees for parents is quite interesting when you take into account the relationship that that has with the percentage decrease the government is giving to day care centres. If you have a child between the ages of zero and two in a day care the fees for parents will be increased by 48 percent. So on June 30 you will pay a certain fee for an infant in day care space. On July 1 you will pay almost 50 percent

more for that same child in day care. If you have a preschool child, a child from the ages of two to six, the parent fees will be increased by 18 percent.

* (1550)

Interesting to note that the government percentage of support for day cares has decreased by virtually the same amount. It has decreased by 18 percent for preschool children and 48 percent for infant day care spaces. In effect what this has done is it has put in one immediate one-time change, completely reversed the percentage of the cost of day care that is paid for by parents versus the cost of day care that is paid for by the government.

The salary enhancement grants has also had two changes. As I mentioned earlier, the grant itself has been rolled into the overall grant to each day care and, secondly and most importantly, unlike the previous NDP government and the minority Conservative government, which gave a salary enhancement grant amount for all professionally trained child care workers for each day care. These current changes that take place on July 1 in the grants to day cares will be the \$4,300 for Child Care Worker IIs and IIIs, but not for every Child Care Worker II and III that you have in your day care, over two-thirds, but only for the minimum. Consequently, day cares that currently have more than two-thirds trained staff will not receive that amount of money in the grant that they had before for any additional trained staff over the minimum two-thirds. The impact of these changes on families is incalculable, as I stated, and as well can be easily calculated.

At this time, I would not like to read completely into the record letters that were written to myself, to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) and to MLAs on the government side of the House. I would, however, like to share with the House today some of the concerns that were raised in these letters, concerns which, I might add, have been addressed by myself, by child care workers, by volunteer day care board members, by the Manitoba Child Care Association as well.

Here is one letter which comes from—it is addressed to myself. The parent resides in the Deputy Premier's (Mr. Downey) riding. I wanted to put that on record, to state that it is not just day cares and parents in New Democrat seats who are concerned about this. She and her husband both work full time and they have two preschoolers who

have attended the local day care centre for the last three years. They are very pleased with the quality of care that they receive and do not look forward to finding alternate care for their children, because they will not be able to afford day care this July.

This mother is a board member of the local day care centre, having watched that centre in a rural area struggle to gain acceptance within the community and win that struggle. She states: If this fee increase goes through, we might as well shut the doors because most of the parents will not be able to afford the increased fees. We have all worked too hard to see that.

I would like to pause here just to state that this is a case, and there are many of these examples, where parents of children in day cares have spent long hours working as volunteer board members for the day care centres. They have worked to establish day cares. They have worked to work with the staff in the day cares, and they have worked to try and educate the community at large, in general and, most particularly, the government of the day, to the need for high quality day care.

They are very concerned that the changes that were announced by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) last month will have an irreversibly negative impact on that day care system and their own family situations. She feels that her children deserve the best of care, as do everyone else's. Why should her children be subjected to second-rate care simply because they cannot afford exorbitant fees? She goes on to state that the proposed changes that are to take place in July affect middle-income earners. The families who are currently subsidized will continue to be subsidized. Families who are currently not subsidized will continue not to be subsidized. The limit at which you, under the new regulations, will not be subsidized are virtually the same range as they were before these upwards of 50 percent increase in fees have taken place.

She carries on with her letter to say: Since most families need two parents working to make a go of it, I think a fairer way of fees could be arranged. Do the people who make these policies have children attending day care? I sincerely doubt it. It would be a crime to destroy everything you have worked so hard for. This is from a woman who lives in a rural constituency.

I would also like to put on record a letter that was written to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) of the province, again from a resident in the constituency of the Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey). She again is a mother of two in day care, and again is above the even partial subsidy level. Seventy percent of the parents that use the day care in her town are above the subsidy level. These same 70 percent are families with two incomes and need two incomes to pay their bills and mortgages.

Again, she makes another, I think, excellent point that many families today have both parents working, not because they make a choice to have both parents working—although that is the case in some cases and should be respected—but because in our current economic climate it is imperative, particularly in rural areas of this province. With the decline in our rural economic base, it is particularly essential that two parents work in these families.

She states that, if she had the choice, she would stay at home, but she cannot because of interest rates on mortgage, low wages and high cost of living. Most of the parents who are nonsubsidized in this day care are already paying over \$600 a month, and the increase would make their rates be almost \$900 a month, which, in some cases, is the total earnings of one parent of many two-income families.

What your proposals are forcing some of us to do is resort to unqualified day care, choosing overpopulated home cares, increased unemployment as day care centres are forced to close due to poor enrollment. She asks a very good question. Is this the result that your government is looking for? I feel that before your government makes fly-by-night changes to a system like the day care, you should be consulting with both the parents and the staffs of all day cares in Manitoba, not just with a particular working group whose recommendations were not followed by this minister at any event.

It also amazes her that people who are far removed from the situation—again like the other woman, not too many of your advisers utilize a day care centre—can sit in their offices and dictate changes without really studying the effects these changes will have, especially in the rural areas. Again, another rural member who is concerned about the changes.

* (1600)

I could read into the record many more concerns, letters and messages that I have received, that my caucus colleagues have received, that members opposite have received up to and including the Premier of the province, in letters, phone calls and public events.

One of the other impacts on families is not only the incredible usurious increase in rates for families, have an unbelievable impact on families—one other impact that I must speak to, that many parents are concerned about, are special needs children. Currently, much good work is done by special needs day care workers whose assistance in day cares, in working with children with special needs, gives those children a leg up onto a higher quality of life. It enables them, after a couple of years in the day care, to be able, in many cases, to go into regular kindergarten classes, to become part of the regular school activities. This preventive work is under very serious danger of being cut back, if not completely eliminated.

The impact on day care centres also cannot be underestimated. The putting together of the salary enhancement grant into a general all-purpose grant, and secondly, decreasing that branch by, in many cases, tens of thousands of dollars because of the change in structure, has had a definite negative impact on all day care centres in the province.

As I stated earlier, the regulations require a minimum of two-thirds trained staff and up until this change last month, the province, through its funding of salary enhancement grants to all trained staff in a day care centre, understood the importance of having quality, trained staff in a day care centre, understood the importance of beginning to attempt to bring up the abysmally low salaries to a level which would perhaps persuade these highly trained individuals to remain in their jobs, to try and reduce the high turnover that has plagued many day care centres.

This will no longer be the case. Day care centres are now being penalized for providing high quality service. Day care centres will lose \$4,300 for every qualified child care worker they have on staff, over two-thirds. In some of the larger centres, as I have stated before, the results to their budgets are in the tens of thousands of dollars decrease.

Another nonfinancial impact that this has is, not only is the amount of money available to a day care centre substantially decreased halfway through or

well into the fiscal year, maybe in some cases halfway through the fiscal year of day cares, but as well it can have the impact and probably will have the impact of causing potential problems between day care boards of directors and their staff. The salary enhancement grant up to this time was kept separate from the Operating and Maintenance branch for a particular reason—it was tied money, money that was to go specifically to child care salaries because of the realization that the system as a whole was underfunded and, most particularly, salaries were dreadfully inadequate.

Under normal circumstances, the New Democratic Party is in favour of block funding, is in favour of grants to organizations that are not tied, that allow boards of directors and staff to work out their own internal arrangements. In this case, however, we feel that it is a major step backward to put that money into an overall operating grant, particularly when you, in effect, cut that money by, in some cases, a third.

The effect that it will have is that day cares which are operating at the edge already, which were only marginally able to meet their nonsalary operating expenses, will now have to decide in many cases between cutbacks to supply purchases, cutbacks on field trips, other events, and cutbacks in staffing, because of the enormous amount of decrease in funding to these day care centres, particularly the ones that have made the best effort to provide quality day care. We are convinced and these day cares are convinced that the end result very quickly will be that centres will be forced to lay off highly qualified staff and replace them with unqualified staff.

I would like to read into the record a statement that concerns us in this issue that was recently raised by a West Broadway day care centre worker. There is already a high turnover because the salaries are so low and the conditions are so poor, she states, and now the Family Services department has advised boards of day care centres to lay off workers with more experience in order to hire cheaper labour.

The day care department, itself, understands that this is the implication and is saying, so be it. We are not interested in quality anymore. We cannot be interested in quality anymore because there is not enough money to provide quality services.

She goes on to state that the minister, when told of the concern raised about the problem that boards

and workers are going to face, said that his workers in his department undoubtedly did not make those statements about firing more experienced staff and hiring cheaper labour.

Again, the minister states something that he has stated time and time again in his responses to cutbacks to Child and Family Services agencies, to shelters, to other areas and in particular in day care. Quote: The boards of the day care centres do their own hiring. We are not involved in staffing.

I find it unbelievable that the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) can baldly make that statement, that his department is not involved in hiring, when by his own press release, his own board, his own cabinet decisions, in another month and a half those boards will be forced to make hiring and firing decisions based solely on the government's own change in direction. If that is not putting the government into the hiring of staff, I do not know what is.

There will also be an impact on the day care system itself. As I stated earlier, since the new child care regulations and act have gone into effect approximately six years ago, the Manitoba system has been held up as a model throughout North America. That model's wheels are falling off. It is about to become not a positive model for day care in North America, but a negative model, a shining example of what happens when Conservatives get into power and start implementing their own narrow, reactionary ideology.

What will happen—and this has been stated not just by official opposition critics. I must make a parenthetical statement at this point to state that there have been virtually no complaints raised in the Question Period by the members of the Liberal Party, largely, I believe, because they are in, more or less, agreement with the government on this issue.

* (1610)

Families, parents, day care board members, day care professionals, as well as members of the official opposition, have stated categorically the impact on this system will be to render it a two-tier system. Families who are eligible for subsidies will be able to access the child care system, and families that are wealthy will be able to access the child care system. The middle, moderate-income family in this province will very shortly, if not this year, be frozen out of the child care system.

We see that having happened in the province of Ontario under the Liberal government there. The enormous day care problems that are currently facing the government of Ontario are day care problems that they inherited in their entirety from the former Liberal government of Mr. Peterson. The day care situation in the province of Ontario was based completely on the kind of system that this government is instituting which is an enormous increase in fees charged to parents, a corresponding decrease in government support and what, in effect, will be a deindexing of the subsidy level.

Year after year, fewer and fewer parents are able to send their children to day cares. Day cares are finding that they have many vacant spaces. They are being forced to close. They are being forced to hire unqualified staff. This is the road that this system is following.

It is not as though these changes are being made in a vacuum. There is a lot of research that has been done on what institutes and what constitutes a good child care system. I would like to quote Ursula Neufeld from the Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association in a letter to the editor of the Free Press, March 28 of this year.

"Recent research reveals that, although young children can thrive in child care outside the family, the quality of care is the key. Developmentally enriching child-care programs are good for children and poor quality care is not good for children.

"It is clear from research and the experience of other nations that developmentally enriching child care is achieved through a good system of regulation, high standards, not-for-profit administration, adequate funding and appropriately educated, well compensated child care professionals."

In all of those areas, under the previous administration, the base was in place. Movement was underway to make more appropriate the level of funding for day cares and particularly salaries for child care workers. Excellent minimum standards were in place. On every single one of those areas, regulation standards, not-for-profit administration, adequate funding and educated, well-compensated child care professionals, this government has made its intentions abundantly clear, and they are to dismantle, to decrease, to impoverish this child care system.

Why are they doing that, Mr. Speaker? I would suggest, as I have suggested in this House before, that what is happening here is a clear enunciation of traditional Conservative ideology which states that there shall be families in Manitoba, and families in Manitoba will be defined as one husband who works outside the home and is able to provide for all of the financial needs of his family, one wife who stays at home nurturing her 2.3 children, one cat and one dog.

Mr. Orchard: That sounds like Conrad talking.

Ms. Barrett: The member for Pembina (Mr. Orchard) states that it sounds like the member for Broadway (Mr. Santos). I would suggest to the member for Pembina that he need not look any further than his own seat and those of his cabinet and back bench colleagues to hear the echo of those statements.

What is happening to our child care system, Mr. Speaker, is the change of this government. It is clear that this government does not believe that child care is a priority. It does not believe that children require quality day care. It does not understand the current realities of families in the province of Manitoba. There are increasing numbers of families—the largest increasing category of families in the province of Manitoba are single-parent families headed by women.

Now the alternatives for those women with preschool and infant children, those single women, are two. They can work, if they have adequate child care facilities, or they can not work. If they do not work, their only recourse is social assistance, the welfare system. This government is going to pay for these families one way or another, and the way that they are choosing to pay for these families is degrading. It is against all standards of equity and fairness, and it is based on an ideology that has more than passed its time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude on a more positive note, which is to re-emphasize the commitment that New Democrats have to adequate, affordable, accessible child care facilities for all regions of the province of Manitoba. I would suggest that members opposite, particularly those in the rural areas, pay close attention to this because there are many families in those areas who are very concerned with the direction that this government is taking.

The Canadian Day Care Advocacy Association also has established principles of child care which I would like to read into the record, which correlate completely with the child care system that we instituted in the province of Manitoba and which this government is in the process of completely dismantling and gutting, and I quote: These principles are principles that we will hold the government accountable for as will the parents, the child care workers and the families of Manitoba. First, child care services should be high quality, including a good system of regulation such as in Manitoba, and wages and working conditions for child care is commensurate with education and the value of the work. Second, the range of services should be comprehensive including a variety of program options to meet local community needs. Thirdly, child care should be accessible to all families in all regions regardless of employment status and income level. Finally, the development of a system of child care which meets these principles will require a commitment of substantial public funding.

The benefits of the enactment of these principles will be that of a consistent quality and availability of care. The benefits to the province of Manitoba and its parents, its children, and its day care workers far exceeds the costs. It has been estimated that a one-dollar investment in high-quality child care returns six dollars in taxpayers' savings because of lower education costs, lower cost of public welfare and crime and higher worker productivity.

This government prides itself upon being good financial managers. I would like to end my remarks today by stating that in everything this government has done in the area of family services and, in particular, its regulations in child care, they are proving to the province of Manitoba that they are far from good managers. They are dreadful managers and the province of Manitoba will show their displeasure of this government very shortly.

* (1620)

* * *

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): I would like to exercise my grievance privilege on behalf of senior citizens of this province.

I would like to start by looking at the process of aging itself, a process through which every one of us here may go through if we keep it up, and how that process of aging can be done in a manner and

style which is happy and gracious, but how it is threatened by the actions of governments. It is very simple to get old. Anybody can do it if you stay alive. The process of aging is simply a natural process of life. Life itself has many stages. We start with the time of birth, then we go through the stage of infancy and helplessness, then we pass through the period of adolescence, then we call ourselves adults, then we have the middle age and the middle bulge and then of course the process of old age.

All these stages of life take place in sequence in a very uncertain world, the one that we live in. This world is like a revolving merry-go-round with its ups and downs until it gradually slows down and finally comes to a stop. So we get up quietly.

An Honourable Member: That is beautiful.

Mr. Santos: I agree.

Getting old involves some kind of readjustment to our life. We have to pare down some of our personal ambitions, wants and desires as we go through that old age stage of our lives.

When we are younger, full of energy, full of dreams, we tend to be tough and ruthless in our search for material things of the world. We stretch our hands greedily for a good job, high income, fancy car, big house, double garage, and of course we seek social status but, as we grow older, as we experience the vicissitudes of life, we begin to appreciate more and more the finer things, the finer values of integrity, of honesty, of honor, of faithfulness, of love.

We begin to enjoy the simple common joy of life: domestic homes, being with the family during weekends and Sundays, enjoying our health and enjoying our little children or grandchildren. We begin to appreciate the inherent worth of human beings, less about the artificialities around them but more about their inner nature as fellow human beings. Our hearts get softer. We become more compassionate to others. We begin to understand the problems of the less fortunate. We begin to value the good and the respectable life.

How do we know that we are really getting old? What will be our standard? What will be our measure? How do we know whether we are really passing through an aging process in our lives?

(Madam Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Is it merely a matter of chronological age? Let me tell you how I feel. Let me generalize a little. Maybe

in the case of the male individual, I think he is getting old if he stopped there watching in the street. If girls no longer attract him, then he is really getting old. If in a good restaurant the gentleman focuses his attention more on the food than on the waitress, then he is really getting old.

What about our female individual? How do we know that she is getting old. There are so many helps, aids and assistance to help her stay beautiful. She can have a face lift, if there is enough money to pay the doctors. She can use all the things that keep her young. How does she know inside that she is really getting old? I think she is getting old if she does not care how she looks. Upon waking up in the morning, if she does not care anymore how she looks, then she is really getting old.

Can we stay younger than we are physically, spiritually, emotionally, despite the number of years that pass by? Certainly we can. We can be as young as we feel. We can be as young as our emotions. We can be young intellectually and emotionally. According to the famous anthropologist, Margaret Mead—you know her—it is utterly false, cruelly arbitrary to put all play and learning into childhood, all work into middle age, and all regrets into old age. That is entirely false. It is a myth.

An Honourable Member: Is that what Meg says?

Mr. Santos: That is what she said, and I believe her. We can stay young at heart by having the correct attitude towards life, by accepting gracefully the process of getting old, and by doing the best we could in order to keep our health.

An Honourable Member: How do you stay healthy?

Mr. Santos: How do we stay healthy? One simple rule is you lead a clean life. A clean life means you do not drink, you do not smoke. Let me tell you what smoking may lead to. Here is a study. This is the most recent one. This is just published May 29, 1991. Cigarette smoking, according to one Boston study, may be the cause of impotence.

An Honourable Member: Is the cause of what?

Mr. Santos: Impotence. Well, this is a scientific study. They have documented a link between impotence and clogged arteries, the penile arteries. It is a risk factor that everybody should understand. Every cigarette you light costs you three minutes of your life. Then it may rob you of your power of sex. This study indicates that cigarette smoking is a risk

factor in addition to high blood pressure, to diabetes, to high cholesterol; it may develop a significant narrowing of the penile arteries leading to impotence. And that is true not only of people who have arteriosclerosis but also of younger people like many of the gentlemen around here. You stay healthy—

An Honourable Member: What about coffee?

Mr. Santos: Coffee has no serocalories, the same as tea, but the trouble with that is that it destroys vitamin C in your body. Yes, and your body cannot absorb the vitamin C that you need—

You stay healthy also by eating wholesome, fresh, natural, nutritious food. You stay away from those fancy, rich foods. Fish is good for the body, especially the oil of the fish.

* (1630)

An Honourable Member: What about doughnuts?

Mr. Santos: Doughnuts are no good. We should eat more fresh fruits, fresh vegetables, salads. Drink all types of fresh juices. Even the humble broccoli that the President of the United States abhors—he said, I abhor broccoli, I cannot take it. You know the greatest mistake the President is making? Let me tell you about broccoli. This is an amazing food. It is better than any vitamin pill that you can take. Reason: it contains high concentrations of beta carotene, carotenoids, quercetin, indoles, folate and glutathione. All of these are anticancer agents. The broccoli is high in vitamin C. Amazing! It is high in chromium. It is antidiabetic and antiheart disease. It contains readily absorbable calcium. You think you can get all your calcium from milk; you can get it from broccoli too. Calcium, as you know, prevents osteoporosis, the sickness of the bones. Broccoli is high in fibre. It helps lower our blood cholesterol. So, the humble broccoli, I eat it every day.

An Honourable Member: So President Bush is wrong, and you are right.

Mr. Santos: President Bush is wrong and you are right if you opt for broccoli. Of course, it may give you something else.

Another rule for staying healthy is you keep active. You keep active, but you get rest when you need it. By being active, we create within ourselves a love for life. We create an excitement for living. We should not say, oh, that is not for me now; I am too old for that. Never say such a thing.

You know, sometimes even sex becomes more work than romance for an older person but you just do what is good for you, not what is bad for you, and always enjoy life to the fullest. Read a poem if you need to, listen to good music, go to a golf course, have some fresh air, go squashing, and since most of us look beyond the grave, make sure that when we are before our Maker, we can report that we have done something good, because only acts of good deeds are worth remembering when we get off this revolving stage of life.

All this hope for gracious living, all this hope for happy, good old age are now being threatened. All these dreams about how we shall retire, how we spend our life, are now being under attack, and the initial threats have come through this very government in this province. They have cut the vital support of those most vulnerable and the most helpless segment of our seniors in this province. They have announced that they will freeze the normal increase in the 55-Plus supplement program.

How does the government justify what they did? They say they want to put money into more vital areas of public policy—more vital areas. What area can be any more vital than the plight of our senior citizens? Is it reasonable for any government, this government or any other government, to give a \$20,000 increase to an executive who is already making \$130,000 and deny \$1.75 to a poor senior citizen so that she can buy her litre of milk? Is it more vital for this government to give a 7 percent settlement increase to medical doctors who already make a hundred thousand annual income or more than that and deny and give nothing to our civil servants, zero increase, even the poor clerk in our society. Is it more vital to give all across the eight-year period a hundred million to the private school system and then close the school at Cartwright?

Is this the kind of inverted priority that we have in this kind of government? How can this government give \$50 million for training in big corporations and yet have no money for health care, have nothing for those who are waiting for their chance at an operation which is essential and necessary because of lack of space in our hospitals? These are not good public policies, Madam Deputy Speaker. That is why I am grieving.

I grieve because in any kind of society which is in general an elitist society like ours, and I am quoting

the late leader of the National Democratic Revolutionary Party of El Salvador, Guillermo Ungo: It is not possible to be a democrat without being a revolutionary, nor is it possible to be a revolutionary without being a democrat. I am a Social Democrat, and I tend to be a revolutionary in terms of fighting the inequities and injustice in our society.

* (1640)

This freeze of the natural increase to the meagre income that the seniors received in the form of the 55-Plus supplement will only save the government \$450,000, but it means severe economic hardship to our senior citizens, especially those who are dependent on that little supplement. It means that it will adversely affect their health care. It means it will drive them more into the deeper and deeper mire of poverty. It means that they can no longer enjoy a good reasonable quality of life.

There are people who reach retirement age and yet find themselves without adequate pension, whether public or private pension. There are many causes of that phenomenon where people get into old age without adequate financial support or financial income.

What are some of the reasons why they do not have any pension income when they get into old age? In the case of the single males in old age, single seniors, it may be due to the fact that he worked in low paying jobs at the minimum wage. It may be that the single senior had worked for small companies where no private pension plan is even available to them.

Indeed, statistics show, according to the Manitoba Society of Seniors issues chairperson, Lil McIlwain, she found out that 51 percent of employed men in 1988 participated in a private pension plan—51 percent. What about the other 49 percent? That means they do not have any private pension plan. If the employment is seasonal, the lack of portability of most pension systems could have prevented any kind of systematic savings on the part of these workers.

What about the women? Women have always been the victim of societal discrimination. They have been working in low-wage ghettos. Even when they were participating in some kind of private pension plan, it was found out that in 1987 the average woman 65 years old or older received only one-third of the amount received by a man. This is

inequitable. This is unjust. This is unfair, to base any kind of differences, differential even in pension, on the basis of gender alone.

I object in principle to such kinds of elitist practices in our society. That is why I can be called a revolutionary. For some reason, even in the Canada Pension Plan, the benefits that a woman received on the average was slightly less than half of what men had been receiving. Of course, in the case of married women, their working history had been interrupted by the fact that they had to raise children, or they had to care for their aged parents. So it is unfair. We cannot, on any ground, justify societal discrimination on the basis of gender.

With respect to the adequacy of pension, you know what a senior citizen usually gets. He gets Guaranteed Income Supplement if he is 65 or older, if they are poor and they qualify for it. They also get spouse allowance plus, of course, the provincial supplement.

However, there are certain developments taking place in the federal government which affect provincial policymaking and policy allocation. In the 1989 federal budget, the Mulroney government first proposed to tax back, in phase-in stages, 5 percent of all income in excess of \$50,000 to the maximum of old age supplement, thereby depriving seniors of the possibility of losing their old age supplement. This 5 percent is increased in 1992 to 10 percent. It will be increased to 15 percent. This claw back by the federal government is increasing year after year.

Even the Canada Pension Plan is threatened. As more people become eligible for the full Canada Pension Plan, as they draw money from the pool, the contributions that are made into the plan by workers become less and less, and then more and more is being taken out of the pool of money. Pretty soon, even our Canada Pension Plan will be in a state of crisis.

If many people are being laid off work and they can no longer contribute nor have deductions for the Canada Pension Plan, less money will be going into the fund. If more people are drawing more and more from that fund, there will be nothing left behind.

There are many other measures that we can, perhaps, undertake to reform our pension system. The National Council of Welfare suggested—this is an advisory body to the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare—the following measures: that the federal government should increase the benefits

from the Canada Pension Plan to lower income people; that the guaranteed income supplement should be made available to all seniors in need, aged 60 to 64, regardless of whether they are single or married; that people should be allowed to put as much money into registered retirement saving plans, subject to reasonable limit, for purposes of tax deduction; that the survivor's pension needs to be improved; and that all occupational pension plans should have provision for splitting pensions between spouses in the case of a breakdown of marriage.

* (1650)

I say that this cut on the pension naturally and logically leads to poverty on the part of some people. More seniors will be poorer and poorer, especially those already at the critical stage, because of the cut in the pension plan. Indeed, it can be observed that, if the money that we spend for consultants in studying the poor are given directly to the poor, the poor would be much better off. There is so much money going into the wrong hands.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Why do people become so poor? I mean, the normal run of individual. How come many in our Western society, in North America, become poor? Do you know why it is so? I have been thinking hard about this. Because they spend more than they earn. I think the best way to wage war against poverty is for federal and provincial legislators to legislate and abolish the use of credit card systems because the credit card system enables individuals to spend money they do not have. It drives them to be the victim of usury on the part of those companies.

Do you know how it feels to be poor? Maybe some of you have already experienced it. As soon as you have paid your tax liability or income tax and other taxes, the property taxes and all taxes, you experience how it is to be poor because you experience it the day after you have paid all your taxes.

One person jokingly said that the income tax is the fairest tax of all because the income tax gives to every individual an equal opportunity to be poor. I say, it is no disgrace to be poor if you are a victim of circumstances beyond your control, and most people are. It is regrettable if they become poor because of the action of this government, because that could have been preventable.

I do not exempt the individual from responsibility. If one becomes poor because of one's laziness, because of one's intemperance, because of one's extravagance, because of his vices, because of his folly, then he shares in that responsibility as well. However, if we separate the greedy from the needy, if you separate the two groups, there will be a good public program. Any kind of public program will help alleviate the plight of the poor, and we can perhaps mitigate the social problem of poverty within affluence in our society. You have to separate the greedy from the needy.

Not only does the cutting of the 55-Plus pension plan lead to poverty on the part of the most vulnerable and most helpless segment of our society, it also leads to the adverse effect on the need for health care in our society. The older you get, the more intense is your need for health care. If we start cutting at that segment of our society, with the older segment of our people, then we are in fact intensifying the problem of health care on the part of the senior citizens.

The Greek philosopher Herophilus stated: When health is absent, wisdom cannot reveal itself, art cannot manifest itself. I used the neutral word to avoid any kind of controversy, because in our society nowadays there is a thing called being politically correct. You sometimes cannot express your individual opinion, because you may antagonize certain groups in our society. That is wrong, because it cuts down an individual's freedom of expression.

Let me continue my quotation: when health is absent, wisdom cannot reveal itself, art cannot manifest itself. If strength cannot fight, wealth becomes useless and intelligence cannot be applied.

Wealth is useless if you do not have health. There are so many people who make the wrong decisions in their life. All their life they sacrifice their health in order to get wealth. When they become wealthy, especially at old age, they are now willing to give away all this wealth to get back their health. It is no longer possible. Time has passed by.

We are not entirely exempted from fault with what happened to our life. There are so many vices that we are prone to and, unless we have self-control, we will suffer the consequences. I have already referred to cigarette smoking. You know, cigarettes

are bad. It destroys 100 milligrams of vitamin C, one cigarette.

An Honourable Member: Just one?

Mr. Santos: Just one destroys 100 milligrams of Vitamin C in your body. What do we need the Vitamin C for? It is needed for the synthesis of collagen. It is needed in order to boost our immune system. Vitamin C is essential so that our immune system can work to fight all the disease that enters our system. If we smoke cigarettes and we destroy the agency that helps us get immune from diseases, then we are only destroying ourselves, our physical health.

Also, what else do we eat that destroys our health? We eat bacon, hot dogs, smoked things. They are good, nice. The trouble is, they contain preservatives, nitrate. Nitrate is present in luncheon meat, in hot dogs and bacon. You know what nitrates do in our body? They rob our body of vitamin A.

An Honourable Member: Now what is vitamin A used for?

Mr. Santos: What is vitamin A used for? It is essential for the normal growth of our tissue. It is essential for our vision. It is essential for fighting infection. What else? Well, we always say, let us drink to your health. The more you do so, the more you drink to one's health, the more you lose your own health. Why? Because one alcoholic drink depletes the body of the B vitamins, B1. B1 is a vitamin for a healthy nervous system. It is steady of nerves and a single drink deprives us of the capacity to have a steady nerve system. It deprives us also B6 for fighting the antibodies for our antibodies, for building up our red blood corpuscles, for the growth of our skin, our hair, our nails. These are all needed, but by drinking too much alcohol we are depriving our body of this capacity.

And you ask for coffee. I have seen so many people who cannot go without coffee. They are so dependent on coffee, without it they are useless. What does coffee do? Okay. Coffee contains caffeine, caffeine robs the body of calcium.

An Honourable Member: Oh, is that right?

Mr. Santos: Yes. What is calcium needed for? Calcium is needed for the strength of your teeth, your bones, to prevent osteoporosis, but you are depriving yourself of calcium the more you drink coffee.

An Honourable Member: Why?

Mr. Santos: Because of caffeine in coffee. What about tea? Some people are tea drinkers—tea time—it is not coffee time—it is tea time. The same thing, because tea contains tannin, the same ingredient like caffeine. It does the same thing; it deprives the body of calcium.

It also deprives the body of iron and zinc. How do we get calcium? Well, of course, the most obvious source is milk, cheese, yogurt, but some people are allergic to milk. They cannot digest milk; there are some people, especially from other places in the world like myself. I cannot drink whole milk without having some trouble in my system. So I am allergic to it. -(interjection)-

How do I get the calcium? Okay. Calcium also is present in considerable quantity in peanuts, sardines, broccoli, almonds, kidney beans—

* (1700)

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

The hour being 5 p.m., time for private members' hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

Bill 22—The Manitoba Energy Authority Repeal Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), Bill 22, The Manitoba Energy Authority Repeal Act; Loi abrogeant la Loi sur la Régie de l'énergie du Manitoba, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing? Agreed.

House Business

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Second Opposition House Leader): Mr. Speaker, on House Business, if I may. The opposition has been very generous and patient in terms of not asking government to start standing up and speaking on the bills that we have presented on the Order Paper for the past couple of months, so I would ask for the government to, during Tuesdays and Thursdays, debate the legislation that we have brought forward to the

House. If they do not want to debate it on Tuesdays and Thursdays, maybe—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must remind the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), if the honourable member would like the honourable minister to speak to the bill, all he has to do is deny leave.

* * *

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave that this matter remain standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld)? Is there leave? Agreed.

Bill 23—Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), Bill 23, Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur le Conseil interculturel du Manitoba, standing in the name of the honourable member for La Verendrye (Mr. Sveinson).

Stand? Is there leave that this matter remain standing?

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Speaker: No, leave is denied.

Mr. Ben Sveinson (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, the multicultural funding that was necessary to continue the many different multicultural things within our province was quite a topic of discussion not too long ago.

I would just like to tell you about some of the multicultural things within my community, within my riding of La Verendrye, which stretches from St. Adolphe all the way to the Ontario border. It takes in many different cultures, one being that of the French people in St. Adolphe, and I have attended many different fall suppers and things of this nature and had the enjoyment of tasting the different foods and the odd little sip of wine that adds to the luxury of the food and the culture that is spread throughout that community.

You can just take a short jaunt down the road and you come into the Landmark area. In Landmark we have a number of different people living there of different cultures but, in fact, it is mainly a Mennonite community. I have also attended breakfasts and dinners of the Mennonite culture and had the opportunity of tasting their foods.

I have attended functions, be it the Gimli festival, or the yearly day that they have in Gimli, and had the opportunity of tasting foods like vinarterta. It is a three-layer or four-layer type of dough that in fact—

An Honourable Member: It is five layers.

Mr. Svelnson: Is it five layers? I am sorry. A Frenchman telling me how it is made, that is quite nice. Thank you, Neil. At any rate, it is a dish that in fact you tend to put prunes in between, crushed prunes, and, if you wish, you could put dates. However, it is mainly prunes. I have had the opportunity of tasting those Icelandic dishes since I was a kid and I have enjoyed them very much.

There is another dish that is made from sour milk. Now what you do is you let the milk sour, you put it into a nice bag, you let it hang in a fairly cool spot, you let it hang there and the juice drains out of it. This is called—in English, I guess you would call it skyr. Then you can take and you can serve it in many different ways. You can eat it just straight without anything else, but I tend to like it by putting it in a dish and a little bit of nice cream and a little bit of sugar sprinkled on it. With a little bit of cake it is absolutely scrumptious.

Mr. Speaker, you can take a little drive down to the eastern area of my riding and you run into many Ukrainian people. Now I just attended a New Year's dance and supper in Elma, and the spread of food that was put out there was just something to behold. I mean, we started off with some beautifully baked ham, some holopchi, perogies. It was endless, Mr. Speaker, and I tend to think that the weight that I have gained in the last six months or so was gained in that hall. However, it was absolutely beautiful.

An Honourable Member: But you enjoyed putting it on, right?

Mr. Svelnson: I sure did. -(interjection)- Not a bit. It was absolutely beautiful.

I think that as you travel from area to area in our province you see the different cultures, the different peoples and you tend to start to separate them. You, and I do not say you as such, I mean people tend to say, well, what about this one and what about that one? Mr. Speaker, is my time up already or what? No? Okay.

At any rate, people tend to start separating and saying, perhaps, is this culture better than that culture, and that type of thing. I would like to just take you for a fast little drive back through my riding

and, if you start in St. Adolphe, looking at the French culture, the French people, you will find the very hardest working people in that area, farming, working out, coming to Winnipeg to work, businesses, very sharp, very good people. You can also take a drive to Landmark and, again, if you look at the businesses, at the farming. Right now they are working on a community centre. It is not a thing of waiting for handouts from government. They have people who are working in the area with Caterpillars, front-end loaders, shovels—

* (1710)

An Honourable Member: Did you go and help?

Mr. Svelnson: Yes, I did—really, a working together community.

Mr. Speaker, I said it before and I will say it again, that I think I have been blessed in the fact that I have a riding that has so many towns and so many people within it that are very hard-working, good people. I do think that taking a positive role and giving a helping hand, where it is possible, is a good thing. It is not to say that we should be slashing money, in fact, away from those cultural groups, to take that kind of monies away from them. I really do think that a helping hand for any of them, it does not matter who they are, is a nice thing.

It is for that reason that I have felt obligated to stand today to speak to the member for Inkster's (Mr. Lamoureux) resolution, to say that, in fact, it does not follow the things that he has been doing in the very recent past. It kind of leaves you thinking that, in fact, this resolution was almost like an afterthought. It was not given good thought. After this member wanting to slash multicultural funding and then coming up with this resolution, Mr. Speaker, it is really quite hard to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this time, and I really do wish that the member for Inkster would think about the things that he puts forward, perhaps even caucus with the rest of his members, although there are not that many. I really wish he would think about it before he puts these things forward. Thank you for the time.

Mr. Jack Reimer (Niakwa): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure, for the opportunity to stand before the House and talk on this motion of the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) regarding The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act.

In looking at this amendment, we must look back to, as was mentioned previously, the motion that

was brought forth during the Estimates program in which the same member for Inkster was looking for the elimination and, if you want, the total destruction of the grants program to the Multicultural Association multicultural grants, MGAC, in a sense of trying to remove over a million dollars worth of funding that was to go to the groups of these multicultural groups.

In fact, there were over, I believe, 230 different groups that had taken advantage of the funding that was in the previous budget. Looking at that funding and looking at the amount of monies that was available at that time, we have to look back to the budgetary process that the cabinet and Treasury Board came forth through the Finance minister at the beginning of this session. At that time, very hard and difficult decisions had to be made as to where and how funding was to be made available to this government.

One of the things that we must commend is the honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) and her ability to go to the table and come forth with monies for these groups. The pressures on all departments were evident, and the fact that a lot of departments came away from the table with a lot of money that was slashed from their budgets. Each department that came forth to the Treasury Board came back with either less, the same, or, in some instances—some of the ministries such as Education, Health and Family Services were fortunate that they got an increase in their budgeting. They had to fight very hard for that budgeting, but the priority was for that emphasis in our government.

The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) came away from the table with monies of the same amount, which, in a sense, was a victory, because she had monies available for the multicultural group. Then, in their efforts to put forth programs, events and the enhancement and the direction that they were trying to come forth with their programs, there were monies available to these groups.

As mentioned, there were just over 230 groups that took advantage of that money, and when you look at grants of approximately \$1 million that was to be slashed from the budget by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux)—you could see that we are looking at a grant structure of somewhere around \$4,000 per group. That money that was made available to

these groups was used for their own edification, if you want, in trying to promote their culture, their heritage, and, at the same time, bringing forth their exposure to all communities and all aspects of life here in Manitoba. Here in Manitoba we are blessed that we have a very diverse and a very multicultural society.

In fact, here in Manitoba we have one of the highest percentage of multicultural groups of any province in Canada. I believe the figure that we have of non-English, non-French people here in Manitoba is upwards of over 40 percent. I believe that around 42 percent of our population here in Manitoba is of ethnic origin, other than English and French. So we are very, very fortunate here in Manitoba that we have learned to live together within these various groups and various organizations. We have had the opportunity and the exposure to various groups and ethnic groups, so that the idea of co-operation and a partnership that has developed between communities comes as a natural effort.

The emphasis that is put forth by these groups in working together to promote their own communities and their own cultures is something that is a self-awareness and a self-fulfilling by these peoples. They get the sense of togetherness, they get the sense of working together, they get the sense of achievement and the sense of accomplishment because of working within their own group and possibly within their own ethnic community. But that is not a bad thing. That is not a bad thing here in Manitoba because the confidence and the strength that they get from their own endeavours and working together within their own group has to have a spillover effect into their work force, into their neighbourhood and into their communities. That is the type of thing that makes Manitoba strong, because of the fact that we do contribute and we do encourage this type of growth within the ethnic communities, but at the same time it is an investment. Our greatest assets here in Manitoba are our people, and our people of ethnic origins are what make this Manitoba province so strong.

The fabric of Manitoba is like our tartan. It is woven with very many colours, very many different designs but, at the same time, as a fabric together it is very strong. These are the types of things that make our province the envy of other provinces here in Canada.

Here in Manitoba we have realized that in working together with a partnership within ourselves we can achieve a lot of the goods and the advancements that come from the multicultural society. The pride that is generated by these groups is a spillover into not only their own groups, as was mentioned, but the pride of Manitoba and the pride of achievement. Manitoba has worked very hard to be very tolerant, and we are recognized as a very tolerant province in the fact that we do encourage and we do support our ethnic minorities to the extent that it is, a lot of the time, an envy of a lot of other provinces. That is only because we are exposed to this magnificent mosaic of cultures that come before us.

In looking at the groups also, the sense of equality and the quality of life is stressed, because peoples of various ethnic groups have the opportunity to explore not only what they are looking for, but they have the opportunity and the equality of knowing that this government is behind and supportive of their actions. This government has shown that it has a social conscience in that the multicultural groups have the strength and the encouragement to come forth and challenge government. They have the strength and the encouragement to come forth and challenge the members to be accountable for our record, and we stand very proudly on our record here in Manitoba.

* (1720)

The peoples who come before the members and all members, which they should do, they should be very aware of this government's position, that multiculturalism has a very strong part in our mosaic here in Manitoba.

In fact, our Premier (Mr. Filmon), just a few months ago, I believe it was in February, renamed the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation to Culture, Heritage and Citizenship to recognize the importance of citizenship and the peoples wanting and needing to come to our province.

Manitoba is a focus. As our geographic area is the centre of Manitoba, it also is the centre of envy. In trying to be more cognizant of the new citizens and the new members of our society, this Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship will now focus on trying to achieve, to amalgamate and to better the wants and the needs of the ethnic minorities and the citizens from other parts of the world who want to come to Canada.

Canada is the envy of nations. If we looked in the paper, I think it was about a week ago, there was an article saying that Canada is ranked No. 2 in the world as a place to come for refugees, for new immigrants and people who are wanting to migrate from their countries. Canada is the second choice in the world, and that is a very strong, enviable position of any country, to have that type of strong response of people wanting to come to our country.

Manitoba is a strong focus of people to come to because of the strong ethnic minorities and the strong ethnic communities we have here now. They can find a place to amalgamate, to come into the mosaic and fit right into their friendships and their own communities. The people who are in these communities have come forth and have set up their programs. They have catered to and are recognizing a lot of the needs and the wants in their own ethnic communities. They have the opportunity to share these with the new immigrants and new ethnic minorities who do come to this province. The experience that they have garnered and the strength that they have received within their own groups is something that other groups will envy in the sense that it gives a purpose for coming here, and Manitoba welcomes these people.

In looking at the amendment that the member has brought forth, the criticism that he has labelled or has come forth with, is the fact that he believes that the funding and the authority should be going back to the Manitoba Intercultural Council; whereas, in fact, one of the reasonings for the change was the fact that the funding was removed from the Manitoba Intercultural Council as a result of a task force report on the MIC and the special audit that was done on this organization.

The report itself seems to be in contradiction with what the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) is coming forth with, in the sense that the recommendation is that there be a different direction taken. Now he is saying that direction that has been taken is wrong. It should go back to the way it was before.

We must recognize that we are dealing with boards of volunteers, and the volunteers themselves that are coming forth are putting in the time, the effort, and the involvement that they feel is the best for their community. The government is providing the funding as a source for them to work with but, at the same time, the direction that they are going to take is on their own.

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

The direction that is put forth by the members on MGAC are strictly volunteer. They are people from various organizations and ethnic backgrounds here in Manitoba and the decisions and directions as to their funding is controlled and directed by the membership. It is granted that the funding comes from the government, but the direction has come from the people themselves. So, really, to have it go back to a system previously just for the sake of a group or individuals who are wanting to control it again does not seem to go in the same direction as to what has already been approved and has gone with the MGAC organization right now.

The member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has indicated from time to time that the Liberal Party is definitely opposed to this direction that has been taken by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) with the new direction; but I see that some of these things still must be addressed in the sense that it has been brought forth by the minister.

I would just like to conclude, Mr. Acting Speaker, that to make difference in changes in midstream and to make the system of a better nature just for the sake of amendment is not the right way. The system that has been in place right now is working. There is an agreement, and there is a co-ordination on the existing board, that the system is working. In talking to the memberships and some of the members that I have had the opportunity to meet, there is an enthusiasm that they look forward to working with the grants available and with the multicultural cultures here in Manitoba.

With that, Mr. Acting Speaker, I will conclude my remarks. Thank you very much.

Mrs. Rosemary Vodrey (Fort Garry): I am pleased today also to take the opportunity to speak on The Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act, and I just have a few things I would like to say by way of introduction.

I think it is very important for us to be aware that the issues relating to multiculturalism are not to be seen in a narrow frame. They are not simply a narrow band of issues that can be fixed by a simple act addressing only a few portions of multicultural issues. My concern is that this particular amendment act addresses only multiculturalism in the very narrow frame.

I think it is very important that this government see that multiculturalism is a series of broad issues, relating to a number of groups in Manitoba, and that these issues should be covered through a multicultural act which would be much more comprehensive and would not look at things only in such a narrow way.

Our goal as a government, and we have stated it several times, is to be, in fact, holistic. We would like to look at the issues relating to the people of Manitoba in a wide and holistic method so that we are not exclusive in legislation and issues that we bring forward. With that as a background and our efforts as a government and our theme as a government not to deal with the quick fix, I would like to talk to you a little bit about some of the multicultural events that I have had the privilege to be a part of. Some of these events have taken place across Manitoba, and it has been a real privilege for myself and my family to be part of this.

One of the events that occurred this weekend on Saturday was a celebration by the Filipino community. It was the Alapan Filipino community, a group of citizens who had lived together on one street in the Philippines. A great number of those individuals have moved to Manitoba, and they use this opportunity to celebrate their festival, much as they did in the Philippines.

My husband and my family and I were welcomed by this group, and we had the chance to read the background and the significance of the day, May 28, to the Filipino community. This day functions for them very much as Remembrance Day does for the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada.

It was an opportunity for us to meet multi generations as well. I think that was part of the pleasure that we had, in that we met grandparents and parents and young people and babies. It was an important part of this cultural event that it not be seen in the narrow range but instead that it be seen in the wide range. It applied to all the people of all ages. Young people were not excluded; in fact, they were included.

* (1730)

We as guests were fully included in the celebrations of the whole day, and we enjoyed it. I will say for the record, a couple of my children were not able to attend. They were studying for exams. The community was so warm and welcoming that they sent home some of the traditional foods for my

children, so that my children could be part of the event and know about the event and could share the heritage, even though they could not attend on the day.

I was very pleased because the celebration took place at Crescent Park, which is in Fort Garry. It was by the river, it was a large park setting, and I was pleased to have that event take place there.

I also attended the Manitoba Caribbean Association and that was an evening of great interest to me, because it again involved whole families. It involved not just adults who were holding on to some cultural issues, but instead it involved whole families, young people and grandparents who were involved in keeping cultural issues alive. Again, it was a real pleasure for me to talk with some of the young people whom I have known for some time and to have those young people explain to me why the issues of their heritage were of such importance to them, and that those issues were not again just issues for one night, one time, a narrow range, but were in fact part of their life and to be shared and to be enjoyed and to be practised.

We also had the opportunity to attend an event at the Scandinavian Centre, and this was a very interesting event also because it included each of the Scandinavian countries. In their centre in Winnipeg, each of the countries has a room in which they have their own books and their language is preserved. People who read in the language can come and do reading and young people can learn not only to be literate in terms of speaking the language, they also have the opportunity to become literate through reading the language.

I think that is another important fact, and that we are not just talking about maintaining traditions in the narrow range that some people know only part, but that there is the opportunity for young people, seniors and families to know cultural issues in the wide range.

As my colleagues have said, we also had the opportunity to enjoy the food on that evening, which was really good, and also the singing. It was one of my first opportunities to see some of the traditional costuming as well. Each of the Scandinavian groups wore a traditional costume with material that represented, or was in fact from, their homeland, and for those people some of those costumes had been handed down or were part of a family's cultural

history. It was a real opportunity for us to be part of that.

I also had the opportunity to attend with my colleague from St. Vital (Mrs. Render) the opening of the Ahmadiyya Muslim Association. This was a very important opening because it was the opening not only of a cultural centre, but the opening of a religious centre as well.

Again, when we look at the issues of multiculturalism, we are looking at them in the broad range. We are looking at all of the areas that the people of Manitoba see as important, not just a simple and narrow range.

On that evening, we had the opportunity to see and take part in a religious ceremony and then also to go downstairs and take part in the festivities. It was an interesting night. I have mentioned it one other time, the head of that association, Dr. Qamar, comes from Fort Garry, and it was very important to me to have the opportunity to be part of an evening with my constituent and share that cultural event.

Now I have said that the issues of multiculturalism do not just relate to the narrow band of an evening out. I have had the opportunity to take part, for Victoria Hospital, in a multicultural birthing day in which the hospital examined the issues relating to the birth of a child where there were issues of multicultural sensitivity. We know that the issues of multicultural sensitivity around birthing can make for a much different start for a parent and a child in their life. I think this was very responsive of the hospital and the hospital staff to recognize that these issues need to be attended to by the nursing staff and by the medical doctors and by the people who work at the many jobs within a hospital. Victoria Hospital, again, is in the constituency of Fort Garry, and I have seen that hospital in my experience with it to be extremely responsive to the many issues raised by the community.

I also want to talk a little bit about the University of Manitoba. The University of Manitoba is also in Fort Garry constituency, and it has, to its credit, students from all around the world who are attending. It also has professors from all around the world which allows students studying there the opportunity for a very comprehensive program.

When we look at students coming to study in a foreign country, many of the students do not speak the language to start with, and some have English to deal with. Some do speak the language, but they

have to deal with cultural changes. Some of them have to do simply with the climate, and some have to do, also, with the places that they live and in developing a social group in which they are comfortable and in which they can start to make friends, and also a social group in which they can feel some comfort from the home that they have left behind and hold on to their language and their cultural traditions.

I am very proud of the fact that the University of Manitoba has the kind of reputation that it will attract students from around the world and also professors of great expertise.

Within Fort Garry, we have a number of the university communities, both students and professors who are living and working in Fort Garry. I have had the opportunity to talk to a number of them representing a number of different cultural groups. Most recently, I had a member of the faculty in physics, who represented the Korean cultural group, come to speak with me. He was an organizer of a Korean music and dance group. I was very happy to have the opportunity to sit and talk with him about his experiences and his efforts with his multicultural group to keep his culture an important place in the life of his family.

Moving from the University of Manitoba, I would just like to move into the constituency of Fort Garry as well. My colleague has reflected on his constituency, and I would just like to tell you about the multicultural representation in Fort Garry, so that you will have the idea and you will have a good sense of the fact that Fort Garry is, in fact, a multicultural community within a small part of Winnipeg. I am very happy that I have had the opportunity to meet with a number of the multicultural groups whose presidents and whose board members and whose participants live in my constituency.

So I think that, in summary, what I would like to leave you with is the thought that my concerns relating to this amendment are that they will view multiculturalism in a very narrow range, and that multiculturalism is, in fact, many things to the people of Manitoba. I would just like to reinforce the fact that this government sees multiculturalism with three very fundamental principles. In fact, No. 1, we value the cultural diversity of Manitoba, and we believe that the cultural diversity of Manitoba is a source of pride and a source of strength to the people of Manitoba.

This government would like to provide some leadership to promote—to continue to provide leadership really—the intercultural understanding and the mutual respect that is necessary between cultural groups, the acceptance and the harmony among Manitoba's many multicultural groups, and this government will continue to encourage the efforts of all Manitobans to enhance and develop their cultures within Manitoba society.

* (1740)

Just for an example, if I can reflect back to the Filipino community and their picnic that I attended on Saturday, the picnic took place in Crescent Park; it was by no means an exclusive picnic. As people rode through the park on their bikes, or they were driving—there was a wedding reception being photographed very close to us—the community was completely open and welcoming, and what they said was, this is not exclusive, this is for the people of Manitoba, this is an opportunity for the people of Manitoba to understand the significance of this day for us and also to share in the celebration of this day for us. I think that was in action a promotion and an effort of Manitobans to include other Manitobans in their important cultural events.

I would like to also say that this government also encourages the retention of languages and the continuing development of the artistic activities, and that is why a number of the groups have received funding for their dance groups and for their language schools.

I thank you for the opportunity in allowing me to speak on this bill.

Mrs. Shirley Render (St. Vital): Mr. Acting Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that debate on this motion be adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 24—The Business Practices Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), Bill 24, The Business Practices Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les pratiques commerciales, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). Agreed? Agreed.

Bill 25—The Environment Amendment Act (2)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), Bill 25, The Environment Amendment Act (2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Agreed? Agreed.

Bill 26—The Environment Amendment Act (3)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), Bill 26, The Environment Amendment Act (3); Loi no 3 modifiant la Loi sur l'environnement, standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

Is it agreed that it remain standing? Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Acting Speaker, it is with pleasure for me to stand here and speak on this particular bill, a bill that the member for St. James put a lot of work and effort into preparing. The member for St. James, during the month of December and January, had participated in a large number of meetings with different environmental groups and concerned citizens in regard to some of the things that were lacking in the environment bill that the government of the day brought in back in December.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I am sure that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) would be very interested in terms of what the government has to say about these bills. Earlier this evening, just shortly after five o'clock, we had tried to encourage the government to speak on bills such as that of the member for St. James as a courtesy. It is not to say, someone cannot stand a bill. We feel that it is important that the work and effort that members put in legislation or proposed legislation, such as this, do deserve the remarks from the government, whether they support the bill or they do not support the bill.

The government, in turn, asks the opposition, and justifiably so, to speak on government legislation. It has been a courtesy of the Chamber, as long as a bill, whether it is this bill or other bills, is in fact being debated, that there is usually agreement that bills will be allowed to stand. So I say that, for what it is worth, Mr. Acting Speaker, because of the effort that

many members, whether they are New Democrats, Liberals or, in fact, on resolutions, the Conservatives, that have put a lot of work into what they have brought forward for private members' hour.

I believe that all of them deserve the comments from all three political parties, especially from the government, from our perspective, because the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) had put in the amount of time that he put in in order to come up with this bill, the number of individuals that he himself has talked to. In fact, like every caucus, there is a great deal of conversation and debate with individual members in the preparation of bills, as was for this particular bill, because this bill removes the discretionary power of the minister to determine whether an assessment is needed to ensure the minister is bound to undertake a review.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this is an issue that we should not take very lightly. That is the reason why the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) felt it was so important that this particular issue be brought up. The significance of the time is that we had a major piece of legislation, government legislation, that was brought forward. That government legislation, I believe, was passed in around January 21. Prior to it being passed, we were in the committee stage in which the essence of this bill was discussed and debated in committee. Different presenters had commented and stressed the concern that it, in fact, was giving to the ministers the amount of power that was being given to the ministers.

The debates during the committee stage and subsequent debates during that long January day gives us, what we believe, just causes and just reason to bring forward, once again, the bill for debate.

The environment is an issue that all of us, we like to think, are very concerned with, Mr. Acting Speaker. We in the opposition, in the past number of years, have always rated the environment as a top priority and have encouraged the government to act where we feel it would be necessary and prudent for the government to act, whatever the environmental issue might be. We have some concerns when we see a minister, through legislation, take so much responsibility in terms of the regulations.

The reason why we say that, Mr. Acting Speaker, is we only need to take a look next door in the

province of Saskatchewan and the whole question of Rafferty-Alameda, the project that has been going through the courts—the politics that were played in that particular dam. I think that is an excellent example as to why it is we should be looking very carefully on what legislation was passed and received Royal Assent back on January 21. One of the things we disagreed with on that legislation is the fact of the responsibilities or that discretionary power of the minister, because we are leaving too many things open for the minister to make decisions that could have devastating impacts on our environment.

We have seen, and I cited, the Rafferty-Alameda project. It is not alone and the primary reason why the Rafferty is going ahead is because of the work that has been completed on it thus far. It is too late to turn around.

If we bring that example to the province of Manitoba, all we need to do is take a look at the Conawapa or the proposed Conawapa deal. No one would oppose having additional power supplied if, in fact, there was the demand for it, and we know that there was going to be a need for it. We have to be very concerned. The public demands that we ensure our environment is protected.

* (1750)

We have seen the government talk about having the environment as a high priority. They say that they are going to have environmental impact studies done on the Conawapa deal. To their merit, at least they are saying they are going to have some environmental impact studies. We know, through the previous administration, when they had developments of that nature—Limestone is what I am referring to—where we did not see anything done for the environment, nothing done to protect the interest of the environment.

Mr. Acting Speaker, this government on Conawapa has said that they are going to do environmental studies, and they are currently spending vast amounts of dollars in order to get the Conawapa up and ready. It seems to me that the government has already, in its wisdom, made its decision on what it is going to be doing about the development of the Conawapa project, whether Manitoba needs it or not.

I know that the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) is a very sincere individual and he says in fact that it has not been decided and the needs study

has to done, as he says from his seat. We will look forward to seeing what the needs study says. We will look forward to seeing all of the environmental studies, whether for the pipeline or the dam itself. I guess in the back of our minds we like to believe that the government will do what is in the best interest of Manitobans on this issue and not do what the New Democrats did when it came to the Limestone issues where they made it a political football, if you will, by doing things that were premature and somewhat deceptive to many northern Manitobans.

If we had not as much discretionary power given to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), there is more of a guarantee for us as parliamentarians that whatever government might be in office, this particular government might say that we are going to be responsible; we are going to be using that discretionary power that is given to the minister in a responsible way. But there are no assurances that in fact future governments will, whether it is the same Conservative party under a different minister, whether it is a change to the New Democrats. We feel what is needed is it should be put in the legislation and that is why, as I say, the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) felt that it was so important to bring forward this piece of legislation.

We do wait for the government to be able to put on the record what they have to say about this particular bill and defend why it is that they feel the minister should be given the discretionary power that he, or in the future she, would have.

I have talked to a lot of my constituents, I will not try to define lot, but issues that come up time after time, the first one has got to be health care. Followed by health care it is very close to a toss up between the environment and job creation and education. The public right now does want a government that is going to be responsible when it comes to our environment. They want to see legislation that in fact will make Manitoba a leader when it comes to environmental concerns and how we deal with environmental issues in the future.

Mr. Acting Speaker, I know that the member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) had introduced, prior to this one, Bill 25, another piece of the environmental legislation, which was at the same committee meetings that Bill 26 was. That is why it is very different, but it came out of the same committee as Bill 26 came out of. That is why, as I say, we have a high priority on the environment. We feel that the government should do more than give lip service to

our environment, that we feel it is of the utmost importance that, in fact, the government start acting in a more progressive way when it comes to environmental issues.

One of the ways they can do that, Mr. Acting Speaker, is by allowing this particular bill and, I would suggest, Bill 25, to go to committee stage and allow the public to have the input on these two bills, because I am sure, as I believe many of the Conservatives are sure, that in fact this is a bill that does merit the attention that would be given by the government, or should be given, I should say, by the government.

Mr. Acting Speaker, we can only hope that some day we will see the government not only speak to this bill, but speak to all of the private members' bills as the government asks us to speak to legislation that they bring forward and, as we do, if bills were stood straight through, the government would have a right to be able to say to us to start standing up, justifiable so. We do stand up to speak to bills when we are asked to, and we did ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), the government House leader, to speak on these very legitimate bills.

On that note, I conclude my remarks and encourage all members of this Chamber, whatever political affiliation you might be, to give the attention which is necessary in order that these bills be addressed in the proper fashion. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): As previously agreed, this Bill 26 will remain standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness).

SECOND READINGS—PUBLIC BILLS

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Bill 16 (The Motor Vehicle Lemon Law Act; Loi sur les véhicules automobiles défectueux), ready to proceed?

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Bill 17 (The Consumer Protection Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la protection du consommateur), are you ready to proceed?

An Honourable Member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Bill 27 (The Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

(2); Loi no 2 modifiant la Loi sur l'assurance-maladie), ready to proceed?

An Honourable Member: No.

DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—PRIVATE BILLS

Bill 32—The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): On the proposed motion of the honourable member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis), (Bill 32, The Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la "Mount Carmel Clinic"), standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

An Honourable Member: Stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Agreed? It is agreed that this remain standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Acting Speaker, I did not quite anticipate speaking on Bill 32 today, but I will be more than happy to put a few words on the record, because I feel that this is a bill which not only the Conservatives should be addressing, as I had mentioned previously in my remarks, but I know the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) had spoken on this bill, and she spoke very eloquently.

This bill does support what we believe in the Liberal Party is essential. So the Liberal Party has no problem with this bill. We look forward, in fact, to hearing what others have to say about this bill, because the clinics are very important. They play a very important role. There are many people who put a lot of time into ensuring that clinics, whether it is this clinic or whatever other clinic, are there for the future. They require volunteers. They require paid staff, and, Mr. Acting Speaker, you know as well as I do that the commitment of the individuals who put in their time and their effort in these clinics are well worth their while. These are people who have a very caring heart, people who want to be able to see and treat people in a very first-class way. It takes a special type of person to be able to do that.

The bill that the member for St. Johns (Ms. Wasylycia-Leis) has brought before us should not be held up, I would suggest, during Second Reading or in private members' hour at great length.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laurendeau): Order, please. As previously agreed, Bill 32 will remain standing in the name of the honourable Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld) and also in the name of the honourable member for Inkster (Mr.

Lamoureux). The honourable member for Inkster will have approximately 13 minutes left.

The hour being six o'clock, this House is now adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow (Friday).

Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, May 30, 1991

CONTENTS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
		Labour Adjustment Strategy Chomiak; Derkach	2710
Presenting Petitions		Department of Housing Plohman; Ernst	2710
55-Plus Program Indexing Gaudry	2702	Regional Housing Authorities Plohman; Ernst	2711
Tabling of Reports			
Departmental Estimates, Finance Manness	2702		
Introduction of Bills			
Bill 11, Residential Tenancies Amendment Act Martindale	2702		
Bill 37, Planning Amendment Act Martindale	2702		
Oral Questions			
Goods and Services Tax Storie; Manness	2703		
Crown Corporations Storie; Manness	2703		
Budget Storie; Manness	2704		
Northern Flood Agreement Ashton; Downey; Neufeld	2704		
Labour Adjustment Strategy Carstairs; Filmon; Derkach	2705		
Pines Project Martindale; Ernst	2706		
Winnipeg Waterways Martindale; Ernst	2707		
Winnipeg International Airport Martindale; Filmon	2707		
Ducks Unlimited Headquarters Cerilli; Enns; Cummings	2707		
Core Area Initiative Carr; Ernst	2708		
Education System Chomiak; Derkach	2709		
		ORDERS OF THE DAY	
		Nonpolitical Statements	
		25th Anniversary, Winnipeg Adult Education Centre Hickes	2711
		Matters of Grievance	
		Immigration Concerns Lamoureux	2712
		Rotary Pines Approval/Pritchard Place Funding Martindale	2717
		Government Policies Impact on Manitoba Families Barrett	2725
		Senior Citizens in Manitoba Santos	2731
		Private Members' Business	
		Debate on Second Readings-Public Bills	
		Bill 23, Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act Sveinson	2736
		Reimer	2737
		Vodrey	2740
		Bill 26, Environment Amendment Act (3) Lamoureux	2743
		Debate on Second Readings-Private Bills	
		Bill 32, Mount Carmel Clinic Amendment Act Lamoureux	2745