

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 2, 1989.

The House met at 10 a.m.

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### PRAYERS

#### Ladco Land Development Deal Cash Distribution

#### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Harry Hansen, Lillian Hansen, Viola Poersch and others calling upon the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba to respond to unjustified drug price escalations by intervening in the court challenge by the Manitoba Society of Seniors and supporting their claim that Bill C-22 is unconstitutional.

The petition of the undersigned of the Province of Manitoba, humbly sheweth:

That until 1987 Canada enjoyed pharmaceutical drug prices among the lowest in the world which resulted from competition between manufacturers; but amendments to the Patent Act initiated certain measures which reduced competition and increased drug prices at rates considerably above inflation, contrary to federal Government assurances.

That high users of pharmaceutical drugs such as seniors, the disabled and persons with chronic health difficulties are often among the poorest Manitobans, and will therefore experience hardship as drug price increases outpace income growth.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba may be pleased to respond to unjustified drug price escalations by intervening in the court challenge by the Manitoba Society of Seniors and support their claim that federal Bill C-22 is unconstitutional.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the Annual Report of the Public Trustee for 1987-88.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to oral questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Winnipeg Beach School, seventeen Grade 6 students under the direction of Larry Moore. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli (Mr. Helwer).

Also this morning we have from the Ochre River School, twenty-five Grade 9 students under the direction of Mr. Arnold Tokaryk and Debra Dupley. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, we welcome you here this morning.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Official Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). The Minister has been repeatedly saying that the Ladco proposal was superior to all others he received. Yes, when you look at the agreement—and we have had a number of lawyers do exactly that—the deal is heavily stacked in favour of Ladco. I would like to draw the Minister's attention to Paragraph 7.1 of the agreement. The agreement provides that MHRC is only entitled to receive a cash distribution in the first five years from the date the first tender contract is awarded, and after that five-year period is not entitled to any distribution until Ladco receives \$6.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister explain to the House this morning why he believes it is such a good deal when all the development costs will take place in the first five years and then Ladco kicks in and gets 100 percent of the revenue?

\* (1005)

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** First of all, again the Member opposite is not reading the agreement correctly. That is probably one of the reasons why I called a meeting for next Tuesday, 8 a.m.

However, at this time to make sure that they understand, I will file the working papers with the House to both critics. My offer is still open for my staff to meet them at 8 a.m., and maybe the critic from the Liberals will explain that is not correct, that they do not receive their \$6 million. If she would read that again, that paragraph 7.1, she will find that if we receive nothing, they receive nothing.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** The Minister of Housing cannot read the agreement correctly, because the agreement says that in the first five years we, as representatives in MHRC, receive 75 percent and Ladco receives 25 percent, but after that five-year period Ladco receives 100 percent.

Will the Minister explain why the lawyers with whom we have consulted indicate that this is a bad deal for MHRC?

**Mr. Ducharme:** Mr. Speaker, I am filing the working papers and maybe I can give an example of where she is incorrect. Ladco only receives the \$6 million in the event MHRC receives the \$5.25 million in the first five years. If MHRC receives nil in the first five years, Ladco receives nil in that period of time after five.

However, the ratio of the land proportion will take over on the profits after that five-year period and that

is the way it reads. We negotiated it in the working documents and in the agreement. That is the way it shows, so go to the meeting on Tuesday. I extend it to the Leader of the Opposition. She can also come to the meeting on Tuesday.

### Proposals

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a supplementary question to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme), yet once again the Minister says we can have working papers, the ones in which he has put a political spin. Will the Minister agree today to file the original proposals from all the developers so that when we attend the meeting, through our representative on Tuesday, we will have the specifics of all three offers?

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, I will go over all the working papers on Tuesday. It will show what I have been repeating for the last five days. This is the best deal for Manitoba by a case of \$5 million. She mentions it had a political spin. She will also see in those working papers a conclusion and a paragraph that provides that whatever scenario my staff looked at, Ladco proposal was the best for Manitobans and I am tabling that.

The proposals from the other two groups have suggested they do not want to file the proposals. We will file the working papers of those particular agreements.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Working papers, Tory working papers—Mr. Speaker, we want the unadulterated proposals. That is what we want.

### Start-up Date

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** With a new question to the Minister of Housing, according to the deal, Ladco alone will determine when the development will start. Wood Gundy, a firm for which I know this Government has great respect—after all, they have actually chosen their candidates from among the ranks of Wood Gundy employees. Wood Gundy confirmed yesterday that the housing market faces a major slump. The timing of this development could be crucial for the Manitoba economy. Yet, Mr. Speaker, Ladco has complete control as to the start-up date.

My question to the Minister is, what guarantees has the Minister obtained from Ladco that they will not stall the project until the market is right for them rather than for the people of the Province of Manitoba?

\* (1010)

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, it is—

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have recognized the Honourable Minister of Housing.

**Mr. Ducharme:** —getting worse. If she would again read the agreement, we have two members who sit on that particular proposal board. We are suggesting that approximately 120 homes a year over a 15-year period and we have not been overly optimistic in that. We are encouraged, we are optimistic in this province that we will be able to accommodate 120 houses in this particular area. It is ludicrous to suggest that the housing market is going to drop, that you cannot get rid of 120 lots in that particular area.

### Housing Market Declining Demand

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** But they gave away control to Ladco. Can the Minister tell this House how he intends to address the problem of a projected 17 percent slump in the market and how, if there is that slump, we are going to get any money out of this particular project?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** I guess I can only say to that, Mr. Speaker, my staff, when they looked at the scenarios from all the proposals, did the scenarios on what they felt the market conditions would be. That is how we worked it out. Regardless of the scenario, it is still the best deal for Manitoba on any of the proposals that we received.

### Ladco Land Development Deal Proposals

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Knowing that I may test your patience just a little bit, will the Minister of Housing, today, table the proposals so that we can have the opportunity over the weekend to study the specific proposals submitted by the development companies and not the arrangements that they have taken and they have worked and put their political spin on?

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged in her preamble that she would be stretching your patience and the Rules of this House with her question in being repetitive. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has been here as long as I have and knows the rules about repetitive questions.

**Mr. Speaker:** I would like to thank the Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, would you kindly rephrase your question, please?

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The simple question is, why will he not table the proposals?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, because the people who made the presentations and the proposals have asked—and that is normal in practice from those people—that their proposals not be submitted. If she would like to maybe go to Genstar and maybe go to the other group, fine, she can go to them and ask.

However, the working papers that were devised by our staff at MHRC show in no uncertain words that was the best deal for Manitoba to the tune of \$5 million difference between the first and second parties.

### Housing Market Declining Market

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** We are awaiting the tabling of those documents. We are also awaiting the tabling of the contributions to all political Parties.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the same Minister. We have a situation where Winnipeg is the only city in Canada under Tory administration where the values of average houses have gone down over the last year. My question to the Minister, given the fact that every average homeowner in the City of Winnipeg has lost \$1,000 on their home in terms of equity in the City of Winnipeg, what research and background material did he have, and impact study material does he have, to justify increasing the housing market in a dramatic way with the developer friends in south St. Boniface and Fort Osborne Barracks? Why is he expanding the market, which will lower the value of every average Manitoban's housing in the City of Winnipeg?

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

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

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, we have one Opposition Leader saying, build and do not worry about the market situation. We have another Opposition Leader who says, we are worried about the flux of 120 to 130 lots a year coming on the market. We looked at the market situation and it shows in that particular area. That is why we worked it over 15 years. We were not overly optimistic on 120 lots a year coming on stream.

\* (1015)

### Impact Study

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, does he have an impact study that he can table in this Chamber to justify to the people of Winnipeg whose houses have gone down in value—unlike previous years when we were in Government, they have lost \$1,000 under this administration in the average price of their house. Does he have an impact study to show what effect the new housing, the up-scale housing, the compatible housing for the rich, does he have an impact study of what that will do to the average price in the City of Winnipeg, given his devastating performance in the last year in terms of housing prices?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, this side of the House, unlike the other side of the House who are negative every day, we are optimistic and will show that when we introduce our Budget on Monday.

### Budget Economic Development

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My question then is to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon). What will be in the Budget to return the equity that people have lost in their houses in the City of Winnipeg over the last year? What will be in the Budget to deal with the situation of hundreds of workers losing their jobs through plant closing, like Lipton's yesterday, under the Free Trade Agreement that he supports—Ogilvie's, Molson's, Lipton's? What will be in the Budget to deal with the fact that Winnipeg has an unemployment rate half a percent off of St. John's, Newfoundland?

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

**Mr. Doer:** What is this Government going to do about it?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** There were at least four or five separate and distinct questions there. I hope I will be given the opportunity to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, firstly, this Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) on the one hand says he is in favour of more affordable housing. He criticizes us for only having spent \$73 million on housing programs to create affordable housing, and then he says we are creating a situation in which the housing is too affordable. It is bizarre, absolutely bizarre.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to him—the figures are available from the Conference Board—our unemployment rate is expected to continue to go down this year. There are 7,000 more people employed in full-time employment in Manitoba today than were employed when the NDP were in Government. Things are far better than when he was in Government.

Thirdly, he refers to the closure of Thomas Lipton, and the officials of Thomas Lipton indicate very clearly it has absolutely nothing to do with, as he says, the Free Trade Agreement. They said that their entire market is Canadian. Their competition is Canadian. He is wrong on every count and I will be glad to have somebody else ask a question who makes more sense.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, the Members opposite think it is funny. If they think it is funny, go tell the workers and families at Ogilvie's. Go tell the workers and families of Molson's. Go tell the workers and families at Canada Packer Egg Processing.

My question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), has he got a strategy and will he be presenting a strategy in the Budget to deal with the fact that Winnipeg now has an unemployment rate half a percent off of St. John's, Newfoundland? It is going up every month under this do-nothing Government. Is he going to come in with a strategy on Monday to deal with the real economic challenges facing working people and their families in this province?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, firstly, Canada Packers closed under his administration. Get the facts straight.

Secondly, the Investment Dealers' Association of Canada have indicated in their report that was released just 10 days ago that we are projected to have the largest increase in private business capital investment in the entire country, 12.5 percent after inflation. The Conference Board says that our growth rate will be well above the national average at 4 percent in 1989. They indicate that our unemployment rate will continue to decline in 1989 and, of course, Statistics Canada reported last month that there were 7,000 more Manitobans in full-time employment than there were a year ago when we took office from that failed administration that he represented. Those are the facts.

### Infill Housing Program Statistics

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** I have a question for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). Last year, the Minister made a commitment to build 38 infill houses. The other day in the hallway, the Minister was making comments regarding the infill housing program and suggested that I was not being truthful. He said the Government did not cut back on infill housing, but rather could not find the lots for the program.

\* (1020)

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the Western Revitalization Board that they have been suggesting lots for over a year. I have been sent a letter that suggests 18 lots, one of which has been boarded up for over the past year from MHRC. Will the Minister today tell this Chamber why not one infill house was built in the fiscal year of '88-89, and tell me who is being truthful and who is not? I am willing to table the letter, and it is dated January 16, 1989. Who is being truthful?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Maybe the Member from across the way observed my frustrations when his Leader, the same day, had to be corrected by an individual on public television that she had made an incorrect statement on this floor. However, I must inform the Member that if he looks at his Weston Group, we committed to 10 infill housing. There are lots available, sure, but the lots, unfortunately, that have been coming forward, the people are coming forward, are up substantially from what they were the last couple of years. The infill program has been so popular that the prices of the lots are going up. We are working, our staff is working, and we will have infill housing, the same as all our allocations when the Budget comes forward next week.

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

**Mr. Lamoureux:** The Revitalization Program has suggested they would be more than happy to help in acquiring the purchasing of some of these lots so that the Government could put infill housing there.

### Budget Infill Housing Commitment

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Because of this Government's dismal failure to construct one infill house in '88-89, will this Minister assure this House that Monday's Budget will include last year's commitment of 38 infill houses, in addition?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** When I am ready to submit, with all my allocations of all my units for '89—and the Member must realize that infill housing for '88 and the proposals that came forward from the year previous were the '88 commitments of the previous administration who did not file at that time those particular infill housing.

### Housing Minister Apology Request

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** The Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) also called me a liar regarding the proposal call the other day in the hallway and the manner in which it went out.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the Honourable Member kindly put his question?

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Okay. The evidence confirms that the accuracy of my statements are correct. If there was a lie, it was not I.

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

The Honourable Member will kindly put his question now.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Will the Honourable Minister stand up today and apologize for his remarks the other day in the hallway?

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

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

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Member across the way, the critic, and his Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) came forward in this particular House and said that there was no notification sent out in regard to proposals. They were wrong. Will they apologize for that one?

Also, they said there was no proposal received by one of the consortiums, and that individual had to get on public television and apologize on her behalf saying, yes, he had given a proposal. Will they apologize? Apologize.

**An Honourable Member:** You apologize.

### Child Care Legislative Requirements

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** As of October 1988, staff trained as Child Care Worker III's were required in the Province of Manitoba to be in the day cares. We are not meeting that legislative requirement, Mr. Speaker. The Universities Grants Commission has just rejected the funding for the Child Care Worker III Program through the Faculty of Human Ecology.

My question is to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach). How is this Minister going to ensure that those legislative requirements are met which the NDP administration failed to meet and which this Government is not meeting?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Our priority in terms of funding or supporting education programs with regard to child care are in that we want to see as many as possible trained child care workers out in the field to fill those vacancies that are out there. Mr. Speaker, in order to do that, we have to support the programs that are now in existence.

With regard to the degree program at the University of Manitoba, the Universities Grants Commission has indeed given a fairly substantial amount of support to the universities this year. It is up to the university to determine what priorities they place in programming and how they are going to spend those dollars. I am not going to impose my will on the university and demand that they offer one or another program. That is up to the university to prioritize.

\* (1025)

**Ms. Gray:** This Minister indicates that they support increased child care spaces. Surely the Minister recognizes that in order to train Child Care Worker I's and II's at the community college level, you require Child Care Worker III's from the university to provide the teaching. Can the Minister indicate to us today what steps he has taken to ensure that the legislative requirements will be met in regard to Child Care Worker III? Can he indicate today if in fact he will ensure that that Child Care Worker III Program will go ahead in September, because they have to know within two weeks or it will not go ahead? Can he ensure in the House today that that will go ahead?

**Mr. Derkach:** My department, through the Universities Grants Commission, is responsible for allocating funding to the universities. Mr. Speaker, the universities are responsible for prioritizing their programming and providing the kind of programming that they see is important and that they see a demand for. As I indicated before, I am not going to intervene in the process and short circuit the Universities Grants Commission by going around them and demanding that the University of Winnipeg or the University of Manitoba, in fact, impose certain courses when they have made a decision otherwise.

### Child Care Workers Standards

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), with a final supplementary question.

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** With a final supplementary to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), can the Minister of Family Services indicate to this House today if indeed her Government plans to change the legislative requirements and lower the standards since there are not enough trained child care workers in the province today? Could she indicate that to us?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** No.

### Plant Closures Layoff Protection

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** My question is to the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond). I would like to first of all extend my congratulations to the Minister on her new appointment. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the new Minister of Labour will turn her back on the anti-labour, anti-worker tack of the previous Minister of Labour and bring about some fairness for working people.

Since the beginning of this year, there have been no fewer than 22 layoffs and plant closures in this province ranging from Ogilvie Mills, Wescott Fashions, a variety of major layoffs and plant closures to the point where yesterday we heard of another one affecting 29 employees of the Lipton factory here in Manitoba. Under current legislation, there is no protection for people affected by a layoff of that nature. In this case of 29 long-term employees, an average service of 12 years, there is no protection in legislation.

I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), will she now commit herself and this Government to passing the type of legislation that was introduced by the New Democratic Party to provide stronger protection for laid-off workers affected by major layoffs and plant closures in this province?

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for his kind words at first. First of all, I would like to say that I certainly do not accept the premise of his first remarks about the former Minister being anti-labour in any way.

We certainly plan to continue to be even-handed with labour and management. As far as the Member's Bill is concerned, we will deal with that Bill when it is up for debate. Certainly we feel very strongly for the people who have been laid off. Our department is doing everything and our Government is doing everything possible that they can to help them to adjust to new areas of work and to help them in any way that we can.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the workers at plants such as the Lipton plant can wait until the

Bill is discussed. I hope the Minister will take a stand before then. Hopefully, its stand is different from the Liberal Party which has categorically refused to support improved plant closure legislation in this province.

\* (1030)

### **Unemployed Help Centres Funding Restoration**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** If the Minister is concerned about the plight of the laid-off workers, I would like to ask, is she willing to intervene with her colleague, the Minister for Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), to get funding reinstated for the two Unemployed Help Centres in this province, funding that was cut by this Government last year, funding that should be reinstated given the fact that we have such a greatly increased problem with unemployment in this province right now?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, to the Member's question on that issue, we believe that is a federally funded program, that it should be dealt with through the federal Government. We will do everything in our power to help workers to get adjusted, to get new jobs. We help them in every way with training that we can through our own departments. There is just no way that we will not give as much help as we can. So we are very much concerned with the workers. We just feel that there is a better way to use those funds.

### **Unemployment Insurance Benefit Reforms**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** This Government will not pass legislation to protect laid-off workers. It will not reinstate funding for the Unemployed Help Centre. Will this Minister at least demand that the federal Government remove its proposed changes to the UIC that will hurt workers laid off in plants such as this plant dramatically through increased requirements for UIC? Will this Minister act to at least ensure that there will not be UIC taken away from these workers?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** We will do everything in our power to help the workers in Manitoba get a fair shake from the federal Government.

**An Honourable Member:** Hear, hear!

### **Riverbank Housing Development Government Support**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme). A developer told city councillors this Minister had promised \$5 million towards the commercial development of highrise condominiums on the banks of the Assiniboine River along Portage Avenue. Instead of preserving the city's riverbanks, this project will clutter them in all kinds of ways with a retail office building and a highrise.

This Government makes grand speeches about preserving and protecting our riverbanks for public use.

Did the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) promise \$5 million towards that development which would make a mockery of the grandiose and lofty language this Government uses to protect Winnipeg's riverbank?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Could you name the project? What was the name of the project? Which project? If it is the one you are replying to, the one recently in community committee, the one that has gone up, I think it is at the Rotary Club. The Rotary Club did talk to me. However, as I said to them, they make the proposal call the same as everybody else, and there were no promises made to anyone.

### **Historical Study**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** With a supplementary question to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), on May 10 of this year, an official with the Historic Resources Branch of the Minister's department wrote to the developer who is proposing this project. The official informed the developer that the land in question has historical significance, both for Manitoba's Native peoples and for English settlers.

The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation has the power to force the developer to carry out an impact study to make sure that these historic lands are not lost. Has the Minister taken any action whatsoever to ensure that these lands are not lost to the citizens of Winnipeg?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Mr. Speaker, I will take the specifics of that question as notice and get back to the House.

### **Noise Level**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, with a final supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), another area of concern in this project is safety and noise level because of its proximity to the Winnipeg International Airport, which has come under fire from, among others, the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and a petition signed by hundreds of citizens of the area. Is the Minister concerned that this development will have an adverse impact on the quality of life in that neighbourhood, and in particular because of its proximity to the Winnipeg International Airport?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the Member that a committee has been formed that is looking at that aspect of it, and appointments have been made both from the Liberal Party as well as from Government. They are looking at the impact of the noise level, the total impact of the air transportation system, and the impact it will have on a housing development of this nature. So all I can indicate to the Member is that they have as much input into it as I will have because the members are appointed from at large.

### Private Schools—Funding Audit Request

**Mr. Jerrie Storie (Flin Flon):** Yesterday, I tabled a letter to the Provincial Auditor in which I requested the Provincial Auditor to involve himself in reviewing the circumstances surrounding the special needs grants, which were provided by the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) to private schools, without appropriate precautions being taken for the accounting of that funding.

I would like to ask the Minister of Education and Training whether he will be supporting my request to the Provincial Auditor to have him involved in this review, or at least will the Minister now accept the premise that the Provincial Auditor should be on the committee that is reviewing the accountability procedures that need to be put in place with respect to funding going to private schools?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, no, I am not going to be in agreement with the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie), because his action of course has been provoked by rumour and hearsay. According to what he said yesterday, he has heard rumours about the funds not being used appropriately and, therefore, he has jumped to the conclusion that now he should write a letter to the Provincial Auditor.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not quite the way we do business in the department. Our department will investigate the matter first and, if action is required to be taken, we will take that action.

**Mr. Storie:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going on rumour. I tabled the letter which I think was quite clear that funds were being used to reduce a deficit when they were supposed to be used for the special needs of children in the province.

### Special Needs Children Funding—Accountability

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, given the admission of the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) yesterday that private schools are not required to file individual education plans for the students attending their institutions, given his acknowledgement of that fact, will the Minister now ensure that private schools that receive public funding for special needs students follow the same procedures, are required to account for the funding of special needs students in the same way that public schools are, so that the taxpayers of Manitoba can be assured that money is being spent in the way that it was intended?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Well, once again, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon is wrong, because in fact before any funding is allowed to flow with regard to special needs students, the Department of Child Care and Development staff do, together with the school co-ordinator, go through each student and ascertain whether in fact that

particular student's level of disability qualifies for any level of funding.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have 35 students at the Laureate Academy who are presently being taught under the special needs area. At the present time, these students are being reviewed by the Child Care and Development Branch to see whether or not they qualify for any of the special level funding that is available to students in the special needs area.

**Mr. Storie:** I am not incorrect. The Minister is in fact incorrect. The application for low-incident support is filed by the individual private institutions but there is no individual educational plan put in place. I have a letter from a parent requesting an individual education plan. It was denied, and I will share that with the Minister.

### Public Schools Funding Level

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** My question to the Minister further is, will the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) explain why he has announced a 6 percent increase in support to the public school system, which incidentally is largely through taxation on property and none of which is targeted for special needs, why that 6 percent announcement has been made, and yet he is keeping the public in the dark about his decision to increase private school funding by 30 percent?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach).

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has been hammering away at this same topic now for two or three days. It has become very evident that his bias and his anti-independent school attitude is flowing over into the House. I have to tell you the support that was given to public schools this year was far more generous than was ever made under his administration. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, it was more equitably shared by the province than was ever done under his administration as well.

Even though our support to public schools was higher than under his administration, this Government was still able to provide support to independent schools to give those parents who wish to send their children there the flexibility to do so.

\* (1040)

### Native Education Post-Secondary Funding

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, with a question to the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), the First Minister I know is going to attend a rally later this morning, as well as the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer).

Can the First Minister tell us today exactly what his position is with regard to the funding of post-secondary education for the Native people in this country and the

contribution which the federal Government has chosen to cut back upon?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) and Members of the Legislature and members of the community at large that my Government has expressed its strong support for the position of the aboriginal people of Manitoba who will, I believe, unfairly have to deal with potential cutbacks in education funding for people in post-secondary level. I have said always the investment we make in education is the best investment that we make as a Government and as a people. I am very committed to that.

I might say that letters have been written to the federal Government stating that position on behalf of our Government by the two Ministers who speak for the Government on Native and educational issues, namely, the Minister of Native Affairs, the Honourable James Downey; namely, the Minister of Education, the Honourable Len Derkach.

Mr. Downey wrote as early as November 25, 1988, to the federal Government, and all of that information has been made available to our aboriginal people in Manitoba. He has spoken at rallies. We have indicated publicly our strong support for their position, our desire to ensure that the education funding that they need for the post-secondary education of their people is indeed made available by the federal Government of Canada.

**Some Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Liberal Party and I am sure on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I thank the Premier (Mr. Filmon) for taking a leadership role in this particular issue.

### All-Party Resolution

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Premier confirm today then the willingness of his Party, as I am committing my Party, that the Member for Rupertsland's (Mr. Harper) resolution will be moved to No. 1 on Private Members' Hour so that we can send a joint all-Party statement to Ottawa indicating our full support for the funding of post-secondary education?

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, speaking for the Government Caucus, I can say that whenever an opportunity arises for Members on this side of the House to assist in making the case for aboriginal people in this country, for their educational rights and requirements, we will be available and we will be willing to use every opportunity to state that case.

### Fort Garry Hotel Casino Gaming/Security System

**Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Lotteries

(Mrs. Mitchelson). Last week, I began a question in this House and I think was cut off by the ending of Question Period. I hope that does not happen again, but I was asking about the study that had been done by the Government to determine the type of gaming and security that would be done for the casino that is going to be set up in Fort Garry. The Minister indicated to me that there would be the best security system in place and that we would be very pleased with it.

I wonder if the Minister can give us a little bit more information on what investigations they undertook to come to the conclusions that they did, both on the gaming and security question and perhaps on the issue of dress code. Having sent a number of staff away to Las Vegas—I think one member to Las Vegas for 10 days and three members of the administration to Monaco for three weeks—is there a report that has come out of those trips that have helped you make the decisions for gaming and security? Could you share the results of that trip by those administrative people and the report, if there is one?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Lotteries Foundation Act):** The decision was made by this Government that we clean up the mess that existed at the Convention Centre and the casino by moving it to the Fort Garry Hotel with a better atmosphere, good security and not the eyesore that existed in the past. Mr. Speaker, we were not in favour of that and we made a commitment to move that and to change that, and we have done that.

Mr. Speaker, there were people from the Lotteries Foundation who did go over to Monaco to look at the European-style casino that we were proposing to set up at the Fort Garry Hotel, not like the Las Vegas type of casino but like the more relaxed European atmosphere that existed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The time for oral questions has expired.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to delivering my ruling, I would like to draw Honourable Members' attention to the Speaker's gallery where we have with us this morning Chief Louis Stevenson, the leader of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs; Phil Fontaine, Assembly of First Nations vice president; Chief Pascal Bighetty from Pukatawagan; Chief Jerry Fontaine from Fort Alexander; Chief Ron Cook from Shoal River; and Chief Harvey Nepinak from Waterhen.

On behalf of all Honourable Members, we welcome you here this morning.

### SPEAKER'S RULING

**Mr. Speaker:** I have a ruling for the House but, before delivering it, I wish to inform the House that in my rulings from now on, references to Beauchesne's will be to the Sixth Edition, unless otherwise indicated.

On May 19, 1989, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) rose on an alleged matter of



privilege respecting, "the events which occurred during, subsequent to and related to the May 1, 1989 meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development."

As is required by our practices, the Honourable Member did raise this matter at the earliest opportunity.

As I understand the matter raised by the Honourable Member, it consists of three principal elements:

1. the alleged contempt of the Standing Committee on Economic Development by its Government Members who rose and left the meeting immediately following the defeat of an adjournment motion;
2. the alleged contempt of the same committee by the Chairman who recessed the meeting in the early hours of May 2 and did not resume or reconvene it; and
3. the failure of the Government Members of the committee and of the Chairman to comply with Manitoba Rule 11 which requires the attendance of Members in the service of the House and its committees unless granted leave of absence by the House.

As all Honourable Members know, privilege and contempt are very serious matters. This particular case is one which may be without precedent in the Commonwealth. Therefore, I have reviewed with special care the advice provided by Honourable Members on May 19. I have had extensive research and consultation undertaken with respect to our own practices and those of the House of Commons of Canada. Consultation has also been undertaken with the Ontario Legislative Assembly. Because this is a very serious matter, my ruling is somewhat longer than usual, and I hope that Honourable Members will bear with me.

Following established Manitoba practice, the Honourable Member raised this matter stating, "I rise on a matter of privilege." In his remarks, he alleged that the Government Members and the Chairman had acted in contempt of the Standing Committee.

\* (1050)

Although privilege and contempt are closely related and are generally raised and considered in an identical manner and often, at least in this House, under the heading of privilege, there are certain differences. Maingot's "Parliamentary Privilege in Canada" explains that privileges are enumerated and known, whereas contempts are not. Privilege is defined by Beauchesne Citation 24 as, "the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions." The same citation also points out that "the privileges of Parliament are rights which are absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers." The principal privileges of a Legislature are: the freedom of speech; the freedom from arrest; the power to discipline; the right to have the attendance and service of Members; and the right to regulate its internal affairs. Erskine May, on page 143, defines contempt in the following words, "Any Act or omission

which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent of the offense." To state it more simply, Speaker Brand of the United Kingdom House of Commons ruled on July 25, 1877 that, "any Member wilfully and persistently obstructing public business, without just and reasonable cause, is guilty of a contempt of this House."

There are certain matters regarding the references by Honourable Members to Manitoba Rule 11, and to the privilege of a Legislature to have the attendance and service of its Members, which I would like to point out to the House. Research has indicated that our Rule 11 has generally fallen into disuse. Our records do not identify any matter of privilege in this House as having been based on a contravention of Rule 11. The corresponding Canadian House of Commons provision, Standing Order No. 15, has not been applied since 1878 and is generally considered to be obsolete. Speakers of that House in more recent times have generally discouraged any reference to this provision.

Both the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) and the Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) addressed some of their remarks to a question of order, in that the matter was being raised directly in the House instead of by a report from the committee. First of all, I believe that as Speaker I have an obligation to point out to the House that under our rules, the Speaker is required to at all times "enforce the rules" and "decide all questions of order". Our own rules, just referred to, are reinforced by Beauchesne Citation 171, which states in part that "the Speaker has the duty to maintain an orderly conduct of debate by repressing disorder when it arises, by refusing to propose the question upon motions and amendments which are irregular . . . ."

The Honourable Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae) supported his contention that the matter was improperly before the House by reference to certain citations in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition and to specific Speakers' rulings in Manitoba and in Ottawa. The research which was undertaken revealed the following additional references relevant to the question of whether or not this matter is properly before the House. Erskine May on page 235 states that "the opinion of the Speaker cannot be sought in the House about any matter arising or likely to arise in a committee." Beauchesne Citation 760(3) reads "the Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for the Speaker to exercise procedural control over the committees. Committees are and must remain masters of their own procedure." Beauchesne Citation 107 states, in part, that "breaches of privilege in Committee may be dealt with only by the House itself and on report from the Committee." A review of the relevant pages in Erskine May indicates that the Canadian practice outlined in Beauchesne Citation 107 also applies to the United Kingdom Parliament. On November 26, 1987, Speaker Fraser of the Canadian House of Commons ruled on an alleged matter of privilege, which had not been brought to the

attention of the House by a report, respecting the impeding of a committee, "that there is no prima facie case of privilege as committees are in control of their own procedure and it is not competent for the Speaker to exercise procedural control over the committees."

When this matter was raised in the House, the committee had not met since it was recessed on May 1 and therefore had had no opportunity to consider and agree upon a report to the House. Understandably, the Honourable Member for St Norbert (Mr. Angus) may have been concerned that raising the issue in the procedurally correct manner could lead to a decision that the matter had not been raised at the earliest opportunity and therefore could not be considered.

In conclusion, firstly, there is no doubt that the charges which have been brought before the House are very serious ones. Secondly, I do understand the circumstances which led to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert to believe that proceeding in the manner in which he did may have been the only course open to him if the matter was to be brought to the attention of the House and given the consideration which he felt necessary.

Nevertheless, based on the authorities to which I have referred earlier and the specific extracts which I have quoted, it is my opinion that to be handled in accordance with long-established practices and procedures, this issue would have to be brought to the attention of this House by a report considered and agreed upon by the Standing Committee on Economic Development and presented to the House. To do otherwise would run the risk of establishing a precedent which could lead to an increasing involvement of the House in the affairs of the committees which must, as indicated by the authorities, be masters of their own procedure.

The Standing Committee is now able to meet and could be called, at which time it could consider the matter raised by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and could decide whether or not to report the matter to the House. That, however, is something which only the committee is competent to address and which it may wish to examine.

With great respect to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert and to all Honourable Members, my ruling, based on the precedents and authorities cited, is that the matter is out of order as a matter of privilege. This does not preclude the matter from being raised in another manner.

### **MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE**

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Yes, I move a matter of urgent public importance, moved and seconded by the Member of Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

WHEREAS successive Liberal and Conservative federal Governments over the past 20 years have offloaded their responsibilities onto Indian bands and provincial Governments without adequate compensation; and

WHEREAS the refusal of the federal Government to acknowledge the effects of their changes to the funding of post-secondary education for aboriginal students is creating a serious situation for hundreds of students in Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the change in post-secondary education policy was unilaterally imposed by the federal Government; and

WHEREAS this new policy is a direct attack on aboriginal and Treaty Rights; and

WHEREAS, despite repeated requests for a moratorium of at least one year, the Minister has refused to agree to a moratorium; and

WHEREAS with rising youth unemployment and a declining provincial economy, aboriginal students are finding it even more difficult to obtain employment this year; and

WHEREAS hundreds of Manitoba aboriginal students now risk losing their chance for further education and training; and

WHEREAS the provincial Government has refused to ensure that no qualified Manitoba aboriginal students will be denied post-secondary education and training because of the federal policy; and

WHEREAS the provincial Government could organize and head a delegation to Ottawa to oppose the changes to post-secondary education funding; and

WHEREAS the Assembly of Chiefs has just announced a Fast for Learning to protest the changes to post-secondary education funding; and

WHEREAS the national caravan on post-secondary education has now arrived in Winnipeg;

THEREFORE I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper, that under Rule No. 27, that the ordinary business of this House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the effect of change in funding of post-secondary education and the need for immediate action by the provincial Government.

**Mr. Speaker:** Before determining whether the motion meets the requirements of our Rule 27, the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has five minutes to state his case for urgency of debate on this matter. A spokesperson for each of the other Parties will also have five minutes to address the position of their Party respecting the urgency of the matter.

**Mr. Doer:** Under the rules, the motion has been appropriately given notice in terms of the Rules of this House. We believe that this is an absolutely urgent matter and a matter that all Members in this Chamber, we believe, should rise as one to speak with Manitoba's aboriginal people in terms of the devastating effect on the change in education funding, in post-secondary education funding in this province.

We think it is tragic, Mr. Speaker, that people, our aboriginal people, have to fast and protest in such a way that will cause even further hardship on their people

and the people who will fast with them. That is why it is urgent today that we go on record, as one, with the announcement of this fast to show that there is partnership with our aboriginal people in this Chamber to deal with this very, very serious situation.

\* (1100)

I was encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the words of the Attorney General who said that we will be available and willing to use every opportunity to discuss this resolution or this emergency debate. I believe the words of the Attorney General show that our rules do allow us to speak on urgent public matters when the priorities of our Manitoba people are the priorities indeed of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity in the last number of months to travel into a number of communities in the province, and the words of the chief and the words of the bands and the words of the people in the communities are one. The grave injustice of the change in the federal funding has been illustrated by youth, by adults, by chiefs, by elders, by members of the band councils, by a unanimous voice about the wronging of aboriginal people and the changing of the policy.

Many times, I have heard the statement that we entered into agreements and Treaties years ago on our word, and we were told that as long as the sun shines, the grass grows and the rivers and the streams run that these Treaties would be enforced by the federal Government. Part of those implicit Treaties and explicit Treaties, Mr. Speaker, was the right to post-secondary education. So this is not an issue of education financing and funding and capping and countercapping. This is an issue of principle, and that is why, as an issue of principle, we have to stand as one in this emergency debate.

Mr. Speaker, the way of opportunity for our aboriginal people—this land was probably, definitely, land that our aboriginal people first settled and developed in our country and we have strong obligations. The way to do it is for us to work in partnership with the aboriginal people, to not only stand outside in the legislative Chambers and give speeches in the Convention Centre and give speeches in front of the people who will be assembled here today, but to stand as one in this Legislative Assembly and all of us urge, as strongly as possible, that the federal Government return the Treaty rights of our Native and aboriginal people. I urge all Members to support this emergency resolution. Thank you very much.

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):**

Mr. Speaker, when I first announced my intention back in January of 1985 to get involved in politics, I cited at that time my reasons for wanting to get involved in politics. The key reason was that there was another generation following ours, a generation which would be the generation to provide leadership to our country in the future, a generation that is going to need to have decisions made now which will be proper decisions and decisions which will make provisions for their future and for our future as we grow older.

For that reason, it is important today that the matter being raised by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) be discussed today and be discussed at other opportunities when those opportunities present themselves. We are talking about financing for education for the original people of this country as they attempt to play their role in our society now and into the future. We expect them to play their role. We must also give them the tools they need to play their role in the economic and in the social life of our country.

The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) says this is a matter of principle. I cannot argue that point nor would I want to argue that point. It is a very important matter of principle regarding participation by all Canadians including, of course, original Canadians in our economic and social life. As I said, education is the key to that successful participation.

I do not want to take issue with the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) today about the niceties of the Rules of this House. I believe that the issues are two for you to decide, Mr. Speaker, those being the requirement of notice, which I have no reason to think would not have been met, and the requirement of urgency. As Government House Leader, it is my responsibility to ensure that the rules, to the best of my ability, of this place are followed and properly followed.

There is a way today for us properly to follow the rules that we have for ourselves. That is, Mr. Speaker, to waive the rules today to allow us to have a debate on this tremendously important matter because the Government of Manitoba supports original peoples in their struggle to obtain the kind of justice they need for the future of their people and for the future of all Canadians, because the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Minister of Education for Manitoba (Mr. Derkach) have made clear not only to original peoples but also to the federal Government the position of the Government of Manitoba in support of a quest for justice and for opportunity for all peoples in this country. This Government would agree today to waive whatever rules might stand in the way of a debate on this tremendously important issue, not only for today but for future generations of all Canadians.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, whatever the rules happen to say, I would join with the Leader of the New Democratic Party and ask the remainder of the Members of this House to join with us in agreeing to waive the rules so that the debate being sought by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and being sought by original peoples in this province and across this country, so that debate can go forward today.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) also has five minutes.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Education—what is it? Education is the opportunity to advance oneself in one's society. It is for most the only opportunity. We already know that people in this country

are not born equally because they are not born with equal opportunities. Nowhere is that more grave and nowhere does it affect more people than with the aboriginal peoples of Canada, because those children frequently do not maximize their potential because those children have not had the same opportunities for education.

Mr. Speaker, in some of my early teaching days, I saw and talked to the children off of the Sarcee Reserve in Calgary. It was so hard to keep those young women, because it was a girls' school, in high school. It was difficult because of the racism that existed within the school system. It was so hard for them daily to go to school because of what they had to cope with. Very few, if any of them, ever got to post-secondary education—very few.

What we have before us now, regrettably, is a federal Government that at the very moment when education has become so critical, at the moment when our aboriginal peoples are preparing themselves for self-government, at a time when they are getting ready to take over their own affairs, when they are willing to stand tall and run their own lives, that a sane Government would deny them the opportunity to be fully educated, to take control of their lives and maximize that potential.

Mr. Speaker, we have a rule in this House about emergency debate. We have a rule which says that the Speaker may on occasion take into account the general wish of the House to have a debate. I believe it is the general will of this House to have a debate and I urge you, Sir, to take into account that rule and give us the opportunity, as legislators in Manitoba, to stand up for our aboriginal peoples, to stand up to our federal Government who has denied our aboriginal peoples and to give our aboriginal peoples justice.

### **SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) did provide me with the required notice.

I have listened with care to the comments of the Honourable Members respecting the urgency of debating this matter today. I thank them for their advice.

Our Rule 27(5)(d) stipulates that this type of motion must not anticipate a matter with reference to which a Notice of Motion has previously been given and not withdrawn. Private Members' Resolution No. 20, appearing on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), in my view, does address the same subject.

\* (1110)

Beauchesne Citation 387 requires that the subject matter of such a motion must be within the administrative competence of the provincial Government. I can appreciate that the subject matter of this motion is of great concern to all Members, but it is not a matter which is within the administrative competence of the provincial Government. There must also be no other reasonable opportunity to debate this matter. In this instance, there are several other

opportunities, such as the Budget Debate, consideration of the relevant department Estimates and grievances.

Despite the procedural shortcomings, which I have pointed out to the House, I note that there appears to be a general desire of Members to debate this matter today. Therefore, in accordance with Beauchesne Citation 387, the question before the House is, shall the debate proceed? (Agreed)

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

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland):** I thank the Honourable Members in this House for allowing this debate to proceed.

I brought this attention to my colleagues and also brought this attention to the House, the elected representatives of the Province of Manitoba, to denounce and also to support the aboriginal people in their quest for post-secondary education, and also to support aboriginal people for self-government.

It is certainly an urgent matter because when you have unemployment in many of the reserves well over 90 percent, and also when you have suicide rates higher, maybe four times, than the national rate, it is certainly an urgent matter.

If this problem were to exist in many of the white communities, you can very well be assured that many of the white politicians would jump up and say this is a public urgent matter, and that is why today I brought this issue up in respect to the conditions of the aboriginal people. We need a way out so that we do not need to depend on the welfare and the handouts of the federal Government. The key to that process is education, an education which has been denied to us in terms of funding and also as a Treaty right.

The federal Government would like us to believe that aboriginal people are asking for unlimited funding, and also the federal Government would like us to appear that we are asking the taxpayer, the citizens of this province, to pay for Indian education. I would like to point out that this is not true. The aboriginal people have paid for their education in return for the lands and resources that they gave up.

It is about time that the federal Government lived up to its Treaty promises and obligations, and I would like this House to support the aboriginal people and also to support self-government for aboriginal people. It is we who have to control our destiny. It is we who have to provide that leadership, but we need some assistance, we need the support of the rest of the Canadian general public.

I hope that this Government, the Leader of the Conservative Party, the Premier of this province (Mr. Filmon) would also take the cause of the aboriginal people in a way, in a manner that he has lifted up the cause for the people in Portage la Prairie. This is not to belittle the fact of the problems in Portage la Prairie, but we also have aboriginal people in this province and their concerns have to be heard.

I know many of the Members in this House want to put things on record and I think they know my position.

I know the aboriginal people in my communities and also in the Province of Manitoba know where my principles stand and also where my position on education stands.

At this time, I would just like to maybe adjourn my debate and give the others opportunities to express themselves on behalf of the aboriginal people.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Before recognizing the Honourable Minister of Northern and Native Affairs (Mr. Downey), I would like to draw to the attention of the public who are with us this morning in the gallery that it is not proper to participate or applaud in any manner from the gallery.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister responsible for Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I somewhat feel that I am being discriminated against, as we have had all the other opportunities for those people to applaud and now I am not going to have that opportunity.

However, I do appreciate and respect your judgment and will continue to put before you the case of the provincial Government and the Progressive Conservative Party as it relates to the Province of Manitoba. Let me first of all thank my colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), for his comments and support in getting this issue on the floor of the Manitoba Legislature, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mrs. Carstairs) and the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and my friend and legislative colleague, the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

Let me first of all explain to this House and to the people of Manitoba how much I have come to appreciate over the past year the pride and the respect and the determination of the aboriginal, the Native people of the Province of Manitoba. It has been expressed in several ways, and I feel very fortunate of having the opportunity to have visited with many of those individuals.

First of all, the love and the respect that the Native community have for their Creator is above question. The respect that they have for their elders, for their children and for the family life, the rest of society could take many lessons from them.

That takes me to the next area, that being of how fairly—and the respect that we have had as a society for those aspirations and for their full involvement in Canada as Canadians—as Canada, as Canadians—and I want that to stick very clearly. I say it was recognized many years ago by a leader in this country, Mr. John Diefenbaker, when he said to the Native people, it is your right, your opportunity, to express who you want to lead this country by giving them the opportunity in legislation, the opportunity to vote and express themselves. That, Mr. Speaker, I think was a tremendous respect for them.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, William Chornopyski, in the Chair.)

I know that this is a non-political issue, and we do not want to make it that. We want to make it in the best interests for the people, the aboriginal people and particularly the young people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to clearly indicate some of the reasons, what I want to put on the record, what it means to me. The Native people, and particularly those people living in northern Manitoba, have a hard time understanding why we should be developing the hydro, the high lines to produce hydro-electric power for the people of southern Manitoba and our highly populated areas when some of those northern Native communities cannot even tie into that resource. They still have to generate that power by electric diesel generators, a clear lack of treating them respectfully with a resource that is every much a part of theirs as it is the rest of society.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is very hard for those people to understand that they are not able to continue on with their traditional ways of hunting, to sell and trade furs, their livelihood, because a group in society say that an animal's life has to be taken. It was the livelihood of those people. It was their way that they obtained their clothing, their food, and yet society has changed to take that kind of support away from them, so it is incumbent upon society, each and every one of us, to make sure that in a changing society those Canadians, those Native Canadians, have the right to education so they can understand truly what is happening and what their future is.

\* (1120)

I believe they have a tremendous future and I want to say to the leadership of the Native community, thank you for advancing this cause because it is a tough fight. I can tell you on many issues we have a difficult time with the federal Government, in eastern Canada, whatever political stripe it is, that we do have to join together when it comes to a common cause. We are joining together.

Let me say as well, I know that each and every one of the Native community are individuals, individual persons, peoples. Yes, we have common causes, but they are individuals as well who want to maximize each and every one of their personal opportunities. We have to realize that. Let me say this, and I know we have just gone through a provincial judicial inquiry dealing with Native justice. Let me put it very clearly on the record, I would far sooner have the Natives, the aboriginal people of this province, being educated so that we do not have to have those kinds of activities, so they can be educated to be the lawyers rather than the people who are accused. That, I believe, is what our ambition has to be.

We have tried and we have worked to encourage through many activities, whatever political stripe, and I can indicate that seriously. I do say that we are far better off today to say education is the answer. We do not want to see anyone in our society have less of an opportunity than the next. There have been and it has been spelled out by agreement as to what the rights of the aboriginal and Native people are. It has been spelled out.

One of the things, and this is no reflection on my colleague, any Minister of Education in the past, but I think it is a societal condemnation, if I may. Why have

we not in our educational system since the beginning of our educational systems in this province taught everyone, whether they are newcoming Canadians, white, black, brown, of whatever colour, why have we not taught Canadian history more extensively as to what the rights of our aboriginal peoples are when it comes to Treaties and our history? We have lacked not only in the support of education to our Native community but we have lacked in educating society as to what kind of a tragedy and kinds of shortfalls we have had between the two races of this country.

So I say without any fear of anyone criticizing me and taking the support that I am for our Native community, I am fully endorsing this. I want the record to clearly state I had no hesitation because I met on the front steps of this Legislature, I believe it was on the 22nd of November—I do not have the date exactly but it could have been the 25th—because I walked in from the steps of the Legislature to my office and immediately sat down on the 25th of November and wrote to the federal Minister responsible, asking for support for those people when it comes to this question of the interpretation of the Treaty and C-22 at the Federal level.

So let there be no question, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I and the Premier of this province, without question, are fully supportive of this initiative and will continue not only to expect increased educational opportunities for our Native people, but as importantly are the educational needs of the rest of society as to what the rights of our aboriginal people are in this country. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise today to ask a number of questions. Unfortunately, the federal Government is not here to answer them, but perhaps they will hear from the debates today the questions that I think all three Parties want them to answer.

The first question has to be, why? Why do you want to deny the Native people of this country, our aboriginal peoples, our first peoples, why do you want to deny them their opportunity in our society to make the most of themselves? Why do you want to do this?

One has to ask the federal Government, is this another way of saying that the provinces that centre around Ottawa are the only provinces that have any real importance, because disproportionately the numbers of Native peoples are found in western Canada? It is western Canada where we need them most to maximize all of their strengths and abilities. Yet they have conducted a study, they spent \$6 million on a study, which has not yet made its report to speak about the need for Native education in Canada, to talk about the way in which Native education can be enhanced. Before they have even received the report, they decide that they are going to cap the funding. Surely they could have at least put a moratorium until they received the report, until they understood the new directions that education may well be recommended to take under this report.

No one is suggesting that the only way we should educate our Native people is through the university

complex. That is not the only kind of post-secondary education training that we need, it is simply one. I think one of the recommendations that may well have come from this committee was a broadening of the base, a broadening of the post-secondary opportunities open to our Native and aboriginal peoples.

That recommendation would have been a good one, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because there is no point in training someone in the university if they would rather develop their talents in a trade school, or they would rather go to a community college, or they would rather take an apprenticeship with someone in business or industry, or they would rather do a training program which is provided by the private sector which might help them to give them the talents that they require in order to help their own peoples grow within our society.

That is exactly what this report was going to do. It was evaluating all of the forms that post-secondary education could take and it was then going to reach out and say these are the programs that must be made available in the future, but before this report was completed the Government acted, and it acted unilaterally. It acted without any consultation with our Native peoples, without any questioning of them as to their priorities, what were their needs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it does not bode well for self-government and future self-government negotiations if our federal Government is unwilling to sit down with the people themselves and negotiate, to discuss, to come up with proposals. This is the unfortunate result of this particular Government's decision.

There was a motion introduced in the House of Commons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, supported by the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, in the hope of getting the Prime Minister of this country to change his mind, but no, they voted—I would like to think not with their hearts—along Party lines and they said, no, they could not rethink or take a fresh look at this particular situation.

I say that I do not think they voted with their hearts because I think that most Canadians, if not all Canadians, believe that there has been injustice to our Native peoples and that we must not perpetuate that injustice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the best way for any human being in our society to grow is through education. That is the best way, whether it is, as we have experienced at various times, through the school of hard knocks or whether it is through a formal education system. But it is Government's responsibility to provide that formal education system.

I was interested in the comments from the Minister responsible for Native Affairs (Mr. Downey). He is quite right when he says that we have not done enough to teach Native history, not enough to make our citizens who are non-Native understand the importance of our Natives in the evolution of this nation of ours.

\* (1130)

That is one of the reasons why I asked the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) yesterday when we were

going to get a human rights education program and when were we going to make that component compulsory for all children in our school systems, because the only way that we are going to eliminate racism is for children to learn to treat other children with dignity, no matter what their colour, no matter what their religious or spiritual beliefs. We have come a long way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think we would all agree with that. We have come a long way, but we have a path still to travel. When children living in a housing project in Winnipeg are subjected to verbal racism on a day-to-day basis, we have a long path still yet to follow, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

That is what is so critical. You must handle it when they are young, because that child who is exposed to that kind of attack on the streets going back and forth to school is not going to like school. If that child does not like school, that child is going to drop out. Then it does not matter what kind of post-secondary education opportunities we have available, they will not be able to take advantage of those opportunities because they will not have the requirement to enter those post-secondary educational institutions.

One of the issues that concerns me most about this new federal Government policy is that they are cutting students off. They say, well, you know, if they do not do well, they should not be allowed to continue. Surely we must examine why they are not doing well. Why do they fail in first and second year, many of them, in formal academic programs? Often they fail because of inadequate preparation.

Surely they should not be penalized from continuing as long as they are making progress, as long as they are moving forward, when we realize that many of them have suffered from disadvantage in terms of their educational experience. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am glad we have all agreed to this debate and I hope we go with a united voice to Ottawa, giving one clear message that this is not acceptable for Manitoba.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** I am pleased to be able to join this debate on a matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that several of the speakers who preceded me identified the nature of the debate that we are having here this morning. This simply is not a question of a Government, a federal Government's decision to establish new guidelines, the so-called E-12 Guidelines. This is a debate about the fundamental importance of education in a person's life, in the life of a community, in the life of a country. It is about education.

We have heard that the Members of both sides of this Chamber support in principle the idea that education is a fundamental part of the development of individual and community life. It has to be. We also know that, at least in this Chamber, there is perhaps for the first time unanimous agreement that in principle the Treaty should be interpreted in such a way as to mean that post-secondary education is an aboriginal right.

That is something that is not in the vocabulary of many people and obviously the federal Government at

the present time. If this Chamber can say with one voice that aboriginal people have, as part of their Treaty entitlement, access to post-secondary education, we will have made a quantum leap for the people in Pukatawagan, in Shamattawa, in Brochet and the dozens of other communities across this province.

It is, to my way of thinking, quite a unique and perhaps historic movement, in terms of the view that we have as Manitobans about our obligations to Native Canadians. So if the people who organized today's event, my colleague, the MLA for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), have done nothing else, they have seemingly brought people together on the notion that, in principle, educational rights, post-secondary educational rights, are a part of our Treaty obligations.

I think that is an important first step in making sure that aboriginal people are able, have the resources to develop the skills that they need and that they desire but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we should not kid ourselves that fighting in this Chamber or in other forums that the E-12 Guidelines are sufficient. The E-12 Guidelines form only a very small part of the jigsaw puzzle which is education in this province.

It is a very small part and I want to tell you that I have met with many of the people who are here participating in this demonstration this morning, including many of the chiefs. I know that people like Chief Bighetty from Pukatawagan and many of his councillors have raised the issue of education funding on the broader scope, on the broader level. I know that, for example, the Department of Indian Affairs provides educational dollars that are about half what the provincial Frontier School Division spends on a per pupil basis.

Now, I do not care how good the education authorities are in communities across northern Manitoba. They cannot function with inadequate resources. They are doing a remarkable job, given the fact that the federal Government gives them resources equal to only half what schools in other communities, adjacent communities, are doing with twice the resources. It is not fair.

The federal Government can talk about fighting illiteracy. It can say we are going to fight illiteracy, and I will tell you that the first place they should start is doubling the funding that is going to Indian schools across this country. That is the way to fight illiteracy, start today. So on the very basic level, on the level of giving quality public school education to aboriginal peoples, we are failing. The federal Government is failing. Let there be no mistake about that.

We believe that the changes to the E-12 Guidelines are an abuse of federal authority when it comes to interpreting the Treaties. We believe, even if the federal Government wants to say, if they want to put on some blinkers and say that the Treaties do not obligate the federal Government to provide post-secondary funding, that they should provide them simply for the economic and social benefits that are going to accrue to Native people across Canada by that funding. They are short-changing themselves in economic terms.

We believe, and the New Democratic Party has long believed, in the primacy of our Treaty obligations. They

include education and health and other services equivalent to Canadians in any part of the country. Even if there are some who say, well, that is a question for the courts or that is a question for further political dialogue, in economic terms this is a foolish, a destructive move for aboriginal people and for us as Canadians, and we should not accept it.

The E-12 Guidelines are not simply going to limit the possibilities of hundreds of thousands of Native Manitobans. It is going to deny thousands and thousands, over a period of years, access to the future. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know that simply having guidelines in place that allow Native people to attend post-secondary institutions is not enough. Again, many of the people who were in the gallery who are attending the demonstration have supported the concept of a northern university that is accessible, more accessible, a university that would be more in tune with the lifestyle, the aspirations of Native people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to turn this into a political exercise this morning. I was pleased to hear many of the remarks that came from the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), the Minister responsible for Native Affairs, but the fact is that the Northern Development Agreement, the agreement that is currently funding many, many Native students to attend post-secondary courses in Thompson, The Pas, Red River Community College and the University of Manitoba are going to be jeopardized by the fact that this Minister has not worked to sign a new Northern Development Agreement.

We believe, and I believe, that we are sliding ever so quickly backwards when it comes to Native and aboriginal education. If we have the imposition of E-12 Guidelines as the way they are drawn up today, without consultation with Native people I should say, then it is one nail in the coffin, one additional denial of rights and access to education. If we do not see a renewal of Northern Development Agreements, half of the money from which goes to Human Resource Development, goes towards training of nurses, social workers, civil technologists, resource people and doctors - (Interjection) - Yes, I attended the graduation of the first Native doctor in the Province of Manitoba. Then, that is the second nail, that is another step backwards.

\* (1140)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was disappointed. I want to say categorically when the Liberal Education Critic (Mrs. Yeo) said on Wednesday at the University of Winnipeg, no, the Liberals do not support a northern university. I want to tell you if the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) believes that post-secondary education is so important to Native people, they have to have access to it. More importantly, they have to be a part of an institution where they have some say, where they have some power, where they are in power. That is part of the provincial responsibility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we know that this issue is not going to be won or lost based on the resolution of E-12, but we are calling today for a moratorium on those

guidelines. When I say we, I hope we mean all Members of this Chamber. I hope that this debate will spark an interest, particularly on the Government's side, because they have a large share of the responsibility in addressing the question of equal access to educational opportunities, whether it is the public school or the elementary system or post-secondary. I hope it will open their eyes to the whole range of issues when it comes to training.

The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) was one of those who was critical of our inclusion of a northern preference for hiring and training with respect to the Limestone project. They were critical of the northern preference. We have to give every possible avenue to Northerners, to northern Native people, to aboriginals, to education and training, not just universities, but colleges, training for skills, semi-skills.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member's time has expired.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity and I hope that we can unanimously pass this resolution.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to rise and participate in this debate this morning. Certainly, I have to acknowledge that this is not a partisan political debate. Rather it is a public issue which needs to be addressed. I am happy that this Chamber has seen fit to address this in unison so that perhaps something positive can occur out of the efforts that are being made today by the Native people, who are displaying their frustration with regard to the cutbacks in support to post-secondary education for Native Manitobans and Native Canadians.

Aboriginal people or Native people are not asking for anything more than most of us would want for ourselves and for our children. They want an opportunity to an education and they want that opportunity to an education so they can contribute fully to society, so they can become employed, so that they can become successful in their communities and in Manitoba. They want to be equal partners, to share equally in the wealth and the opportunities of our province. They want to be able to be responsible and to be able to stand up with the rest of us in society and say that they are truly equal partners in the development of the resources of our province and in the development of the society of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, how do they get there? Well, certainly they can never get there if they are not provided the opportunity for an education. Illiteracy has become an important issue in the Native community because it has always been there. It is there by a larger degree than it is in the rest of society. We must address that issue. We can only address that issue by making sure that programming is available to those communities where that programming is needed. Much of this programming is needed in the remote northern communities of our province. It makes no sense to offer that programming where the people do not live.



I, as a teacher, worked with the Native community some 16 years ago. Working in a school setting where we had children from Kindergarten through Grade 9, I could not help but notice that in the Kindergarten, in Grade 1 and in the primary grades, those little children, whether they were Native or whether they were non-Native, did not distinguish in the differences. They would roll around in the classroom, romp over one another, and it did not matter whether you were Native or whether you were white.

But when you got to about the Grades 4 or 5 level, there appeared to be differences, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The differences, as far as I could determine, resulted not because there were vast differences in these children and their aspirations and their hopes and the things that they wanted to do, but the difference was that these people, the Native people, came from a surrounding, an environment, which did not allow them to have the things that perhaps the non-Native children had. The reason they could not have these things, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was because their parents were not given the opportunity to an education and to be able to contribute to society and, yes, take from society what society owed them. I feel there has been a great injustice done to the Native people of this province and of this country because they have not been able to participate fully in the opportunities that we should have afforded them.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I support this debate. I support the move by the Native people of this province in taking this caravan across the country and making sure that the federal Government begins to understand. It is not just good enough to criticize, regardless of what the stripe of that federal Government is. It is not good enough just to criticize and say, well, why are they not doing this and why are they not providing this. I think it is important to make them understand why they should contribute, why they should support these programs.

I attended an ACCESS graduation program two days ago where we had a handful of 18, only 18 students were being honoured. Graduates of the Native community were being honoured at the University of Manitoba for their achievement. It was a beautiful occasion because we had the university community come out and also give some expression of support and congratulations for the students who had achieved. The students themselves stood up and said a few words. Each one of them who spoke indicated how thankful they were because they were afforded the opportunity to get an education and now were going to be able to contribute and be able to bring their families along so that their families—there was a hope for their families to be able to achieve the things that all of us want to achieve for our children.

That is touching, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because those little children do not want any more but they should not have any less than any one of us want for our children. I spoke to the director, who is Native herself, and she expressed the tragedy that exists out there because they are only allowed such a small number of people to enter the ACCESS program because of the funding. Somehow we, as people of this province,

have to band together and ensure that the opportunities are afforded to these people, to the Native people of this province, so that down the road they will be able to be the doctors, the lawyers, the professionals, the businesspeople, the educators.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

One of the other sad things at that graduation was that the staff were introduced, Mr. Speaker, at the ACCESS graduation. To my dismay, the support staff, the academic counsellors, there were no Native people in those positions. The only Native person was the director. The rest were non-Native. It is long past time that we began to employ those individuals in those positions.

We should not be creating separate little units for the educational opportunities for these people because, when these Native people graduate, they should be standing side by side by the rest of us on that graduation stage, so that they receive their diplomas together with the rest of society, so they are not segregated into separate schools, into separate organizations where they are given a separate certificate for their achievement.

They need the supports, it is true, because they do not have the resources to be able to send their youth to the universities. So they need the additional supports. They need the additional resources for, perhaps, upgrading because they have not had the opportunities of an educational program that many of us have had.

\* (1150)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and I encourage that others get up and support it as well. I thank those who have lent their comments to this debate today. I guess especially I have to acknowledge the comments that were made by the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper), because he is a member of that community and probably knows better than any of us the anguish that his people feel because of the fact that they have not been given the opportunity.

So I have to tell you that as the Minister of Education for this Government, I fully support this kind of move. We, as a Government, are going to do everything we can to make sure that we provide those opportunities for those people. We have begun, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you this, in that we are providing more training for the North, in the North, because that is where it should be. We should not be taking the people necessarily out of northern Manitoba, plucking them out of their communities and bringing them into a city setting, which is foreign to many of them, and trying to impose upon them the society values perhaps that they are not accustomed to.

For that reason, we have to find innovative ways, perhaps ways which have not been approached before to make sure of not just university programming, but programming for universities, for community colleges. That is why we have moved to ensure that, for example, the Keewatin Community College in The Pas, which has been there for some time and has not been used very effectively in the past, becomes utilized more

effectively for providing programming not only to the people of The Pas but for the people in Thompson and all the other northern Native communities that exist in northern Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I have to say, thank you for the opportunity in rising today and being able to contribute to this very important debate, and I look forward to other comments which maybe led to this debate. Thank you.

**Mr. Herold Driedger (Niakwa):** Mr. Speaker, it is also my—I do not wish to use the word “pleasure” because it does not give me pleasure to speak on something whereby we are addressing a negative. Normally, you speak with pleasure when you are trying to praise something, and here we are dealing with an issue where an obligation that has been undertaken by the federal Government is one that is not being lived up to anymore.

I think it does us well for us to take a look at what this obligation actually means. When this obligation—and we are talking now of the obligation of offering education, and that is the only term that was used in the Treaties, offering education to our Native people, to our aboriginal people, when the Treaties were first drawn up. Many of these agreements were drawn up after, when western movement was coming across Canada from the people from Europe, that the federal Government felt it may come to agreements to make negotiations with the Native people living here. So the decisions were reached that by a negotiated agreement the Indians would move to one part of the country and basically give up part of the country to the federal Government and subsequently to the provinces.

In this particular agreement in the obligation, frequently the negotiators at hand would say one thing to get the people who were gathered around them to say yes to the terms of the negotiations, to the terms of the agreements. Then these same negotiators would go back to Ottawa and say, well, this is what we said, but since there was no written record and since there were no people to defend, to state that what they actually said meant this or meant that, the federal Government was able to look at those terms and say, well, that is not actually what we meant.

I think what we have in this particular cutback of the post-secondary education, we have a federal Government that says, well, we never did mean university education. We never did mean post-secondary education. We were only talking about something else. It is this “something else” that we need to examine because times change. There was no way that the negotiator who sat down with the people in Manitoba—and it was not Manitoba at the time—to say that we are going to provide in Treaty 1 and in Treaty 2, we are going to make this provision for education. There was no concept of what electronic education would mean. There was no concept of instant communication and yet we have that today.

There was an implication in the term “education” that this was going to be extended to the whole meaning of the word in the way it was meant then, and that brings me to the point then, why do we actually offer

education to anyone? Why do we offer education to our own people? Why do we offer education to Third World countries? Why do we offer education to anyone? Why does a society value education? The answer is very simple. It is only through education, through the collective adoption of the rules by which we live, the collective adoption of the opportunities, the collective adoption of the curricula that we actually move forward together, not separately, but together. It is this which has its roots in the very earliest times.

I may misspeak myself in my knowledge of history but it seems to me that one of the first efforts at trying to include all of society in an educational drive was made by the Etruscans or perhaps the Romans with the publication of the 12 tablets in the main square. All these 12 tablets said were these are the rules and these are the things you are going to be judged by and, if everybody knew those, you could then live in that society comfortably. You would be able to know what was right and what was wrong.

Our society has gotten one heck of a lot more complicated, a heck of a lot more complex. We can no longer publish 12 simple rules or 12 simple statements. We now must include a whole host, a whole raft of things which we have to include in an implicit promise and an implicit obligation. I go right back down to the Treaties. I have read them, where we have simply stated the federal Government provides an education for the people, the people that they were dealing with, the Indian people, and implicit in that term is now today post-secondary education. We need to take a look at why post-secondary education.

It was referenced here earlier that the people who need to train the people need to be aware of some of the concerns. I think Mr. Speaker's own forum yesterday where we had disabled people speaking to the enabled, if I may use that term, telling us that only a person who is truly disabled can tell you what would be right for him or her, not wanting a person who does not understand the problems from having experienced them to deliver a program or deliver a solution.

For the same reason, we want to have Indian people, Metis people, Inuit people, the whole gamut of what we include in the term “aboriginal people” involved in the delivery of programs, in the delivery of education, in the delivery of law, in the delivery of medicine. In all aspects, we want to have these people involved and you cannot do that, Sir, if you are going to cut back on the obligations, on the kinds or the numbers of people you will let through.

We have reached a stage where we here, in the mainstream society, have pretty well grown used to the concept of universality of university education. It is so easy, we can actually have restrictions. However, among the Native community, universality of university education is nowhere near the level at which we have it in mainstream society and, consequently, we need to bring this average up.

There is a disproportionate number of representation of the aboriginal community in all kinds of society that we consider negative, in the prisons, on welfare, unemployment, in the different regions of the country,

in the different regions of the province, but nevertheless it is this disproportionality which is not recognized when we say there is a disproportionate representation of these same people in our university institutions, in our post-secondary institutions. It is that aspect that the federal Government must accept its responsibility to redress and to address, and which we here in the provincial Legislature must address at the level at which we can and which we are empowered to do.

\* (1200)

We must go further. I think the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) referenced the fact that we have not done enough in society to even educate ourselves as to what our obligations are. It is in this instance that we must go back in history and start teaching in our own schools for all people, everyone to know that there is a pre-history in this country that pre-dates 1492, that pre-dates when the written word came here, and that was European written word not the Native written word. There was a history, there was a contribution to this country before the white man came, and that even subsequent to that there were contributions made by our aboriginal people, by our Metis people, even into our own province and to the fact that this province would not exist if the Metis people had not done what they had done under Riel and actually stood up to the federal Government, which is perhaps what Manitoba is doing again. This is something that we need to do. We have to even go further than just simply participating in this emergency debate.

I think we, in this Legislature, need to go further and perhaps by addressing my comments to be Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson) I might be able to suggest that the Native people's contribution, the Metis people's contribution and the Indian people's contribution to our country and to our province should be recognized prominently in our Legislature by plaque, by statue, whatever, and not put in the back of the building hidden by a fence, but rather something we can all be proud of here in the front for all people to see, because I think it takes all people to live, to co-exist.

With that, I will conclude my remarks and just simply urge this Legislature to support this resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Today I think was one of those days I will remember as a Member of the Legislature, the day when all three Parties put aside political differences to agree on a motion of major importance. As we did that, I was struck by just the ambience of this Legislature, these figures that we see day in and day out representing justice, western civilization. The Native people of this province coming here to this Chamber, as they have done to the House of Commons seeking justice and finding—if you look at history that time and time again they have been denied justice, that all the great precepts, the principles of western civilization have failed.

I was struck by that because I really believe, at this point in time on this issue, that this society has failed Native people. We are dealing with a situation where

Native people signed Treaties as First Nations with Canada, Treaties that included the right to education. We are finding today that the federal Government despite all the developments we have seen and all the talk of self-government and aboriginal rights, is denying the fact that includes post-secondary education.

We talk about justice. Is that justice? I have looked at situations just this past few weeks that really make me question what justice we have in society, personal incidents that have affected people in our society today. Last week, a school group from my own community of Thompson coming to the Legislature, finding out just the day before, here they were on their first trip to Winnipeg in many cases. They had gone to a shopping mall in Winnipeg, been detained, been harassed, subjected to what I consider to be absolutely disgusting treatment and I believe because of the fact that they were Native students. Is there any justice in that?

I have seen people over the last few weeks. I have talked to people who are putting their entire family into financial burden to support members of that family who are attempting to go through post-secondary education, who are being denied now the very rights they should have under Treaty obligations as Native people. They are seeing their families having to face that burden. Is there any justice in that, Mr. Speaker?

Is there any justice in a society where Native people today face a situation that only 20 percent finish Grade 12. On reserves, 19 percent of houses have two families living in those reserves. The unemployment rate is over 35 percent of the working age population, is as high as 90 percent. The death rate is between two and four times the rate for non-Native people, suicide is three and four times the national average, infant mortality up to the age of four weeks is 60 percent higher than the national rate.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

How can there be any justice in Canada so long as these conditions prevail? That is what is sad, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we sit here in this Legislature day in and day out surrounded by these figures from western civilization, talking so much about justice as do the Members of the House of Commons in very much the same sort of atmosphere, the same historic surroundings as they sit there day in and day out.

How can we have allowed this to happen in Canada? It is I think a credit to Native people that given all this, given the injustice, given the conditions they face, they are fighting back. That is why I remember this morning, not for the Chamber or dignified surroundings, the historic background of this Chamber. What I will remember are the Native people themselves coming to this Chamber, despite all that has happened, still having some hopes, some faith, that somewhere the system will correct these injustices and particularly on this issue.

What I was struck by was the fact that there were all ages of people here today, particularly young people, who in very many ways, whose future we are determining by our actions today. That is what I am struck by, whenever I talk to Native people, is the importance they

attach to young people and particularly to education. I was at a class yesterday, Native students, single parents as part of a single-parent job training program. What struck me was, despite the personal difficulties many of those students have faced, just the commitment they have to getting an education, to getting training, to getting a job. It is a commitment that is based very much on their children.

I have had the opportunity, as an instructor for Inter-Universities North, to teach both in Thompson and in Cross Lake, and I have been struck once again by the commitment to education. I have seen in my own community that many people have moved to Thompson for no other reason than the fact that their children can get a better education. That was the prime reason why they moved to the community of Thompson. I am convinced that when Native people say they want their full Treaty rights, it is not an academic or a legal or a political argument. It simply and clearly is a matter of justice.

To my mind, when I look at what they are asking for, when I look at all the injustice that has taken place in this country in the treatment of Native people, to ask that they simply have their Treaty rights after western civilization has treated them so poorly, taken away their land, their livelihood, provided these types of conditions, is it really that much to ask that they should have their Treaty rights, that they should have the right of self-government? I say no and, in fact, I feel the struggle of Native people on this issue and the struggle of Native people for self-government, the struggle of Native people for aboriginal rights as part of the Meech Lake Accord, I say that today we, in this Chamber, could have learned from Native people about what justice truly is.

\* (1210)

With that in mind, I think we should say clearly that by debating today, we are supporting the efforts of Native people. Today they are involved in a major rally. I know the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) who did wish to speak in this debate, asked me to indicate that they are out showing their solidarity for Native people today as part of this campaign. I say we, as the Legislature, should join them in their efforts, support the caravan, support the protests, support the fast for learning and say to Native people, yes, we believe in justice and we believe in the justice of your cause. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Despite the fact that I had an opportunity earlier today in Question Period to state very clearly and unequivocally on the record our Government's support for the Native people of Manitoba and indeed the aboriginal people of Canada as they oppose the capping and the reduction of funding available to them at the post-secondary educational levels in this country, I wanted to take a few moments just to speak in support of the efforts that are being put forward, the all-Party efforts that are being put forward to support our Native people in this province.

I have said on many occasions and many forums that I believe that the best investment that any

Government makes is the investment that they make in education and training. I spent a good deal of my life in the field of training and witnessed on many, many occasions how that investment in training paid dividends for years and years, for an entire lifetime to come.

I have enjoyed the opportunities in travelling throughout Manitoba to meet many of the graduates, for instance, of my business college who took training at the post-secondary education level and applied that training into meaningful employment on behalf of either their bands, or in many cases in the private sector or in Government positions. I know that investment made in their education at the post-secondary level, that training they received, resulted in their ability to lead a far more rewarding and productive life in future.

I have said this and I believe it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the investment we make in education not only pays dividends for the lifetime of the individual, but oftentimes it goes beyond into many generations.

The fact of the matter is that I have seen in my own experience people who have come to this country perhaps not speaking the language, people who have cultural differences with the mainstream of our society, people who are disadvantaged in many, many ways, rise from the lowest levels of our society, socially or economically, to the highest in one generation. Why? Because of an investment of their time, their energy, their ability, and obviously some monetary investment by Governments and society in education.

Education is the most powerful tool that we have at our disposal to change dramatically for the better the lives of our aboriginal people. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that investment must continue to be made for the Native people of Canada at the post-secondary level.

Again, in speaking about the opportunities that education provides and the things that we need most to help our aboriginal people, we need role models for them because for years and years—and it goes back to the early 1960s—in my interaction and knowledge of Native people in the North, I was always struck by the fact that when you went up there most of the teachers were not only from other areas of the province, but in many cases they were from other areas of the country, went there and found a disproportionate number of the teachers had come from Maritime provinces, had come from other areas of the country to teach in northern Manitoba.

It struck me that what we needed were role models, people who themselves were from their local communities who understood the culture, who understood the different needs, perhaps the value systems and all of the things that were so important in ensuring that our Native people benefitted to a greater extent from their education.

I longed for the day when we would see Native people themselves return to their homes and return to their communities and become teachers of the Native people. I was delighted in the late '70s and throughout the '80s to be very, very supportive of the BUNTEP program, Brandon University Native Teacher Education Program,

which has been so invaluable to our remote and northern communities in providing for them teachers, educators who themselves come from a Native background. It was a struggle, and that program required not only resources but tremendous support from people throughout the community and certainly from Governments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to ensure that it continued. It was begun in the mid-'70s under the Schreyer administration. It was carried on during our Lyon administration, and I know at that point in time that our then Minister of Education, the Honourable Keith Cosens, said that he was very committed to it. He believed very strongly in it and showed that by virtue of our continued support for it.

I know that the former president of Brandon University spoke to me in the early '80s and said that all of us, as previous Governments, should be proud of the fact that they had won an award, an International Universities Award, for that particular program, for it doing something to meet stated objectives that were so worthwhile in both the social and an educational sense and for the effectiveness of that program and its ability to train Native teachers and have them go back into their communities.

We wanted, of course, to continue providing role models. I have always said that our young Native children, like all children in society, should be encouraged as much as possible to take advantage of all the educational opportunities. Good heavens, that is why we make that investment as a Government, millions and millions, hundreds of millions of dollars that go into our education system. We want that money to pay dividends and we want all Manitobans and all their children to have the access and the advantage of that investment. That is why the former administration developed the ACCESS Program that encouraged Native children to go into further post-secondary training, a special funding for that opportunity for them to become doctors, lawyers, engineers, all of the professional disciplines.

I was very, very pleased to support that and very pleased to tell you that our Government not only continued that funding, but has extended that funding. I say to you that I was very disappointed as I went through material, for instance, on the Liberal election campaign of 1988 to find that was an area specifically that the Liberal Party running for Government in Manitoba had targeted as a cut, \$800,000, from that special educational ACCESS funding for post-secondary training of our Native students to go into the professions, to go into those highly specialized fields of endeavour that create the role models, that create the incentive and the opportunity for our young Native people to want to go further and improve their lives. That was to be cut by the Liberal Party running for office in Manitoba, this same Liberal Opposition that is now attempting to somehow offload criticism on somebody else's decisions.

The Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) suggests that it is selective quoting. It is in black and white. It is in the Winnipeg Free Press of April 6. It is in their policy document.

Here it is, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I will read it from their policy document: "The Department of Education

announced an \$800,000 ACCESS Program for our universities. A Liberal Government, by putting more funding directly into the hands of the universities, believes these institutions will now have the independence to establish their own ACCESS Programs and, therefore, this grant can be eliminated." The fact of the matter is that these universities, these institutions, did not in the past provide that kind of ACCESS fund and would not in the future, were it not targeted specifically for that purpose.

I have had the discussions with people from the universities, in the administration, and without it being targeted it would not be spent there. That would not be a priority that they would choose on behalf of their institutions. This is an instance in which Government has to put its money where its mouth is, has to show the courage of its convictions and has to say that this is a priority. The Liberals, of course, would not do that. The Liberals would cut off the funding to our aboriginal people, to our Native students, and that is their kind of leadership in this regard.

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

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

**Mr. Filmon:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In conclusion, I want to indicate that our Government stands firmly and strongly in support of the aboriginal people of Manitoba and throughout Canada in their opposition to the new E-12 Guidelines which would have the effect of reducing the availability of funding for our Native people to go into post-secondary education. We believe it is a priority, we believe it is of utmost importance and we are firmly committed to supporting their efforts in ensuring that they continue to have funding for their needs at a post-secondary level.

\* (1220)

**Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek):** I will try and keep my remarks as apolitical as possible because it was my understanding that was the agreement when we began to discuss this. There are several things that I would certainly like to say in response to some of the slurs that were thrown across the floor in the last few moments, but I will choose to save that for some other time.

Albert Einstein said, "To study gives us an enviable opportunity to learn." When I prepared a study skills booklet in my position in my past life, I used a picture of Albert Einstein and that particular expression underneath it to place in the front of the book because I believe it to be so true that we are very fortunate that we individuals in the human race have so many opportunities to learn, to study. It is a tremendous right, a tremendous opportunity, and indeed it is certainly a tremendous responsibility for those teachers and those learners as well.

I have found, when we heard about the denial of funding, that it was abhorrent to me. As has been said

before, it was a Treaty right for the aboriginal peoples, and I think that the aspect of the new policy that bothered me the most was the concept, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of removing the possibility for continuing funding should the student fail.

To me, that is a terribly discriminatory recommendation in the new policy. Are my children denied the right, if you will, to fail, other than the fact that I would be very upset with them? As a matter of fact, one of my children did not make one of her subjects at university. I will tell you, the failure that she felt personally was a tremendous failure. She is still at university. She is back taking other subjects. She has that right. How on earth can this right be denied our aboriginal peoples? I think the demoralizing effect of failure is enough, let alone the fact that these students would then have their funding taken from them.

I have no objection whatever to tightening the administration of the funding to be sure that the funds are going to eligible students. I do not think anybody can argue with that, that these students are in fact attending the universities and colleges.

I was fortunate to have been a teacher in a nursing program. I taught for 12 years at the St. Boniface School for Practical Nurses, 100 students a year for 12 years, a significant number of students. Of those 1,200 students approximately, there were many, many aboriginal students. I think of two in particular, Julie Matwichuk (phonetic) and Sharon Sinclair, two absolutely marvellous young women.

Sharon, in particular, I recall because she was a single mother with two young children and that girl worked tremendously hard. She was receiving funding from the federal Government and she had a very difficult time with the amount of money that she got to try and support those two young children. She worked very hard, she worked very diligently. She had to take time off from the program which was only 11 months long, but she still had to take time off because the stress was tremendous for her, but she came back and she finished and she is now working with her peoples and has bettered her own life and that of two very fine young people that she is raising in her home.

We are pleased, on this side of the House, to support the resolution that was placed on the table by the NDP, the emergency debate that the NDP House Leader (Mr. Ashton) presented to us today. How unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as I look to my left, I see 12 empty chairs, not one single Member of the New Democratic Party.

I would like to say that this position is not an acceptable position—

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** What is your point of order?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, without being accused of any association, politically or otherwise, I think it would be important to reference the rules in terms of any indication of presence in the Chamber. That is not allowed in the rules, and it is a long-standing rule of this House. I wish you would draw that to the attention of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.— (Interjection)—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Minister is correct. It is not proper to refer to the presence or absence of any Member or Members. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) has the floor.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I can see that the time is almost up, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I would like to end my statement with the thought that in March, at the time when all of the hunger strikes in Ottawa were taking place, several people in my constituency did a door-to-door poll and asked education issues, and then at the end we said, are there any other concerns? I was really impressed with the support that the people of Sturgeon Creek had for the plight of the aboriginal peoples. Without any prompting on the part of any of us, there was support for the need for post-secondary education for the aboriginal peoples, or in fact enhancing the support that they get because if one were to look at the cost of the alternative to educating the aboriginal peoples, the cost in the prison systems—and there have been people who have said and the aboriginal peoples themselves have said that if in fact these people are not educated and given the opportunity to go to centres of higher learning, that they may well end up committing various crimes and ending up in our penal institutions.

The cost of welfare is a tremendous cost. How much better it is to help these individuals become motivated, productive people in our society. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The hour being 12:30 p.m., according to the Rules, this House is now adjourned and remains adjourned until 1:30 p.m., Monday next.

## ERRATA

On Monday, May 29, 1989, Hansard Vol. 7B, Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan), in his reply to the Throne Speech, was incorrectly transcribed in two places on page 193. The corrections are as follows:

(a) Paragraph 2, right-hand column, last sentence:  
“We have talked about the Health Advisory Network and this is a major fault.”

(b) Paragraph 3, right-hand column, second sentence:  
“The Minister of Culture (Mrs. Mitchelson) stood up in this House and she thinks there is a big pot and that pot is continuing to grow and they can solve everything with that.”