



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

STANDING COMMITTEE

on

LAW AMENDMENTS

39-40 Elizabeth II

*Chairperson
Mr. Jack Penner
Constituency of Emerson*



VOL. XLI No. 7 - 7 p.m., MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1992



MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Fifth Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LAW AMENDMENTS**

Monday, June 22, 1992

TIME – 7 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Jack Penner (Emerson)

ATTENDANCE - 11 – QUORUM - 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Messrs. Ducharme, Ernst, McCrae, Hon.
Mrs. Mitchelson

Messrs. Chomiak, Ms. Friesen, Messrs.
Gaudry, Lamoureux, McAlpine, Orchard,
Penner

*Substitutions:

Ms. Cerilli for Mr. Chomiak (2006)

Mr. Santos for Ms. Friesen (2006)

APPEARING:

Steve Ashton, MLA for Thompson

Marianne Cerilli, MLA for Radisson

WITNESSES:

Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

Lorna Cramer, Private Citizen

David Cramer, Private Citizen

Max Saper, Private Citizen

Bill 98—The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act

Sidney Green, The Manitoba Progressive
Party

Bal Kapoor, Private Citizen

Paul Kammerloch, Private Citizen

Wade Williams, National Black Coalition of
Canada

Lena Anderson, Immigrant Womens'
Association of Manitoba

Arnold Eddy, Private Citizen

Osmond Anderson, Manitoba Multi-Cultural
Resources Centre

Done Tole, Manitoba Association for the
Promotion of Ancestral Languages

Ijaz Qamar, Private Citizen

Joseph Reza Fanai, Private Citizen

Ron Schuler, Manitoba Inter-Cultural Council

Mary Richard, Manitoba Association for Native
Languages

Murray Trachtenberg, The League for Human
Rights B'nai Brith Canada

Norma Walker, The Congress of Black Women

Art Miki, Private Citizen

Mohinder Singh Dhillon, Private Citizen

Amar Singh Dhaliwal, Punjabi Seniors
Association

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS:

Catherine Collins, President, McDermot-
Sherbrook Residents Association

MATTERS UNDER DISCUSSION:

Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

Bill 98—The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Will the standing committee on
Law Amendments please come to order.

This evening the committee will be resuming
consideration of Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg
Amendment Act (3), and will also be considering Bill
98, The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act. What is the
will of the committee? Do you want to continue
hearing and finish the hearings on Bill 78, The City
of Winnipeg Amendment Act, and then move into
Multiculturalism? Okay.

There are also a number of other bills,
outstanding Bills 86, 87, 93 and 97 that could be
considered after we hear the Multiculturalism Act.
What is the will of the committee? Should we make
that decision when we get there?

An Honourable Member: Let us hear all the
delegations first.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. There are presenters on
those bills, if we wish to hear them—86, 87, 93 and
97. If we wish to hear them, then we should notify
the presenters, that they might be heard tonight.

committee? It appears that we have 12 presenters on Bill 78, and about 30 presenters on Bill 98, and it would appear to me that by the time we finish the hearings of those two bills, it might be well into the morning. By the time the consideration of clause by clause on both bills is finished, we will have had an extensive day. So if that is the will of the committee, we will then hear those bills at the next sitting of the committee. Is it agreed? Agreed.

Did the committee wish to indicate which bill we want to consider? Do we want to continue with Bill 78? Is that agreed? Agreed. We will then continue.

There are five written submissions on Bill 98 that have been received. What is the will of the committee? Should we distribute them and accept them as distributed and record them in committee Hansard? Agreed.

Could we hear from councillor Bill Clement? Is councillor Bill Clement, city councillor for Charleswood here? He is not here.

Councillor Greg Selinger, city councillor for Tache, is he here? Not here.

Mrs. Lorna Cramer. Is Mrs. Lorna Cramer here?

Bill 78—The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3)

Mrs. Lorna Cramer (Private Citizen): Yes, I am.

Mr. Chalrperson: Would you come forward, please? Have you a presentation for distribution?

Mrs. Cramer: I have made it available to the secretary. Would you let me know when you want me to make my statement?

Mr. Chalrperson: Could you come a bit closer? You may proceed.

Mrs. Cramer: All right.

Mr. Chalrperson: Okay, you may proceed.

* (1910)

Mrs. Cramer: This is in connection with Bill 78, The City of Winnipeg Amendment Act (3), Section 574(2). The interpretation of this section per explanatory notes to Bill 78, page 6, Part 20, Planning and Development, I quote: The existing definition of committee of council is amended to state that variance and conditional use appeals cannot be heard by community committee.

My statement is as follows. I oppose the amendment for the following reasons.

It has been suggested that if the amendment gets passed, our community councillors will be permitted to make representations at the Board of Adjustment and during the appeal. I would like to point out that our community councillors would not be required to attend these meetings. Their presence is optional and would only come about at their discretion. Should they choose to attend, they would not be entitled to vote or adjudicate. Therefore, any recommendations put forth by our councillors are not binding in any way whatsoever.

By removing the application procedures and the appeal procedures from community committees, our councillors' formal responsibilities to the electorate are removed. Their linkages to the people, the electors, are attenuated. In effect, our councillors are officially relieved of their responsibilities, and the electors are left with no formal representation. The councillors would lose their accountability to the electors. How then would the community be provided with an official forum for voicing to its councillors, those who have a vested interest in the community and are accountable to us, our concerns, either collectively or on an individual basis?

This is not the kind of representation that our community wants. This is not why we went out to vote. We went out to vote so that our councillors would make binding decisions which represent the people who elected them.

If the amendment gets passed, it would pave the way for the introduction of unsuitable enterprises into our neighbourhood. I refer to video arcades, massage parlours, and other establishments of this kind that are generally unwanted in most residences and neighbourhoods.

If the amendment gets passed, the City of Winnipeg could virtually do whatever it chooses to do with little regard for the welfare of the people and the communities.

This is not our idea of democracy. These issues stand in the way of our accepting the amendment. We have no choice but to remain in opposition. I remind this assembly of people that we have placed our trust in the hands of our legislators who create laws, but we do not need laws that will be used like blunt instruments against the people.

Thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you, Mrs. Cramer. Are there any questions of Mrs. Cramer? If not, we will

proceed to the next presenter, Mr. David Cramer, private citizen.

Mr. Cramer, have you a presentation to distribute?

Mr. David Cramer (Private Citizen): No, nothing to distribute, I merely want to corroborate what my wife has said. I will read a short statement that more or less repeats what she said.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please?

Mr. Cramer: I wish to say that I am opposed to the amendment of Bill 78 that will disallow the community councillors from hearing appeals of conditional uses and variances, as this will obviously eliminate their power to effectively represent the interests of their constituents. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Cramer.

The next person that the committee would call is Dena Sonley. Is Ms. Sonley here? She is not here.

Is Michael Sawka here? Michael Sawka? Not here.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Peterson. Are Mr. and Mrs. Robert Peterson here? Would you come forward, please, if you are here? Not here. Mrs. Antonia Engen here? Not here. Ms. Lori Janower? Is Ms. Janower here? Not here. Mr. Max Saper here?

Mr. Saper, have you a presentation to distribute to the committee?

Mr. Max Saper (Private Citizen): No, I have not, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed please with your presentation.

Mr. Saper: With your permission and the committee's indulgence, I beg to make my presentation orally.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. Proceed.

Mr. Saper: Firstly, I would like to introduce myself to the committee. My name is Max Saper. I live at 159 Gilia Drive in West Kildonan. I have lived there for the past 28 years. I moved in there when the city of Winnipeg was the city of Winnipeg and not metro Winnipeg and West Kildonan was a city by itself.

A lot of people like myself moved into that area because we wanted to move into a city of our own, like some of you have moved into Charleswood, St. Vital, East Kildonan and even, in recent times,

Headingley, when they seceded from their demise in the City of Winnipeg.

Throughout the years, when the City of Winnipeg amalgamated and we had resident advisers, I was one of the first advisers to be elected in West Kildonan. I served as a resident adviser for close to 20 years, so I am not strange to the workings of City Council, councillors, committees, amendment committees and appeal committees and so on. That is why I felt that I did not have to make a written presentation, because if I did, I would have one 126 pages long. So actually, I am going to try and keep my remarks as brief as possible, but I may get carried away because I am noted for that.

I would like to start out by saying, the reason I am here and some other people are not is because I had a personal experience within the last year in the city of Winnipeg with a decision made by the community committee, which went downtown to an appeal committee. The community committee was in favour of the presentation which I made, I was in opposition to the establishment of an amusement parlour in West Kildonan, which we had never had from the days of West Kildonan and also up until this point in time in the city of Winnipeg.

When it went to the appeal committee downtown—it was denied. The decision was reversed. This reversal of this decision was absolutely shocking, because here we have a community committee, councillors, resident advisers and dozens of people appear before community committee and voice an objection to a certain change, a certain variance, a certain conditional use that affected our community. We convinced the councillors that that particular conditional use or variance should be denied and the majority of councillors agreed, and it was denied.

However, when it went downtown, the representation of our councillors was void. The way the appeal committee was set up, if most of you do not know or if they do know, is the fact that no councillors from the community committee can sit on that appeal committee, nor could they appear by it.

Now, when we first made our appeal to the community committee, besides myself and about 500 signatures and several other persons who appeared as a delegation at that time, we also had the Seven Oaks School Division appear, the superintendent with about three school trustees and

the chairman of the Seven Oaks School Board No. 10. They vehemently opposed the establishment of this amusement parlour in our community and rightly so.

Now, when it went to the appeal committee downtown, there is no way that I could foresee, with the presentation of the Seven Oaks School Division—which incidentally is a democratically elected body, the same as the councillors, and they are responsible to the city of Winnipeg. The school board represents over 15,000 families, over 9,500 children that go to the Seven Oaks School Division which includes three high schools, and yet the appeal committee absolutely ignored this kind of presentation. I think, in my opinion, that is not democracy in action. Those people who represent the school board are just as important, if not more important, than the councillors in this particular instance, because this was a situation that was affecting the children in our community.

As far as I am concerned, I have no children going into the school division and I have no interest in amusement parlours, for or against them. To me it was the kind of thing that we wanted to keep our community void of, because I pointed out several times—and most of you people know that the establishment of amusement parlours proved itself on north Portage Avenue, whether it is good for the community or bad for the community. I do not have to recall what happened to north Portage Avenue. It all starts from one amusement parlour, and that is the way that cancer grows.

* (1920)

I did not appear at the appeal committee, incidentally, because I went off for my winter holiday, and I thought, well, after reading the school board presentation and after 20 people were going to appear at this committee, how could the appeal committee possibly reverse this kind of presentation? It was absolutely amazing, and the reports that I got from that particular meeting that the committee that was sitting as the appeal committee were various councillors from different communities throughout the city. They themselves had no knowledge of what our community is consisted of, how it was put together, and why we people live there and why we want to live in a certain manner. Maybe in their own communities they have an idea, but not in West Kildonan, and they absolutely ignored the presentation of the Seven Oaks School Division. I presented a video for 28 minutes and

they fast forwarded it for three minutes, and the committee just took their time until it was all over, which was just a matter of a few minutes and the decision was made.

You know, it smacks to me of payoff and payback. This is what we have to get out of our community committees, because when councillors from different communities have to sit in judgment upon a decision of a certain community committee, if they cannot uphold the majority decision of that community committee, then there is something wrong in the state of Denmark. I am not going to expand on that, but this is the kind of community government that we have today, and I hope that maybe in the next five or six months this situation will get a turnaround.

At the present time, as you know, we now have a Board of Adjustment, where the appeals for conditional uses and for variances go to the Board of Adjustment and then a decision of the Board of Adjustment is appealed to the community committee, correct? I think so. All right. Now, this particular committee here wants to change a small part of that particular process. The City of Winnipeg is also aware that you want to change a small part, so on January 6, the City of Winnipeg had a discussion on the change that this committee wants to make and the make-up of the appeal committee.

The original motion that came from the City of Winnipeg was recommendation that the appeal committee of the community committee to consist of the planning committee and the committee of community service as well as the Executive Policy Committee. Now, there was an amendment made at that particular meeting that the appeal committee should be changed to read: The recommendation issue No. 2—and this I am reading right out of the minutes of the City Council meeting of that particular time—replacing the words with "respective community committee."

In other words, the City Council decided that if there is going to be an appeal to the community committee it should be the community committee as a whole, and that was passed by a vote of 17 to 10. Therefore, your city community committee, whether it be West Kildonan or Charleswood or City Centre-Fort Rouge, they will have the final say of what the variances or what the conditional uses should be in the community that it affects.

To give you an example, after we lost our case, because we did lose it—you know you win the war and you lose the battle, or vice-versa, you win the battle, you lose the war. Subsequent to that decision, several applications were made for amusement parlours in different areas of the city, in different communities. Coincidentally, they were all turned down, and some of these community committees where these applications were turned down were in the communities that the appeal committee members were in who voted that it is all right for us to have amusement parlours, but it is not okay for us to have them in my area. That is what happened.

So they went from Notre Dame and they went into St. Vital and they went into Osborne Village, as recently in Osborne Village as within the last couple of weeks, and every one of these applications was turned down. In each one of these community committees there was at least one member of the appeal committee that reversed our decision that was sitting at that time. So it is like I say, it is pay off and pay up and pay back. This is exactly the way the community committees sit today, and we have got to get rid of that situation.

Now when we come to the amendment that you want to make, you specifically state—and I might read this on your Section 574(2) so and so, page 13. At the bottom it says "community council" means executive policy committee, a standing committee, or a community committee, designated under the by-law passed under this Part."

Then we go over to the next page, on page 14 at the very top; this is the gist of it: Meaning of "committee of council"—the "committee of council" means executive policy committee or a standing committee designated for the purpose of those subsections designated by law, passed under this act.

This is what I do not like about this particular amendment. That should be changed, that the committee of council should specifically state: the community committee as a whole. That is the final voice of appeal because those are the people that we as citizens of this city elect to represent us. They are the people who are responsible to us. They should have the responsibility to respond to the wishes of the people who live in the community, and if we can show them that we want certain things to happen and we do not want other things to happen, then this is what I call what a great statesman said

one time: government for the people, by the people, of the people.

This is what we have to get back to. This is something that we have drifted away from in the last several years in all levels of government. This is something we have to get back to. So when it comes to the appeal, at the bottom of page 14, I want to draw this to your attention again: "The approval of a conditional use or an order of variance by the committee of council under clause 3(b) may be appealed to the committee of council designated by by-law."

Now that committee of council must be stroked out and in there must be substituted, the community committee. They are the people who are responsible to us. We elect them, and if the citizens of a certain community feel strongly about a certain issue, then they should be listening to them. It is the old story. If you say to a politician, I do not like the decision you made, you know what he tells you—I have heard it more than once; there are some people sitting around here that have told it to me: If you do not like it, you know what you can do. Do not vote me in next time, vote me out. There are people sitting in this audience who gave me that answer, but on a different matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my presentation to you tonight. I would strongly urge you to consider my presentation to you because if this situation ends up in the manner in which you people are proposing it, it is going to be nothing but grief all over again.

The idea of this kind of a change in the bill is supposed to improve matters, and I think through experience—now when I say experience, I do not mean experience of just because it bothered me last year, because it is 20 years of experience sitting in council as a resident advisor and listening to these appeals of different variances and different conditional uses so that the people are able to look after the good and welfare of their own community. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Saper. Would you entertain some questions?

Mr. Saper: I will answer any questions you like, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Saper. I think you quite eloquently put a lot of the concerns that have been raised. This afternoon we had hearings on this matter, and we had a Seven Oaks trustee here who made some of the same

points again. We had a city councillor here who made some of the same points. We had at least six or seven representative groups of committees that made the same points that you are making, and I think you summed it up well. I can indicate, as I have indicated before to the minister, I have had over 140 letters back to me from the community that you are a resident in, and that I have the pleasure to represent, opposing this particular amendment based on the points you made, and I just want to sum them up.

Basically the points we heard over and over again, and I want to see if you agree with me basically when I sum it up, is that, firstly, this change will take away from the accountability. We will no longer feel that our councillors are accountable on those decisions. Secondly, a downtown body or a planning body is not representative and is not aware of the local concerns, the community concerns that only a councillor generally is aware of. Would that be a fair representation, because that is my summation of what I basically heard this afternoon and what I—

* (1930)

Mr. Saper: Yes, that is correct. That is absolutely correct, because that is the kind of responsibility we expect from our councillors and that is the kind of responsibility we want from our councillors.

Mr. Chomiak: Mr. Chairperson, one of the really interesting suggestions that came through this afternoon was from an individual who works for city planning and he knows about some of the difficulties in dealing with the city, and he indicated—and he also assists people in taking matters to City Council—a valid middle ground if the government wishes to put this through is to let it go. Try it again for another year. Let the present system stay. Let the community committee stay, see how it works and re-examine it in another year or another two years. If the government is proceeding, would you accept that as a compromise?

Mr. Saper: No, I would not, sir. I would not accept that.

Mr. Chairperson: Let me just interject here for a wee minute. People that are presenting here do not know that unless you are recognized by the chairperson your mike does not come on and your comments are not recorded. So we want to record everything you say for posterity, that if politicians a thousand years from now want to read what you

have said, that can be done. So that is the only reason we need recognition of the chair.

Mr. Chomiak: I think Mr. Saper answered the question. I would assume you may want to complete your answer that you want—well, I will let you complete it. I will let you say it in your own words.

Mr. Saper: Mr. Chairperson, in reply to Mr. Chomiak's question I would like to say this: In my experience over the years in the workings of City Council I do not take anything to answer a question yesterday that is going to be decided tomorrow. As far as I am concerned, if you leave the status quo remain this year, it is forever.

The change is going to be taking place now. You people are dealing with it now. Then let us have a proper decision now, because if we accept the status quo now we may never ever get another sitting like this again. I do not know who is going to run this committee next year or what government is going to run this committee next year, but we have an opportunity now. You people sitting around this table have an opportunity to respond to the citizens of this city, to respond to the citizens of a community that have suffered because of the inadequacy of the way the appeals are handled at the present time.

I will recognize the fact that we now have a Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment up to this point in time has been working very well, but if you are going to make the change, you are going to make a change because you must realize that a change is necessary.

I am not going to delve into the workings of the Board of Adjustment at the present time because none of them are members—well, maybe one of them might be a member of our community committee. We get back to the same old story again. We have people involved making decisions that do not live around my house and do not shop in my shopping centre and do not go to my SuperValu or my Safeway store, so they do not know what is going on. So therefore you have an opportunity now to make the councillors responsible to the voters and to the citizens of their community.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Saper. The next presenter is Mr. Robin Weins. Mr. Weins, would you come forward, please. Is Mr. Weins here? Not here. The next presenter is Mr. Richard Chartier. Is Richard here? Not here.

That concludes the list of presenters for Bill 78. I thank all the presenters for having appeared before the committee. I thank the committee members for hearing the presenters.

Bill 98—The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act

Mr. Chairperson: I will now ask that we move to Bill 98 for consideration of presentations to The Manitoba Multiculturalism Act. The first presenter is Mr. Sydney Green of The Manitoba Progressive Party. Is Mr. Green here? Yes, he is. Mr. Green, have you a presentation to distribute?

Mr. Sidney Green (The Manitoba Progressive Party): No, I have not, Mr. Chairperson, but as indicated, I believe in two or three days you will have one.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Would you proceed then, Mr. Green.

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairperson and members of this committee, I am here because I and the party that I represent feel very strongly about this legislation and the path that it leads to.

I think it is of some value for me to indicate my own background. My parents lived in Russia until 1921, when they left that country in the midst of the civil war following the revolution. They are both Jewish; I am Jewish. I speak Yiddish. Je parle français. I speak English. Ich kann Deutsch sprechen.

I am concerned that there are steps being taken to formalize or institutionalize a minority status on myself as a second generation Canadian and all people who come to this country and do not belong to one of the two ethnic minorities which form the basis for the official languages, namely the English and the French. I wish to emphasize that no legislation that I know of, Canadian or provincial, confers any status on people because of their ethnic background, other than Section 96 of the Indian Act, which says that the federal government will be responsible for Indians and reserve lands.

Other than that, to my knowledge, every citizen of Canada is deemed to be a full Canadian and is not deemed to be or looked upon as a minority. I, in particular, do not wish to be regarded as a minority group, do not wish to be dealt with as a minority group, because I consider myself the equal of every other citizen in this country.

I consider the same to be true for everyone who comes to this country, whether it be 100 years ago or one year ago, that once they become a citizen of Canada, they are a full Canadian, and that they are not dealt with on the basis that they are being in any way regarded by the rest of us as somebody who we will deal with kindly because they are minorities. I do not wish to be dealt with kindly because I am a member of a so-called minority; I wish to deal with with integrity because I am a citizen of this country.

In 1966, Mr. Chairperson and members of the committee—and even before 1966, but I think that I will deal with 1966—the City of Winnipeg had a mayor of Ukrainian origin, who was elected from every part of the city regardless of the ethnic flavour of the section of the city that elected him. He was elected without any legislation saying that we have to make the Ukrainians a target group who have thus far been unrepresented in mayoralty status in the city of Winnipeg, and in time, through legislation, that we saw that one of them was elected.

Indeed, it would have been the biggest insult to Steve Juba, whom I know very well, if it was suggested that he was given some type of clear path because he was of Ukrainian origin, and it was their turn because they were unrepresented as mayors from the time that Winnipeg became a city in about 1870 until the present time. It could be slightly before 1870.

In 1966, the public of the province of Manitoba, through every area, elected a Premier who was of German origin, three cabinet ministers of Jewish origin, a cabinet minister of Polish origin, a cabinet minister of Ukrainian origin, a cabinet minister of French origin. I cannot recall them all, but I believe that there were even some Anglo-Saxons represented as well, that the public of Manitoba decided that they would not discriminate against Anglo-Saxons, and they too were represented in the cabinet.

* (1940)

By the way, the public of Manitoba—whom I note that Frances Russell has called bigoted because they opposed a stupid piece of legislation brought forward by the New Democratic Party in 1981—had this basic, all-embracing attitude without a single piece of legislation which suggested that our province must deal with people and treat them fairly on the basis of their ethnic background.

I said earlier, there is no legislation except what the province tried to enact unsuccessfully in 1981, which gives any dominance at law to people of Anglo-Saxon backgrounds or people of French backgrounds.

What is given status in federal and provincial legislation is the French and English language, but we do not regard, or at least I have not regarded the French language as being other than a language of Canadians. I do not regard it to be the language of the Francophones.

Comme je parle français, je ne parle pas une langue qui est la propriété d'un autre groupe ethnique. Je parle la langue qui est moi-même.

[Translation]

Since I speak French, I do not speak a language which is the property of another ethnic group. I speak the language which is me.

[English]

If it is not that way, if it is not the language of all of us, if it is the language of the Francophone, then I say it should not be an official language because I do not believe that any language is a Canadian language because it happens to be the property of an ethnic group.

I have noted of late, and I note in this piece of legislation, that more and more we are institutionalizing the suggestion that people in our society should be dealt with not as individuals but as members of groups of ethnic communities, and I say, Mr. Chairperson and members of this committee, that this is a most dangerous and almost inevitable path, not to reducing racism in our society, but increasing racism in our society.

I say that I am very proud of my ethnic background. I have absolutely no problem with being recognized as a Jewish citizen of Canada. I do not wish to be recognized by the government as somebody who will be dealt with as a member of the Jewish community, not that I am not a citizen of Jewish origin who participates in the community, but I wish to be treated as a full Manitoban and not with anything that specifies me as a member of an ethnic community.

There is good reason for this, Mr. Chairperson. We have had this type of treatment in the past. In the late '30s there was a program in the medical school which said that Ukrainians and Jews will have quotas on the number of people they can have

in the medical school. Furthermore, may I say that culture and the manner in which ethnic values are dealt with are not something which can or should be regulated by the state. As a matter of fact, to coin a phrase, the state should stay out of the ethnic background of its citizens and let them evolve as they will, and evolve they will without any legislation, without any legislation whatsoever.

When I grew up in the '40s and in the '50s there were strong Jewish organizations, not one, many. I do not know which one you are going to deal with and designate as the Jewish community. There were strong Ukrainian organizations, not one, but several. There were Greek organizations, there were Polish organizations, there were Russian organizations, there were German organizations, and still are. These have grown and flourished not because of, but in spite of the fact that the government had a hands-off policy with respect to them, and they were recognized as normal features of our society.

When you pass a bill that says that we are going to recognize them, then, as Shakespeare said, methinks the lady doth protest too much. What is the purpose of this legislation, and what will the result of the legislation be?

If you are going to say that our society is divided, and I notice that you also protest that phrase, that is unified, if you will have it, by groups of ethnic communities, then do you propose to identify these ethnic communities? You propose to give grants to them? Whom will you choose? There is no ethnic community that has a formal structure which elects representatives as such. What you will be doing is trying to do what the communities themselves have not done. You will be trying to designate which are the ethnic communities, who are their representatives, and what is one of the salient facts about ethnic communities is that the organizations are maintained—and this is right, I am not objecting to it—by people who are more affluent and prominent.

* (1950)

The average person of any ethnic origin does not have a great deal to do with the leadership in these communities, and some of them have no involvement in them. I am not saying that is good or bad. I am saying that when this province deals with someone, they should deal with him as a Manitoban. They should not deal with him as a

group, and they should stay completely out of any involvement in the development, progress or strength of the community organizations, because that is something which the organizations and which the communities must do for themselves.

Unless, Mr. Chairperson, you regard this as in some way being negative towards the existence of these communities. I assure you that I am very positive to the existence of the organizations and have seen them flourish and participated in them without any government involvement whatsoever. The more the government gets involved the more they will generate what they supposedly are trying to avoid.

I note, Madam Minister, that one of the things that you talk about is a committee of 12 and not more than 18 members, representative, I suppose, of the various multicultural organizations or groups in our society. Now you immediately will create a problem for yourself, because it is not hard to count to even 18 and not include everybody. We will deal with ethnic French, Scottish, Irish, German, Polish, Ukrainian, Hungarian, Italian, Serbian, Croatian, Sikh, Hindu, Chinese, Malaysian, Japanese, Africans of various countries, Dutch, American, Belgian. We are well over 18, and if you are talking about a secretariat—I do not have Anglo-Saxon in there, English—and one group feels that they are not represented, or two groups or three groups, are you not creating a problem for yourself?

When you are talking about grants, how do you decide which ethnic organization will get a grant? I am not talking about whether it is Ukrainian or Polish. I am talking about which Ukrainian organization or which Polish organization or which Greek organization, and why? Have the organizations not flourished? Have they not been of themselves reflective of our society so that they do not have to be recreated so as to be reflective of our society?

We do not need legislation to say that it is a multicultural society from the time of its original population, whoever that may be. Are you sure that the North American Indian is the original population of North America? Are you positive? If you are, you know more than the anthropologists know. I regard the Indian citizen of our society in the same way as I regard every other citizen of our society, and the designation of the Indian as special in the British North America Act is largely responsible for the fact that the Indian citizen has been degraded to the

lowest rung of every social and economic index of betterment that we use to class individuals. So why are we doing this? What is the reason for the Province of Manitoba suddenly to start dealing with people on the basis of their ethnic origin?

Mr. Chairperson, I suggest that one of the reasons is that we are bringing this policy into consistent juxtaposition with that policy which is euphemistically referred to as affirmative action and which is really a position which institutionalizes racist treatment of individuals, so that we get in Alberta an advertisement for the RCMP that white males need not apply. Now, I do not say that white males should be granted a preference, nor do I agree that they should be discriminated against because they happen to be white males. In this regard, I believe the same should be true of black males and black females, and Oriental males and Oriental females.

I am now reading from how your Human Rights Commission grades people who are applying for jobs. They grade them on experience, leadership, attitude, organization, and one could have the highest marks in this area and then get zero for affirmative action because he is a white male and lose the opportunity based solely on his ethnic origin. That is, whatever you want to think about it, racist. That is where the policy goes.

If you think I am exaggerating, Mr. Chairperson, then I will tell you that I go to Australia every year. Before I tell you about the advertisement, I suggest to you that this policy—because the Province of Manitoba has so many classifications, you legislators think and have thought that you could categorize people on the basis of how they achieve sexual satisfaction. It is impossible for any genius to do it, because the methods of obtaining sexual satisfaction are infinite and undefinable. But the legislators of the Province of Manitoba are able to define it. They say there are males, females, homosexuals, and lesbians.

They have policies based on that. If you took your affirmative action policy to its conclusion, its logical conclusion, you would run around to determine how many homosexuals there are. You would find out perhaps—I do not know what you would find out, because I never tried to determine from another individual what his or her sexual orientation is—but you may find out that homosexuals are 10 percent of the population.

Then you will look around your employment force, and you will say: How many of you are homosexuals? You will find out that there are 2 percent. So then you will say, the homosexuals—and I am using your language—are underrepresented in the work force. They are 10 percent of the population and 2 percent of the good jobs or the jobs. Therefore, we have to have an affirmative action policy for homosexuals to bring them up to the 10 percent of the population.

I am being smiled at like this exaggeration. In Australia, an ad for a government-funded social service agency advertised for an aboriginal lesbian to fill the job. That was advertised, and I really have no objection to, nor feel any antipathy to, a person who is aboriginal and happens to be what is commonly referred to as a lesbian, but I do not see that categorization should give job preference over another. Your bill appears to say that it will not, but then it says, speaking out of both sides of its mouth that it will, because it says the multicultural policy will give equal access to opportunities. To whom? To individuals or to groups?

If you are going to deal with groups and deal with myself as a member of a group, you have two problems: If somebody is underrepresented in the work force, then ipso facto, it is an inescapable corollary that somebody is overrepresented in the work force; and if you are going to say that we are going to undo this imbalance then you have to go from the underrepresented and undo some of the overrepresented. So, if you have people who are a group—and you deal with groups—who are 1.5 percent of the population and have 10 percent of the work force, is it not logical, will you not say, if you proceed with this policy, that that group is overrepresented, we have to stop hiring those people, and start hiring the other?

* (2000)

By the way, Madam Minister, this may sound harsh, but that is exactly what Hitler said. Exactly. That was his exact position on this question as between Germans and one of the groups that you want to designate as the minority ethnic groups in our society.

Madam Minister, Mr. Chairperson, it is my suggestion to you that the state should stay out of the ethnic backgrounds of its people. People who wish, and there are many, to preserve their ethnic culture will do so, and many will become part of what

is a North American pattern, and I see nothing wrong with that. I think that most people in my group, that you would classify as a group, have adopted North American standards and yet retain a strong identity to their culture. They do so without any assistance from the state, and to get assistance from the state would be a danger, and I use in this respect the same argument that I use with regard to separate schools.

Once an ethnic group depends for its existence on public funding, inevitably the state will start telling that ethnic group what they must do in order to obtain that public funding. You will create racism of the nature that is now being stirred up in eastern Europe if you institutionalize rather than let ethnic backgrounds in our society take their normal course, because we have seen the result of their normal course.

By the way, I have a problem—I indicated there would be a personal problem—when you start dealing with the target groups, what target group does Jewish-Chinese fall into? Or will you make up a separate one? I have three grandchildren who are in that group, and I wonder what their job opportunities will be or what target group they will belong to if they are going to be dealt with on the basis of groups.

I have no problem with this country progressing as it has. As a matter of fact, I have often extolled the fact that we in Canada, and to a smaller extent in the United States, but we in Canada particularly, because of the Quebec situation, have not had a fetish about ethnic nationalism. We do not regard our nationalism as being an English nation or a French nation or a German nation or a Russian nation. We regard our nationalism as being a Canadian nation, being composed of all kinds of people from different lands who come here and retain whatever of their background is valuable to them and become part of Canada.

I submit to you that this kind of legislation is a backward and not a forward step, that the backgrounds of our people are best left to the people themselves and that the state should stay out of it. Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Green. Are there questions of Mr. Green? If not, then thank you again for your presentation, Mr. Green. The committee calls Joe Glasgow.

Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson): Yes, I request to make a committee change. Is there leave for that?

Mr. Chairperson: Yes. Is there leave for committee change? Leave granted. Proceed. I am sorry, you are going to have to get a committee member to move the changes. You are not a committee member and therefore—Mr. Chomiak is a committee member. He could move the—

Committee Substitutions

Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan): I, for Law Amendments, move Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) and Broadway (Mr. Santos) for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

Mr. Chairperson: Radisson for Kildonan and Broadway for Wolseley. Are we agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Committee calls Joe Glasgow. Joe Glasgow, not here. Mr. Bal Kapoor? Committee calls Mr. Kapoor. Mr. Kapoor, have you presentation for distribution?

Mr. Bal Kapoor (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Kapoor, would you please proceed?

Mr. Kapoor: Mr. Chairperson, the honourable Minister responsible for Multiculturalism (Mrs. Mitchelson), the honourable members of the committee, I wish to thank you for allowing me this opportunity to appear before you today and express my views and comments on the proposed Manitoba Multiculturalism Act. I speak on my behalf as a concerned Manitoban and in my capacity as the president of the National Indo-Canadian Council, Manitoba Chapter.

I have reviewed the proposed act and read the remarks made by the honourable minister in second reading. In my respectful opinion, the proposed act will be the foundation stone of a very healthy, prosperous and united Canada.

If the provisions of the proposed act are fairly and properly implemented and followed, we feel we will be following the path leading to a perfect and very enlightened society.

This act meets with the objectives of our association, which if I may briefly relate are: to encourage and assist Indo-Canadians to participate fully in Canadian society and to address matters that

specifically concern Canada; to provide members with a national forum in civic, social and economic matters; to foster among Indo-Canadians and others an understanding, appreciation, retention and security of the heritages of the peoples from the Indian subcontinent, and thus to play a role in the promotion of Canadian multiculturalism; to be involved with the rest of the Canadian society in the promotion of global humanitarian and multicultural endeavours of our country; to promote good will and positive relationships among the people of Canada and of India; and finally to encourage the establishment of centres and services to meet the needs and aspirations of Indo-Canadians in the spirit of respect and appreciation of differences.

I, sir, as an individual and in my capacity, that of the president of the National Indo-Canadian Council, stand before you to indicate that we fully support the act and compliment the honourable minister for introducing such a perfect instrument. Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kapoor. Are there any questions of Mr. Kapoor?

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Kapoor, for your presentation. Was your presentation—

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Cerilli, could you please pull up your mike a wee bit closer so we can hear you? Thank you.

Ms. Cerilli: Just to clarify, you are here representing the group the Indo-Canadian organization?

Mr. Kapoor: That is correct.

Ms. Cerilli: And the brief was agreed upon by the entire organization?

* (2010)

Mr. Kapoor: That is correct.

Ms. Cerilli: You say that the act will be the foundation stone of a very healthy, prosperous and united Canada. Can you clarify for me which sections of the legislation you feel are going to do that and why?

Mr. Kapoor: I read the proposed act in full and all the provisions of the act lead to that very one part. If you want me to point out a specific provision of that act, I would have to read the act and speak to you, but I am talking about the act as a whole and in general. I see nothing wrong with it. When we talk about multiculturalism, in my respectful opinion, this is an instrument which leads to that very part.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Just one question, Mr. Kapoor. When you say that in principle you support the act, and I believe all three political parties inside the Chamber support the act in principle, is it safe to say then that like some concerns that we might have with certain aspects or certain clauses in the act that might cause us some concern, your organization, when you say you support the act, you are not necessarily talking about every clause, that you are referring to the act as a whole, that in fact there are some things, no doubt, that you might want to see in or out of the act?

Mr. Kapoor: I have not really paid much attention to that particular aspect of your question, but I guess perhaps the only thing that I may have any concern about is perhaps of a granting of the funds and who does the granting.

Mr. Lamoureux: I guess that is one of the things which we have pointed out. As an example, if we were to take out the Grants Advisory Council, is that something that you would support or you would have to get back to your association with, or something of that nature?

Mr. Kapoor: I will prefer to get back and then, if necessary, come back and speak to that matter for you.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Kapoor.

The committee calls next Paul Kammerloch. Mr. Kammerloch, would you come forward please? Have you a written presentation for distribution?

Mr. Paul Kammerloch (Private Citizen): No, I do not, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please?

Mr. Kammerloch: Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to make some comments on the proposed multicultural act.

I should just tell you a little bit about my background. I was listening to Mr. Green's presentation earlier with interest. I am here as a private citizen, however my background is my parents are German immigrants, came to this country after the war. They lived in German communities in Ukraine for over 100 years prior to coming to Canada, so we have a little Ukrainian, a little German in our background, and I was born here in Canada.

I am a past president of the German-Canadian Congress. I am appearing here—I would like to clarify that—as a private citizen, however my background is with the German-Canadian community in Manitoba as a past president of the German-Canadian Congress, which is an umbrella organization for Manitobans of German-speaking heritage in Manitoba of which there are approximately 192,000.

What I would like to say is, firstly, after listening to Mr. Green who is also a lawyer as I am, I guess the old saying that you get 10 lawyers in a room and ask for an opinion, you will get 10 different opinions. I think that is very valid, because I read the same act he did, but I did not interpret it or understand it the way he did. Rather than categorizing Manitobans into different ethnic groups, I think the language—and one thing that I strongly support—is very clear and saying exactly the opposite.

Where I support it strongly and I applaud the minister for the wording of the act is it makes it very clear that, firstly, we are all Manitobans. I am reading from the preamble where it says: "AND WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba believes that Manitoba's multicultural society is not a collection of many separate societies, divided by language and culture, but is a single society united by shared laws, values, aspirations and responsibilities"

Being involved also on the pro-Canada committee, and in consultations with our community and providing a brief on the constitutional amendments, that is very much the position of the German-Canadian Congress, that when we talk about multiculturalism we are not talking about dividing Canadians or Manitobans into different ethnic groups. What we are talking about is defining our society.

I think despite what Mr. Green indicated, in our Constitution we do talk about the English majority, the French majority. We do talk about founding nations, and what I feel is very special and remarkable about this legislation is we are having a recognition of what our society is on a cultural level, and that it is not just French or English cultures. Manitobans are representative of cultures from all over the world, and that is what is Manitoba, that is what is a Manitoban. We do not have classes of cultures. Everyone is equal in terms of preserving and promoting their cultural heritage.

Approximately one-third of Canadians are not of French or English cultural heritage, and what we do have is a sense of alienation at times, even from very large groups such as the German-Canadian community, that they did not form part of Canadian history or Manitoba history. This act clearly recognizes that and it says that all Manitobans, regardless of their cultural background, are equal in terms of they are part of what makes this province, they are part of the definition.

I think what is important is this act really—I see it as something like a Manitoba act in the sense that it is defining what Manitoba is, what Manitoba society is. For that I think it is a remarkable piece of legislation, and I really applaud the minister and the government for bringing in that legislation.

The other details of the act, in terms of the Multiculturalism Secretariat, in terms of its implementation and things of that sort, are very flexible. I think it will take time to see how the act is implemented and how it should be implemented, and I feel that there will be, as in any legislation, perhaps refinements required once the legislation is underway and its operation is more closely understood.

I would just like to conclude by saying, the act clearly sets out, the way I read it, that it does not exclude any aspect of Manitoba society. It is an inclusive piece of legislation. It supports an inclusive concept not an exclusive concept. It does not put people into groups. Everyone is part of Manitoba society, and it is unifying and it is thinking.

Again, that is strongly the position of the German-Canadian Congress in its brief on the constitutional amendments. That brief very much stressed a strong Canada clause which gives recognition to Canadians of whatever particular cultural background they are, so again I would support that very strongly and the wording of the act very strongly.

I think basically it says, in analyzing it, whether you are a Manitoban of native origin or a recent immigrant, or whether you are part of a visible minority or whether you are part of a large mainstream group, that your cultural heritage and your right to promote it is equal, that your particular cultural background, your heritage has contributed just as much to the making of Manitoba as any other, and I think that is really the most significant recognition in the act. I applaud the minister for

bringing in an act which makes that kind of a remark, recognizes that particular aspect. Those are my comments.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Kammerloch. Are there any questions?

Ms. Cerilli: I have some questions, and I want to pass Mr. Kammerloch a section of the government's multicultural policy, if I could. I want to ask you, first of all, Mr. Kammerloch, if you can tell me what the main concerns or the main objectives are of the German-Canadian Congress.

* (2020)

Mr. Kammerloch: Well, again I would like to clarify, I am not here on behalf of the German-Canadian Congress. I am here as a private citizen, but from my experience within that organization and from my involvement in preparing a brief on the constitutional amendments, I would say, as I already indicated, it is really a recognition, and being part of the definition of Canadian society and Manitoba society is very important to the German-Canadian community. We often hear of English Canada and French Canada, but we do not identify the other cultural groups that have had a major involvement in the building of Canada and Manitoba and those groups that through immigration may continue in the future to have an involvement.

I think what we have to understand is that Canada and Manitoba are a composite of all those different cultural groups and we have to get away from a class structure of different cultural groups. We have official languages; that is part of the make-up of the country to recognize official languages. There is a historical reason for that, and we accept that, but I do not think anyone accepts official cultures. What I support in this act is that it very clearly defines what is Manitoba society and recognizes that it is multicultural in nature.

That is really the thrust of what, as I understand it, the German-Canadian community wants to have—that kind of a recognition not just for itself but for all Manitobans and Canadians of various cultural backgrounds.

Ms. Cerilli: Would it be fair to say that the organization as well is there to ensure that the German language and culture are continued and that people of German heritage are going to be portrayed in a favourable way in the society that we

live in in Canada? Would those be things that the organization is here for?

Mr. Kammerloch: I think that goes hand in hand with the recognition aspect. If German Canadians are Canadians and part of Canada as much as any other group, certainly they have a right to have their particular heritage and culture promoted. Where they need assistance in that regard, as being Manitobans or Canadians, they have a right to some assistance in that regard, on some reasonable basis. But language is a very important part of culture, and certainly the preservation and promotion of a language is very important.

Mr. Green was indicating, well, we do not have—we have never had, a policy of official cultures. Just by the fact that you do have official languages, there is an advantage in having your language, of your particular cultural background, as an official language. If you are of a cultural background that does not have that language pervasive in society, you are at a bit of a handicap, and you may need a little assistance in terms of preserving that particular language.

I think this legislation directly deals with heritage languages. I also think there happens to be a tremendous economic spin-off from citizens of our province knowing different languages, especially languages that are what you would call world languages. That goes hand in hand with understanding those cultures as well, in terms of trade, in terms of doing business in other countries. So there are, very happily, some economic benefits to that kind of a policy as well.

Ms. Cerilli: I am going to assume that you would support the government's policy that was developed a couple of years ago—that this government developed. In that policy, there is specific language that says a government has a responsibility to ensure that communities are able to promote the continuation of their language. The papers that I put before you are an outline of that policy.

I am going to ask you: as a lawyer—would it not strengthen the legislation, in terms of ensuring that ethnocultural minorities and groups with a language that is not an official language of the country, would it not ensure that the policy to promote those languages would be stronger if it were included in the policy section of the legislation?

Mr. Kammerloch: To promote those languages?

Ms. Cerilli: That is right.

Mr. Kammerloch: I have not had an opportunity to review what you have provided me with, but my understanding is, in the act—I will just turn to the section that deals with that—it does refer to "encourage the use of languages that contribute to the multicultural heritage of Manitoba" under "Purpose of secretariat." So I think it does, to some extent, reflect that and state that in the act.

Ms. Cerilli: Again, I will try and be more clear. This is one of my concerns with the legislation, that it is not strong enough because it does not put some of the multicultural policy that the government developed into the policy section of the act, and that the part that refers to heritage language is simply a role of the secretariat.

I would like—if we might benefit from your legal opinion on legislation; that it would be stronger if that were actually part of the policy section; the pages that I gave to you are the government's own multicultural policy, where it is very clear—I guess, to ask if you can understand why that entire government policy, which includes the preservation of languages, would not be included under the policy section of the act.

Mr. Kammerloch: Well, first of all—

Point of Order

Mr. Chairperson: Excuse me. Madam Minister, on a point of order.

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship): Excuse me, Mr. Chairperson, on a point of order, I would just like to clarify, because I think that some of the questioning is highly inappropriate in certain degrees, because we are trying to get a legal interpretation from a presenter—

An Honourable Member: A free one.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Yes, without charge, I might say.

Mr. Kammerloch: I was just going to say that I was not here paid to provide a legal opinion.

Mrs. Mitchelson: But can I just clarify that, in fact, there are three fundamental principles—

Mr. Chairperson: Sorry, I will interject. The minister does not have a point of order, but I will allow the minister to clarify.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I want to make it clear to the presenters and all of the presenters—

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Chairperson, I would just like to put on the record that if the Chair is going to allow the minister this kind of point of order for point of clarification—which is what it actually is—then the other members of the committee during this session should be afforded the same opportunity.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Cerilli does not have a point of order. I will allow, if for clarification purposes, at any given time, the minister to intervene to ensure that members of the committee and that members of the public understand the legislation clearly that is being put before them.

* * *

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairperson, I do just want to indicate to the presenter that there are three fundamental principles in "Manitoba's Policy for a Multicultural Society" that we adopted into the legislation. Under those three fundamental principles there are action statements, things that government has already committed to take action on. Those are actions that flow from the three policy statements, and I would hate presenters to be confused, believing that in fact there are more than three fundamental principles when that is exactly what it states in the policy, and that is being reflected in the legislation. Government from time to time will have ongoing action, and there will be new action, and there will be action that will be accomplished and will no longer need to be continued. So I just wanted to make that point of clarification.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Chairperson, on a further point of clarification. The section that the minister has referred to includes the word "culture" in part 2(b), but—

Point of Order

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, I was somewhat tolerant in terms of the manner in which the minister got to express, for clarification. I think we should remind both the minister and the member for Radisson (Ms. Cerilli) that in fact we are hearing presentations from the public. It is more appropriate to listen to what the public have to say, and if we have questions, that we ask questions of the presenters, and that applies to all three parties.

* (2030)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much. The Chair will take that as note, although the honourable member did not have a point of order.

* * *

Ms. Cerilli: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairperson, that the word "culture" could include language, but since the minister's act has not defined culture we cannot assume that that section includes language. So I think that my questions are quite in order.

Mr. Kammerloch: Mr. Chairperson, I think what really the point of this whole discussion is, it has made it very evident that it is a question of interpretation, and as I indicated earlier, you put forward legislation. The basic principles that are stated in the legislation, it is my feeling, are very profound. They are very positive. I would support them very strongly in terms of defining Manitoba society as a multicultural society and giving that recognition.

How this legislation is implemented and how it is followed is something we will have to watch very closely. If changes are required I am sure we will be—after some experience with the act—I am sure there will be some contact and lobbying in terms of making any changes that are required. I do not think you can draft a piece of legislation and have it perfect. It has to stand the test of time. So I would just say, generally in terms of the expression of the intent of the act, I support it very strongly.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Kammerloch, I understand that you are on the Manitoba Intercultural Council as a government appointment. Is that correct?

Mr. Kammerloch: Yes, that is correct.

Ms. Cerilli: Do you feel that this legislation is going to assist in any way in the role between the Multicultural Secretariat and the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and if so, how?

Mr. Kammerloch: I think that would be difficult to say. I understand there is a study being undertaken by Don Blair in terms of MIC's role, and how it will interact with this legislation. So I would think that is the subject of a major study.

I do not think I can answer that question from just looking at this particular act, and make any kind of a comment on it. I can only—as I said earlier, the general principles that are stated in the act are very positive and I would support them very strongly. I would hope that the study that Mr. Blair is making will assist us in understanding how MIC will play a role in this legislation.

Ms. Cerilli: As a member of MIC, do you not see it as a weakness in the act that there is no mention of MIC? There is a section that refers to the minister consulting with bodies in the community, groups in the community, that there is no mention of MIC in that section or that there is no definition of MIC as giving information to the secretariat?

Mr. Kammerloch: The way I see it, Ms. Cerilli, this is an act about Manitobans, about defining Manitobans. It is not an act about MIC, it is about defining Manitoba's society as a multicultural society. How MIC will fit into that is, as I said, a subject of a study and I will not comment on that, but I think you have to look at this legislation as very fundamental legislation defining the nature of our province as a multicultural society. That is what is important to me, and I believe, Manitobans. How that is implemented is another matter.

Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway): Mr. Chairperson, can I ask a few questions to Mr. Kammerloch?

Mr. Chairperson: Proceed please.

Mr. Santos: I would like to ask Mr. Kammerloch if there can be any society which is multicultural without being multilingual?

Mr. Kammerloch: I would say no. I think culture and language go very much hand in hand, not at all times but very much so. That is a very large component of culture, and I think it is a positive thing if we do have a multilingual country and province.

Mr. Santos: Another question, Mr. Chairperson. Can any cultural group truly express its culture in any other way than through its own language?

Mr. Kammerloch: I would say you can to some degree. As I indicated, I think language is a very important component, but I think there are other aspects of culture such as music, dance and traditions, food, all kinds of things that can be expressed other than in language. As I indicated, it is a very large component of culture.

Mr. Santos: Does Mr. Kammerloch accept or not accept equality of all cultures, and correspondingly, equality of all languages?

Mr. Kammerloch: I accept equality of all cultures, but I really do not look at it that way. I look at Canada, Manitoba as having one culture. We are all Manitobans and part of the makeup of that culture is the input that we all bring from our particular cultural heritage. I do not see it as separate

cultures, and I do not think the wording of this legislation sees it that way.

We are one culture. Each of us have contributed something toward that culture, and by allowing us to promote and preserve our cultural heritage it is part of the evolution of Manitoba's culture. In terms of equal rights as to languages, I am personally prepared to recognize the history of this country.

You have to have an official language for a country to function, and I am prepared to recognize the unique history of this country in terms of French and English being the official languages.

Mr. Santos: If I accept your premise that all cultures are equal and by definition the means, the medium, through which that culture is being expressed, namely by language, how do you reconcile any incongruity or inconsistency in a social system where some languages are designated as official and by definition have higher status than others that are nonofficial?

Mr. Kammerloch: As I indicated, for a country to work you have to have an official language. We happen to have two official languages because of our history, but you cannot have a country work with 20 or 30 official languages, so I am prepared to recognize that.

That does not mean you cannot, in the workplace, at home and all kinds of other environments, in the educational system, et cetera, preserve and promote a particular language. That is what I support. As an official, I just do not think it is practical to have more than one, or in the case of Canada, two official languages.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any other questions?

Ms. Cerilli: Do you support a program of equal opportunity through affirmative action policy?

Mr. Kammerloch: No, I do not. That is my personal opinion. I support equal opportunity.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much for your presentation, Mr. Kammerloch.

Mrs. Mitchelson: The point of order that was raised by the member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), was a point well taken. I do want to indicate that I am not saying very much. If I can just say right now—hopefully all of the presenters are here—I want to thank all of you for your valuable contributions and I will try to keep my remarks very limited.

The purposes of our being here, as all three parties in the Legislature, is to listen to the

presenters and hear your points of view. So I will thank you all in advance, and for those of you who have presented already, I thank you for your valuable input.

Mr. Chairperson: Would the committee next call Gabriel Dufault. Not here? The committee next calls Mr. Gene Lloyd. Is Mr. Gene Lloyd here? Not here? The committee next calls Mr. Wade Williams.

Mr. Williams, have you a prepared text to distribute?

Mr. Wade Williams (National Black Coalition of Canada): Yes, I have passed it to your committee about an hour ago.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Would you proceed, please?

* (2040)

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairperson, committee members, ladies and gentlemen, we of the National Black Coalition welcome this opportunity to appear before you to speak to Bill 98, which is intended to enact multiculturalism in the province of Manitoba.

The Winnipeg chapter of the National Black Coalition of Canada, NBCC, was formed in 1980. Our organization's aims and objectives include the following:

- 1) To ensure that black people of Canada achieve full social, cultural, political and economic participation in the shaping of a humane society, and that blacks benefit fully from this society;
- 2) To eradicate all forms of discrimination in Canadian society;
- 3) To foster communication and a spirit of solidarity among blacks in Canada, regardless of national origin;
- 4) To foster communication and co-operation with blacks of other nations in matters of common interest;
- 5) To provide a basis for a community response to crises and issues of general concern;
- 6) To provide a vehicle through which the black community may avail itself of the aid and advice of the most experienced, skilled and committed resource persons;
- 7) To foster communication and co-operation with other Manitoban communities, community organizations and individuals in matters of common interest.

Our chapter presidents to date include brother Lee Williams, brother Ralph James (deceased), sister Agnes Calliste, sister Ethel Whyte-Cousey, brother Louis Moore, brother Alix Jean-Paul and myself, Wade Kojo Williams.

Over the years, our chapter has initiated several important community projects. We have advocated on behalf of our community and our race, as well as other minority communities, and we have lobbied all levels of government and political parties on a number of issues of concern to our community and society at large. Our main annual activity is the sponsorship and co-ordination of activities to celebrate Black History Month during February.

The NBCC has been most active and vocal on issues pertaining to human rights. We are indeed a small and tireless group in the struggle against racism and the fight for equal access to opportunity for all Canadians, regardless of race and socio-economic circumstances. The National Black Coalition of Canada holds memberships in, and networks with, several international, national and provincial organizations including the Manitoba Intercultural Council and the National Council on Employment Equity.

The NBCC has carefully studied Bill 98, line by line, clause by clause. We would like to say from the outset that our organization welcomes the introduction of a multiculturalism act for the province of Manitoba. We, as an organization, wholeheartedly support the concept and principle of Bill 98.

However, there are some aspects of the proposed legislation which we feel should be strengthened. There are some areas we feel should be deleted, and some roles of agencies outlined in the bill which we believe will result in a waste of taxpayers' money since they merely duplicate existing roles and services and leave room for widespread politicization of these agencies.

One cannot but wonder why, in this period of financial restraint, the government of the day creates agencies and councils to provide services already provided with a great measure of success and fairness by existing agencies. Neither can it escape the eye of the most casual observer that either by coincidence or by design these new agencies are all staffed by individuals with direct links to the political party of the government of the day.

For this bill, Bill 98, to have meaning and improve the lifestyles of the disenfranchised Manitobans several changes must be made. The government needs to introduce companion legislation as well as amend the Manitoba Intercultural Council's act.

We of the NBCC fail to understand why someone has been contracted to study the MIC when this council has already been studied to death in the last five years. There was the special Auditor's report of 1988, as well as several symposiums out of which came several resolutions during the Biennial Assembly of June, 1990 and 1991, and of course several council meetings within the last two years.

We now call on the government to make a public disclosure of its contract with Mr. Don Blair for his study of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. Further to this, there was the Neil McDonald Report which resulted in a comprehensive study of the structure and the mandate of the MIC.

Let me now focus on Bill 98 and recommend necessary improvements. I would like to take you through the bill clause by clause.

The preamble: The NBCC supports the Multiculturalism Policy introduced by the government in May, 1990. Again, we support the preamble of Bill 98.

"Interpretation": Delete "Council." We oppose the inclusion of the Multiculturalism Grants Advisory Council in this or any other bill. Insert and define cultural values, cultural communities and equal access.

Under "Multiculturalism policy", Clause 2(c): We would like it to be amended to read, enhance the opportunities of Manitoba's multicultural society by acting in partnership with all communities and by encouraging co-operation and partnerships.

Under "Mandate of minister", Clause 3(a): Amend to read, upon advice of the Manitoba Intercultural Council as mandated in The MIC Act, the minister will act as an advocate to ensure that policies and programs throughout the government reflect the multiculturalism policy set out in Section 2.

Clause 3: Insert (e) to read, and this is a new addition to that clause on the minister's responsibility, work to ensure that companion legislation is put in place to make The Multiculturalism Act effective, and (f) to read, The Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship

responsible for Multiculturalism shall chair the Multicultural Affairs Committee of Cabinet.

Under "Multiculturalism Secretariat", Clause 5(a): Amend to read, work in consultation with the Manitoba Intercultural Council and officials and other departments and agencies of the government to identify, prioritize and implement actions to contribute to the achievement of a successful and equitable multicultural society in Manitoba.

Clause 5(b) delete. We believe that this role is already carried out by the MIC.

Clause 5(c) delete. We believe that this role is already carried out by the MIC.

Clause 5(d) delete. We believe that this role is already carried out by the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

"Community access office"—Clause 6. We recommend that it be deleted. We believe the existence of this office is a duplication of the services already provided or which could be provided by the MIC, the Immigration/Settlement Branch of this very ministry of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship and/or the International Centre.

We strongly urge that the government enhance the services of these agencies.

* (2050)

Under "Multiculturalism Grants Advisory Council", Clauses 7 through 13, delete. We believe then, that is when MGAC was brought into being, and we believe now that there is absolutely no reason for this agency to exist.

Again, we call on the government to provide a comparison analysis of the workings of MGAC and the grants committee that existed when the MIC was the body with the funding authority.

We believe, and we believe the taxpayers would like to know what it costs to have MGAC functioning. We still wholeheartedly support the immediate amendment or immediate amendments to the Manitoba Intercultural Council act and the restoration of the funding authority to that organization.

The MIC believes that the minister would be better advised or grants will be more fairly awarded by a body elected by communities across Manitoba. Surely, we do believe that the minister and government believe that funds to operate MGAC is unnecessary waste.

"Annual report"—Clause 14. We support this clause. This is the only evidence that the government is willing to listen and act upon the recommendations coming out of this committee stage of the bill. We note, with interest, the exclusion of the Multiculturalism Grants Advisory Council from this clause.

"C.C.S.M. reference"—Clause 15. Agreed.

"Coming into force"—Clause 16. Agreed.

The NBCCs' call for companion legislation and amendments to The MIC Act are quite straightforward. The latest statistics coming from the government's own affirmative action program, which is nothing more than an agreement with the MGEA, are enough to signal to the government that Bill 98 would be meaningless without companion legislation containing, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.

Does the government expect to achieve equal access to opportunity by merely relying on change of attitudes in society? Does the government expect to achieve the freedom and opportunity to participate in the broader life of the society without any provision to mandate antiracist and multicultural education throughout schools in this province?

Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, our presentation here tonight is not an attempt to criticize the government for what we believe should be or should not be included in Bill 98. We are putting forward what we believe are recommendations worthy of consideration and implementation.

As was the case immediately following the unveiling of the multiculturalism policy in 1990, the National Black Coalition now commends the government on its bold initiative to introduce a multiculturalism act for the province of Manitoba. We trust that this bill will be improved before third reading and passage.

Over the past 10 years, the NBCC has been at the forefront of community organizations in the struggle for society change in this community. Our presentation here tonight is the work of concerned Manitoba and Canadian citizens after thorough and rational analysis of the bill before you, Bill 98.

On behalf of the executive membership and supporters of the efforts of the NBCC, once again I would like to thank you for allowing us this opportunity.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Williams. Are there any questions?

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Williams. That was a very good presentation. I appreciate the detailed work you have put into the amendments, and I think that a number of them are very good amendments.

I want to start off by asking you what your hopes were for what should be included in this legislation. What are the key things that you think should have been included in this legislation?

Mr. Williams: What I hoped for, and I believe what all Manitobans hope for, was a legislation that will give not only legal authority but would give enabling authority to multiculturalism, the department of Multiculturalism and other agencies involved with the delivery of services to provide equal access to opportunity in Manitoba.

I am not a lawyer. I am not a student of law. As a matter of fact, I am not a student of anything, but I believe that those of us who have been involved in this area for a number of years would feel very disappointed.

Yes, the government ought to be commended, but unless Bill 98 would have enabling clauses or unless the government is willing to introduce immediately, companion legislation or amend the MIC Act and give back the powers that were taken away from the MIC within the last four years, we would have been better off saving taxpayers the thousands of dollars and the hours wasted here because we were doing just fine with the policy. If this is what this bill is, we would have been much better off with the policy.

Ms. Cerilli: Are you concerned that the legislation does not enact the complete government's multicultural policy that was developed recently?

Mr. Williams: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, we are concerned. The minister, in raising a point of clarification outlined that the act proposes to encompass the three fundamental principles outlined in the policy. A policy is the basis for legislation and the fact that the three broad fundamental policies included in the multiculturalism policy, the fact that they are included here, means nothing to this act, to the minister or to Manitoba.

The time for platitudes are over. Platitudes in the policy, fine. A legislation to enable that policy to be given some teeth and some meat is long overdue, and I do not see it here in this legislation.

Let me remind the honourable members sitting around this table, and we can check our watches, the time and the date that I am making this statement. We in Canada believe that we are the envy of the world when it comes to race relations as bad as things seem to be sometimes. However, if we sit back in a complacent manner, if we sit back in a holier than thou manner, I believe that 20 years from now history will judge every one of you fine gentlemen and ladies around this table for avoiding the experiences of Brixton and Notting Hill and Miami and the Bronx and New York to be visited on any city in Canada.

This bill can be improved so that we could work toward keeping Canada free of these kinds of experiences. We hope that it will be improved before the third reading stage.

Ms. Cerilli: When you are speaking of enabling legislation, is what you have in mind that there would be a descriptive policy statement with respect to affirmative action and equal opportunity in employment with respect to heritage language, with respect to multicultural/cross-cultural education in the schools? Are those the kinds of things that you are looking for?

Mr. Williams: Precisely. I know that I would be told, well, there is a multicultural policy in Winnipeg Division No. 1.

However, unless multiculturalism, a multicultural curriculum is developed in all Manitoba schools, unless we have antiracist education in all Manitoba schools, unless we have, call it employment equity, call it affirmative action, call it EEO, as the city does, unless, we have, first of all, a school system that is conducive to every student having access to learning, and until we have a work force that provides for equal access to opportunity, I challenge anyone to tell me that there are not discriminatory hiring practices. I challenge anyone to tell me that once some of us are hired, as tokens, as window dressers, and so on, that we do not face discrimination in the work place, unless there is cross-cultural training, not only in the schools, but in the workplace.

* (2100)

Unless we have these kinds of measures put in place through legislation, multiculturalism in Manitoba—multiculturalism which is what Canada is, because to deny multiculturalism is to deny the existence of Canada—multiculturalism will continue

to be song and dance and a vote-catching mechanism by politicians.

Mr. Lamoureux: First, I must say, right from the onset, Mr. Williams is likely one of the most consistent individuals whom I have run across. Whenever an issue comes before the Chamber, he is definitely on the telephone to get a hold of me to express his opinions, as I know he does for many different individuals. I commend him on his effort in putting forward the presentation that he has put together, on relatively short notice, no doubt, for the committee this evening.

I notice, in his presentation, that he has made reference, in terms of the Manitoba Grants Advisory Council—something that we firmly believe in, something that we will be moving an amendment to get the MGAC taken out of The Multiculturalism Act—and other issues that he has brought before the committee. No doubt, we will be seeing some of the amendments, being proposed at the very least, that Mr. Williams is bringing forward.

My question is just to help me clarify, with respect to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, are you, Mr. Williams, of the opinion that the MIC should be incorporated into The Multiculturalism Act or would you just as soon see MIC legislation? You made reference to a change where they would be given the granting authority. Now, would you rather see MIC outside of the act, albeit changed in itself, or a part of a multicultural act?

Mr. Williams: Thanks, Mr. Chairperson, through you: to me, the answer to that question is that it is as broad as it is wide. We can take either route. I do not believe we have to scrap the MIC Act and incorporate the MIC's structure and its operation into Bill 98 to have the MIC functioning as the bona fide—and note the word, the "bona fide"—representatives of the communities across this country.

If the Manitoba Intercultural Council Act is amended as was proposed a year or so ago by both opposition parties and several community organizations including the MIC, if it is amended and the MIC is given back its roles, that is one to advocate on behalf of its constituents, that is the more than 430 organizations across this country, and then advise the minister who would advocate within cabinet and within government, if the MIC is given back its role to act in a proactive manner on behalf of its constituency and if the MIC as it has for

a number years is given back its funding role, which by the way I believe costs a very small fraction for the administration of the grants under the MIC as it is causing now under the super agency called MGAC, we believe that if the act is amended to do those things that the MIC can function alongside what is, minus of course MGAC, included in Bill 98.

The other route is, to forget that there is an MIC Act, and I think it would be wrong because I think it would not be beneficial to the communities. The other route would be to have MIC incorporated into this bill, but we need not do that so long as it is clearly outlined in this bill, the role of the MIC or the role it shall play in terms of achieving the goals of this bill.

As long as we understand the relationship between the MIC and the ministry of Multiculturalism, as long as we understand the working relationship between the MIC and the Multiculturalism Secretariat, I believe that this bill would go a far way into achieving what I believe the minister and government and all Manitobans want to achieve. So my answer in a nutshell, Kevin, is, whichever way we slice it, there is need for the role of the MIC to be included in Bill 98.

Mr. Lamoureux: Finally, Mr. Chairperson, I would concur with what Mr. Williams is saying on that point is that if you had a choice, where because we are given a majority government, in which we could have Bill 98 passed in its current form or to be defeated, what would your choice be? Would you rather see Bill 98 passed in its current form given the flaws, and no doubt there will be amendments put forward, but after all, realistically, it is a majority government? If the amendments do not pass would you rather see it become law or be defeated?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairperson, that is a tough question, and I think I have to give it a political answer because we have to understand that we have waited for more than two years after this bill was supposed to be before us. I do believe that we can wait a little while if the government believes that it is necessary to line the pockets of some lone individual who has so much experience in multiculturalism, who is so hard working and dedicated to the cause of a multicultural and equitable and just society that they have to overload him and overburden him with another contract. If in wisdom the government decides to continue to enter into this contract and have this study done, which I believe is useless, why can we not wait for four months? We have waited for two years.

* (2110)

Now, to answer the question directly. Politicians on the opposition side of the House, I believe, will be blamed for denying Manitoba, particularly those of us from the so-called visible ethnic communities, a multiculturalism act and the government will have a field day. Community activists like myself and organizations like the one I belong to, if we were to say kill the bill we would be accused of standing in the way of a multiculturalism act for Manitoba.

Well let me say here and now, there is nothing in this bill to kill, because there is no life in this bill. There is nothing here to kill. If we have to kill the bill, and I hope we do not have to because I am sure—I know the minister very well, I am a vociferous critic of her policies on a daily basis, but I know her very well, we still get along and we still speak, I can still pick up the phone and speak with her. I know the minister will make the necessary changes, so Mr. Lamoureux, I do not think we will have to get to the point where the bill has to be killed.

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): Mr. Chairperson, I will not take too much time because all of the presenters are here but, as Mr. Williams knows, sometimes we are not on the same wavelength on some of the issues, but on this I have to agree with him on one issue which is very important.

I will ask his opinion here, that by giving authority to an appointed body, in fact, government may be dividing the ethnic communities in the long run because, whether they realize it or not, when you are making an appointed body, you make a powerful organization to distribute all the funds.

We have, on the other hand, the MIC, which is an elected body. I think in the long run by bringing in this bill and having that part of the bill in this present form, I think it will do the ethnic minorities more harm than any good in the long run. I would like to have your opinion.

Mr. Williams: In a very frank way, as I always am, consciously or subconsciously, I believe taking away the powers from the MIC, the funding authority, whether you give it to MGAC or SMGAC or PLGAC or whatever, consciously or subconsciously it is racism and I will tell you why.

I sat on the executive of the MIC, and I can boast about it, elected unopposed two consecutive terms. In order to get there I had to be elected three times. For any one of you to be here sitting around this

table, which I hope I will be sitting around in the not-too-distant future, you had to be elected twice. You had to be elected during a nomination process, and then you had to be elected by the people.

First of all, I had to be elected as the representative of my organization. Then I had to be elected by all of the organizations in my group in the MIC to get onto the council. Then I had to be elected by the council at large to become an executive member.

Now what the government said to us clearly, and like I said before, I am not a student of anything, but I believe that what the government did was to say to the communities we do not trust you to give funds, and you are not qualified to do the job. You visible ethnics cannot do it, so we have to go and set up our own committee. The committee cannot give grants; all the committee can do is to advise the government on who should get the grants.

I am saying, that the power was taken away from the people. In a time, and a day, and an age when we see it before our eyes around this world that power is being handed back to the people, in this case, the power was taken away from the people. I caution politicians, as well intentioned as these actions might be, they can have serious consequences in the long term.

I believe that the funding agency, the CRAC committee of the MIC, worked extremely well. I believe that no committee, and I can go through the list, I do not want to get involved in partisan politics, but any political party of the day will do the same thing, who are in power. Committees like MGAC, the outreach office, the Multiculturalism Secretariat they are nothing more than dumping grounds, it seems to me, for either failed political candidates or people who have worked closely on political campaigns, and I am saying that is not in the best interests of multiculturalism. It is not in the best interests of Manitoba. It is not in the best interests of Canada. It is not in the best interests of this planet Earth.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Williams, I heard that you are saying that in any society the people who are elected by their constituents at any scale are the ones who have the mandate to make decisions for them.

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Santos: When MIC was originally established, it was established as a truly democratic system, as a macrocosm of our political system.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairperson, I believe so, sir.

Mr. Santos: One observer of political life had made a generalization that most organizations start as a democratic system. Then, as it operates and as it finds its benefits and advantages there is this inevitable oligarchical tendency, what he calls the iron law of oligarchy, that operates within that organization where this democratically shared power correspondingly is being narrowed down into the hands of fewer and fewer hands. Do you accept such a generalization?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I would not accept such a generalization because I do not want the acceptance of that generalization to make it appear that I believe that there was a power for the few in the MIC.

Mr. Santos: Do you think this iron law of oligarchy is now actually operating within MIC, in these kinds of legislative changes?

Mr. Williams: Well, what I know that is happening in the MIC is that the rules have changed over the last four years, and we have a situation now where the executive of the MIC is made up of over 60 percent government appointees. When I made the last check a few hours ago, 85 percent of that 60 percent of government appointees had direct contact with government or activities of the party of the government of the day, either as campaign workers, or the husbands were campaign workers and that sort of thing.

The point I want to make here is, it would be wrong to throw out the baby with the bath water. If we are to say, because there were some things that were not quite so right in the MIC so take away their funding authority, we would not have a government functioning anywhere in Canada today, because every government in Canada that I know today has its skeletons not only in the closet but walking all around every government building. It is called corruption, patronage, nepotism.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, I would like specifically to refer to paragraph five on page 2 of Mr. Williams' presentation. Why do you object to the partisan politicization of government agencies when you know very well that government cannot run without political parties?

Mr. Williams: There is politicization and there is politicization. I feel very, very satisfied tonight when I look around this room, I see a number of visible minorities here.

Brother Santos, you know that in 1983, FAME came into being and this was our philosophy that visible ethnics should be involved actively in the political process in the party of their choices.

We believe that visible ethnics must be involved and we are not all socialists, we are not all Conservatives, we are not all Liberals. I would even love to see some visible minorities involved in the Reform Party, so that we can have the Reform Party come to its senses, because sooner or later we would have to do business with the Reform Party.

The point I am making is, when I talk about politicization, let me make direct reference, and again, nothing personal. I cannot accept that less than three weeks after someone is defeated by the electorate in a constituency in this province that a department as sensitive as the Multiculturalism Secretariat, that person would be appointed there. Eminently qualified for the job, timing and circumstances were wrong, and I cannot understand why this person is able to take with him in that same department his campaign manager. I cannot understand why this person is now overseeing a Multiculturalism department, because that is what our head of the secretariat is, a very powerful man as far as multiculturalism goes in this government.

We have someone who sat with him and worked with him for years on the Folk Arts Council, now being given a one man task to study the MIC. This is the kind of crass politicization that I am talking about. I am not talking about politicization in terms of actively participating in politics.

* (2120)

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, accepting Mr. Williams' distinction between political participation, which he seems to say is legitimate, and crass, in his own terms, politicization which he probably would classify as political corruption of some sort or of some degree, may I ask whether or not he feels that any kind of policy, including multicultural policy, no matter how beautifully it appears in print, the true meaning of the policy will depend on how its interpretation affects social reality in our society.

Mr. Williams: You are quite correct, but in order for us to measure that, this policy which will be put in

legislation, must be able to do something. As far as Bill 98 goes, none of us around this table or sitting behind me can question the concept, the principles and all that is in the preamble and so on of this bill.

However, all I am saying is, that unless this bill is given enabling and monitoring clauses, or unless we have companion legislation you will not be able to realize, Mr. Santos, those goals that you have set out in your question to me.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, I did not state anything of a goal that I am trying to achieve. All I am asking is whether or not a multiculturalism policy's true meaning can be found not in the wording of the policy but in the actual implementation of that policy and how it affects social reality.

My question is: Do you think this legislation before us will affect that social reality in terms of concrete action like affirmative action policy, equality of opportunity and stamping out of discriminatory practices?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairperson, no, sir, because even the Multiculturalism Affairs Committee of Cabinet is not mentioned in this bill. This bill would not do those things, Mr. Santos.

Ms. Cerilli: Yes, I do not want to take too much time because we do have so many more presenters, but you just mentioned something that I want to ask you about. You have gone through a lot of detail with some of your amendments but I am wondering if you could put forward some sense of what you mean by "monitoring" clause.

Mr. Williams: Okay. In the federal Multiculturalism Act it is not there, but in the Official Languages Act we have a commissioner of official languages and that commissioner of official languages monitors the implementation and the compliance with the Official Languages Act. This is the kind of monitoring mechanism that I am alluding to.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Williams, for your presentation. Would it be the will of the committee that we take a five minute break? Agreed.

* * *

The committee took recess at 9:25 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 9:31 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Would the members of the committee please come back to the table? Could the committee please come to order. Order, please. I would ask members in the back or the presenters to come to order please. The committee would call next, Arnold Eddy.

Ms. Cerilli: I just have a couple of questions for the committee. I was not on the committee when it began for the evening session. I am wondering if we could clarify if there has been an agreement of when the committee is going to sit till this evening.

Mr. Chairperson: The agreement before you came in, was that the committee would sit until we had heard all the presentations and then go into clause by clause of both bills. That was the agreement at the beginning of this evening's sitting.

Ms. Cerilli: Was that an agreement made after the discussion of the House leaders? Were the House leaders involved in that decision at all?

Mr. Chairperson: That agreement was arrived at in this committee.

There was a request made that we hear a women's group. I guess it is the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, and if there is leave from the committee and consideration of those presenters who are still left to make presentation, if it is with their will, these women have asked whether it would be possible for them to be the next presenters. What is the will of the committee? Would you want to hear them and would that be with the agreement of [interjection] Pardon?

Mrs. Mitchelson: If we could ask just for some affirmative sense, yes or no, from those presenters who are waiting. Would it be possible to move the Immigrant Women's up to be heard at this point in time?

Mr. Chairperson: Everybody agree to that? Then I would ask Lena Anderson of the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba to come forward at this time. Ms. Anderson, by the way, have you a written presentation to distribute before the committee?

Ms. Lena Anderson (Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba): I do not have enough copies, Mr. Chairperson, to distribute.

Mr. Chairperson: We can make copies for the committee if you have some copies.

Ms. Anderson: Okay. Sure.

Mr. Chairperson: I am going to ask you to start your presentation while the copies are being made. Would you proceed, please?

Ms. Anderson: Sure, Mr. Chairperson. Good evening to all of you honourable people and thanks for allowing us to make our presentation at this time.

I represent the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, and on behalf of the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, we welcome and we congratulate the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson, Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship for introducing our first ever Multiculturalism Act for the province of Manitoba.

This to us is a positive step in the right direction. The preamble is significant. It has recognized multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of Manitoba. Similarly, of significance, is the recognition of heritage language in the act.

However, one of the drawbacks of Bill 98, in our view, is the fact that it is presented in broad generalizations and offers scope for wide interpretations and applications.

The character which at once seems to be its greatest strength could be its greatest weakness in cases where specific correctness are warranted.

The Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba would like the bill to become more specific in the following areas:

1. In the legal justice system. Example: The increase in violence against women in both the immigrant community and the community at large continues to need the sensitivity and responsiveness of government, because the need is urgent and violence against immigrant women and all women in Manitoba continues to be an obstacle to the full participation of women in society. We would like to see the bill more specific in this area.

2. Multiculturalism education. We feel that multiculturalism education should be an integral part of the school system from Kindergarten to Grade 12. Also, that settlement, language and programs, which is referred to as the SLP and the ESL, should be included as a multicultural right of immigrants, especially immigrant women in Manitoba.

3. Racism and discrimination against immigrant women and members of the visible minorities continue to be a major problem. We therefore feel that The Multiculturalism Act should address this by

inclusion of its intention to eradicate this social disease from our institutions and society at large.

We would like to see specific reference to the elimination of racism and discrimination, social injustices and inequalities against immigrant women in the workplace, in education and in politics included in the act.

An important tenant of this act is equal access to opportunity. The Immigrant Women's Association feel that this statement should be expanded to include a firm and clear commitment from the government of Manitoba to employment equity and contract compliance. The act should also include provision for training to facilitate employment equity. This is the only way we believe that the underrepresentation of immigrant and visible minority women in government and agencies could be effectively addressed.

Regarding the MIC, the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba feel that the MIC should be included in the act. We are disappointed by the absence of any mention of MIC in the act. We are also saddened that the proposed review was not taken in time to be included in the act.

We hope, however, that the results of the review will have a positive effect on MICs role, i.e., it will serve to strengthen its role and that it will be consolidated as part of The Multiculturalism Act.

* (2140)

On behalf of the Immigrant Women's Association of Manitoba, I would like to thank the Assembly for giving us this opportunity to voice our concerns with regard to this act.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Ms. Anderson, that was a very good presentation. I am skimming through, looking for a place where we can try and incorporate some of the recommendations that you have made to specifically identify that women may need some additional amendments to deal with their needs because there is sort of a double discrimination there. I appreciate that.

I am wondering if some of the recommendations that you just made, you believe should be included in the policy section of the act. Is that your intent?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, I am not so sure, because I am not a policy maker, whether it should be in the policy or whether it should be in the act itself. I am not very sure on those, Ms. Cerilli.

Ms. Cerilli: Are you familiar with the government's—have you read the government's policy on multiculturalism? Do you remember reading that?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, I have read it, yes, time and time again, but not specifically this time.

Ms. Cerilli: Would you agree that it is kind of odd that the government would develop that policy and then not include it in legislation, would develop a multicultural policy and then not include all the parts of that policy where they claim to have a commitment to affirmative action or employment equity, they claim to have a commitment to heritage languages preservation, and then those things are not included in the act. Does that not seem odd?

Ms. Anderson: Perhaps it does seem odd, but maybe we cannot get everything at the same time, Ms. Cerilli, and maybe it is us, the people, who have to advise the government and tell the government where maybe we could strengthen and perhaps some of these things to come in and to help us. I know it is a very sensitive issue and it is not a very popular issue. Therefore, I am not going to be the one to condemn, but rather to ask to accommodate us in some way.

Ms. Cerilli: You referred also to the timing of this legislation with respect to the review that was also proposed at the same time of MIC, and I am aware that you are part of MIC. Is that correct?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I am one of the board members of MIC.

Ms. Cerilli: Can you describe for me more what your concerns are about the ramifications of the review not being completed before this act is brought in?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, my understanding is that the review was warranted and inasmuch as we would have liked to have the review before, so that it could be included in the act or a part of the act, that did not happen. Therefore, we are optimistic that the review will be positive or aspects of it will be, and those positive aspects could be more or less implemented in the act.

Ms. Cerilli: I am assuming that you were here for Mr. William's presentation?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, I was here.

Ms. Cerilli: Do you share his concern that a number of the clauses under the secretariat's

section are actually taking on some of the mandate of the Intercultural Council?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, in answer to your question, I did not study that part as such. In some areas I thought there was some duplications, but again I do not know the ramifications.

Ms. Cerilli: Yes, I appreciate that you are here representing the Immigrant Women's Association and that was the focus of your presentation.

Ms. Anderson: That was the focus of my—yes, Mr. Chairperson, I am representing the Immigrant Women. We all sat together and this was the brief that we thought we would present.

Ms. Cerilli: Okay.

Mr. Lamoureux: I just had a couple of questions. First, once again, I think maybe what I should do is qualify all of the presenters who are here, like the minister did earlier, by saying that we acknowledge all the hard work, no doubt, that is put forward in all the presentations.

I do have a couple of very brief questions. One is with respect to the Manitoba Intercultural Council. In your opinion—because I am not too sure if you had the opportunity to really have the type of dialogue that you might have wanted to have with respect to a multicultural act—do you feel that if you had an amendment brought forward to Bill 98 that included in some part—Mr. Wade Williams points out a couple of areas in terms of ministerial responsibilities in the secretariat's office and so forth but does not make any reference to the Manitoba Intercultural Act. In other words, we leave two acts, but have reference to the Manitoba Intercultural Council in The Multiculturalism Act. Would you support something of that nature or would you still rather see MIC incorporated into a multicultural act?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, from my vantage point, I think I would rather see MIC incorporated as part of the act too but, strangely enough, that is just my own opinion. I did not discuss that aspect with my members.

Mr. Lamoureux: Finally, I was going just to ask—I was really interested when you pointed out in your presentation the importance of education, if you will. I do not think that you can underestimate the importance of education in terms of multiculturalism and racism and so forth. Is there any type of conclusion that you came to in regards to how something of that nature could be put into

legislation? Did you come to any conclusions in that respect?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, the how to put it in, that is not really my prerogative. I do not know how we would work it, but I strongly believe there is a place where we could put it. I would have to study it further to see at what stage or at what place, but I do know that there could be a place for it there.

I think under the part in the bill that has to do with the secretariat and where it talks about equal opportunity, in that area, I think it is (d) or (c), I think it is broad enough to be inclusive if we want to add such things in that area, like education, for instance.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you.

Ms. Anderson: I do not know if I answered your question.

Mr. Lamoureux: Yes, you did, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Anderson.

Mr. Santos: Ms. Anderson, what experiential evidence or observation can you say when you stated that there is a need which is urgent against violence against immigrant women?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, those of us who even read the newspaper over the last few weeks have seen women are being battered here and there before our eyes, on the streets, in our homes, particularly by our partners. We see it on television. It is in the newspaper. It is all over, Mr. Santos.

Mr. Santos: Do you think some of this behaviour is culturally related?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, I do not think violence can be cultural.

Mr. Santos: I mean the macho image.

Ms. Anderson: I do not think so and, even if it is, Mr. Santos, we have to have something in place to help us to take care of our women or else pretty soon we will not have any, with the rate at which it is going today, the violence, the battering. Therefore, we have to have some legislation there and then we would perhaps look at the legal system and see if something could not be worked out there to protect all women.

Mr. Santos: Do you think this violence and discrimination is directed only against immigrant women?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, I did mention in my presentation that immigrant women, and all women for that matter, particularly immigrant women, but all women in general, too.

* (2150)

Mr. Santos: There is an emphasis in your No. 3 there, racism and discrimination against immigrant women and members of visible minority continue to be a major problem.

Ms. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, that is so true. We have just to look at the recent riots in Los Angeles and in parts of Toronto to see that is evident when it comes in terms of the visible minorities. We, as immigrant women in Manitoba, we too are losing out.

Mr. Santos: How would you remedy, if you were in a position to do so, what you perceived to be underrepresentation of immigrant and visible minority women in government and agencies?

Ms. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, if I understand your question, Mr. Santos, I would like to—as you have seen mentioned in my brief, about affirmative action and contract compliance accompanied with training for our immigrant women.

Mr. Santos: So, you think then this should be included in the act?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I think there is a definite need for that sort of action.

Ms. Cerilli: I just want to pick up on that one question. Are you aware that the government's policy statement does include all of those things? Are you aware of that?

Ms. Anderson: Yes, but what I am saying, I would like to see it spelled out in the act.

Ms. Cerilli: Good, so would I.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Anderson, for your presentation.

We will revert back then to the order as listed. The next presenter will be Mr. Arnold Eddy, private citizen. Mr. Eddy would you come forward, please? Have you a formal presentation to distribute?

Mr. Arnold Eddy (Private Citizen): No, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please?

Mr. Eddy: Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. I appear before you this evening as a private citizen, and as chairperson of the Multicultural Grants Advisory

Council in a voluntary capacity. I wish to speak in support of the Manitoba Multiculturalism Act, as was presented by the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson, on Wednesday, June 10, 1992.

I hold a B.A., majoring in psychology and minoring in sociology, so if the reverse is true, majoring in sociology and minoring in psychology, a BSW in social work and an MSW in social work. I have been in this country for over 20 years, and I was privileged to work with different people from all the ethnic groups, not just visible minorities, in a professional capacity, and in my role as a volunteer worker, like what I am doing now as the chairperson of MGAC.

I was present on May 15, 1990, when Premier Filmon and the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson announced Manitoba's policy for a multicultural society. At that time the government defined Manitoba's multicultural society as a single society which shared laws, aspirations and responsibilities. It rejected the concept of our society as one based on a collection of many separate societies, divided by language and culture.

It further set forth its three fundamental principles of pride, equality and partnership. The restatement of the above, and the addition of shared values to the definition of the act, is an indication regarding the sincerity of the government in its multicultural legislation.

Within that framework, cultural diversity is recognized as strength rather than as weakness. Moreover, the right of all Manitobans, and I say all Manitobans, to equal access in opportunity, participation in all aspects of society and respect for their cultural values is acknowledged.

I have noted too that the process provides for the advancement of the Manitoban multicultural society by endorsing its partnership with other cultural communities.

I refer next to the multicultural policies structural facilitations.

First is the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson, who is the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship and the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism. Mrs. Mitchelson is a capable person who is dedicated in serving Manitobans. Her support with the ethnic community across the province shall surely assist her in discharging her responsibility. Her achievement in this realm, after only a two-year period, suggests that the office could never have been in better hands.

The second important facilitator of the multicultural policy is the secretariat, established primarily as an advisory and co-ordinative body. It has already distinguished itself as a fundamental tool, all its present sevenfold duties as spelled out in the act on page 4.

One sees the elaborate function of this body in operation. Its communal enhancement, promotional responsibility and encouragement activities set it apart from any other multicultural body that existed in this province prior to its coming into being.

Consequently, Mr. Chairperson, the establishment of this structure must be commended, for it is this agency that operates at a popular level and hence serves as the intermediary between people and government.

The opening of the community access office is the third important arm of the multicultural policy officially opened on May 14, 1992. It is an office which provides practical assistance to groups and individuals in dealing with departments and agencies of government. The purpose of this office says it all. That is, the commitment of the government to its people in its cultural pursuit, therefore the greater the access the wider is the communication beyond the channels between the government and its people.

The fourth pillar of the multicultural policy is the establishment of the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council. This body was established to further the three fundamental principles by recommending funding to assist in community organizations in its promotion and shared cultures, heritages, and address the challenges of living in harmony.

* (2200)

Guidelines are provided to assist organizations which may be considering applications. Cultural development is stressed.

Priority is given to Manitoban-based activities of an intercultural nature, upgrading of skills of human resources to volunteers and the development of communities and organizations.

Mr. Chairperson, on a personal note, sometimes I get frustrated with people in the community. Here I am, I have a full-time job, I give up my time on Saturdays, Sundays, sometimes during the week, only to be criticized by some people in the community for talking about favouritism and patronage.

I am not here talking for each member of the board of the Grants Advisory Council, but I am sure we have different ideologies. Sometimes it really gets to you that people are just there criticizing.

I felt very happy when the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship (Mrs. Mitchelson) sent a positive message to our community by appointing me as the first visible minority chairperson to head the Grants Advisory Council. I thought that was a good thing and she should be commended for that.

I shall now turn my attention to some of the accomplishments of the multicultural policy, since its adoption in May of 1990. There are two instances of the co-operative collaborative approach, as it is called for in multiculturalism.

One of these is the setting of an awareness program between the Minister of Labour (Mr. Praznik) and the Multiculturalism Secretariat. The other is that of the multicultural education policy, through co-operation between the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) and Multiculturalism.

These programs underlie two of the essential attributes of multiculturalism. One, awareness; two, education. The government is in the process of reviewing the Manitoba intercultural policy which was established under a different legislative act. A consultant, as it has been mentioned, has been appointed to undertake such a process and report to the minister by October 15.

It is beyond me to try and figure out why you have all this paranoia. The study has not yet been done. How can we address what is going to be in the study and what is not going to be in the study? We have to wait until the study has been accomplished.

(Mr. Gerry McAlpine, Acting Chairperson, in the Chair)

As far as I am concerned, this multicultural policy that is being debated here this evening is a kind of a base line study on which to bounce off. It is like a springboard. In the future, amendments, I am sure can be made. You cannot include everything in any policy, just like how you cannot fill your house up with all the furniture that you would like to buy. It just would not hold it.

The artistic expression of the Manitoba cultural diversity has always been encouraged by the government. Many ethnic groups received financial support over the years, and the government is still committed to a continuation of its role in that area.

Toward that end, an Arts branch has been established within the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship. Its purpose is that of funding all community-based arts, including that of the folk ethnocultural type. In its battle against racism, the government appointed an antiracism coordinator within its Citizenship Division on March 20 of this year.

Recognizing the effectiveness of co-operative approach, the Citizenship Division, in alliance with the Civil Service Commission, implemented a pilot antiracism training program within the Department of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship. Funding is provided to this agency through a process called Bridging Cultures and several antiracism projects have been approved for funding.

Immigrants have had difficulties from time to time. With an appropriate evaluation of their credentials, to deal with this problem, the labour market and Immigrant Credentials Branch of the Citizenship Division was created in March of this year. These are all positive steps.

Mr. Acting Chairperson, I can suggest to you that the foregoing is not a paltry accomplishment of the government on a matter so new as the multicultural policy of May 15, 1990. This achievement does not come from a government which has a lukewarm commitment to multiculturalism. Rather this success comes from a government that is zealously pursuing the policies set forth in the act.

What I am about to say is personal, Mr. Acting Chairperson. From a personal point of view, while criticism has a value in society and sometimes brings about change, that which is groundless and offered only for that sake is worthless in my opinion, that the government should not be dissuaded by those fitting the description that I have just described. We read some of these in the printed media and hear a number of the same things from disgruntled individuals, some of which you have heard this evening.

In the media, we often find those which suggest that government by itself be the embodiment of multiculturalism but, Mr. Acting Chairperson, in fairness, the constant use of the word "partnership" in government literature and multiculturalism indicates a simple fact. That fact is awareness that multicultural policy will succeed only, and I underline the word "only," in co-operation between citizens and the legislators.

Consequently, the government need not be concerned about such baseless attacks. The government is also advised to pay no attention to certain individuals who never see any good in anything. In their zeal to condemn, they have lost the ability to commend. Unable to move forward, they shuffle backward, taking the weary with them.

As citizens of the province, they have the right to express themselves. However, forward-looking members have no obligation to listen to them.

Mr. Chairperson, I want to thank you and your committee for the opportunity given me to make my presentation. As a citizen and as the chairman of the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, I hope and pray that this act will be passed as a base line whereby future amendments can be made. Thank you.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): Thank you, Mr. Eddy. Would you entertain questions from the committee?

Mr. Eddy: Certainly, Mr. Acting Chairperson.

Mr. Lamoureux: I have likely a number of questions, and we could probably go on for a few hours with Mr. Eddy and some of the comments he has put on the record. Unfortunately, because we have so many presenters, and we do want to hear all the presenters. I know I will be given more opportunities to sit down at different functions with Mr. Eddy where we can further explore some of the comments that he has put on the record this evening.

In short, Mr. Eddy, one of the things that you are asking this committee to do, all three political parties to do, is to put into legislation the whole concept of multicultural grants and the appointments or politicization of what maybe you might not perceive as politicization but what many do believe is politicization.

I think it is important that I acknowledge your background and the things that you have contributed and the goals that no doubt you establish for yourself and so forth, but it is also important to realize that other communities, other groups such as the Manitoba Intercultural Council also had individuals such as yourself who donated of their time and made the decisions that were necessary in order to distribute the multicultural funding. In essence, I think that there are really two issues when it comes to multicultural funding.

Mr. Eddy: Excuse me. Would you ask your question? What is the question?

* (2210)

Mr. Lamoureux: There are really two issues. The first issue is: Do you support multicultural grants? I think that you will find that all three political parties in this Chamber support multicultural grants.

The second issue is the way in which those grants are distributed. You will find that there is some conflict in this area. Right now it is currently through the appointment of a minister where the chairperson, and you happen to be the chairperson this time around, for the Manitoba Grants Advisory Council, which is completely made up of individuals selected from the minister. Now, previously it was selected through the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and I do not think I need to let you know how the MIC came out into its being and how grants were handed out at that time.

I am wondering if you believe that the public as a whole, if they had a choice to have a politically appointed body hand out multicultural grants as opposed to community-elected individuals from the different ethnic groups handing out the grants, who do you think in all honesty would the public say a yes to. Which one do you think they would say yes to?

Mr. Eddy: In your preamble, where with the venom that maybe you have introduced into that statement, maybe people polarize to what you have just said, but my feedback in the community is that people will polarize toward the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council. Some of the things that you say about the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council have not been said from a framework of knowledge.

The Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, and you can check it out—it is not only my opinion—is a very empirical body. There are criteria which we have to follow. Applications have to be processed, and as a matter of fact, I have never come across a board, and I have sat on many boards, that is so objective in handing out these grants. There is no political interference. You either fit the criteria or you do not. Right? You have people on that board, although I am not speaking for them, but just like how you go around and you work crowds and you get things from people, they belong to parties that have different political ideology. I mean, I think you are living in a world of fantasy.

Mr. Lamoureux: Well, Mr. Chairperson, you know the minister has often told me that we are going to have to agree to disagree, and I think this is one area that Mr. Eddy and myself will have to agree to disagree with.

I would suggest to you that the MIC also had a process in which it could have gone through, and a process which could have been changed if concerns were brought to their attention. In fact, there are reports, the Auditor's report, that makes reference to a number of the changes that should have occurred, that suggested that in fact the Manitoba Intercultural Council should have been the body solely responsible for the distribution of multicultural grants and so forth. So both have a process.

I am convinced that if I put it to the people that I will find overwhelming support of those that say yes to multicultural grants will take a board that is based on community representatives, that are elected from within and then appointed, than in a board that is selected and chosen, because, whether through your chairmanship or not, the integrity or the perception is still wrong.

You might choose to feel that what you are doing or as the chairperson of that particular organization that there is nothing wrong that is occurring. You might feel that as an individual, but I can assure you that other individuals do not feel that and that there was another process, but again, you and I no doubt will have ample opportunity in which we can go at—

Mr. Eddy: I was about to ask the Acting Chairperson if I was here to be lectured or to have questions posed at me. I was just waiting for the question. I did not come here to be lectured, I came to make a presentation and to answer questions based on my presentation. I rule you out of order, really.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I guess at times I do exercise myself somewhat and want to try to persuade other individuals to come along the same thinking as I do, no doubt like the presenter himself. I will get right to a specific question and that is in regard to the community access office where it says that the minister may establish an office.

I would ask Mr. Eddy, as a private citizen, if in fact the word "may" is something that should even be there? Could you not have the minister "will" establish an office? By saying the word "may", what you are doing is you are saying, well, if the minister

wants one she can have one, or he can have one, or they can decide not to have one.

What is the purpose of that word even being in there? Would he not agree with me?

Mr. Eddy: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I do not agree with you. I am not a grammarian, No. 1, and No. 2, I put in my presentation here that I personally have the greatest confidence in the minister and her department, that if she wants to use the word, "may" it is okay with me.

Mr. Lamoureux: I guess that is part of the reason why I feel that it is somewhat necessary to let the chairperson of MGAC know that whatever the minister says, does not have to be, that there are other ideas out there that the chairperson of MGAC does not necessarily have to follow. I think it is—

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): Order, please. I would remind all members that you are here to ask questions of the presenters for clarification, and I would ask the honourable member to ask his question now, please.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Acting Chairperson, again, because I do want to go on to hearing more presenters, I will leave it at that and thank the member for coming forward to make his presentation. I look forward to seeing him at future functions. Thank you.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Eddy, do you think that the government has a responsibility in trying to create a more equitable and truly multicultural society, that they have a responsibility to support policies like education in the schools that is going to deal with racism, that they need to ensure that various cultures have the right to promote and the ability and resources to promote their language, that there be a policy that supports employment equity? Do you think that those things are necessary if we are going to have a more equitable society?

Mr. Eddy: I do not know if you were listening closely to my presentation. I would have to go over the notes there that the Minister of Education (Mrs. Vodrey) together with the Minister of Multiculturalism (Mrs. Mitchelson) have taken some of those things that you have mentioned into account, some of the things that you have just expressed concern about as stated in the act. But, of course, some of these things will have to be taken into account. Equality, I mentioned it in the presentation, pride, equality and partnership. Did I answer your question on that?

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Eddy, what do you think of the policy section of this act?

Mr. Eddy: I think it is excellent. I think it is good.

Ms. Cerilli: Are you satisfied that it truly incorporates a specific commitment to some of those initiatives that you agreed are essential or necessary to creating a multicultural society?

Mr. Eddy: Yes, I do. I said earlier on that this act is a base line. You know like when you do a base line study, if you do not have an act you cannot make any changes. You know, life does not follow a straight line. There are curves. You go up and down.

When you are comparing the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, like Mr. Lamoureux said before, we are not here to divide the community. I have friends who are in the MIC, you know. We get along. We have people in the community generally. We are not here to make enemies, but people have to be objective.

* (2220)

You have to start somewhere, and the minister should be given a lot of accolades in having started here.

In the future, as these community leaders see the need for change, you add the changes. Do you know what I mean? Exponentially, this is what happens.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Eddy, do you not wish that we did not have to move in such teeny, tiny steps when we are trying to create equity?

Mr. Eddy: You will excuse me for mispronouncing your name, Ms. Cerilli. I would say that you look fairly young to me.

When I came to this country, what is happening now has improved a thousandfold. I am talking from experience. Maybe you just graduated from university or high school or something, but I am talking about, when I first came here, there was nothing. This is an improvement. You see, people are just coming like they were blown in in the last shower of rain, and they have a negative speech pattern. That is what I am picking up, a negative speech pattern.

There is an improvement; it is not perfect. I would be a fool to stand up and here and tell you that there is not racism. Is that what you want me to say? But we have come, and the step-by-step progression method is operational now. It has been actualized,

and now it is operational. We move from here, and we go forward, not to be always criticizing.

The minister and her staff did not have to put in all the countless hours and devote all the energy that she has done toward our cause, and I am speaking as a visible minority. You are not defending me. I mean, I can defend myself. I am the one who is out there walking the streets as a visible minority. If I had an opportunity there with Mr. Lamoureux, I am telling you, the feedback that I am getting in the community is that people prefer the way in which in we hand out the grants from the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council.

But I am not here to criticize MIC. I am not going to give you the feedback. But people are pleased because it is done fairly. It is not 100 percent. When we come across negatives, we feed these things up the line.

Ms. Cerilli: One final question, Mr. Eddy. Do you think the government has a responsibility to consult members of, in this case, the ethnocultural community from outside its political party when it is developing policy and programs? Do you think that it should make sure that its consultation is broad?

Mr. Eddy: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I agree with you 100 percent, but the minister did exactly what you have just asked.

Ms. Cerilli: Do you not feel that that requirement should be embodied in legislation that is going to try and ensure that that happens?

Mr. Eddy: Are you going to embody everything? Do you need a person to wash your face, tell you when to wash your face and go to the thing? Do you know what I mean? We are not kids, you know.

No further questions? Mr. Lamoureux, do you have another one?

Mr. Santos: I have one question, Mr. Chairperson. As chairman of the government Multicultural Grants Advisory Council and an appointee of the government, do you feel that you are in a difficult situation in that you cannot but say anything which is favourable to the government?

Mr. Eddy: Obviously, I would empathize with you because you really do not know me that well, but I just happen to be appointed. Is it a negative to be belonging to a certain political ideology? You know, if you were to be real and be honest, if your party is in power, you are going to appoint people. I mean, you all are not modern-day Jesuses.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, I feel compelled just to make a few comments, Mr. Eddy. I guess I wanted to ask you whether you were aware and maybe if you might comment on a situation that happened when the NDP were in fact in power. The then-minister Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis politically interfered very blatantly with the Manitoba Intercultural Council, because what normally happens is that they recommend to government whom the chairperson should be. At the time, when she was the minister, they did not take the Manitoba Intercultural Council's recommendation, but in fact they brought someone else in who had not been a part of the Manitoba Intercultural Council to be the chairperson.

I do not know, maybe I could just ask you whether, throughout the community—because I know that when I did become minister, there was a terribly negative feeling among the Manitoba Intercultural Council members for the blatant politicization of the Manitoba Intercultural Council by the former administration. I just would like to ask you whether you were aware of that and whether you might want to comment on that.

Mr. Eddy: Yes, I am very much well aware of that.

As I have said before, I think that when people say these kinds of things and throw these negative things towards the act, it is just a matter of game playing, because it has been done, what you have said in the past.

Point of Order

Ms. Cerilli: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairperson, I do not think it is game playing, to clarify—that asking that affirmative action be included in a multicultural act is game playing.

Mr. Eddy: Who said that? I did not say that. I did not say what you just said. I mean, you are putting words into my mouth. How did that come about?

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): It was not a point of order, Ms. Cerilli.

* * *

Mrs. Mitchelson: Thank you, Mr. Eddy.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): Thank you, Mr. Eddy. Thank you very much for your presentation and answering the questions.

The committee will call now Mr. Jock Lowe. Mr. Jock Lowe not here.

Mr. Osmond Anderson. Do you have a presentation to distribute?

Mr. Osmond Anderson (Manitoba Multicultural Resources Centre Inc.): Yes, Mr. Acting Chairperson. I think it is already distributed.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): Please proceed, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, members of the committee, my name is Osmond Anderson, and I am very delighted to be here to make this presentation on behalf of the Manitoba Multicultural Resources Centre.

I am pleased at this time to congratulate the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson, the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, on the tabling of Bill 98 on June 10, 1992, in the Manitoba House. In our opinion, it is a genuine action in the fulfillment of the promise of the multicultural act of Manitoba as presented in the throne speech of May 18, 1989.

Some may say that four years is a long time to fulfill a promise, but MMRC has no issue with that time frame. The act itself is very broad in scope. Apparently, there are no precedents regarding multicultural acts in Manitoba, and only time can measure its application and its effectiveness.

MMRC is particularly pleased with the preamble of the act. In particular, the preamble highlights the importance of the multicultural history of Manitoba. It legitimizes the multicultural reality by declaring that multiculturalism is a characteristic of the province.

* (2230)

MMRC request that the preservation of culture and heritage be included in Section 2 of the act. Reason: MMRC's primary mandate states that we seek to preserve and promote our rich multicultural heritage and to facilitate multicultural understanding and activities in our community. Therefore, we strongly recommend that financial support should be provided to organizations like MMRC, which provides service to the community and promotes harmonious relationships between ethnocultural communities.

We have said before, the act includes a framework that invites amendments. MMRC, on numerous occasions, has presented advice regarding the inclusion of elements which would strengthen or include in the act.

MMRC has stated that the act should provide a framework to remove racial and systemic discrimination and to achieve reduction in prejudice, that the act should make a definite commitment to establish processes and structures to achieve harmonious ethnocultural and race relations, that modification should be made to the legal justice system to make the spread of hate propaganda illegal, that the act should provide equity in the Civil Service and to make contract compliance compulsory for business and corporations that do business with the government, that the act should contain a commitment to Affirmative Action programs which would plan and develop training that will bring the disadvantaged into the main stream of employment in Manitoba, that the program should include training in either of both of the official languages through the ESL, FSL programs, that the act should provide provisions for the training of Manitoba teachers in multicultural education on techniques.

These concepts and components can be included in the act by simple amendments in the future.

Mr. Acting Chairperson, ladies and gentlemen, I thank the committee for allowing me to appear before you on behalf of MMRC, and we definitely hope that these recommendations that I present before you this afternoon will be considered as improvement to the act. We sincerely hope that you will find them very useful.

The Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): Mr. Anderson, thank you very much. Would you entertain questions from the committee?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, sir.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Anderson, for your presentation. I appreciate the specific nature of your proposals. I am wondering if you would like to see those amendments this time around while we are considering this bill right now. We have a chance through this committee for amendments, after we hear all the presentations, if you would like to see them included as much as possible this time around.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Acting Chairperson, that is my recommendation. I would like to say, though, with a little bit of modification, I see the multicultural act as an organic structure growing and improving with time. I think we should prepare it, without any kind of partisanship, recognizing the very importance of

this act, the first act which, as I said before, has been very long in coming.

I would be very, very disappointed if we look at this as a completion in itself, but we all should join together to make sure that this thing grow and grow organically to incorporate all the problems that it should solve. We have quite a number of problems. So what I am appealing for is for co-operation, good sense, reasonableness in allowing this thing to grow so it can accede and really respond to the expectations, the expectation of all Manitobans.

Ms. Cerilli: I agree with the sentiments of your comments that you would like to see this done in a nonpartisan way. Unfortunately, the structure of our political system in this province and the country is very partisan at the time being, and although many of us, I think, would like it to be different, we are forced often into the structure that exists and we try to work as best we can to move away from that.

I am hoping, through discussions that we have had with the minister, that there will be some amendments considered. I was encouraged during Estimates, when I asked the minister about an amendment to this act to include all of the policy, the government's own policy on multiculturalism, into the policy section of the legislation, that she was going to consider that.

I am wondering if you are familiar with the policy statement that the government has put forward that did have a direct commitment to things like language training for newcomers, that had a commitment to heritage language services, that had a commitment to employment equity, if you would also endorse that kind of an amendment for this act.

Mr. Anderson: Ms. Cerilli, I am quite aware of what is embodied in that policy paper. I am very, very aware, and I want to say, whether the intention is clean and clear, I think is referred or alluded to under the Section 1, under minister in the act, where it refers in a very definite way to the policy, not very clearly stated. I would have to agree with you that, you know, governments go and governments come, and the intention of an act like this, definitely, I would like to see some of those things stated very, very clearly, the expectations, so that whether they can be interpreted today or tomorrow or next year, there should be no problem with these things. I hope I have answered your question.

Ms. Cerilli: Yes. Further to that, I am just wanting to indicate that the Canadian federal government

multicultural policy does have those specific commitments, and I have some material here that highlights it, that talks about, federal institutions shall ensure that Canadians of all origins have equal opportunity to obtain employment advancement in institutions, that they will make use of language skills and cultural understanding of individuals of all origins, which points to things like the accreditation issue.

* (2240)

I guess I just want some indication of, how important do you think it is that these kinds of things be included now and if you have had any conversations with any individuals, with the minister perhaps, who are going to give us some confidence that these things are going to be included at some recent time, at some time soon in the future, perhaps when the review of MIC is completed—I am not sure—if you have had any kinds of indications that there will be amendments to this effect in the near future.

Mr. Anderson: Yes, Mr. Chairperson. Indications—you want indications that they will be included in the near future. I have none of those indications. What I am saying and what I am hoping for—now this act is very broad in its scope. I have said that. You know my record in race relations here, and whether it is this government or any other government, what the difficulty is, is always a lack of political will in many cases when we start dealing with multiculturalism or race relations or that kind of thing.

If there is good will, I am saying if there is good will, the act is so broad in scope that it gives you and me and everyone a tremendous facility for interpretation of multiculturalism within the act. If we could interpret those things with time, usually with time, timely interpretation and have this implementation taking place with change, with time, I could see the adjustment taking place very—well can I use the term "accurately"?—more accurately with the growth of society than now.

But let me answer the question. For myself personally, yes, I would like to see them as quickly, as soon as possible, but my preference, with enough political good will, with the scope of the act, I would really like to see this thing take its own time to grow and grow properly and grow well, adjusting itself to problems that we must solve as we move on, because this is an organic society that is

changing all the time, and I cannot see how anyone could sit down and write this act to adjust specifically to all the problems that we are going to have in this country in the next 20, 25 years. So I have my sympathies.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, to Mr. Anderson, or better yet I should say O.T., as I know he much prefers to be called. I was interested in reading through your report, O.T., that there were a number of recommendations that you have brought forward, and all of them, of course, no doubt interest all of us at this table.

I looked in terms of the one where you make modifications to the legal and justice system to make the spread of hate propaganda illegal. I think that is one of the amendments that we might, in fact, be able to see to this particular act quite possibly. I think, no doubt, as you had pointed out yourself, that this is a starting point, and I would concur that we now have a multicultural act, in which in the future no doubt we will see amendments and, like you, I too would be disappointed if in fact this is the last we ever see or hear of any changes to the multicultural act, because I think it is through time that we will find out how effective the act actually is and where it is that we can improve the act.

I notice, as I say, that you brought forward recommendations in terms of what you as representing the Manitoba Multicultural Resource Centre feel is necessary in order to make this a better act. Is there anything that you might say, and I do not want to drag you into a political thing here, but I would ask, is there anything that you would like to see out of the current act? In particular I am looking, of course, at the Grants Advisory Council. Do you feel that it is necessary to have that put into the legislation? Again, I do not want to put you into a political spot here, so you can feel free to answer that question directly or not.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Chairperson, I could have written that question down before I came here. I was almost sure that was going to be asked from Kevin.

Yes, it is a political nightmare for me, and I am not going to give you a straight answer. I am going to be very, very, very fair with you. I have seen the two bodies function in time addressing the same problem and, at this time, I have not really given a heck of a lot of consideration to see the effectiveness of how both bodies function to make

a comparison, to make a determination for you, so I think I am giving a little cop-out here but, to be frank, as chairman of the Manitoba Multicultural Resource Centre, my board has not given enough consideration to this question in order for me to give you an affirmative or a no, so I prefer not to answer this directly, and I am sorry.

Mr. Lamoureux: Fine, Mr. Acting Chairperson, and I can appreciate, as I say, why it might put you in a bit of an awkward position, but I can say that I know he has the support and respect of all three political parties inside this Chamber as everyone else, no doubt, to some degree that makes presentation before the committee, but would encourage him to talk to all, in particular to the critics and to the minister with that respect in terms of what his personal opinion as opposed to the resource center's opinion is on it.

I wanted to ask one final question with respect to the Manitoba Intercultural Council. That is, as I had pointed out earlier, do you feel, or does the resource centre have an opinion as to, the role of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, in the sense—should it be in a multicultural act or is it sufficient to make reference in The Multiculturalism Act to a Manitoba Intercultural Council act, or does it really matter?

Mr. Anderson: I think I am going to have to give a little bit of historic perspective on this. I want you to understand that I have an implicit interest in the Intercultural Council. The Intercultural Council was born one Saturday afternoon in the Casa Italia where 12 of us were sitting. We sold the idea and we saw it grow and move along to its present state. I want you to understand that. I have special interest in the Intercultural Council.

Time has changed and so the Intercultural Council has changed. There was need for a review of the act, and I think many attempts have been made for reviewing the act. As one person said, it would have been very nice to have the act of the Intercultural Council reviewed in time for the publication of that act, with the review incorporated in the act. Well, fortunately or unfortunately, it has not been done, but a good intention has been expressed that the act will be reviewed. We hope the review will be very objective.

Frankly, it is my opinion that whatever comes from that review will be enough. I said the act is flexible enough, it is broad in scope, to absorb new ideas, new concepts, new facts and new structures. I

hope that the act will take care of that when it comes. I guess, we just have to have a little bit of patience. I know one of the questions I am getting all the time, should we have it in now.

I do appreciate that we want to have that, but I guess, in my opinion—I have worked in multicultural affairs for nearly two decades and it is not the easiest system to work in. Nor can you predict what it should be tomorrow. I would like to say, though I would want to see it now, that we be reasonable enough to look at some of these things, because whatever we are building now is not to serve us now but tomorrow, next week, next year, probably ten years from now.

We should build it strongly. We should build it firmly. We should be reasonable in whatever we do. I know I have been over some of these things, and my patience is not very long and deep. Ask my wife; she can tell you that. I guess in some of these things, we have to be a little bit more cool in our temperament and let reason flow.

Could I just move back to one question, Kevin, which you slid off without asking me? I would like to answer it since the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) is sitting here. It has to relate to hate literature and hate propaganda in our community. This is a serious business in the multicultural society. In my opinion, hate literature and hate propaganda has two layers to it. It is coming from a layer that is up there and superior down to a layer which is somewhat inferior.

In my opinion, this is one area in the multicultural spectrum, in the act, where I believe legal remedies are needed and possible. It is not going to be easy to determine what that legal remedy is going to be, but I think we should spend a good time looking at it so we could have that incorporated in the act. I think that we have suffered too much. Some people are taking too great an advantage of people who are not able to help themselves.

* (2250)

I know that Mr. Trachtenberg is here also—there he is—and we have worked on this together. We have sympathies and we understand that this is a serious problem within our community. I hope, I really hope, that you, Mr. Minister, will look at it with a very, very dear and important approach. If a committee is warranted, I am willing to serve.

Mr. Acting Chairperson (Mr. McAlpine): There being no further questions, I would like to thank Mr.

Anderson for his presentation and co-operation in answering the questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson): Yes, Mr. Acting Chairperson, before we proceed further, I note that we are getting fairly late in the evening. We have had some discussions amongst House leaders, and there has been an agreement to call a meeting of the committee tomorrow.

I am wondering if, in order to assist members of the committee, if we might canvass those who wish to make presentations tonight if at all possible, and those who might be available tomorrow because, in looking at the clock, I know that we do not want to sit to too unreasonable an hour, but I am sure the committee would like to accommodate in whatever shape or form, both tonight and tomorrow as well, in terms of listening to the public.

Also there has been discussion—I have discussed this with the minister and amongst members of the committee, not to proceed with clause-by-clause tonight anyway, so we would be in a position to continue public hearings which I think is of concern to all members of the committee, to make sure that everybody has the chance to make their presentation.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Ashton and I have had an opportunity to talk, and I guess what we want to do is ensure that those who have signed up to make presentations have the opportunity to be heard. I think we are prepared to stay as late as we need to, to hear those who want to be here this evening, but we do want to indicate that if you would prefer to come back in the morning to have your presentation heard, that we would be willing to accommodate that also.

I think it is a matter of personal preference. If we have to stay here longer to accommodate you so you do not have to come back, that is fine, and if you do want to come back in the morning, we will accommodate that too. I wonder what the best process would be, and maybe we need to confer to see whether we go through the list and see how many people are here and ask them whether they want to make a presentation tonight or tomorrow? I do not know what the process should be.

(Mr. Chairperson in the Chair)

Mr. Ashton: Perhaps if we could ask the committee Clerk to canvass the members of the public who are here tonight as to whether they would

like to present tonight or if they are available tomorrow. We could perhaps begin the next presentation, and perhaps ask the Clerk in the meantime, or did you want to adjourn?

Mr. Chairperson: Could I ask that there be a general show of hands as to those who would want to present tonight? Could you indicate by hand? How many would want to come back tomorrow?

We have five that would like to come back tomorrow, and the rest we will hear tonight if that is the will of the committee. Thank you. We will have a five-minute recess, and then we will return.

Ms. Cerilli: I want to ensure that the Clerk will get the names of the people who are going to come tomorrow, and we would get that information.

* * *

The committee took recess at 10:55 p.m.

After Recess

The committee resumed at 11:03 p.m.

Mr. Chairperson: Could the committee come back to order.

Mr. Done Tole and Ms. Brenda Kass, Executive Director of the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages, would you come forward please. Mr. Tole, have you a printed presentation that you want to distribute? Thank you. Will you proceed, please.

Mr. Done Tole (Executive Director, Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages): Mr. Chairperson, members of the committee, the presentation that I am going to read tonight is on behalf of the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages. Ms. Brenda Kass, our Executive Director, is not present this evening.

It is often difficult to define a multicultural society since it is a unique and advanced concept. The future success of Manitoba as a multicultural society depends on the contributions of its ethnic communities and its entire population in terms of language and culture. As the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson stated in her address to the Legislative Assembly, multiculturalism is part of our identity. It helps define who we are.

The Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages Inc. was formed in 1983 to promote and encourage the enhancement of heritage languages and to represent the common

needs of language groups to all levels of government. MAPAL continues to promote and support the study of heritage and world languages as both an economic and cultural tool. Through activities such as public education, outreach and information sessions, MAPAL strives to foster a better understanding of the importance of multicultural education in today's society and to secure such an understanding for Canada's future generations.

It was therefore a great honour and pleasure for representatives of MAPAL to meet with the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson, Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, on May 5, 1992, in order to convey our concerns and needs regarding the newly formed Multiculturalism Act; that is, Bill 98. Upon meeting with the minister, MAPAL's table officers were able to stress their view on the importance of language as a common denominator. By promoting heritage and world language education in this province, the community is able to commit itself to the growth of many individual cultures. With this commitment comes the growth of a society which is diverse and yet unified. Such a diversity within unity is one of this province's initial founding principles and thus can only add to our growth.

Upon receiving a copy of The Multiculturalism Act in writing, along with the Honourable Bonnie Mitchelson's speaking notes from the second reading of the act, MAPAL's executive members were able to review the content and the wording of the act during an executive meeting. The executive was in agreement that The Multiculturalism Act expressed the truth about the purpose of multiculturalism in this province. We were content that the act showed the need for multicultural education for all Manitobans as a means for combatting prejudice and racism. We were also pleased to see the roles of the minister of multiculturalism and the Multiculturalism Secretariat defined in the act in order to provide a clearer picture to Manitobans as to how this act will be carried out.

We felt that the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, also defined in the act, should be sensitive to the needs of this province's ethnocultural communities and be flexible in providing greatly needed financial assistance for multicultural programs and education. This financial support is crucial for Manitoba's ethnocultural communities

due to the recent funding cutbacks from the provincial government.

Finally, we were particularly in support of the wording of The Multiculturalism Act which stresses the importance of multiculturalism in all communities and includes people from all religions, cultures and races. It is the hope of the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages Inc. that The Multiculturalism Act become a strong and vital force within the province of Manitoba in order to provide Manitobans with a strong base on which to build a bright future for ethnocultural relations and multiculturalism as a whole. On behalf of the membership of MAPAL, I offer our support for The Multiculturalism Act in the hope that it will be proclaimed and carry out that which is its true purpose in Manitoba. Thank you.

* (2310)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Tole. Are there any questions?

Ms. Cerilli: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and thank you, Mr. Tole for making your presentation and sticking it out with us here tonight. The presentations that people are making are very important. We are going to seriously look at amendments tomorrow.

I wanted to ask you if you are aware that the federal government's multicultural policy includes a specific policy section that refers to heritage language. I can even read it: It is hereby declared to be a policy of the Government of Canada to preserve and enhance the use of languages, other than English and French, while strengthening the status and use of official languages in Canada.

I am wondering if you are aware that there is a government policy at the federal level, a specific commitment to those kinds of programs.

Mr. Tole: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I am aware of that and I also support that idea.

Ms. Cerilli: Would you support that kind of specific wording in our Manitoba policy?

Mr. Tole: The way we have studied it so far, we feel that this is already implied in the Manitoba act, as it reads now.

Ms. Cerilli: Can you clarify for me which section of the act indicates that to you?

Mr. Tole: At the lateness of the hour and not having the act in front of me, no, I cannot.

Ms. Cerilli: This is one of the concerns I have about the legislation, is that this is only under the Multiculturalism Secretariat, and that this secretariat does not have any granting authority over funding for heritage language. By simply having a clause in there that says that the secretariat is to encourage the development or the use of heritage languages—I could read specific wording—but the concern is that this is not a strong commitment on behalf of the government to continue to fund heritage language programs, especially outside of the Department of Education.

Currently, you are probably aware, we no longer have funding for heritage language programs, for community-based programs. The only programs that exist now are through the schools. I am concerned and I am wondering if you share my concern that we could not have a stronger commitment in this act to funding heritage language programs.

Mr. Tole: I wanted to refer to the fact—you made reference to the fact that the only heritage language programs that are offered are those through the schools. This is not correct, I think. We have many supplementary schools which are community based and community supported.

The wording for the encouragement of heritage language education on the part of the secretariat, I feel that the encouragement is necessary, although I realize that funding is not tied in with it, and funding is an important aspect to us, and certainly funding of our supplementary schools is important.

Mr. Chairperson: I want to remind committee members that we are not here to try and impose our thinking or our will on the presenters. We are here to listen to the presenters and listen to their suggestions for the bill and their presentations of the bill, and we are here to question them on their presentations, so I would remind members that we keep our direction fairly clear.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Chairperson, I appreciate the clarification. There has been a decrease in the funding for those programs and there is no longer a separate funding or granting program to fund those programs, and I understand that there have been a number of communities that have had trouble maintaining their programs. My concern is that we could have a stronger policy commitment similar to how we could have a stronger commitment to employment equity programs, to ensuring that ESL

is provided. All of those kinds of things could be put into the policy section of the act.

I am wondering if you have any other recommendations for the legislation of areas of the act that should be deleted, if any of the other presentations that you have heard tonight have impressed upon you in that way.

Mr. Tole: Nothing that I could refer to at this moment, no.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you, Mr. Tole, for your presentation.

The next presenter is Dr. Ijaz Qamar. Have you a written presentation for distribution?

Dr. Ijaz Qamar (Private Citizen): Yes, I have.

Mr. Chalrperson: Thank you, Mr. Qamar, would you proceed, please?

Mr. Qamar: First of all, I would like to make clear that I am appearing this evening as a private citizen, because on different days I wear different hats. Sometimes I wear different hats during even one day. In the morning I have one hat, in the afternoon a different hat, so this is my appearance as a private citizen.

I am very much enthused about Bill 98. My enthusiasm is based on a number of factors:

1. This bill contains all elements of Manitoba's policy for a multicultural society announced in 1990. Having gone through experiences of intolerance in my earlier life, that is, before coming to Canada about two decades ago, in parts of Africa and in parts of Asia, I was well qualified and personally tuned in to publicly speak and write in support of this policy. I have shared my views through the local print media—some of the copies are attached with my submission—and through the public symposia organized by various communities in Winnipeg.

2. Three essential elements of our multicultural ideal, that is, pride in cultural diversity, a determination to enhance equality irrespective of religious affiliation, culture and race and a sense of partnership of all have been incorporated in the proposed act.

3. The term "multicultural" is intended in the bill as an all-inclusive term. In other words a multicultural society encompasses all cultures and not just aboriginal culture, African or Asian culture, subcultures, Anglo-Saxon cultures, et cetera. The text is "our culture", and not mine and thine. The we

and they concept is irrelevant and is inconsistent with our present-day society in Manitoba.

4. This brings me to the fourth point and that is that our multicultural society is viewed as a single society, united by shared laws, aspirations and responsibilities. Common and shared values in the multicultural context are also very striking and are in line with what I have brought out in one of my articles which is also attached. Even though individually we are all different, and that makes this life spicy, interesting, as well as challenging, yet collectively we are all one as human beings.

This phenomenon prompted me to hold a public symposium just last week on "Unity and Diversity: Cultural Understanding and Racial Harmony". In previous years I have organized symposia dealing with issues of combatting racism, empowerment of women and human rights. In most of these public events members on both sides of this committee have participated and they know very well what I am talking about.

With these thoughts, I fully support this bill. However, I must say that this bill is a human product and is not an act of God, and therefore expecting perfection will be asking too much, too soon. Therefore, I have some suggestions.

In my view what is missing from the act is a specific mechanism to deal with acts of racial discrimination. In my view, specific provisions are required against acts of racial discrimination in all government institutions and agencies in this province. This will not only be a deterrent against discriminatory behaviours but will also strengthen human rights legislative machinery already in place in this province.

* (2320)

I would also propose that a comprehensive race and ethnic-relations strategy be designed for Manitoba which will bolster our multicultural policy by providing grounds for a racism-free Manitoba. For this purpose I propose that a "Directorate for Racial Harmony" be established in the government of Manitoba. This will be an innovative name for this office.

I know some jurisdictions in Manitoba they have an antiracism secretariat, an assistant deputy minister for antiracism. I think, in my view, those are reactive titles. I think we should have more proactive titles and more positive titles. With this, I submit that these suggestions may be incorporated

in the act. With this, I thank you. I am willing to answer questions if they are short, brief and to the point.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Qamar. Are there questions?

Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples): I just want to tell Dr. Qamar that his wording in his last line, I do not want to take too much time, but the word, the racial harmony, is probably the most important thing we can do because cultural diversity, which is so important to all of us, we can only do by learning and caring about each other.

Taking the proactive role and the positive attitude, in my view, what I have seen here in this building for the last five years, I think, that is the most beneficial. I think we should consider your suggestion very carefully and in a very positive manner.

Mr. Qamar: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Qamar, for your presentation.

The committee calls Mr. Joseph Reza Fanai. Have you a presentation to distribute?

Mr. Joseph Reza Fanai (Private Citizen): Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Would you proceed, Mr. Fanai?

Mr. Fanai: My encounters with a mosaic of people in a challenging journey through life increased my understanding of racism, discrimination and supremacy. I believe these are common strategies for defending self-gratifying objectives, and their destructive power stands in reverse proportion to the awareness of their existence in even the most tolerant persons.

I believe the essence of Bill 98 promotes such awareness. I feel it has addressed the present need of our Canadian-Manitoban multicultural society in an unbiased and committed manner. What I support the most in this bill is its foundation on the human similarities. The intelligence in this bill promotes also the understanding of human differences which will lead to the discovery of further similarities.

My respect for Canadian-Manitoban multiculturalism spirit manifested in Bill 98 is risen out of my own experience in Canada. I arrived here eight years ago with an outlook warped by all sorts of religious, political, social and economic doctrines. I justified my own racist and discriminatory behaviours. For example, I supported only laws

and doctrines which protected my own interests. I declared the Queen as the untouchable white symbol of colonialism.

The roots of some of these outlooks rested undisturbed in the deeper grounds of my childhood imprinting in another country with a monocultural-oriented society. The multicultural wisdom in Manitoba widened my horizon and I began recognizing the benefit of the laws that protect a majority in the world.

I believe many of our multicolour, multiethnic, multireed mainstream employees of the public, civil and private sectors need to say yes, to such a straightening process as well. Canadians showed me that the Queen of England is the symbol of a government which is open to criticism and has the strength to change. Hence, multicultural wisdom in our society triggered in me a process of straightening which, I suppose, will continue as long as I live.

I believe that I am one of a majority group of the contemporary refugees and that the same spirit manifested throughout Bill 98 will trigger similar process in others.

I would like to refer to this article in the Winnipeg Free Press from Monday, June 15, 1992. The Winnipeg Free Press article, fear for jobs mutes criticism of act, is a reason for delight in spite of its more discouraging voice. It reflects the communities attention to one of the most world-oriented steps of their society.

The Canadian relatively unlimited opportunity for criticism gives me greater piece of mind for supporting this bill unconditionally because criticism fuels the process of perfection in democracy. Part of the article reflects an expectation for having great achievements offered in golden plates. History is decorated richly with courageous people who sacrificed their lives for bringing about changes we have inherited. Losing a job for saying what one believes is not the highest price one pays for multicultural democracy which does not kill but demands ideological courage.

Being ideologically courageous has its own price by degrees. Losing job or grant money is part of such price. I believe not criticizing for the fear of losing job or grant money is the danger to multicultural democracy rather than the shortcomings of Bill 98. Too much complacency affects democracy in the same way too much fat

affects the heart. Such complacency when challenged may overlook the welfare of a majority and become like a gun to one's head, even in democracy.

The brain of this bill is of many colours and creeds. The sound and deep wisdom of this bill is multicultural. It is promoting culture awareness and communication. It is repairing damages inflicted upon humanity by colonialism and religiosity. It can increase the enriching effect of technology for everyone in the world.

I believe this bill offers all sorts of potentials for the promotion of multicultural justice needed in the world more than bread. To materialize these potentials, the hard and dedicated work in the creation of this bill must continue for centuries. I feel no sacrifice is big enough for helping this important move continue the process of maturity.

I am finished, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Fanai. Are there any questions, comments? Thank you again for your presentation.

Mr. Ron Schuler of the Manitoba Intercultural Council. Mr. Schuler, do you have a prepared statement for distribution?

Mr. Ron Schuler (Manitoba Intercultural Council): In fact, we gave it to the Clerk and they are—it is in two parts. There is an executive summary and the submission. I am sure you will be pleased to know that I plan on reading the whole submission, I mean, the executive summary—just joking.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed then immediately, Mr. Schuler.

* (2330)

Mr. Schuler: Before I begin, I want to introduce three individuals who are with me here as well today. It is the vice-chair of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, Wendy Maximilian. I have the executive secretary of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, Mr. Sam Koshy, and we have our policy analyst, Mr. Vijay Sharma. As well, representing another group but still on the board of the MIC is Ms. Norma Walker, and the others have left us.

As you know, I am Ron Schuler. I am chairman of the board for the Manitoba Intercultural Council.

Mr. Chairperson, honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Citizenship, members of the committee, as an advisory body to the government

of Manitoba, the Manitoba Intercultural Council is pleased that the province is soon to have its first Multiculturalism Act. We welcome, amongst others, the recognition of the importance of heritage languages in the act, as recommended by the MIC. We also welcome the recognition of multiculturalism as a fundamental characteristic of this province.

It should be pointed out at the outset that multiculturalism acts are a relatively new phenomena in Canada, federally and provincially. Neither governments nor the public have had much experience with the enactment, implementing and review of these acts; therefore, it is important that after the passing of any multiculturalism act, both governments, ethnocultural communities and the multicultural organizations consult with each other continuously and engage in positive exchanges to perfect the legislation over the coming years.

The MIC, as a representative body of all ethnocultural communities in Manitoba, is well suited and prepared to facilitate that dialogue over the coming years. In fact, we welcome it. While the council does not want to make the "perfect" the enemy of the "good", as Canadians seem to be doing with our Constitution, it believes that some amendments will strengthen the government's positive intentions and address the aspirations of all Manitobans. The proposed bill legitimizes the existence of the Multiculturalism Secretariat, the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council and the community access office. It is not seen as including provisions in terms of monitoring accountability and evaluation of the act.

The act also does not include the government's advisory body, the Manitoba Intercultural Council. With that in mind, the council recommends that the proposed bill be delayed until the role of the MIC can be incorporated into the act or the present MIC Act is amended.

The council provides the following recommendations for the committee to consider when debating the bill in this committee. It should be noted that the comments and recommendations made in this paper are done in a context of previous positions taken by the council. Others are natural extensions and logical extrapolations based on discussions and sentiments held by the council. I refer to Appendix 2, possible questions for the committee's consideration are also provided. I will not be reading those tonight. They are for your later review.

At the outset, the council wishes to be on record that the recommendations provided below are by no means exhaustive or conclusive. To facilitate the work of the Legislature committee in developing a comprehensive multicultural policy for the province of Manitoba, again some possible questions are provided for the committee's considerations as seen in the appendix.

1. We would like to ask for the delay of the passage of the act until the role of the MIC can be incorporated into the act or the present MIC Act is amended.

2. Provide linkages, roles and responsibilities of the MIC with the Multiculturalism Secretariat and the ACCESS office.

3. Amend reference to the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council as "council" since the MIC is already referred to as the "council" in the MIC Act.

4. Include the Multicultural Affairs Committee of Cabinet and the Minister responsible for Multiculturalism as the chairperson of MACC in the act; and

The chair of the MACC be required to table in the Legislature an annual report on the activities and initiatives of the MACC.

5. With reference to the section on annual report in the act, amend the clause to include the MGAC along with the Multiculturalism Secretariat.

6. Provide for the Manitoba Intercultural Council to be an advocate for its membership, similar to the mandate provided to the minister, i.e. Section 3(a)—the minister has the power and authority to: a) act as an advocate within the government to ensure that policies and programs throughout the government reflect the multiculturalism policy set out in Section 2.

7. The enforcement and monitoring mechanism of the act can be strengthened. The appointment of a commissioner of multiculturalism or an ombudsman are the two mechanisms most often recommended by council members.

8. Include provisions in the act similar to that of the federal multiculturalism policy ensuring that Canadians (Manitobans) of all origins have equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement in those institutions. The council believes that the act should advocate education to improve race relations, i.e., Affirmative Action program and contract compliance. Alternatively,

provisions could be made in other legislations to enable and ensure the same intent.

9. Collect statistical data in order to enable the development of policies, programs and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multicultural reality in Manitoba. The intent was cited from the Government of Canada's Multiculturalism Act.

10. Encourage and insist the social, cultural, economic and political institutions of Manitoba to be both respectful and inclusive of Manitoba's multicultural character. Again the intent has been cited from the Government of Canada's Multiculturalism Act.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much Mr. Schuler. Are there any questions?

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Schuler, for a concise presentation with very clear recommendations. I want to ask you if the recommendations that you have made were presented to the minister and how that was done since you are the body that is to advise the minister on policy.

Mr. Schuler: These recommendations have been made over many years. In fact, I believe some of these recommendations were made to previous ministers, not just to this minister. There are recommendations that were done in writing and were done verbally.

Ms. Cerilli: Mr. Chairperson, with respect to the request for delay of passage of the act, do you have any understanding of why this is not happening?

Mr. Schuler: I would love to stand here all night and speculate, but I do not think I will. I will turn down that question.

Ms. Cerilli: Have you had any indication from the minister that some of these recommendations will be included once the review of MIC is made?

Mr. Schuler: Personally, no, seeing as I was on holidays and the minister did not have the opportunity to speak to me, and I did not have the opportunity to speak to her. So, no, I could not even answer that question. I am sorry.

Ms. Cerilli: From the analysis that MIC has done of the bill, what is your current understanding of how the legislation will be enforced?

Mr. Schuler: We believe that the mechanism of monitoring the act will be through the annual report.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, I just had a couple of questions I wanted to ask Mr. Schuler and thank him, too, for the presentation, of course, and that is in regard to one of the recommendations to delay the passage of this until Mr. Blair possibly comes back and gives his recommendations. I can appreciate that after all Mr. Blair might come back and recommend that MIC should be distributing the multicultural grants. We really do not know.

One of the questions that I would have for Mr. Schuler is with respect to—Mr. Wade Williams had pointed out that one of the things that we might want to do is include MIC at least in part in the multicultural act and leave the Manitoba Intercultural Act as a separate act. Would MIC support that?

* (2340)

Mr. Schuler: I believe there should be a correction there. I think Mr. Williams agrees with the MIC. For instance, if you look at item No. 2, we very clearly state that provide linkages, roles and responsibilities of the MIC with the Multiculturalism Secretariat in the access office. May I explain.

We are not saying that the MIC Act should be abolished and that we should just be in the act. In fact, we are not stating that at all. We feel quite comfortable with the MIC Act and the fact that there is time for review and changes are going to be made. We have asked for that. In fact, the minister is responding to our request.

What we would like to see is linkages made. Why we asked for the delay is we would like the whole package to be dealt with at the same time. So for us, it was a natural progression that the review be done and then the changes to the MIC Act and the Multiculturalism Act be taken together. That is where we have come up with the linkages under item No. 2.

Mr. Lamoureux: I can appreciate what you are saying, Mr. Schuler, but knowing that we want to see no doubt Bill 98 and given the time period that we are actually operating under, I am not too sure if we will in fact be able to see the amendments brought forward. I believe that the intent of all three political parties is to pass Bill 98.

I guess what I am trying to get some sort of idea from you is with respect to having or incorporating an amendment that would at least acknowledge the existence of MIC and that MIC has a role. Now we could come back four or five months from now when there are recommendations that are brought

forward and the recommendations, as I say, it is very hard to speculate, nor should we really speculate what the recommendations would be.

The question, quite specifically, is: Would MIC, would you as the chairperson of MIC, recommend—if I may put it that way—to the executive that it would be sufficient to see the multicultural act pass in the next couple of days if the minister were to bring in an amendment that would at least acknowledge the existence of MIC and possibly give it a couple of the tie-ins in terms of responsibilities?

Mr. Schuler: Actually, we have recommended what we have recommended and I will stand by those recommendations. However, being a realist and realizing that you do not get everything you want, what you are proposing, and if that is actually what it ends up being, well, I guess then that is what we will have to take.

But, no, we have established recommendations and I would stand by those recommendations.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, I know if I was to recommend, there were a number of things that I would recommend, MIC being completely incorporated into the act, the chairperson not being appointed from the minister, the executive director not being hired from the minister, and so forth.

But being realistic as the president puts it, or the chairperson put it, I would suggest that if there was some indication from the minister or a possible amendment that MIC would be incorporated even in some minor way, that would at least put it into the multicultural act and leave the Manitoba Intercultural Act, so hopefully in the next session we could possibly see the amendments to MIC. I just wanted to add those comments and thank Mr. Schuler for his presentation.

Mr. Schuler: First of all, I was not appointed by the minister, I was elected by the community. As a matter of fact, on the first ballot out of three I won more than 50 percent. The appointment by the minister, it is a custom that the minister appoints the No. 1 person chosen.

Number two, why we did not make all kinds of recommendations insofar as what should happen with the MIC is because that is actually a different issue, and I did not think it was proper to come here and give you a presentation on the review of MIC because that actually is a different issue. We are not touching the review of it.

Mr. Lamoureux, actually we both agree. We are just, I think, going around each other. Item two of our recommendations is saying exactly what you are saying, is that we would like to provide linkages and that is exactly what you are recommending. If that, in fact, is what this committee decides, then may I state on behalf of the MIC, thank you very much.

Mr. Lamoureux: Mr. Chairperson, just to clarify because I do think it is important that I do say some nice things about the minister, and I did commend her on changing that aspect of the act, if not formally, informally by ratifying an individual who was selected.

Mr. Santos: I would like to ask the chairperson of the Manitoba Intercultural Council how he feels about the government's action in taking away the fund-granting authority away from an elected body like the Manitoba Intercultural Council and then giving it to an appointed government body called the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council?

Mr. Schuler: First of all, I am not sure it is a wise position to be making comments on things that happened before I was the chairman. But seeing as the question was presented to myself, you can either sit and bemoan the fact that things have happened to you or you can try to find the positive in it. We believe that among the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council, the Multiculturalism Secretariat, the outreach office and the MIC that there are a lot of positive things that can be done and are being done in conjunction with them.

I do not think we should necessarily view everything as being negative, and the fact that that decision was made is in the political realm. We have made it a position of our board that when an issue like that enters the political realm, I do not want to get dragged into a debate where that belongs. We have a role and a mandate, and the role and mandate was created before we were ever given the funding arm of it.

We are back to our original role and mandate, and we are on a day-to-day basis, doing exactly what we are supposed to be doing, and in fact the minister can attest—and members of the opposition know what we have been doing in the last couple of months, very progressive and positive things. The funding side of it, I am not going to get into that.

Mr. Santos: Mr. Chairperson, I am not talking about particular occupants of positions. I am talking

about institutional arrangements and institutional processes, the very pattern of taking an authority from an elected body into an appointed body. Do you or do you not accept this as progress or retrogression?

Mr. Schuler: The previous council of the MIC did take some positions on the issue. They presented them to the minister, and we have decided, as the MIC, that we can continue fighting, or what we can do is progress and do positive things. That has been this particular board's decision, that we will do the kinds of positive things like we did about three or four weeks ago in which we had an incredible event dealing with racism. We had members of all levels of government and of the opposition in government. I believe that is MIC's role and that is MIC's mandate.

* (2350)

I am sorry, I do not believe it is my position to delve into the past and get involved with old political fights. It has nothing to do with myself.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Schuler. I am not going to allow the further discussion of what MIC's role is. I am going to entertain the discussion on what the contents of the bill are. If we have further questions on the contents of the bill or references to the bill, I will entertain those discussions. If not, I will proceed and thank Mr. Schuler for his presentation. Thank you.

Mr. Schuler: If I may make a point of clarification on a presentation that was made earlier on today, there was a statement made that 65 percent of my board are government appointees, and I would like to clarify that. It is actually 28 percent of our board are government appointees, not 65 percent, which accurately reflect the composition of the council.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Schuler.

The committee now calls Les Latinecz. Is Mr. Latinecz here?

An Honourable Member: He is not here, I do not think.

Mr. Chairperson: He is not here.

Is Evelyn Hecht here?

We have a presentation from the Winnipeg Jewish Community Council, a presentation to the legislative standing committee. Could I ask that the committee allow this to be entered into Hansard. Agreed. Thank you.

Is Mr. Frank Fiorentino here? He is not here.

Mary Richard, is she here? Mary, have you a presentation to distribute to the committee?

Ms. Mary Richard (Manitoba Association for Native Languages): No, I do not have a written one.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please.

Ms. Richard: I guess, first of all, before I go into a presentation, I would like a clarification. Bill 98 reads as follows: Whereas Manitoba has been a multicultural society from the time of its original population, the aboriginal peoples. Does that mean that we are part of the bill, or are you just recognizing the fact that aboriginal people were here first, in spite of what Mr. Green thinks?

Mrs. Mitchelson: Mr. Chairperson, if I might qualify, the answer that I always use in the community is that in fact from the beginning of time our aboriginal peoples were multicultural. They came from different parts of the country to Manitoba—or different parts of the province. In fact, they spoke different languages, had different customs and different traditions. So what I am saying is, from the beginning of time, Manitoba has been multicultural. Our original peoples who were here, in my definition of multiculturalism, means that because they had different languages, different cultures, different traditions, different customs—that is my definition and our interpretation as government of multicultural.

Mr. Chairperson: Ms. Richard, would you please continue with your presentation?

Ms. Richard: I guess based on that, and the Manitoba Association for Native Languages has been involved at the national level with the national committee on language issues and cultural issues. In fact, we lobbied the federal government to exclude us from the multiculturalism act of the federal government. We have on record as well, we have asked that we not be included in the heritage languages bill.

So I guess my request at this point in time, to remain consistent, is that we not be part of this Bill 98, because we are in the process of discussion at the national level and hopefully at the provincial level, that we will be asking for a separate bill and separate recognition. Therefore, at this point in time, Mr. Chairperson, I would ask that we not be included in this act.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Are there any questions of Ms. Richard?

Mr. Santos: May I ask if this position is authorized by your membership?

Ms. Richard: Yes. Mr. Chairperson, yes, it has been. We have negotiated, like I say, at the national level. We are on a steering committee that has pushed and lobbied ministers. In fact, I have written ministers in the provincial Legislature who had supported our request that we not be part of The Multiculturalism Act.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Ms. Richard. Are there any further questions? If not, thank you for your presentation. We will then ask Mr. Murray Trachtenberg.

Mr. Trachtenberg, have you a prepared text for distribution?

Mr. Murray Trachtenberg (The League for Human Rights B'nai Brith Canada): No, Mr. Chairperson, I do not.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please, then.

Mr. Trachtenberg: Mr. Chairperson, my name is Murray Trachtenberg and I am the Chair of the B'nai Brith League for Human Rights, midwest region.

B'nai Brith is the largest and oldest membership-based Jewish organization in the world and in Canada. Its aims are, broadly speaking, social, philanthropic, fraternal and educational. The League for Human Rights is one part of B'nai Brith Canada. It is the arm or agency of B'nai Brith which is devoted to the preservation and improvement of multiculturalism, the fostering of interfaith, intercultural, inter-racial, dialogue, harmony and exchanges.

Another important part of the activities of the league is the mandate that we have from B'nai Brith to seek out, expose and combat racism, bigotry, and to advocate for the advancement of human rights of all Canadians. We achieve that through a number of activities including legal intervention, legislative lobbying and intervention, and education.

Mr. Chairperson, I see by the hour that I will have the pleasure of addressing the committee both today and tomorrow. I thank the committee and the government for that opportunity. Earlier this evening, I had serious doubts if I would be able to attend, and I thought about it for a few moments and I realized that this, indeed, is an historic occasion in

this province. Although the hour is late, and the numbers have somewhat waned, I did want to mention that because I think we are all involved, no matter what views we bring to this process tonight, in an activity of historic proportion.

I want to commend the minister and the government for bringing forth this act at this time. I say that because we are all aware that there are forces in Canadian society and in Canadian politics now that represent ideas and a viewpoint that is in direct opposition to the principles enshrined in this legislation. I think the government should be commended on the timing of this act because, quite frankly, I think a lot of people in the multicultural communities and a lot of Canadians of all political stripes are getting sick and tired of the use of multiculturalism by some segments of our community as some sort of dirty word, as some sort of principle that stands for abuse. It stands for a representation of minority interests only.

I view this act, and I know B'nai Brith views this act today that is before the House as one that enshrines and reaffirms a principle of both Manitoba society and Canadian society that we are all very proud of. Enough accolades because it is only a piece of legislation, and one of the speakers tonight so aptly put it, it is not cast in stone. It is not an act of God, and it is capable of being improved. I would like to address the committee on a couple of points where we think it can be improved at a minimal effort. The redrafting is minimal.

* (0000)

I was very pleased when I read the minister's speaking notes at the time of the introduction of the act. I notice on page 5, the minister addressed her attention to racism and the place it now has in Canadian society and the problems as a society we have seen with the rise of racism. I will quote part of what she said, because I think it bears great attention by the committee.

She said on page 5 of her notes: We must, without exception or condition, make it clear that racism has no place in our society. Refusing to take a stand against racism is accepting it, and we are not prepared to do that.

We commend the minister, and we commend the government on that statement. It is indeed a very forceful and bold statement.

When I looked at the act today before I came, the word "racism" does not appear in this act. There are

comments here and everyone who has attended tonight has talked about multiculturalism and multicultural policy as enshrining the concept of fighting racism. When you go through this very short, very simple but very important act, I do not find the word "racism." I do not find a clear comment, concise and to the point, that the policy of this government and that the intention of this Legislature is to fight and combat racism.

In that regard, Mr. Chairperson, I have a very simple suggestion. The wording, of course, the committee can deal with as it sees fit. In the preamble, I would like to suggest the addition of one sentence which would read, WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba is committed to eradicating racism and bigotry in Manitoba.

Very simple, Sir. Do not be afraid to use the word "racism" in your legislation. That is the clear intention of the government and of the minister and, in fact, of all the groups who have appeared here today. One component of your multicultural policy must be to recognize racism and to affirm your ability to stamp it out. If you accept that as part of your preamble, I am asking the minister also to support the same wording to be added as Section 2(d) as part of the policy.

So there will be no ambiguity and there will be no difference between what we all accept as bold and very supportive statements in the House and a very simple and concise statement in this act that everyone can point at and say this government, this House, is committed to stamping out racism. That is part of the policy.

When I looked at Section 2(a) of the act, I read it. I think I understood the intent, but I went back to the preamble. Madam Minister, I went back to the second part of the preamble of the act where it states that the diversity of Manitobans as regards culture, religion and racial background as a fundamental characteristic of Manitoban society which benefits all Manitobans economically, socially and culturally. I must say, I like seeing that statement, but I would be a whole lot happier if that statement was in Section 2(a) instead of what appears to be a very limited statement only to the words "cultural diversity."

What happened to religion and racial background and diversity in that? If it is so fundamental, let us put it in as a policy recognition, please.

Mrs. Mitchelson: Just for a point of clarification, if you could go back and repeat that. I just missed that portion of it. There was an activity ongoing and I am sorry.

Mr. Trachtenberg: That is just fine.

Mr. Chairperson: I am afraid I detracted her.

Mr. Trachtenberg: Now we are into tomorrow or it is today, I guess, so I am pleased to do so, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: You are one of the very few and privileged people in this province. You are the only one who is going to be allowed to make a two-day presentation on this bill.

Mr. Trachtenberg: I said historic proportions—little did I know, thank you, sir.

Madam Minister, I was saying that in the preamble, the second paragraph, the one that commences—it is the first "and whereas", and I will not read it into the record again. I saw that recognition of the fundamental characteristic because it involves both or all of culture, religion and racial background, and when I viewed that as your preamble, I note that Section 2(a) only talks about recognizing, promoting and understanding that cultural diversity, and then it goes on.

It is my suggestion that it would be quite simple to save 2(a) as it now reads in part, where it says, "recognize and promote understanding", but then go back to your preamble and lift in the words: That the cultural, religious and racial diversity of Manitobans is a fundamental characteristic of Manitoba society which benefits all Manitobans economically, socially and culturally.

From an interpretive point of view, it is my submission that this will create, once adopted as policy of this government, a much larger policy that will encompass all three areas. That concludes my submission, sir.

Mr. Chairperson: Are there any questions of Mr. Trachtenberg?

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you, Mr. Trachtenberg for your recommendations. I appreciate that your focus had been similar to mine, and I was concerned when I saw the bill about the limitations of the policy section.

I would like to ask you if you would consider a section that is part of the policy that the government has developed that is not in this legislation. I wonder if you would think it would address some of the concerns that you have, and I would note that

the policy of the government does not mention eliminating racism either as a goal.

But there is a section that reads: The government will strive to prevent all forms of discrimination through education and through enforcement of provincial laws. That is a section that I hope to amend into the act as well. I wonder if you would find that to be suitable, or if you specifically want to see the word racism included in that as well.

Mr. Trachtenberg: I like the suggestion that you have just advanced, and I assume that this is being quoted out of the policy statement from 1990. But in addition to it, somewhere in this act should be a short, concise statement that the government, the Legislature, has taken to task racism and set as an objective, the eradication, elimination, whatever the word that will ultimately be used. I use eradication because to me it denotes a much more forceful approach, and it is a very strong word.

Mr. Santos: I like the presenter making the quotation that racism has no place in our society and that refusing to take a stand against racism is in itself a way of promoting it.

Are you saying, then, Murray, that in not including any reference to racism, is the government refusing to take a stand or is it merely an oversight?

Mr. Trachtenberg: I suspect it was clearly an oversight because I believe I am the first one tonight who has drawn it to the committee's attention. I think, quite honestly, that there is other language in the act, especially in 2(b), where it talks about equal access to opportunities.

The intent, as I read it, is very clear, that is, to recognize an effort at stamping out racism. My suggestion or submission, though, is just simply say it in a short statement. I have just referred to the minister's statement because I quite frankly was quite impressed with the strong wording in the speaking notes.

Mr. Santos: If it is merely an oversight, should there not be a duty to correct the oversight?

Mr. Trachtenberg: I am suggesting that the opportunity—the duty, of course, will be determined by this committee, I guess, as you move through potential amendments. Having drawn it to all members' attention, including the minister whom I have the opportunity of addressing tonight, I am submitting or suggesting that that oversight be corrected before the bill is returned to the House.

* (0010)

Mr. Lamoureux: Quickly, Mr. Chairperson, I would ask the presenter if he has any thoughts in terms of what I had alluded to earlier with regards to two particular issues: one, the inclusion or exclusion of the Manitoba Intercultural Council, and the Manitoba Grants Advisory Council being included in the act, if he feels that is an appropriate place for it.

Mr. Trachtenburg: I basically have no position and no thoughts. I have come tonight to address the area that the league, at least locally, has been preoccupied with over the last few years that I have been involved, namely fighting racism and hatred.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you, and I guess that is in part the reason why we will definitely be voting for the bill.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Trachtenburg, for your presentation.

The committee calls Norma Walker. Would you please come forward? Have you a prepared text for distribution?

Ms. Norma Walker (Congress for Black Women): No, I am sorry, Mr. Chairperson.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed, please.

Ms. Walker: My name is Norma Walker. I am president of the Congress of Black Women of Canada, Manitoba chapter. This is a nonprofit organization planned and developed to enhance the consciousness, education, rights for black women in Manitoba. Just quickly, one of our aims, objectives is to foster a climate in which it is acceptable for black women to openly examine issues which affect them and their families.

The Congress of Black Women of Canada, Manitoba chapter is pleased that the government has decided to introduce this important piece of legislation, Bill 98. Manitobans have long awaited this act, and we feel that it is timely. Unfortunately, we feel that this act is one without much substance. There are no specifics. This act has left us with some skepticism. There are too many important issues that were written into the Manitoba multicultural policy that are not included in this act. In the policy it states that Manitobans, regardless of culture, religions or racial background, have a right to equal access to opportunities, to participate in all aspects of the life of the community.

It went on to say that the government will ensure that the multicultural nature of our society is

reflected in its hiring practices and in appointments to boards, commissions and other provincial offices so that these institutions are representative of the community, yet in Bill 98, all that is mentioned is equal access to opportunities.

My organization feels strongly that a multicultural bill must include a commitment to affirmative action as government policy, also contract compliance. This bill must either refer to affirmative action policy or, as some people say, an addition. I am not quite sure.

There is a great need for the province to ensure economic development for target groups, especially our youth. Our youth painfully realize that the entire system, the government, politicians, the courts, the police, the corporations, the media are denying them equal access.

So what has the government done so far? Not much. There are no coherent policies addressing these urban problems. You have a chance now to do something before it is too late.

They feel that the government, the corporations have no intention of hiring them at real wages and the politicians are ignoring their needs. We do not want our youth to take to the streets. This government can do something worthwhile to promote employment equity: equal access to post-secondary education, the majority of our young people are dropping out of school; special project funding for our youth.

Total lack of the mention of race relations in Bill 98, total disregard for the recent onslaught of racial injustice in Manitoba is puzzling to us. After the Toronto demonstrations, federal, provincial governments hastily sought community leaders for advice on race relations. All community leaders volunteer their time in this community. The politicians have abdicated their responsibility in this whole matter and most of time are looking to community leaders for answers.

Racism is a crime, and it is up to the government to establish racism as a crime. There is a need to restore credibility in the justice system, which has been failing the nonwhite people.

While the act recognizes the importance of encouraging the use of heritage language, it is also silent on the matter of encouraging and continuing development of the artistic activities throughout our multicultural community, as stated in the policy paper again.

My organization strongly feels that the Manitoba Intercultural Council belongs in the multicultural act, of course, as much as the Multicultural Secretariat and the community access office. What we noticed is that the secretariat now duplicates the MIC role and mandate. MIC, to us, is the only legislated province-wide body representing all these ethnocultural organizations in Manitoba. So instead of including or even making reference to MIC, the minister chose to completely ignore the existence of MIC in the act. I noticed they even took away the word "council" and gave it to the secretariat. The secretariat is now the council.

Why on Earth did the government not have the review since it was recommended December 1990, when they were asked, why now? The perception of many people I have spoken to concerning the intent is they are fearing that this is one of the ways of just watering down MIC or getting rid of MIC in favour of the secretariat.

Again, my organization feels that this legislation has no teeth. There must be some way of including real issues, addressing violence in the community, all forms of violence caused as a result of injustice, violence in the home, in the workplace, violence caused by racism, classism and ageism. An important issue again is the race relations, and we think it must be included in this policy—support for antiracist education in the schools, in the public service, in the police force. The real issue of racism must be addressed. Racism must be recognized again as a crime.

I also want to mention MERC for those of you who recall the Multicultural Education Resource Centre. That centre was designed to help promote multiculturalism in the schools. Of course, over the years, this centre has been watered down. They got rid of most of the staff. This centre was very, very important, always there to recommend antiracist literature, literature that was free from biases and stereotypes.

The centre was quietly stripped of its staff and its liaison with the community. That is what I call—this was a strong bond with the community. It is no more. So if this government is really serious about multiculturalism, as this act might show, then they should reinstate MERC and get the community involved and the schools, again.

I think one other thing I have to say is that there should be some inclusion of MIC in the act, or

linkage. The government also should continue to build, or to include building, better race relations and, of course, recognizing racism as a crime.

That is my report.

* (0020)

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Walker. Are there any questions of Ms. Walker?

Mr. Santos: I just have one question. Do you think, Ms. Walker, that the omission of MIC in the multicultural act is also an oversight?

Ms. Walker: I do not know if it is, but if it is, I am hoping that it will be corrected.

Ms. Cerilli: Thank you for your presentation, Ms. Walker. You have hit on a lot of key issues that we are starting to hear a number of times in other presentations, so our questions will become fewer and fewer, but I also just want to clarify that you are a member of the Intercultural Council, elected from your community.

Ms. Walker: Yes, I am chair of the human rights standing committee.

Ms. Cerilli: I realize too that you are making the presentation today on behalf of the Congress of Black Women, but with respect to your role on the Intercultural Council, why is it that people are so concerned about the review coming in and coinciding with the presentation of this act?

Ms. Walker: Well, as I mentioned in my report, from December 1990, I think it was, the government was asked to do the review. Anybody would be skeptical. Why now? Why now, when a multicultural act was just introduced in the House? Why do a review right now? Why not even mention or include MIC in the act and maybe later on have a review, or why not the review before, if they knew that the act was going to be introduced in the House? It is skepticism; we are skeptical.

Ms. Cerilli: Maybe just clarify again for the committee the key importance that you see for MIC and why it is important to the community, why it is important to be included in the multicultural act.

Ms. Walker: Well, as I say, most of the ethnocultural organizations, see MIC as that very important link to the government and to multicultural policy. Because now that they are given a multicultural act without MIC, they cannot see that. It is always such an important government community link with multiculturalism that people are wondering why. How can you have a multicultural

act without not even one mention of MIC? That is what I am hearing, especially from communities that I talk to.

Mr. Lamoureux: Ms. Walker, thank you for your presentation. I think you are being too easy on the government with regard to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, that in fact there was a fairly strong commitment, at one point in time, to come back with a plan for MIC which saw the incorporation within the legislation. I concur with you in that respect.

I notice towards the latter end of your comments, you made reference to what I had alluded to earlier. That is that if we are unable to see an amendment that would incorporate MIC in its entirety into the multicultural act, do you feel your organization would support references made to the Manitoba Intercultural Council within the multicultural act and some of those linkages established? Would you support that and retaining the Manitoba Intercultural Council Act?

Ms. Walker: Yes, I think if we cannot get the whole thing, I would definitely have to go for some form of linkages.

Mr. Lamoureux: Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Ms. Walker, for your presentation.

The committee now calls Mr. Pandey Senior—

An Honourable Member: He is going to be here tomorrow.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Prag Naik. Is he here? No. Antonio Portillo, Art Miki. Mr. Miki, have you a presentation for distribution? Would you proceed please, Mr. Miki?

Mr. Art Miki (Private Citizen): Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. My name is Art Miki. I am speaking as a private citizen although I am very closely connected with the Japanese Canadian Association of Manitoba.

Part of the reason I stayed till the end is because I think there is a point to be made of all of this. When I was contacted, they said seven o'clock which is fine. I can tell the time. I came down at eight thinking it likely would not start right on time, but to be here at 12:25 in the morning to be presenting information I feel, if I were in your positions, I do not think I would listen to sit here that long. So I am not too sure what type of response I am going to get from you. I know that when I phoned my wife at

10:30 to say I would likely be a little later, she said, do not be silly. Why do you not come home. I mean, this is crazy. I said, I have to stay because there is a point to be made.

We talk about the act that is supposed to encourage opportunity to participate fully, and this is participating fully, to have to try to beat the clock or beat the committee or whatever. It does not make sense to me, because it is a very important bill. I know that this a very worthy endeavour on the part of the government, and they should be commended for the initiative.

I also welcome that the act recognizes multiculturalism and the recognition of the importance of heritage languages. I support the principle that multiculturalism applies to all people. Yet, when I heard Mary Richard I have to sympathize with them, too, because I feel that they should have a voice to say whether they should be included or not.

It is because of the process that I wanted to come today, because when I talked to our local community organization, they said we just got the information. Even this morning when I phoned, they were not too sure whether the hearings would be on for sure. That, again, is a reflection of what we call open process.

I think it is very important, when we are talking about a bill that is going to affect Manitobans, that they should have an opportunity to speak on behalf of it. I would recommend that regardless—I know that you want to get the bill through, but I am not too sure whether two months or three months is going to make that much of a difference—other Manitobans have an opportunity to speak out, and I think the majority would support your bill.

I have some recommendations on it that I feel could likely strengthen it, but I think Manitobans would support it. I think that it would be more credible if people had an opportunity to speak more openly and to be able to express their views because you are trying to do it for Manitobans. I hope you are not trying to do it for yourselves because it does apply to all Manitobans.

* (0030)

I think it has been mentioned a number of times now that the bill itself lacks specifics. I attended the legislative committee hearings when they did The Multiculturalism Act for the federal government. At that time, we made presentations. There were very

specific points that we wanted included, so that when people read the act, they could see very strong points of what the act really meant.

I read your policy of 16 lines. Essentially, the policy is condensed into 16 lines and is very general. It makes comments such as equal access to opportunity, but what does that really mean? Is it really reflecting the idea of affirmative action? It says, rights of all Manitobans. What does it really mean? I hear that all the time, but it really does not mean anything, unless you could put some other words to it that have some meaning. Does it mean something about racism and discrimination, that these are not going to be tolerated? What does it mean?

I guess the bill itself has that type of vagueness to it, and I would encourage the members of the committee to look at it and maybe to look at other bills. I realize that there are not that many bills around, and I commend the government for taking the initiative, but I think if we are going to do a job, let us do it right, and let us make it strong so that we can be all proud of it.

Another part that I want to comment on is on the structure, which I feel, at the present time, does not allow for effective communication. You have the secretariat. Now you are talking about community access offices. These are both government instituted mechanisms, and I think that whether it is the Manitoba Intercultural Council or some body that is representative of the community, it should be playing a greater role. They should be the access to the policy. They should be the ones who could provide the information.

I think there is some credibility when you have an organization that represents a community doing the job, more than an institution that is developed by government, because there is always that question, whether you mean it. In all good sense, it may not be accepted that way, and I think that you know that there are a lot of criticisms toward governments and how they operate.

So I feel that there should be a community-based body established to monitor the implementation of this bill and that this body also be a forum for those groups that want to have access to the information that the government—or that it would convey the information to the government. I do not see the purpose in having a community access office by putting up more money for a structure when that

money could likely be used to provide some opportunities for the communities to have input.

I think the Multicultural Grants Advisory Council that was mentioned—and I know that MIC at one time, and I was on that particular body, had the responsibility for grants. That was taken away and replaced by this particular group. Regardless of what group monitors the grants, the concern I have is that the membership of that council should be representing the communities in some fashion, that perhaps the nominees for that committee come from the community and not be someone who is chosen because of their contribution, perhaps to the party or whatever the case may be.

I think the bill itself lacks monitoring and an accountability mechanism. The only accountability mechanism you have is one report, the annual report by the minister which will be tabled in the House. It does not involve anyone else. To me, that is not a very strong monitoring mechanism. I would recommend that there be an independent body or an individual like a commissioner. That may become again too bureaucratic, but perhaps the Manitoba Intercultural Council or some body could even play that role to some degree.

I have tried to summarize the key issues for you. I think I have touched on all of it. I think the one other comment I would like to make is, whatever communication vehicle that you use in terms of having government personnel meet with communities, that these people who do that type of job should have strong ties to or knowledge of the ethnocultural communities so that they become part of that system, of the linkage that I have heard of tonight.

Those are my comments, and I do appreciate the fact that even at 12:30 in the morning, we are sitting here, and you look pretty wide awake, so I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Miki. Are there questions?

Ms. Corliss: Yes, Mr. Miki, that is a good summary, I think, of key points, and I appreciate your staying, and I appreciate the experience you have on these issues and the whole concept of what you are saying, that because the bill is being brought in so late in the session and given the late hour and the lack of time that people have had to prepare, that this process is not very accessible, and people are

not really being given a chance to participate and that is reflective of the bill.

I gather this is what you are saying, that the bill is somewhat like that because it is not providing a communication link to representatives of the community, and that is what you are saying. Is that—

Mr. Miki: Yes, just to clarify that, that is what I am saying.

The comment I was making is when you put words into the bill that have strong inference toward community involvement, I would think that in the process of developing that bill, you would also continue or carry over that same principle. To me, it is hypocrisy if you say that in the bill and then you do not do that in developing the bill. I guess the question of credibility of that bill can be raised because if words do not mean much in the application, then how would it mean much once you have it on paper?

Ms. Corliss: Can you just clarify for me again some of the key ways that you think the communication with respect to the bill would be improved and some of the links to the community?

Mr. Miki: I think you need to have a body, and I recognize that MIC is a community-based body, except that I think over the years, it has changed to some degree, that it no longer is that reflective perhaps of the needs of the community as much, or there may be a feeling that the MIC does not represent those views as strongly. So I think that there is a change in the perception.

I think we need to bring it back a wee bit and say this is a community-based organization, and in the bill itself, the MIC bill, it should be reflecting that. Somehow if we can bring that together, then that is a link that you are going to have to the community. I do not think offices will do it. I do not think that is the mechanism that will get people running into your office with all kinds of information or ideas. I do not think they would do that.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Miki, for your presentation tonight.

Mr. Santos: It is a paradox. The law has to be general, but the higher the level of generality, the more ambiguous the provision becomes. The more specific the provisions are, the less flexibility there will be. Which would you advise the government to have?

Mr. Miki: Well, I guess you have to put a lot of trust into the politicians, and I think what we are saying is that we need to have things that are tighter because I think that when it is too wide, if it is too vague, then there are too many opportunities for abuses of what the intent of that bill is.

I would rather, and this is an individual comment, see things that are more clearly laid out than they are in this particular bill. I think if you look at the federal bill, that does it to some degree, but I am not saying that you should adopt it.

Mr. Santos: It might be the case that the MIC has changed throughout the years. As I have indicated before, when an organization is started, or initiated, it is usually very democratic, but as power consolidates, then there is a gap between the leadership and the membership, and it becomes less and less representative of the masses or of the membership.

If that is the case, and regardless of its defects, is it still your opinion that this is a much better structure than a government-appointed or a government agency?

* (0040)

Mr. Miki: Well, I guess I would support the premise that if you can get grassroots involvement, you are going to have more commitment to whatever you are doing. I mean, you can appoint people too who are very good at what they are doing and who have the sensitivity to the community. I think when I heard the present chairperson speaking tonight, it changed my mind. I was thinking that you can also overdo it. I think you have to be sensitive to the situation.

I think that regardless of how flawed it is to have grassroots involvement, there is not much commitment if you do not get them involved. I guess even with the distribution of funds, I think it is very important that the community sees that it has some role in it.

Mr. Santos: Do you think that the combination of electoral mandate and appointed personnel on account of their skills and technical expertise would be a better combination?

Mr. Miki: If they are appointed through some nomination system which does involve—I mean, you could have a dozen people being nominated, but you may only look at one, but then you at least have assurances that this is someone whom perhaps the community feels that they would have confidence in.

I would see that type of combination certainly being acceptable.

Mr. Santos: What is your conception of an independent body, regardless of a situation? I tend to be very skeptical about a so-called independent body.

Mr. Miki: When I talk about an independent body, it means that a body, even though it is an advisory body to a government, it has some latitude in terms of the things that they could recommend.

In other words, I think the value of a body, if it is advisory, is that it finds out what the community's concerns are, and it can bring it to the government. Now, regardless, the role of government then is to make some decisions in terms of whether those recommendations are viable or not.

I think the process is important. That is what I am saying when I talk about an independent body, that those people are there because of the communities, rather than because of the government.

Mr. Santos: My final question, Mr. Chairperson, do you agree and believe that process is substance?

Mr. Miki: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Miki, for your presentation.

The committee calls Irène Frigo, Antonio Portillo—not here, Kyle Goomansingh, Mike Maendel, Lena Anderson—oh, we have heard from her, I am sorry. Mohinder Singh Dhillon.

Mr. Dhillon, have you a presentation, a prepared presentation for distribution?

Mr. Mohinder Singh Dhillon (Private Citizen): No, I do not have.

Mr. Chairperson: Would you proceed please?

Mr. Dhillon: Thank you very much. Actually, I will be short as the time tells us. First of all, I really appreciate and recommend and give congratulations to the Honourable Minister Bonnie Mitchelson to introduce this bill. It is the time to recognize the multicultural nature of our province. But I have, like the other speakers before myself, some concerns which are becoming a part of this act, for instance, funding. I also believe that an appointed body by the minister certainly politicizing the situation.

If the record shows and the percentage of the appointed people are political people and, certainly, they are definitely a partisan people, especially a

multicultural body whether it is MIC or the multicultural act, the appointment of the board should be above the partisan, because in every ethnic community there are certain people who belong to all three major parties.

A few years back, a friend of mine told me at that time when we have some grants—at that time, it was NDP government—and people were very happy. He said, well, this is one part of the government when they divide people. I did not believe at that time, but later on I began to realize that this is a fact. If the funds go to one ethnic group more on the party basis than the other, then there is a split and there is starting enmity among the groups. So it should not be a part of this act. I must say that ethnic communities generally really do not want any special grants or any special privileges, but they definitely want to see equal privileges.

Before me, many people touched this racism. I think racism is such a thing that we cannot reduce it. We cannot eliminate it. Our criminal codes also are very useful to suppress racism, as a couple of years back we had this experience. We met the honourable Attorney-General—he is sitting here—and he very effectively did suppress that notion.

The money should go into the different multicultural people, should go to the multicultural education, not only on the school levels, but also to the adult education. Unfortunately, because this comes to me, this is my experience, that many people do not understand each other's cultures. For instance, like in our culture when we go to our church we cover our head. We have turbans or a handkerchief, but when we go to church they want to remove their hats. So this is the cultural differences. If the money is spent to educate the Manitobans, that will be very useful.

Similarly, I say that this act did not touch MIC. I think many of our speakers said that. I was also involved from the very first day of the MIC's existence, and what I gained out of this, because I am also here from seven o'clock, and many of the faces I saw we became friends through the MIC by annual meetings or as other association gatherings.

When we begin to know people, we become friends, and when we become friends to each other, we begin to respect each other's cultures. We have pulled down the curtains of cultures and peeked through the other cultures and begin to respect that.

That is what we want. That is what I gained from MIC. This is why I support MIC.

Secondly, the fundamental and most cherished thing in our country, the character of our country is the democratic system, which we really enjoy. We speak our minds. MIC has a board which is democratically elected and which is—not the point that we are not talking about today's government. We should think about the future governments. They can also politicize for their own purpose, so we must fill this gap one way or the other to think, so that people or the government of the time should not take advantage of the multicultural society.

Many things have been said which I do not want to waste any time. This is my submission. Thank you very much for listening.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Dhillon. Are there any questions of Mr. Dhillon? If not, thank you again for your presentation.

I call John Jack. Is John Jack here?

I call Dr. Amar Singh Dhaliwal. Mr. Dhaliwal is a walk-in presenter.

* (0050)

Dr. Amar Singh Dhaliwal (Punjabi Seniors Association): This is by chance that two people belonging to the same community have come one after the other.

Mr. Chairperson, I am really thankful to you for giving me the time and, culturally speaking, it is very important when the clock large hand crosses twelve because it is during early hour that you can say something very much enlightened according to Punjabi culture. I may kindly be excused for this.

I have knowingly used "chairperson," because in the western culture, in each family there are two cultures: Women are different, men are different. British Columbia university has expended \$70,000 on proving that one or the other sex is superior in comparison to the other. That is why now you can appreciate that I have used this "chairperson" knowingly as a neutral gender.

The western culture, I am quoting from the encyclopedia: The basic difficulty with the western culture is that they believe in differences; they observe differences. But, actually, the eastern culture says that all men try to see similarities and then there will be no problem. So I will be speaking on the misleading nature of the multiculturalism as a conflict.

Racial difference is cultural and politically motivated, polluted very nicely to deceive the people. In Manitoba university, in Winnipeg university, in Toronto, I spoke on this issue that race as a concept does not exist. It exists only when you remain satisfied with the overtly perceivable phenomena.

I have got the same kind of temperature, I have got the same kind of blood, I have the same kind of skeleton. I have the same kind of cuticles. What is the difference? I have the same kind of chromosomal differences. I have the same kind of genetics. Where is the difference in the human races?—it is man-made. Racial difference is not a concept for the student of academics.

For my introduction, I have taught in the universities for 25 years, cross-cultural psychology. I am a member of the Cross Cultural Psychology of America and they have published a book and carried my article. Thirteen students of mine have received Ph.D. degrees under my supervision in the areas of education and cross-cultural psychology. So I regard it excuse that if you fail to carry out scientifically sound analysis of any concept—and multiculturalism is that kind of concept—then the whole of the system will go helter-skelter and downright misleading. I am not taking the side of this act or that act. I am talking about the misleading nature of the concept.

Broadly speaking, every culture—now if science can use the common denomination for all the cultures, then there is no difference in the culture—by definition, refers to that as something which man produces on this Earth in order to make the process of life facilitated. Now what are those things which we produce to enjoy life on this globe? Material culture.

I have not brought my material culture over here. I have brought only one which is overtly perceivable, but nobody tries to understand as to what this is indicative of. It is indicative of responsibility, accountability. The man who bears this crown, he is held accountable and responsible for the people being represented by him as a man of the turban.

If I accept this concept in this way, then there is no difference. Why should people hate those people, those who are accountable, responsible for their jobs? I am working for the Age and Opportunity as a volunteer. People enjoy it. It is the conceptual analysis which will help you to reach the

decision making. If you are satisfied that the cultural differences are really there, the second material culture, then cognitive culture.

I have not brought that cognitive culture also here, because I know that certain cognitions in India, according to the theory of multicultural relativism, they are true there. Why should I bring those? I have not brought those cognitives which are not meaningful here in Canada, in Winnipeg.

Normative culture, the third component—all the cultures of the civilized societies are having the three components. These three components, if they go as common denominators in all the cultures, then where is the difference between the cultures? Neither have I brought material culture, with the exception of this, nor have I brought normative culture of mine. It is the cross-cultural fertilization which we need here at Winnipeg and Manitoba and Canada as a whole.

You have very nicely done one thing as the Manitoba government, that you do not give grants to the religious institutions, but I dare say, as a student of psychology, cross-cultural psychology and education, that religion is the most important component of any culture, religion. If you take away my religion, it means—but I will nurture my own important component, because that is something personal, and if I need that, it should be passed on to the coming generations, my second generation in Canada. I will arrange my own things to nurture that, to flourish it. You give me freedom but do not give me a grant. Why?

There are about 77 colleges—62, the denomination of colleges run by the religious bodies, and Punjab is now burning. You have sent some commissions to study the situation. Why? There were 62 denominations, religious institutions, and now we are fighting for our religious cultural establishment over there. You read the news. It means a very nice decision on the part of the Manitoban government that now they do not give grants to the most important component of culture.

Similarly, language is the second important component of any culture. You have retained two languages, and now you are facing a problem, whether you accept it or not. I have 565 languages, but constitutionally we have recognized 15 in India. Now try to see linguistic chauvinism has overtaken the central government, and people are now fighting for the establishment of their languages.

Language is a very important culture. We are fighting for our material culture, normative culture, our cognitive culture. So if any culturally meaningful unit of all the groups intends to be retained in the cross-cultural fertilization, kindly see that those components of the cultures will dominate in the cross-cultural fertilization which are potent enough to survive in the common culture, the Canadian culture.

I am sure that if we go to solve the problem of multiculturalism by education, it means, what is needed through education to be inculcated in the minds of the common people—one is the concept of neighbourhood school. I held on through it. I worked as a volunteer in School Division No. 1. What is that? If we cannot put our children, the future citizens, in the same stream—I requested the Education minister that I intended actually to present the educational problem in the presence of the Education minister, but she was indisposed, and therefore we could not discuss the issue. It means the neighbourhood school, the concept, it is very much meaningful—and Carstairs could also enjoy it, the teachers, even in the neighbourhood school. It means, if we are floating in the common stream, there is no difference of high and low and rich, then we can look after that Canada not be afraid of this, because we are human beings, belong to the same race, one race.

* (0100)

The second term which is very important, racial differences. It is a politically oriented concept. Those who are interested in knowing this, they can go to the book, the politics and science of I.Q. In racial differences, this is the I.Q., the most misused, abused concept, and actually it does not exist. Who says? Komaine. Komaine is the author of the book. He says that it is politics of divide and rule. Talk about superiorities and inferiorities, and people will certainly accept you.

I request by August assembly that the problem should be given for its solution to the two departments, the Department of Biology, the Department of Psychology, at the Canadian level. The professor should be asked to prepare a pamphlet based on the up-to-date researches in the two areas. Neither the concept of I.Q. is there, nor the concept of race is there. How can you misuse? It means that the problem is very acute, no doubt, but I feel that it is not through annexation, but it is

through a meaningful system of education which will help us in solving the problem.

We should aim at sharing social cohesiveness. I feel that the difference of opinion is not possible on this issue. Our job, ultimate goal, when we talk about multiculturalism and the problems related to multiculturalism, is to ensure social cohesiveness. What is that needed for? Equal opportunities for the deserving people. I am not asking for any kind of reservation for the Punjabi people. I am representing the Association of Punjabi Seniors. Because we are seniors, therefore, we are actually working as volunteers here and there. The other day, we were given that kind of recognition as volunteers by our Premier (Mr. Filmon).

Actually the thing is, the more these people go near to each other, the more are the chances for social cohesiveness. If they are nurtured in watertight compartments, in different kinds of schools, accessible and not accessible to some people, then certainly, somehow or other the dragon of multiculturalism, so-called, will be there and it will never die out.

For example, in equal opportunities, what I am demanding, that if you ask me because I have become a landed immigrant and kindly go in for the test of TOEFL, it means, why do we not ask our 12th grade students completing their 12th grade in the schools to go in for TOEFL and there will be no rush in the universities? Certainly I feel that only one university will be sufficient to nurture the creative minority, to nurture further to serve the community.

So the federal government has very nicely arranged in Canada for ensuring that the people in all the subgroups, subcultures— you can say if you like to use the term "culture," subcultures, are different groups of the societies. They use objective type tests. If I first seek citizenship of Canada, then go in for that kind of competitive test in the federal government service, then it is my ability, or my cognitive capacity with the help of which I will go.

I will not like to be labelled as a visible minority and so and so, and so and so. This is all misleading and downright misleading. I want the person who has the inside strength, who has the capabilities, who has the cognitive structure to deal with the complex issues. Why should I go for this or that kind of visible minority and all these things?

Actually, when we fail to understand the true nature of the concept, then all kinds of efforts are

likely to prove exercises in futility. I am sure that, because we have joined our heads to think over this problem, therefore, ours will not be the exercises in futility, but the test analysis of the concept is needed and we remain satisfied with the surface analysis of the concepts.

So I have talked about the equal opportunities, and when this subjectivity on the part of the observer of my behaviour goes away in objective-type tests, and the Free Press has very nicely picked up this concept of mine; that actually I have the right to survive here, not through that kind of reservation, that kind of meekly, or this kind of respectability to the particular language.

I have accepted, when I accepted this migration to Canada, then I was asked in the Canadian Embassy: Dhaliwal, have you the capacity to speak in English or in French? Yes, sir, both the languages I can express myself in. Well, where would you like to go? Where English—Why do you not go to Montreal? Because I am not having that kind of fluency and flexibility in that language, therefore, the expression. So language is a kind of equipment.

Mr. Speaker: Could I call the honourable presenter to order, please? We are dealing with a bill and we would like the presentation to be directed towards the bill.

Mr. Dhaliwal: Certainly, sir. It is the orientation of the person concerned, and I feel that the act is bound up with this kind of discussion. You can carry out the act; you can do anything you like. I will be having no grudge, but my humble submission is that it is an academic issue and it needs to be thrashed out in the academic forums. My request is very simple.

Neither am I on this side, nor on that side because I am not talking about the act, but I am talking about the concept of, multiculturalism, multiparty system. It means in Canada we are accepting these multiparty systems and I know that in 29 constituencies in 90 in Manitoba, that the larger voters are not being represented in 29. It means we are still having that system.

Another thing, grants should not be given for any kind of nurturing of cultural differences. If they feel that any item, any complement of their culture, of the different groups is needed, they should be thrown in the cross fertilization in the pot, and if they have the capacity to survive, they will survive. Otherwise

they should be left on their own. My humble submission is neither of saving money but my purpose is to ensure social cohesiveness. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you very much, Mr. Dhaliwal. Are there any questions of Mr. Dhaliwal? If not, thank you very much for your presentation.

The committee will resume hearings tomorrow (Tuesday) at ten o'clock.

Committee rise.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 1:09 a.m.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS PRESENTED BUT NOT READ

Committee for Bill 78

Dear Committee Members:

I am writing on behalf of the McDermot-Sherbrook Residents Assoc. Inc. to express our opposition to Bill 178. According to our reading of this bill, the city's Planning Committee will become the appeal body for the hearings of the Board of Adjustment. At present, the appeal body is constituted of the councillors on the appropriate Community Committee. The Board of Adjustment and Planning Committee will hear variances, conditional uses and matters that were formerly licenses.

Bill 78 is a fundamental violation of the democratic process. First, the Board of Adjustment is not an

elected body and therefore is not accountable to anyone. Secondly, the city's Planning Committee is not the elected representatives of the area where the variances and conditional uses are necessarily being heard. In the past year I have had to go before the Planning Committee on zoning and license matters. I have not encountered a single councillor from my community committee on this body. In one case, I was subjected to an outright violation of the procedure for hearing zoning by-laws for which I had to seek a rather expensive legal redress. The Planning Committee is a very powerful body that generally includes councillors from wealthier parts of the city. These individuals are not sensitive to the needs of the entire city.

As far as we are concerned Bill 78 is a step backwards in civic government. Our elected representatives on our local Community Committee are accountable to us because we at least have the chance of electing them. Bill 78 removes their authority and the accountability of the entire municipal government. Bill 78 will do a great deal of damage to the poorer parts of the city which are already under a great deal of stress.

Please include this letter in the record of opposition to the passage of this bill.

Catherine Collins

President

McDermot-Sherbrook Residents Assoc., Inc.