

Third Session - Thirty-Eighth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS
Official Report
(Hansard)

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable George Hickes
Speaker*

Vol. LVI No. 42A - 10 a.m., Thursday, May 5, 2005

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Eighth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
AGLUGUB, Cris	The Maples	N.D.P.
ALLAN, Nancy, Hon.	St. Vital	N.D.P.
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	N.D.P.
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	N.D.P.
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	N.D.P.
BRICK, Marilyn	St. Norbert	N.D.P.
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	N.D.P.
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	N.D.P.
CULLEN, Cliff	Turtle Mountain	P.C.
CUMMINGS, Glen	Ste. Rose	P.C.
DERKACH, Leonard	Russell	P.C.
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	N.D.P.
DOER, Gary, Hon.	Concordia	N.D.P.
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	P.C.
DYCK, Peter	Pembina	P.C.
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	P.C.
FAURSCHOU, David	Portage la Prairie	P.C.
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Lib.
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	P.C.
HAWRANIK, Gerald	Lac du Bonnet	P.C.
HICKES, George, Hon.	Point Douglas	N.D.P.
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri	Fort Garry	N.D.P.
JENNISSON, Gerard	Flin Flon	N.D.P.
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	N.D.P.
KORZENIOWSKI, Bonnie	St. James	N.D.P.
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Lib.
LATHLIN, Oscar, Hon.	The Pas	N.D.P.
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	La Verendrye	N.D.P.
LOEWEN, John	Fort Whyte	P.C.
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	N.D.P.
MAGUIRE, Larry	Arthur-Virden	P.C.
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	N.D.P.
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	N.D.P.
McGIFFORD, Diane, Hon.	Lord Roberts	N.D.P.
MELNICK, Christine, Hon.	Riel	N.D.P.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	P.C.
MURRAY, Stuart	Kirkfield Park	P.C.
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	N.D.P.
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	N.D.P.
PENNER, Jack	Emerson	P.C.
REID, Daryl	Transcona	N.D.P.
REIMER, Jack	Southdale	P.C.
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Rupertsland	N.D.P.
ROCAN, Denis	Carman	P.C.
RONDEAU, Jim, Hon.	Assiniboia	N.D.P.
ROWAT, Leanne	Minnedosa	P.C.
SALE, Tim, Hon.	Fort Rouge	N.D.P.
SANTOS, Conrad	Wellington	N.D.P.
SCHELLENBERG, Harry	Rossmere	N.D.P.
SCHULER, Ron	Springfield	P.C.
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	N.D.P.
SMITH, Scott, Hon.	Brandon West	N.D.P.
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	P.C.
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin-Roblin	N.D.P.
SWAN, Andrew	Minto	N.D.P.
TAILLIEU, Mavis	Morris	P.C.
WOWCHUK, Rosann, Hon.	Swan River	N.D.P.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 5, 2005

The House met at 10 a.m.

*PRAYERS***Introduction of Guests**

Mr. Speaker: Prior to Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of all honourable members to the public gallery where we have with us from Darwin School 41 Grade 9 students under the direction of Mrs. Janice Pauls and Mrs. Loreen Granda. This school is located in the constituency of the honourable Minister of Family Services and Housing (Ms. Melnick).

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS****DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS—
PUBLIC BILLS****Bill 201—The Legislative Assembly
Amendment Act**

Mr. Speaker: Resume debate on second reading of public bills, Bill 201, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

What is the will of the House? Is the will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina? *[Agreed]*

It is also standing in the name of the honourable Member for Minto, who has five minutes remaining.

Mr. Andrew Swan (Minto): I realize I just have a few minutes left to speak, but I do wish to put some more comments on the mantra of my friend, the MLA for Inkster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are certainly lucky to live in a country and a province where people are free to believe as they wish, and of course many in this House believe in the existence of a higher power. Some do not. They are free to do so, but those who do believe in a higher power are certainly going to be

interested to think of what will happen to my friend, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), when he is called for judgment, and by judgment I do not mean the next election day when the people in Inkster get a new MLA, but a far more serious day. *[interjection]*

My friend says he wants to campaign in Minto. He just did, and it did not work very well.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, those who do believe in a higher power and who are considering what will happen to my friend from Inkster know that he will raise a point of order, and the answer to that point of order will be found in a book, but it will not be *Beauchesne*. It will likely be the Book of Genesis. I am sure the speaker in that house will point out to my friend, the MLA for Inkster, that there was a lot of work. There was the creation of light, land, plants, animals and people. I can almost predict what the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) will say. He will say, "Yes, yes, I appreciate that is good, but you only sat for six days."

Mr. Speaker, everybody has their own idea of how forgiving a Creator we have. Certainly, the Member for Inkster will hope that it is a forgiving Creator. If not, though, he will be fine because where he is going there will be lots of other members of the opposition. The Member for Inkster will be able to do what he does best, which is to vote against a progressive government and vote with the Tories on almost every single bill, and, of course, in that forum he will get his wish because there will be a sitting 365 days a year into eternity. So it may be a good place for him.

My point is this, Mr. Speaker. The point is that if the member was truly concerned about the amount and the quality of the work that goes on in this Chamber, he could say so but he does not. His concern is not about the value of the work being done. I am very proud that in this session this government, an active, positive government, is bringing in a great deal of progressive legislation which is going to make things better for the people in this province.

As I look down the list of 45 bills this government has introduced, I look at The Workers

Compensation Amendment Act, which is going to modernize The Workers Compensation Act and provide additional protections for all Manitoba workers. I look at The Electricians' Licence Amendment Act which is going to provide safety so we never have another tragedy as occurred to young Michael Skanderberg. I look at The Water Protection Act, and I know we have a lot of debate to go and a lot of work to do, but certainly as someone who lives close to a river, someone who enjoys spending time on the shores of Lake Winnipeg, I am very proud of the work this government is doing. I am also prepared, as we all are, to accept there is going to be debate and some negotiation on how that act should look.

So the point is the question should not be how many days is this House sitting. The question is what is this House doing. As a member of the government side, I am very proud of the work that our government is doing. I am very confident that we do not need some artificial rules set up by my friend from Inkster. Whether it is 60 days, 80 days, a hundred days that this House is sitting, we are prepared to go forward and do the work we need to do for the benefit of the people of the province of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any other speakers? Okay, when this matter is again before the House, it will remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Pembina (Mr. Dyck).

Bill 202—The Health Services Amendment and Health Services Insurance Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 202, The Health Services Amendment and Health Services Insurance Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Minto (Mr. Swan).

What is the will of the House? Is it the will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Minto? *[Agreed]*

Bill 203—The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 203, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg).

What is the will of the House? Is it the will of the House for the bill to remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Rossmere? *[Agreed]*

The bill will remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Rossmere.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): I am very pleased today to rise and speak to Bill 203, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act, sponsored by the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson).

Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to say that the Tories have come a long way in the last 32 years since MPIC was formed. Back in 1971, they were organizing big 10 000-people rallies out on the Legislature lawns and fearmongering among the public, and trying to destabilize and defeat what at that time was a minority government.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

* (10:10)

Just four years later, in 1973, when the government went for re-election, the Tories at that time came to the conclusion that even they would not sell the corporation back to the private sector. I recall a statement made by Ross Thatcher, back a number of years ago in Saskatchewan when he became Premier, he was asked about whether he would sell off SGI, and he said, "I may not be a socialist, but I am not a fool either." Because he realized what a value a public insurance corporation is and can be to a jurisdiction like Saskatchewan or like Manitoba.

Let me explain why that is. For example, we have seen a history of low rates under public insurance, but that is only part of the picture. The other part of the picture is that the premiums are staying in the province; 85 percent of the premiums are used to pay the claims. But before those claims are paid, the premiums are invested locally in bonds, in every school, pretty much, in the province. Every municipality in the province for the last 32 years has had MPIC money lent to it through a bond.

What would happen if a private insurance company was operating in that investment environment? Would they be investing in schools in Manitoba, municipalities in Manitoba? Of course not, and it is their mandate to get the best return they

can, and if they can ship the money to Toronto, to their head office and invest it in the stock market in Ontario or investments in Ontario where they get a higher rate of return, that is what they are going to do. That is what they did for a hundred years until the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan set up public insurance in their provinces.

Another reason that the Tories have not attacked public insurance over the years is that the premium increases over the last 30 years have been lower than inflation. Let us compare that to what the rate increases have been and were just in the last couple of years in Canada. As a matter of fact, while Manitoba is basically flat, rate increases may be 1 percent or 2 percent, if that. In other provinces we have had 20 percent and more increases in auto insurance.

As a matter of fact, you only have to look at New Brunswick with Premier Lord who came in with a big majority, and his first re-election effort ran aground and he just about lost the election. He ended up with, I believe, a minority government because of large increases in automobile insurance in that province. As a matter of fact, he was so shocked by what happened to him that, in fact, he looked west, he looked to Manitoba to examine how our system operates. I believe he came very close to implementing our system, but at the end of the day, the insurance lobby got to him and promised to roll back their rates, which they have done a bit. He has now deferred bringing in public insurance, which I think is a wrong decision, but nevertheless he is a Conservative, and so it does make sense in that context.

Now, if we want to look at rate comparisons, because this is all sounding too good to be true, lowest rates in the province, investment that stays in the province. How do the rates look across the country? Now we have Runzheimer Canada who did a comparison and they are comparing a 2001 Taurus, a 45-year-old driver, six years claims free, all-purpose use, \$200 deductible and \$1 million liability. Sounds like the average MLA to me. Now let us look at those rates.

You know, we have a low rate here in Winnipeg. Well, Brandon, we have a rate in Brandon of \$970, the lowest in the country, Brandon, Manitoba. The highest in the country, over two and a half times higher, same coverage, same car, not the same MLA

though. Two and a half times more, \$2,428, and that is in Montreal. In Toronto, that same car, that same driver, would pay \$2,234. You have a system that keeps the money in the province, pays 85 percent of the rates, the lowest rates in the country, pays 85 percent back to the public. How could you possibly find fault with that? That is what I am looking for over here.

What is the current policy of the opposition on MPIC? I do not see any policy over there. They are not saying they want to sell it, at least not now. We hope that is not what some of them have in mind over there. I hope that is what they have in mind, but they are not saying they should sell it. You know what is interesting, they are not suggesting we go back to the tort system. They are sticking with their previous government's move to bring in a no-fault system. We support that.

Let me give you a bit of history here. After our unceremonious departure from the Legislature in 1988, we did not have a lot of traction on the Autopac file at the time so we looked back to Judge Kopstein's report, who had done a report on MPIC. He had recommended a no-fault system. We thought we were on fairly safe ground to propose a no-fault system. That is what we did.

After two or three radio interviews and press interviews on the subject, maybe six months down the pike, the Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings), the minister at the time, just about knocked us over. He has a press conference and he announces no-fault. We could not believe it. No wonder they stayed in power so long. Why did they do this? They did it because the tort system, which was in place at the time, was creating a huge backlog of small claims where people were having little whiplash claims, some of them imagined, some of them real. Lawyers were taking on these cases and settling routinely for \$5,000 and \$10,000 just to get rid of the claim. They knew that if they were to continue in this vein, rates would have to go up. Of course, the public would not be too happy about that.

What they did was bring in a no-fault system. What was the result? The result was a \$100-a-vehicle saving. It certainly threw us into disarray for awhile. Also, what it did was give better benefits. Prior to that time, your income replacement was a rather small amount, \$35,000, something like that, for many years. Overnight, the income replacement

came in at some \$50,000, which was a big improvement.

Here we were, the opposition, the Conservatives, adopting our proposal, and now we were with them supporting the proposal, but where were the Liberals here. Where were they? They, of course, were being led by a lawyer at the time. He just found it instinctively, intuitively, to just pick up the legal position on the matter and that is fine. There are some points to be made there as well. If you can wait three or four years for your settlement and you want to pay your lawyer a third of it, I guess it is probably an okay system. If you are presentable to a jury and you have got a good lawyer, you might get a little more than someone who does not have as good a lawyer.

In the States, it is a big industry. Professional lawyers who know what they are doing, have really presentable clients, big bucks, but a client who is not so presentable, and a lawyer who is not as experienced in that area, not so big. You could die waiting for your settlement too.

So what did the Liberals do? They jumped in bed with the lawyers holus-bolus. Once again, I say that is not bad because it gave the other side of the argument. The member, I think it was from Osborne, but now he is a big federal Cabinet minister in control of Manitoba, at least that is what he says, for now, and he may be back here some day. He was totally misrepresenting what it was about. I mean, it was up there in black and white that we were doubling the income replacement. He was saying that it was a worse package. So the Liberals of that day, I mean, they were not even reading the documents right.

* (10:20)

But having said that, we had our own problems at the time dealing with the issue, because we had the, you know, it is instinctive for opposition to oppose, so all of a sudden we had this confusing system where the government is introducing what we wanted. So now we had a couple of members saying, well, maybe we should be looking at what the lawyers are offering here. And at the end of the day, what happened was we went with perhaps, it was 20 to 30 amendments into the committee, but we were not arguing with the basic premise of no-fault. We were supporting no-fault. We had decided that. We

were not going to change our mind on it, but we wanted to make improvements to their bill, and one of the improvements that we got to their bill was a three-year review of the whole proposition and, in fact, they did that with Sam Uskiw. Three years later, he did a review and they made some changes.

So what they are proposing in this bill should, in fact, be subject to a review at some point in the future, but it should be looked at in the context of the whole proposition.

For example, I will give you one amendment that I thought we should have brought in at the time, back in 1994, that we were told at the time, no, it is a good idea but we are just going to stay with what we have got. There are a lot of snowbirds in Winnipeg who will go to Texas for the winter, and they are right on the Mexican border. There are thousands of them, and when they park their cars on the American side they are covered up to the border, but to drive their car just across the border they are now uninsured. So they have to buy a policy that is very high-priced and not very good coverage, and they take their chances driving to Mexico.

You know, Mexico does have decent roads these days, but I often wondered why do we limit the coverage to Canada and continental U.S.A. Why do we not include Mexico? We were told at the time, "Well, you know, we will look at that in the future. Right now we are just getting into no fault. We want some experience to see how things are going to go, and we will look at these changes possibly in the future." So if at some point in time we do look at a review of the no-fault system, then I think that is one amendment that we might want to take another look at, given that many of us are aging and may be driving around the Mexican border at times.

So this is just one suggestion. I think that the whole area, to the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), is an evolving process. I think essentially we have a good process, but we should not exclude the possibility of making changes as the times change. Once again, I do not know what the Tory policy is on MPIC that I see at the moment, because we have the Member for Fort Whyte (Mr. Loewen) saying that we should be getting into equities. He wants even more of their money invested in the stock market, that coming from a professional investment type over there, and so we have got a lot of little piecemeal approach—

An Honourable Member: Jimmy, are you just making this up? Did somebody write this down for you?

Mr. Maloway: I do not mean to attack my good friend from Fort Whyte. He is just such an inviting target, I just cannot resist. He seems to me like a kind of an independent guy in that caucus who keeps running into walls. He needs lots of room to maneuver, and they do not give him a lot of room, and he has been a Finance critic now more times than I can count. He gets in there. He is there for a few months time, and he is back and he is out. We cannot keep track of him. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The member's time has expired.

Mr. Jack Reimer (Southdale): Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand up and give quite a few words on comment about Bill 203, introduced by the Member for River East.

It does not seem to matter, whenever I get up in this House to speak, I seem to be always following the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) in some of his tirades and his rambles on the bill here. I believe somewhere in his tirade, he was talking about possibly even looking at supporting this amendment. So I was pleased about that sort of filtered through in some of his ramblings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, from time to time as legislators, we take on various causes, and usually a lot of times it is something that has come through our constituency or somebody has brought to our attention a matter that they feel that possibly we can help them with. It is something that I think each one of us as legislators takes note of.

We work very hard not only for our constituents in our constituencies, but overall in all of Manitoba we try to bring forth legislation and amendments that help people that are having a problem. This is one of the reasons for this amendment that was brought forth by the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson), and it is a very, very unique situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What you have got is you have got two people who, through misfortune are on disability. One of the individuals is on disability through MPIC, the other is on disability through CPP. Unfortunately, there

was a split in their relationship, and the woman in question that was involved with the accident with MPIC was on a disability payment through the government program. When the split was made by the couple, a portion of the CPP disability benefit that the gentleman was realizing was part of the settlement to the ex-wife in regard to a payment on the monies received. What happened then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was MPIC clawed back that amount that she was getting.

Now, it is not a big amount, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is between \$150 to \$175. I believe it is in that range. It is a small amount, but for people that are on disability, it is a big amount of money, and it is something that this lady has been trying to get some sort of recognition through MPIC. They have made appeals, they have made presentations, they have talked to the Member for River East. They have even, I believe, approached the minister in trying to get some sort of recognition that this is a very, very unique situation and that it warrants some sort of attention.

It is unfortunate that it is something that cannot be corrected by the minister or by the department so that this situation can be corrected. It means coming to the Legislature and asking for an amendment on this particular bill.

The MPIC have been in contact. They know this situation quite well because they have even said to the family, in fact, that this is the only case, this is the only appeal of its kind brought forward to the corporation since the inception of the no-fault insurance, a totally unique situation that can be corrected. It can be corrected by the agreement and the passage of this amendment on this legislation, and it could mean a quality of life for two people that can enjoy some of the benefits of having a small amount of money that this lady can realize from her settlement, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

An Honourable Member: It is not going to break the corporation.

Mr. Reimer: I mean, the corporation itself, you know, we are talking multimillions and millions of dollars in this, but because this is a totally unique situation, one of a kind if you want to call it that, the corporation recognizing that this is a very unique situation, we believe that this is something that should be passed.

We look forward to the minister receiving this favourably so that we can get on with it, it can go to committee, we can have presentations and the amendment can come into effect in a very short time. We are totally in agreement with it. We believe that a lot of the members in the government recognize that there is a problem here, and we can try to correct this. As legislators, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the ability to make a change is something that we can all be very, very proud of as an elected official in this Chamber.

We have the ability to make those types of changes, and those are the types of things that I think, for the quality of life for individuals or the quality of life for people in the community, are things that we should all be very, very proud of. We take this very much to heart as elected officials and the responsibilities that the constituents put in us to make changes.

* (10:30)

We naturally cannot change everything, but small things for a quality of life for two individuals that are put in a very unfortunate situation, a totally unique situation, a one-of-a-kind situation, if you want to call it, for this couple, which has been admitted to by MPIC, you would think that this maybe is, for lack of a better word, a no-brainer. We should be just passing this amendment. We should get it into committee. We should move it on so there is a recognition that we can make a change. Just make sure when we go to committee that these things are passed.

The member from River East would have the satisfaction of talking to her constituents and say, "We got this for you." We do not want to go back to those people and say, "Well, we tried, but this government said no." They said no to this couple, no to this individual. I think there is a responsibility to look at this amendment to MPIC in a very positive way, that the members in government, particularly the minister responsible, have the ability to either talk to the Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson) or be more involved with the case, get the facts more readily available and update himself to what is happening, and have this thing go on to committee.

We have always looked at MPIC. The member from Elmwood has mentioned the rates and the situation that Manitoba is in with the MPIC. We

have no fault with MPIC in a sense of the handling of its insurance and things like that. Naturally, there are places where we feel there should be changes in the government's direction that they are going with, but those are political decisions, and those are what this milieu is about, really, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the political ramifications.

This particular incident is about people in difficult times. Two people caught in a circumstance that is totally unique, one of a kind. Recognize it as one of a kind that can be corrected. The amount of money that we are talking about, as I mentioned before, I believe the last amount that was mentioned is around \$165. I think that is something the government should look at, or the MPI should look at very seriously in trying to come to some sort of resolve on it. Their hands are tied because of the parameters they have to operate under with MPIC. They have said the only way they can act is if there is an amendment to the legislation.

Bill 203 is that amendment. It was brought forth before by the Member for River East. I believe it was Bill 206 at that time in the last Legislative session. It was debated, it was carried. It died on the Order Paper, if you want to call it. It has been brought back as Bill 203 this time. We are very optimistic that the government will look more favourably on it this time. We look forward to some of the other members' contributions on this bill, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would highly recommend that this bill does pass into committee, go through the routine of third reading and at that time, bring back to the House and before we adjourn some time later in the year, or whenever we adjourn, then we have the ability to pass this bill and have some good news for these people.

With those comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will let some of my other colleagues in government and in our party put something on the record. Thank you.

Mr. David Faurshou (Portage la Prairie): I do appreciate the opportunity to rise in the House in support of Bill 206, which has been brought to the Assembly here by the honourable Member for River East. It is her constituent that has raised this issue, and I understand it is a unique situation. However, I do believe that as we see the population age in the province of Manitoba, we might, indeed, see other situations where pension monies are being received

from the federal government, and individuals that are in a relationship or also, too, eligible for monies being paid to them through an unfortunate accident, may indeed see a clawback of pensionable funds, disability funds, whether they emanate from the federal government or from the private sector, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

This unfortunate situation, as I say, is unique. However, that does not lessen the importance that we as legislators recognize the injustice that this circumstance presents itself as. It is our responsibility. It is incumbent upon ourselves to right a wrong and to bring fairness to legislation that we, the Assembly of Manitoba, are responsible for.

This private member's legislation does just that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It does address a wrong. It does bring fairness to The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act that will address the issue of the constituent of River East.

I believe that the other members have put on the record information pertaining to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, that from their perspective is valid. We are raised in various locales within the province of Manitoba, and we have the benefit of diverse observations as to how our Public Insurance Corporation has addressed and fulfilled the needs of Manitobans. The honourable member from Elmwood has an observation from his locale within the province of Manitoba, within the Perimeter, that sometimes shields one from not only the floodwaters of the Red but possibly the information and observations of other Manitobans.

I know that we do benefit from low premiums. Although I will say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the premiums that all of us pay here in the province of Manitoba, respective of the vehicle in which we operate on the roadways of Manitoba, do average the premiums of all Manitobans. If we were to isolate, as the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) suggested, someone that is in mid-forties with a good driving record and is driving a modest Ford vehicle, the premiums are indeed the lowest in Canada. However, if the member is essentially to really evaluate areas where one can be isolated as a 45-year-old living in—as I did when I was 45. I am a couple years advanced of that now. I selected Cochrane, Alberta, which is a similar-sized community as Portage la Prairie. I used the same vehicle which I operate today, a 1991 Mazda B2200 pickup truck. The premiums I was

paying here in Manitoba exceeded \$700. If the same coverage was afforded me and I was residing in Cochrane, Alberta, I would be paying one-half of that amount in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, if I had even looked at other options that are not available to me in Manitoba, and currently sitting as a legislator, that of farm plates, which I am right now an inactive farmer and so do not qualify, but if one looked at—

Point of Order

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A point of order is being raised.

Mr. Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that MPIC has a problem with people working in Alberta, who insist upon buying their insurance in Manitoba because it is a lot cheaper. MPIC for years has had a problem with Ontario residents in northwestern Ontario having post office boxes as addresses so they can buy their insurance in Manitoba because it is less than half the price. It is a problem with Alberta. There is a big problem with Alberta, people from Manitoba working in Alberta, keeping their Manitoba insurance because it is a lot cheaper than Alberta and it is better coverage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The honourable Member for Elmwood has no point of order. That is a dispute over the facts.

* * *

Mr. Faurtschou: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I appreciate your observations on that point of order. The Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) does have legitimate information and I appreciate him adding to the debate in the House today, but I was just getting to the point to which I really wanted to make, and that is the options that are available in other jurisdictions that are not available here in Manitoba.

*(10:40)

I suggest that older vehicles should be afforded the option that we not participate in actual collision insurance because our collision insurance that we are purchasing here in the province of Manitoba, essentially, is greater than the vehicle value on the open market. My Mazda pickup, for instance, is valued at approximately \$500, whereby I am paying

in total more than \$700 in insurance and registration fees. If I was afforded only the opportunity to purchase the option of liability and registration, I think that is an option that I personally would consider because of the value of the vehicle and repair. *[interjection]*

I know the person from Elmwood continues to try and participate in the debate even though his time has elapsed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I want to stress the fact that Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation does look at the market value of vehicles and they continue to write off vehicles if the repair is greater than the actual market value of the vehicle. So if I was in even a minor collision and we all are aware of the costs of repair these days, it would not take much damage on the vehicle to exceed \$500 worth of repair bills. In fact, even a quarter panel, by the time one repairs the quarter panel and paints it, in a minor accident, I would suggest that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation would be inclined to write the vehicle off.

So I ask the question, and I believe it is a valid one: Why am I paying for collision insurance when essentially the collision insurance really is of no actual value to me because, as in the example I cited, is even greater than the deductible that is on the policy? I really question as to whether or not I should be paying for collision insurance.

I do digress, but I am trying to make the point that it is incumbent upon all of us to continue to keep ourselves abreast of new information of experience of the corporation and of Manitobans and to fully evaluate, fully apprise ourselves of that information and to make necessary changes to the legislation so that we are able to bring to Manitobans the best of insurance that can be possible.

In the situation that we are looking at, Bill 206 will address this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It is made even more important by the fact that the individuals concerned with this circumstance are impoverished. This government of the day, the New Democratic Party, has always prided itself, at least they state publicly that they pride themselves, in coming to the defense of those persons that are less fortunate than others.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

That is why I look to the members on the government side of the Assembly that they should be the first to their feet to speak in support of Bill 206.

An Honourable Member: Bill 203. You are talking about 203.

Mr. Faurshou: My goodness, Mr. Speaker, I have been in error right from the very outset. I said that I was speaking on Bill 206. However, I would like to correct the record at this juncture in time. I am, in fact, speaking of Bill 203, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act, as proposed by the honourable Member for River East (Mrs. Mitchelson). I guess I am going to have to admit for the record that I have now been prescribed reading glasses, and I do not have them in my possession at the moment. That is my failing and I apologize to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying in regard to the New Democratic Party, the government of the day has always told Manitobans they believe in coming to the defence of individuals that are less fortunate, and I believe this bill is within that framing. I believe it is opportunity for the government to, in fact, walk the walk as they talk the talk. I am looking to the government members to rise to their feet when I yield the floor and bring their comments from their side of the House in support of this legislation. Then, at the end of the day, to see this legislation go to committee so that the individuals this legislation does have impact on have the opportunity to talk to us, the legislators, face to face.

I know it is not truly in this government's keeping to see private members' bills come forward and go through the process. Most times the government sees fit that the legislation, even if it has merit, if they did not think about it and if they did not bring it forward, then we cannot support it. It is a failing I hope the voters of Manitoba see, in the next couple of years that we, as individuals elected to this Assembly, have and should have the opportunity to bring forward legislation to improve the lot in life of everyday Manitobans.

I believe this legislation does just that, and I look to the honourable members across the way, especially to the honourable member from Transcona, who has the privilege of participating at the board of directors of Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I wish, Mr. Speaker, I had more time this morning because I would like to share more information and good ideas Manitobans have presented so we could act upon that, and the member from Transcona could have the benefit of taking that information forward to the board table for the corporation to act on.

Mr. Speaker, make it very clear that I have stood and spoken on behalf of supporting Bill 203, The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act and it has been my pleasure to do so. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Any other speakers? When this matter is again in front of the House, it will remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for Rossmere (Mr. Schellenberg).

Bill 207—The Medical Amendment Act

Mr. Speaker: We will now move on to Bill 207, The Medical Amendment Act, standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. James (Ms. Korzeniowski). What is the will of the House? Leave the bill remain standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. James? *[Agreed]*

* (10:50)

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I want to rise today and thank the member from Russell for bringing this bill forward to us today. I can relate to the circumstances which have been brought about by this bill.

We have a mother-in-law who was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer a year ago in January, and thanks to homeopathy traditions and medications, Mr. Speaker, she has come along quite well. The doctors at Selkirk gave her less than five weeks to live. If it would not have been for the homeopathy that has been brought forward by the challenges in the marketplace and also in alternative medicine, she is still with us today. I thank not only the founders of this product but the doctors that pursue to try and come forward with new ideas in homeopathy and new traditions in medication. We do thank them for that opportunity.

This is a product that is called Ambrotose and I do not know if anybody on that side of the House or them on this side of the House has heard about this product, but it is a product that has done wonders. It is out of the great state of Texas and I know that a number of people have been on it. It is just one of those situations that, as I said, has given my mother-in-law a huge amount of optimism in life and has also given her a better quality of life. That has been brought about because of this Ambrotose product.

I know that a number of years ago, in fact in 1994, I was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis, and

I went to a specialist and he prescribed a few different alternatives. Believe it or not, some of those alternatives did work, and that is why we need to be open-minded. We need to be mindful of the fact there are alternatives out there. Talking to my own doctor, he is very open minded, very progressive and sometimes we get caught up on the prescription drugs that sometimes science does not have the time to look into all these, and the cost to get these products to the marketplace is astronomical.

In fact, the doctor that I saw, the homeopathic doctor, ran some tests and the mercury level was quite high. I do not know if it is because of the fish out of Lake Manitoba or Lake Winnipeg that I was eating. Maybe they were too high in the mercury level. We are not too sure of that, but having said that, the products that the homeopathy physician prescribed to me took care of that, and I am very thankful for that. The mercury-level test we did about a year and a half later, and it was in the accepted level. We still eat a lot of fish in our family and we are very proud of that fact. That hopefully was not the problem, but if it was, we can thank homeopathy for that opportunity because of the fact that we need to look at these alternative medicines.

I also know of a situation similar to that. A colleague of mine, a friend in the livestock equipment business that I knew quite well, in fact he was one of my former bosses when I was with the Interlake School Division, and he went out to visit his daughter in Toronto and while he was there, he ended up getting a spasm, a muscle spasm in his back, and he was in severe pain. They put him on a stretcher, flew him back to home, which was just out of Winnipeg, over in the Marquette area. He was bedridden for almost two months, which is a severe amount of time to be laying on your back, not able to get up and eat, not being able to get up and do your bathroom duties and the other things that we like to do in life and need to do in life, but he looked at alternatives to try and come up with a way of which he could be looked after and cared for in his needs.

He got in the homeopathic mode and they found out some of these remedies were very helpful. He also called a reflexologist in and they went to work on his feet. The chiropractors tried to help him, could not do anything to get the nerve endings back to where they were supposed to be, and this particular individual called the reflexologist. The reflexologist came out to his home and began to work on his feet.

He found out that, within five minutes, he was up being able to walk.

We take these things, that the doctors are the only ones that can heal each other, but yet there are all kinds of alternatives out there that we need to be looking at. I know I have a niece that lives in Phoenix and she is into the reflexology mode. We find that not only by working on your feet, it will cause several symptoms in your body be healed and move on to better things and better quality of life. Whatever we can do to do that, we need to look at. My niece that lives in Phoenix started studying reflexology and the different modes. Also, in the roof of your mouth, there are a number of muscles and tender sites there that can be massaged or treated, and also that is another form of alternative medicine that we need to look at when we think about the different modes that we can go through when it comes to forms of medication that we need to be looking at.

Also we need to be mindful of the fact that we rely on medicine to heal so much, and we go back to our forefathers in the old days of our medical profession treating different problems within the medical profession. We have come to rely slowly on that, and we need to go back to some of these home remedies that grandma and grandpa and our great grandparents used to use before we got into the high-tech drugs.

We find out that some of these high-tech drugs are not just what they are made out to be. Maybe they are not safe as we thought they once were. I know one of the drugs that I was on for my rheumatoid arthritis was a drug called Celebrex. They said that was the one to be on. I know that being involved with that drug every day, I started cutting back. I am very glad that I did. There are other alternatives out there that I am personally looking at. I want to make sure of the fact that I do not do myself more harm than good.

I know another situation that I can relate to is with my father. He had severe neck pain, so he went to the doctor, and they put him on a medication to alleviate the pain. It burned a hole in his stomach, so then they end up having to put another drug into him to try to solve the hole-in-the-stomach problem.

So, you know, we look at the medical profession and we wonder sometimes if that is not the right way

to go, whether there is another alternative out there that we need to look at. I know diet has become an important part. We are not eating properly. Our fast-food diet has taken over the world. We are obese. We are taken into the situation whereby we are not sure that we have time to eat properly, time to take time for ourselves, the physical fitness side of it, the side that we need to make sure we are mindful of when it comes to exercising right, dieting properly and that is the truly best way that we can look after our bodies, our minds and our souls.

I know that we on this side of the House are very supportive of the fact that we want to make sure that we are healthy. We want to live the good life that we want. In fact, yesterday we met with the Canadian Cancer institute, and one of the things we talked about was prevention.

We need to be mindful of the fact that we need to not only worry about the sunlight when we are out in it but also the foods that we eat into our bodies. I mean, farming has changed so much. We are using a lot of chemicals. We are using products that we do not know what is sometimes better for us. I know even in our beef industry, you know, we have the implants that we put into cattle, and sometimes that is not necessarily the right thing to do either. I know when I was in the livestock equipment business, we made sure of the fact that what we put into our animals was a safe hormone.

The thing is that what is important is to make sure that what we consume is the best that we are able to provide for the Canadian economy. I know that the farmers in the Interlake and in the province of Manitoba are very diligent about the fact that we want to provide the best quality products that we are able to consume.

We need to be mindful of the fact that sometimes, when you get into these products, the products that we consume, we have to make sure they are safe. I know that the farming practices have changed dramatically with the way we keep our product. In fact, I know the University of Manitoba and the Food Development Centre in Portage are working on ways to keep our grain and farm products longer, keep them safer for us, and I know for a fact that is going to be the wave of the future.

I know our aeration system has changed dramatically for the way we keep our grain stored,

making sure there is no way that mice or any other ruminant animal and animals that are pest animals can get into our grain bins, make sure that it is stored in a way that it is safe and consumed when it hits the grain elevator so that there is less opportunity for the waste to be brought forward, that we get a fair dollar for our product, and that will be carried forward within the way of which it needs to be brought.

* (11:00)

I know in the livestock sector, not only do the beef people, but the poultry people also bring in their products to make sure they are safe. The Northern Goose processing plant within Teulon, who process a number of geese. In fact, they are the largest in the world. They were beaten up quite badly by the debate that came forward on how their meat was stored. They were cleared of those charges, and we are very proud of the fact they are able to sustain that industry within the confines of our great community in Teulon. There are other businesses, in fact, the turkey industry which our family has been involved in. We go beyond the 9000 certification.

Mr. Speaker: Order. When this matter is again before the House, the honourable Member for Lakeside will have three minutes remaining.

The hour being 11 a.m., we will now move on to resolutions.

RESOLUTIONS—COMMITTEE SELECTION

Res. 4—Redress of Canadian Wartime and Immigration Measures

Mr. Speaker: We will deal with Resolution 4, in the name of the honourable Member for Burrows, Redress of Canadian Wartime and Immigration Measures.

Mr. Doug Martindale (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Dauphin-Roblin (Mr. Struthers):

WHEREAS many Canadians were affected by Canadian wartime and immigration measures; and

WHEREAS Ukrainians, Italians and Germans were interned in camps during the First and Second

World Wars as the result of The War Measures Act enacted in 1914; and

WHEREAS Chinese immigrants were subject to a poll tax as high as \$500 between the years 1884 – 1923, after which the Canadian government passed The Immigration Act which effectively excluded all Chinese immigration to Canada until after the Second World War; and

WHEREAS from 1907 to 1914 a series of restrictive measures, such as the "continuous journey" legislation of 1908, were imposed on immigration from south Asian and India countries (mainly Sikhs), which effectively brought immigration from those regions to an abrupt end; and

WHEREAS during the Second World War, 711 Jewish refugees from the holocaust were interned under suspicion for being spies and 900 Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany aboard the liner St. Louis were denied entry into Canada on June 9, 1939.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature commend the federal government for allocating \$25 million over the next three years in the February 2005 budget for commemorative and educational initiatives meant to highlight the painful aspects of Canada's history; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Manitoba Legislature urge the federal government to continue negotiations with the affected communities to resolve their individual grievances and enable these communities to properly commemorate those tragic events and to ensure they will be understood and remembered by all Canadians.

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Member for Burrows, on a point of order.

Mr. Martindale: I would like permission or consent of the House to change the seconder to the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) since he has agreed and would be honoured to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Is there leave to change the seconder from Conservation to the honourable Member for Russell? *[Agreed]*

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The resolution will now read, moved by the honourable Member for Burrows, seconded by the honourable Member for Russell:

WHEREAS many Canadians were—

An Honourable Member: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Dispense.

Motion presented.

Mr. Martindale: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be the person who introduced this resolution, although I must say there are many painful aspects of Canadian history that are itemized in this resolution. We believe it is not too late to make amends for these historical facts so we are concluding this resolution by commending the federal government for allocating money to commemorate and educate the Canadian public on some of these tragic events.

Mr. Conrad Santos, Deputy Speaker, in the Chair

Many Canadians were adversely affected by Canadian wartime and immigration measures during the early 1900s until after the Second World War. These measures included the Chinese head tax imposed after the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Chinese Immigration Act, the Continuous Journey Rule imposed in 1908, and the War Measures Act of 1914. The immigration acts of 1910 and 1919 further restricted the immigration of undesirable groups, or I should say so-called undesirable groups into Canada.

Between 1881 and 1884, approximately 17 000 Chinese came to Canada. The majority were brought in by contractors to construct the new Canadian Pacific Railway. In 1885, with the CPR's completion, an act was passed to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration. A \$50 head tax was imposed on all Chinese immigrants entering the country, which was later increased to \$500 in 1903. Meanwhile, Chinese were denied Canadian citizenship. In all, the federal government collected \$23 million from the Chinese through the head tax.

Despite the head tax, Chinese immigrants continued to come to Canada. In 1923, the Canadian Parliament passed the Chinese Immigration Act, excluding all but a few Chinese immigrants from entering Canada. Between 1923 and 1947 less than

50 Chinese were allowed to come to Canada. The Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed in 1947.

The Head Tax and Exclusion Act prevented most Chinese immigrants, especially those brought here to help build the CPR, from bringing their families to Canada, resulting in a long period of separation of many families.

Immigrants from India began to arrive in British Columbia during the early 1900s. In 1907, the government of British Columbia disenfranchised East Indians, even though they were British subjects. In 1908, the Canadian government passed a policy requiring immigrants to come to Canada by a continuous journey from their country of origin, which effectively stopped immigration from India and south Asia. The landing money required of Indians was also increased from \$50 to \$200. In 1910, the order was extended to the wives and children of those already in Canada.

In 1914, after a two-month voyage, 376 Indians, mostly Sikhs, sailed into Vancouver harbour on the steamer, *Komagata Maru*. The ship had been chartered by Gurdit Singh to test the government ruling. Vancouver and Victoria newspapers of the time described the group of mostly adult male immigrants as undesirable, sick, hungry, and a menace to women and children. Upon arrival, they were refused the right to disembark. The steamer sat in detention, under deteriorating conditions and diminishing supplies, for two months. Following attempts to intimidate and force passengers off the steamer for immediate deportation, the *Komagata Maru* was finally able to obtain provisions for a return trip to India and was escorted out of the harbour by the *H.M.S. Rainbow*. With the exception of 20 returning residents and the ship's doctor, none of the passengers were permitted to disembark.

The War Measures Act was a statute legislated on August 22, 1914, conferring emergency powers on the federal Cabinet. This act allowed the Cabinet to govern by Orders-in-Council rather than by approval of the democratically elected Parliament when it perceives the existence of war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.

The War Measures Act authorized the government to do whatever the government thought necessary for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada, which could include censorship

and suppression of publications and communication; arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation of any person; control of all means of transportation; control of trading and manufacturing; and appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property.

This legislation was applied during both world wars, most notably for the discriminatory treatment of Austrian-Hungarian Canadians, mostly Ukrainians, during and after World War I and the Japanese-Canadians during and after World War II, which included the uprooting, detention, confiscation of properties and expulsion from Canada.

After Great Britain entered the First World War in August 1914, the Government of Canada issued an Order-in-Council under the War Measures Act. It required the registration and in certain cases the internment of aliens of enemy nationality. This included the more than 80 000 Canadians who were formerly citizens of the Austrian-Hungarian empire. These individuals had to register as enemy aliens and report to local authorities on a regular basis.

It should probably be pointed out that it was not simply a security concern on the part of the Canadian government that motivated this legislation. We know from historical records that companies such as the CPR and others were lobbying the federal government to bring in this legislation. There was a concern that there would be indigents on the streets of cities, who would be unemployed and that this was needed to clean up this so-called problem. So the government was lobbied to do something about these people, and this was the route that they chose.

*(11:10)

Twenty-four concentration camps, later called internment camps, were established across Canada. In Winnipeg there was a collection point, the Fort Osborne Barracks, and that is commemorated in a plaque on the Legislative grounds. In Brandon, there was a camp. It was not a work camp but it was an internment camp. The camps were supposed to house enemy alien immigrants who had contravened regulations or who were deemed to be security threats. Enemy aliens could be interned if they failed to register or failed to report monthly, or travelled without permission, or wrote to relatives in Austria. Other less concrete reasons given for internment included acting in a very suspicious manner and being undesirable.

By the middle of 1915, 4000 of the internees had been imprisoned for being indigent, that is, poor and unemployed. A total of 8579 Canadians were interned between 1914 and 1920. Over 5000 of them were of Ukrainian descent. Germans, Poles, Italians, Bulgarians, Croatians, Turks, Serbians, Hungarians, Russians, Jews and Romanians were also imprisoned. Of the 8579 internees, only 2321 could be classed as prisoners of war and the rest were civilians.

Upon each individual's arrest, whatever money and property they had was taken by the government. In the internment camps they were denied access to newspapers and their correspondence was censored. They were sometimes mistreated by the guards. One hundred and seven internees died, including several shot while trying to escape. They were forced to work on maintaining the camps, road building, railway construction and mining. As the need for soldiers overseas led to a shortage of workers in Canada, many of these internees were released on parole to work for private companies.

The First World War ended in 1918 but the forced labour program was such a benefit to Canadian corporations that the internment was continued for two years after the end of the war. Because Canada and Britain were at war with the likes of Germany, Austria, Hungary and the Ukraine, immigration from these countries was suspended entirely. Residents from these nations already living in Canada were considered enemy aliens under the War Measures Act of 1914.

After the war the federal government enacted new measures to keep out immigrants who were deemed unsuitable for life in Canada. The Immigration Act of 1919 included a new rule, Section 38, which allowed the government to limit or prohibit the entry of undesirable races and nationalities. Section 38 formed the basis of an Order-in-Council paper later in 1919 that prohibited the entry of Austrians, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Turks and others who fought against Canada in World War I. This section was also used to prohibit the entrance of Doukhobours, Hutterites and Mennonites because of their particular religious customs and habitats. The government repealed both these prohibitions, however, in 1922-23.

During World War II, the War Measures Act was used again to intern Canadians and 26 internment camps were set up across Canada. In 1940, an

Order-in-Council was passed that defined enemy aliens as all persons of German or Italian racial origin who have become naturalized British subjects since September 1922. A further Order-in-Council outlawed the Communist Party.

Estimates suggest that some 30 000 individuals were affected by these orders, forced to register with the RCMP and to report to them on a monthly basis. The government interned approximately 500 Italians and over 100 Communists. In New Brunswick, 711 Jews, refugees from the Holocaust, were interned at the request of the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, because he thought there might be spies in the group. A further 900 Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany aboard the liner *St. Louis* were denied entry into Canada on June 9, 1939.

After the bombing of Pearl Harbour in 1942, the government passed an Order-in-Council authorizing the removal of enemy aliens within a hundred mile radius of the B.C. coast. On March 4, 1942, 22 000 Japanese-Canadians were given 24 hours to pack before being interned. Women, children and older people were sent to internment camps in the interior. Others were forced into road construction camps. Men who complained about separation from their families or violated the curfew were sent to the prisoner-of-war camps in Ontario. The property of Japanese-Canadians, land, businesses and other assets, were confiscated by the government and sold and the proceeds used to pay for their internment.

In 1945, the government extended the Order-in-Council to force the Japanese-Canadians to return to Japan and lose their Canadian citizenship or move to eastern Canada. Even though the war was over, it was illegal for Japanese-Canadians to return to Vancouver until 1949. I am aware that the CCF was the only political party in the House of Commons to oppose the War Measures Act as used against Japanese-Canadians during the Second World War.

In 1988, Canada apologized to the Japanese for this miscarriage of justice, submitting that the actions of the government were influenced by racial discrimination. The government signed a redress agreement providing a small amount of money compensation. No other group has received an official apology or redress from the Canadian government for their mistreatment, unjust internment and confiscation of possessions caused by the War Measures Act or various immigration policies.

Since 1984, the Chinese Canadian National Council has been seeking redress on behalf of the surviving head-tax payers and their families who have suffered from decades of discrimination as a result of these laws passed by the federal government. Over 4000 head-tax payers, widows or descendants have entrusted CCNC with representing them and seeking an apology and financial redress.

The Ukrainian Canadian Congress and the Ukrainian Canadian Civil Liberties Association have been petitioning the Canadian government for the past two decades for redress to the unjustified internment of Ukrainian-Canadians during the First World War and the loss of their freedoms and confiscation of valuables and properties.

In 1991, the House of Commons unanimously approved a motion that finally acknowledged the internment of Ukrainian-Canadians between 1914 and 1920 were unwarranted, unjust and contrary to the principles now adopted and reflected in The Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The UCC and UCCLA continue to fight for redress.

On February 23, 2005, the 2005 federal budget, and in the budget the Canadian government set aside \$25 million over the next 3 years for commemorative and educational initiatives meant to highlight the painful aspects of Canada's history.

I have spoken to the executive director of the Ukrainian Canadian Congress who says that the Ukrainian community is not seeking monetary redress or an apology. What they are seeking are plaques and interpretive points as well as historical research on human rights abuses so that the Canadian public will be educated about the events in the past regarding, basically, racist acts against various ethnic groups and immigrants in Canada.

We hope the money that has been set aside in the budget—well, first of all, we hope the budget will be passed by Parliament. If the budget is not passed, we hope that a future government will honour the commitment made in this budget to various groups in Canadian society and that, in fact, the commemorative plaques and the historical research will be done, that Canadian society will acknowledge these wrongful acts of our past, and that this will remind us that we should never do this again in the future, that it will make us more conscious, as a society, of human rights and, indeed, of human rights abuses.

We know that some of that will be addressed by the Human Rights Museum in Winnipeg so that people in Winnipeg and across Canada will be educated about human rights and the abuse of human rights in the past by Canadian society and by other societies in the world. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Leonard Derkach (Russell): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to rise and put a few comments on the record with respect to this resolution.

First of all, let me extend my sincere thanks to the member from Burrows for allowing me to second this resolution because I believe that this, once again, is a demonstration of how we in this Legislature can work in partnership, if you like, to at least move on resolutions that make sense to all of us in this Legislature, but more importantly, affect in a positive way Manitobans and Canadians.

This resolution speaks very specifically to the wartime measures that were taken against certain groups in our society, and that was wrong in those days. We recognize that today, but unfortunately governments throughout time, as stubborn as governments can be, have not addressed this. Of course, I do not care which party it is has a majority in government, it is more difficult to appeal to that government than it is when government sometimes has a minority in power. I would have to say that probably the Canadian government right now is in a position where the will of the people, perhaps, can be done much more easily than it is if the government has a majority.

* (11:20)

So I think it is as a result of that we now have a recognition by the federal government that, indeed, some wrongs were committed against people in our country and that those wrongs should be corrected. It is for that reason we have the federal government putting in \$25 million over the course of the next three years in their budget to address those wrongs. I do not think \$25 million is ever going to do the repair that should be done, Mr. Speaker, to these groups in our society, to us as Canadians.

If you look around this Legislature, you will find we come from a variety of backgrounds. A variety of our ancestral roots go back to many parts of the world. Our ancestors came to this land looking for freedom, looking for justice, looking for a better life for them and their children, and it is regrettable that a

government at that time looked with suspicion at these people even though they had cleared the hurdles of immigration to this land. Just because we were at war with some nation and perhaps that nation was not directly at war with us but was in fact impacted by the war because of its geographical location or because of the political circumstances in that country at that time, the innocent people then bore the responsibility for decisions that were made beyond their control, away from their present location, away from their present land. To that extent these people suffered in this country we called a country of freedom and a country where people could exercise their freedom, supposedly, Mr. Speaker.

I do not recall any of these of course. Many of us, or all of us in this Chamber, were probably too young to recall those circumstances, but I think we have heard about those from our parents, from our grandparents, from our great-grandparents. We heard how unjust the treatment was that these people received, and to try to correct some of that is a fairly large task, but whether we like it or not, it has to be done.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

Finally, we have a recognition given to it by the federal government that we are going to try to at least acknowledge that the government indeed made an error in the War Measures Act, that government made an error when it implemented the immigration measures that were implemented in 1914 and that, in fact, government now has a responsibility to apologize to those cultural groups, to those ethnic groups, for the wrongs that were committed and, more specifically, to the families of those people who suffered as a result of misguided federal and government direction.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a known fact that whenever a country goes to war, that country goes to war on the basis of information that is provided, the intelligence the government has. That results in decisions being made by the government, but someone in those days made a very terrible error in judgement when they decided to implement the immigration measures act and to intern groups of people just because they had come from a particular land without doing any checks as to whether or not these people had any connection to what was going on in the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we saw a little bit of that just recently when the war on Iraq was proclaimed, and there was suspicion of innocent people who are living in our land today that perhaps they had some connection to al-Qaeda or to some terrorist groups because they happened to come from that part of the world. Today we should learn from mistakes that were made in the past, and we should not judge entire groups of people just because they come from a particular part of the world. We should look more at our laws as they pertain to immigration to make sure security checks are all in place for those people coming in. Once they have been cleared and presumably the homework had been done, these people then do not have to live under a cloud of suspicion just because they happen to come from that particular part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have moved some way to modernize our approach to that, but every time you get into a war situation, it causes people harm. All I have to do is point to the border just south of us and look at even the measures that have been taken with respect to protecting, if you like, in the name of protection of our border. Canada and the United States are, you know, we are similar people. We used to go back and forth fairly easily, but today that situation has changed. All of it has changed because of 9/11 and because of the war on Iraq, and because we are perceived as Canadians to be somewhat lax in the way that we allow immigrants into our country.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that we need to keep our doors open to people who, of course, if they have criminal records, if suspicion is warranted to keep them out of the country, we should keep them out of the country, but if they are innocent people who are trying to find a better life for themselves and their records and their criminal checks clear them, then I think that we need to maintain an open-door policy to people like that. We should always be mindful of what happened in 1914 and beyond, and the war measures and the immigration measures that were pronounced in those days. We should use that as a lesson of the wrong things that were done and the things that need to be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of money is it going to take to fix the situation? It is not just money. I do not think families are looking for money alone. I think they are looking for recognition that this was a wrong perpetrated on their families, on their ethnic

groups. They are looking for someone to acknowledge the fact that this was wrong. I think a public pronouncement indicating that it was wrong by the government to do that and the government apologizes to the people and, in a symbolic way, governments can do something to recognize that this was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing that with the museum to a certain degree. We are recognizing that, indeed, this was a wrong to humanity, but I think the museum has to be opened up so that it embraces more than just the people that it is embracing at this time so that it becomes broader and it becomes truly a museum to humanity.

I think if we look at all Canadians and all Manitobans who were impacted by the immigration measures act, the War Measures Act, we can, indeed, open up our arms and embrace in a symbolic way that wrongs were committed, that we have now learned from those wrongs, and we are prepared to stand and not only make an apology to all of those people, but to ensure that those wrongs are corrected by ensuring that other generations that come behind us can learn from the wrongs that were committed and that we never, ever commit those same types of atrocities and wrongs again, whether they were done here or elsewhere. They were done in this world. They were done to people who inhabit this world. They were done to our brothers and sisters, and that should never happen.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I heard the member from Flin Flon speak about the issue of war and him as an individual living through the horrific incidents that occurred while he was a young person during the war. His experiences are direct. His experiences are real. His experiences are alive. Those are the types of experiences we should always be reminded of when we have a temptation to go to war.

Yes, every nation has a responsibility to protect itself. It has a responsibility to ensure that its armies and its machinery, the war machinery, are capable of protecting them. But we should never be the aggressor. We should never take that first hit or that first shot or that first attack, because that is wrong. Neither should we look at members within our society as suspected peoples because we are all equal in this country. We all have a right to be here. We all need to treat each other with extreme respect. That

will go a long way to ensuring that the right things are done, not only in this province, but in this land.

* (11:30)

I am completely supportive of the BE IT RESOLVED portions of the resolution, whereas we as a Legislature should commend the federal government for allocating even this amount of money over the next three years for commemorative and educational initiatives. To me, it is the educational initiatives that are the most important here, Mr. Speaker, to highlight and to ensure that these painful experiences in Canada's history are never repeated again.

I am also supportive of the BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we urge the federal government to continue its negotiations with affected communities and families to resolve their individual grievances and enable these communities to properly commemorate those tragic events, and to ensure they will be understood and remembered by all Canadians.

I think here in Manitoba a very significant step is being taken in that regard with the museum, Mr. Speaker, but I do believe that we must go, and continue to go further, as time goes on.

So with those comments, Mr. Speaker, I endorse this resolution, and certainly commend it, not only to this Legislature, but to all Manitobans, with the hope that this is truly a learning experience in a positive way that has been put forward by the member from Burrows.

Hon. Steve Ashton (Minister of Water Stewardship): Today, I think it is fair to say that in Canada we see ourselves as a model for the world, a model of diversity, a model of tolerance. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, dare I say that there is a great deal of truth in the fact that we as Canadians can truly say that "we are the world," and that we can build a country and a society built on that tremendous diversity.

Mr. Speaker, as much as we see ourselves that way, and many people across the world see ourselves that way, the historical reality of our country is that we have a significant history of racism. We have a significant history of oppression. Indeed, as we debate this resolution today, nowhere is that more evident than our treatment historically of immigration, and our treatment of various ethno-cultural groups at times of war.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I often say that we tend to forget in this country that it was only just a few decades ago that First Nations people were able to vote for the first time in this country, in 1960 in Canada, in the 1950s provincially. It was not until 1948 that South Asians were able to vote in British Columbia.

If you look back at the evolution of our society and of our country, you will see that, at one time, British Columbia in particular had more than a hundred statutes on the record that discriminated against South Asians, discriminated against Chinese-Canadians, everything from holding office, to purchasing property, some of the most basic, fundamental civil rights that we would take for granted. So we have a clear record, indeed, Mr. Speaker, of racism in terms of statute and domestic policy.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere is the racist history of our country more evident than in terms of immigration. I commend the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) and the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) for identifying some of the very specific elements of that. But I want to remind people of the Chinese head tax, the terrible treatment of Chinese workers, the denial of the ability of Chinese workers to be able to bring their families to Canada and, in effect, a system that was not that much different from slavery.

I remind members of the Legislature of the straight passage law, which I know the Member for Burrows referenced. So determined was the government of the day to prevent South Asian immigration that what they did is they sat down and they recognized that many South Asians, particularly those resident in India, were actually British subjects. They were entitled to come to Canada because at that time Canadian citizenship was essentially British citizenship, something that continued really until the 1970s in this country.

So what they did is they came up with a law that said you had to come directly via Britain. You could not come in from India. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, many Indo-Canadians, many Sikh-Canadians, today will remind us of that terrible time when that was the law. These were laws that were not just done by elements of the bureaucracy. This was at the highest level. In fact, Mackenzie King drafted many of these laws, and you will find many references to the kind of attitudes about immigration throughout his memoirs.

It continued into the 1930s. Canada, at the time of the oppression of Jews in Europe, was the worst country in the Western world in terms of admission of Jewish refugees. In fact, we specifically turned away shiploads of Jewish refugees. This is Canada. This is Canadian history that we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I could run through our immigration policies that discriminated against people from particular countries, particular religions and particular ethnic groups, and it really was not until about 30 years ago that Canada adopted a non-discriminatory policy in terms of immigration, although I still think at times to our resourcing of immigration services that there are still elements of that type of discrimination. It is important for us to recognize that history.

As the resolution also points out, at times of war, we must admit again that Canada had a very racist attitude towards people that were deemed enemy sympathizers. In the First World War, the internment of anybody that was of an ethnocultural background that was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, many Ukrainians, Poles and others, the internment of German-Canadians. In the First World War, this country basically took a blanket approach and treated virtually any and everyone that it deemed as being a potential threat, as being a target for internment. The Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) outlined that. It is still a hurt that is felt in the Ukrainian community in this province and across Canada, a hurt that still has a great resonance with Ukrainian-Canadians and many other ethnocultural communities that were impacted.

Mr. Speaker, we continued that in the Second World War when we saw the internment of German-Canadians, and most infamously, of Japanese-Canadians. The horrific treatment of Japanese-Canadians is still a blot on the history of this country. The internment, the confiscation of property, the incredible racism of taking Canadians, simply because of their ethnocultural background, and assuming they were somehow less supportive of this great country. I say that because this is the history, and this is indeed the history.

I point out with some pride that the party which I represent has a proud history of opposing this kind of racism. When I speak today, and I certainly appreciate what I hope will be all-party support, I do so with an element that goes beyond just recognizing this resolution.

The CCF in particular fought against racism. In fact, in the 1930s in British Columbia, the Liberals who ran against the CCF, the forerunner of the NDP, had banner headlines in newspaper advertisements that said a vote for the CCF is a vote for South Asians. I daresay, I found it quite ironic because the CCF paid the price when Ujjal Dosanjh became Premier of British Columbia. Until 1948, Ujjal Dosanjh could not have voted in British Columbia. Such was the degree of racism in our society. We took a stand at that time. We took a stand against the internment of Japanese-Canadians, again, something that was not popular.

* (11:40)

Mr. Speaker, during the War Measures Act, again, in this particular case, many people were rounded up simply through association, assumed threat. Again, it was the NDP that stood clearly in terms of the protection of minority rights. I am very pleased today that again we see here, the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), who I know is passionately committed to human rights, passionately committed to the fight against discrimination and racism in our society, as are so many other Members of the Legislature, I want to commend him for moving this resolution.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why would I dwell on the history of this country? Why would I dwell on that? Well, I dwell on it because I would argue that we have moved significantly in removing discrimination in statute. We have adopted human rights legislation in this province to have broad protection against discrimination.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, and I will be the first to put this on the record that yesterday, the House of Commons took a very significant vote in terms of marriage, which I believe is very much a part of this evolution in this country of moving towards statutes that do not discriminate against anyone, and in this particular case, on the grounds of sexual orientation. I want to stress that as we have progressed significantly legally, as this country, by the way, has become the leader not just in terms of domestically but through, John Humphrey, for example, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, at the international level on so many human rights issues, it is important to recognize that we still deal with racism in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I note the Member for Russell (Mr. Derkach) referenced the Human Rights Museum. I have had the opportunity to talk to a number of people who have been involved with that, most recently, Gail Asper. I want to put on the record that I do believe that the Human Rights Museum has obtained very broad support from many communities and is worthy of federal and provincial and city and citizen support because, you know, we have to continuously learn the lessons of the history of this country, but also of the world, and that is that when we allow ethnocultural background, when we allow religious affiliation, when we allow political affiliation, when we allow any characteristic, sexual orientation, any characteristic could be the basis for discrimination, what we allow is for us to have history repeat itself.

You know, as I stand here today and as we are so aware this last few days of history, particularly with the end of the war in Europe, V-E Day, the liberation of much of Europe and the compelling stories, again, that remind us of the Holocaust and how many victims there were this terrible period in history, I am always cognizant of the fact that there are some in every society, including this society, that will attempt to use racism or discrimination on any grounds to further their political or economic or personal agendas. That is why it is so important that we support this type of action, as is outlined in the resolution.

Some people say you cannot change history. Well, that is true. You cannot change history, but you can learn from it. When you acknowledge, as many organizations and many ethnocultural communities have urged, that there was significant wrongdoing in the past, it is not just a question of redress. It is not just a question of compensation. It is a question of making a clear identification that indeed, what happened was wrong, and that we have learned.

I want to add, Mr. Speaker, although this is not part of the resolution, I consider it a national disgrace that so many of the survivors of residential schools, so many First Nations people, still have not received compensation. When I attended the funeral of an elder, a war veteran, a survivor of residential schools who died, I see so many elders who are passing away year after year after year without receiving that kind of compensation, there is a role for us to adopt, a

view that says, if we are going to, if not change history, at least learn from history, we have to have that recognition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saying that I am proud of this country in the sense that I think we have truly made an effort to learn from our racist history and move to being a non-racist society. I see dramatic differences just in the last 10 and 20 and 30 years, but I see that we have more work to do. There are still victims of racism, still victims of discrimination in our society, and it is important for us always to remember the importance of never allowing the political whims of the day, the political whims of the majority to oppress any minority and always put forward the vision that Canada truly can be a model for the world.

I believe we are well on that way, Mr. Speaker. We have more work to do, but so long as we remember our history and learn from our history, we will be a model for the world. Thank you.

Mr. Ralph Eichler (Lakeside): I just want to rise to put a few words on the record regarding this resolution brought forward by the member from Burrows and the member from Russell.

I want to go back in history a little bit and to our family. We come from German descent and my wife's family come from Poland, which went to the Ukraine and migrated through there. I know the hardship that was brought forward by my wife's family, in particular, hiding in cellars and hiding underneath the floors of the homes which they retreated from. When they came, they had just the clothes on their backs. My wife's father's dad was a tailor and lost his mother at a young age. He was only eight years old, and that was quite common back in those days. I know they had the hardships and the tough times of raising a family as a single parent and not by choice. I know that today, in this day and age, a lot of single families are there by choice as single parents. But I know the hardship that they went through. I know that when they migrated here to Manitoba, they settled in Pine Ridge and shuffled clothes back and forth from the city that needed alterations or needed to be remade.

Also, the member from Burrows gave me a lesson about two weeks ago about how things as opposition do not always get moved forward, but I want him to know I am supporting his resolution as

opposition, that things do change. I know I brought a resolution last year that carried in this House regarding retaining youth in rural Manitoba.

So I thank the member from Burrows and the member from Russell for bringing it forward. I think it is time that we address the issue, time and time again, and let our children learn from the hardship that has been out there, from our fathers and grandfathers. I think that, especially in this Year of the Veteran, it is important to recognize the fact that there is so much hardship, there is so much out there.

I know the member from Thompson talked about being proud about his party on that side of the House and racism. I want to correct the member from Thompson that we are all proud, not necessarily whether we are any particular stripe, whether Conservatives or NDPs or Liberals. That is shameful that the member had to bring it forward as his own party is the only one that wants to address this issue because it does have an important factor for all Canadians and all people.

I know that the member from Thompson was also talking about the Human Rights Museum, along with the member from Russell. I, too, am a proponent of that museum, making sure that it does move forward. I am glad to see that there is history that is being repeated here in a way that we can learn from our mistakes and learn from our initiatives that we have to deal with each and every day.

I know war is a time that we do not like to have to talk about, but if we can remember some of the things that we have done, some of the mistakes that we have done and pass them on to our children so that those mistakes are not repeated again in the history of the country. We need to remember the fact that racism is not about colour. It is not about the way we walk or the way we talk or the way we believe, but the idea of the fact that we have to make sure that our children are able to make sure that this does not happen again.

* (11:50)

I know that we need to stand up. I am one that believes in fighting for words, not with retaliation or with litigation. Mr. Speaker, I know the fact that that is the best way, and when we get into those other modes of battle, I think it just goes on to hurt us as individuals. Members of this House have to be cognizant of the fact that it is important for us each

to remember that we are human beings by treating each other with that dignity and that respect.

Having said those few things, I know there are lots of other members, at least on this side of the House, that want to get a few things on the record, so I will leave it at that. I do want to just end my comments with the member from Burrows and the member from Russell, regarding the Manitoba Legislature to continue to urge the government and to continue negotiations with the affected communities to resolve grievances and properly commemorate these events in history so that they are remembered and understood by all Canadians. I know that in my area of Lakeside, we have a large number of people that live there from the Ukrainian descent. I am valued by the fact that I am able to serve those people and remember them for what they have had to go through and endure in order to become a great part of this area, the people of the province of Manitoba and, indeed, the country of Canada.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Arthur-Virden): I too would like to put some words of record in the House today in regard to the motion that we are speaking to, the redress of Canadian wartime and immigration measures, brought forward jointly by the member from Burrows and the member from Russell. I think the House is to be commended for the joint resolution that is brought forward in this regard, and I would hope that the House would, as well, accept this kind of motion unanimously.

I only have a few words to put on the record in this and a few personal notes as well. I want to say that there were many atrocities done, or have been, throughout wartime measures acts and those sorts of things that have taken place during wars. Sometimes we overreact to certain circumstances and situations, but the people who are making those decisions at that time make them in the wisdom that they are making a decision that is needed at that particular moment. One of the things that we can learn from history, however, is that such atrocities, if they have occurred in those particular times under those duress situations, there is no fault in going back later and acknowledging the shortcomings of those decisions.

The member from Burrows has indicated the concentration camps here in Manitoba and across the country during those times when Ukrainians, Italians, Germans, it goes on later to the Japanese internments of the Second World War and a number

of those areas, First World War as well, and I wanted to just say a few things in regard to a particular circumstance that I came across in 1970. I had the opportunity after college of spending a winter in British Columbia working in the community of Kamloops. I became very close friends with a family there by the name of Sakaki, a Japanese family that had been interned, whose father had been interned during the war and forced to move inland. He took up his family and moved into the Kelowna region.

I want to bring this up particularly because it would have been very easy for this family to hold a grudge, and I am assured that they had second guessings about the means that they were being moved or the reasons that they were being moved, because in speaking to them a few times about this, their circumstance was that they felt they had done nothing wrong. They were victims of a war that they had nothing to do with. But they picked up the band, if you will, and made the very best of it.

When I was in British Columbia, it was Mr. Sakaki's son Norio who hired me to work for him during that particular winter, and I want to say that, if he had not, if his family had not picked up the challenge and moved forward and made the best of a poor situation, they would never have been in the situation that they were in to hire me in the first place. I just want to say that Mr. Sakaki was a kind of a bustling individual. He was a man of few words from the short time that I knew him, but he certainly must have taught his family well, because all of them, all of the sons that he had and the one daughter that I met that worked with the North Kamloops Motors at that time in North Kamloops on the way out to the airport, ran a very entrepreneurial-style business. They ran a Toyota dealership in North Kamloops Motors. They ran a front-end shop with gas distribution. They ran some 12 bays of service for automobiles as well as a body shop. They sold boats and motors. They had motorcycle sales. They were a family of entrepreneurs.

I wanted to just put on the record how much I appreciated working with that family and how much I appreciated the opportunity to be in their homes at holiday times such as Christmas and Easter and, even though these were more or less North American customs in some circumstances, I enjoyed the opportunity to share their cultural opportunities as well.

That is something that, even though I was only working there for a short time, started in November of '70 and left to come back to the farm in the spring of '71 in April, I gained a great deal of respect for those individuals and the energy and enthusiasm that they had and the entrepreneurship that they had in regard to their family or my own personal circumstances, how much they cared for what we were doing as employees for them and also how much they cared for each other and their family.

It was also to be noted that they made a huge contribution to their community as well. You have to keep in mind that this was only some 25 years after the end of the Second World War, Mr. Speaker. I have always felt that this was a great experience for me but an experience where they certainly took up the challenge and made the very best of a bad situation.

I would also just like to say that, if it were not for the opportunities to have other cultures come into Canada that we have seen, I have had personal circumstances where we have accepted people into our family from other areas of the world, in particular a niece who left Vietnam under forced circumstances when she was only one, I believe, no more than two, Mr. Speaker, and she married my nephew a few years ago, and it has been an absolutely wonderful opportunity for us to get to know her and her family, her mom and dad on a more personal basis.

We have also, Mr. Speaker, had the opportunity recently of befriending a young nurse who has come to Canada from Korea and, after immigration with her landed immigrant status, now I have had the opportunity of meeting her daughter who has come to Canada as well as her mom and dad. I recently had dinner with them in the city of Winnipeg here just a few short weeks ago. I would like to welcome Hee Jin and Minji to Canada as well as her parents and look forward to perhaps some day seeing them as immigrants in this country as well.

So, with those few words, I will close on this. Suffice to say that I certainly support the motion that has been put forward for us in this House, Mr. Speaker, on this particular bill and hope that the Manitoba Legislature accepts this unanimously.

* (12:00)

Point of Order

Mr. Speaker: The honourable Minister of Water Stewardship, on a point of order.

Mr. Ashton: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Given the time, I am wondering if there might be leave not to see the clock and not to have a quorum call to allow a number of members who wish to speak on this resolution to speak on it and then allow the House to vote on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the will of the House? Is there leave to not see the clock and also to not have a quorum call? [*Agreed*]

* * *

Ms. Marilyn Brick (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, our great country, this beautiful land we call Canada, is a land full of the most amazing sights. When I think of Canada, I visualize a lighthouse on the shores of Prince Edward Island, the Rocky Mountains in Alberta, the cities of Victoria in British Columbia and Winnipeg, Manitoba. But when I think of these, I also think of what an immigrant would have seen and experienced if they had come here 100 or 120 years ago. This country is a beautiful country. It is a country full of beautiful people. We very much value our freedom.

Here in the Manitoba Legislature, we were honoured to be visited by the vets on Tuesday, May 3. Those vets fought in World War II, in World War I, some of them in the Korean War. My grandfather William Carter was a vet of the First World War. He talked to me often of the freedom that we have gained here in Canada. He also talked to me about the horrors of war. There are many people who have celebrated our freedom and make us remember how much freedom matters to us.

I want to thank the Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale) for bringing this resolution forward. I think about Martin Luther King, who often talked about "I have a dream." I have a dream of one world where we all live together.

Every year on March 21, we celebrate the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Canada was one of the first countries to support the UN declaration to celebrate March 21 as the International Day for the Elimination of Racial

Discrimination. Celebrations happen here in Canada and they involve many youth.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things that Canada has done that it should not be proud of. Some of those things involve people of Asian descent. St. Norbert has a high population of people of Asian descent. Between 1881 and 1884, 17 000 Chinese came to Canada. I think there are many things here that we should not be proud of. I am very happy to see that the member from Burrows has brought forward this resolution to seek redress for some of these individuals.

We need to be proud of our country, Canada. We need to be proud of Manitoba. We need to continue to ensure that freedom, equality and respect are present for all people in our province and in our country. Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I do want to put a few words on the record in regard to this resolution, a positive resolution, a resolution we can very clearly indicate that we are prepared to support and ultimately ensure that it gets unanimous support from this Chamber.

There are some issues that, at times upon reflection, people have to wonder why they happen. I was really touched by a movie known as *Mississippi Burning*, which was produced a number of years back. When I watched the show, and I have had the opportunity in the last few years to watch it again, there is a certain amount of anger that builds up. The anger is towards not understanding how it is that people can behave in such a fashion, that they feel they are better than another race. You know, when I see shows of that nature, it is actually quite angering and upsetting, but I find that I do learn from it. I look, in terms of those world icons, if I can use it that way, the member from St. Norbert made reference to Martin Luther King, and you get them at different levels. You have those positive images such as that one, the impact that Gandhi had on the world, the impact of Malcolm X and, ultimately, some would say, someone like John F. Kennedy, that there are individuals who have had a very significant impact on the whole issue of human rights. It is interesting, and I think that all members of this Chamber are quite pleased with the efforts of the Asper family, in particular, in terms of trying to get the Canadian Human Rights Museum located here in the province of Manitoba. I do not think we will find a dissenting

voice inside this Chamber, possibly even in our province.

You know, it was interesting, I was at a statue unveiling where, I believe, it might have been one of the first really significant art pieces donated, and it was a statue of Gandhi. I think it bodes well in terms of if we can get behind this project in a very substantive fashion, that we can make, through Winnipeg, through this human rights museum, a very strong positive message to the world.

Yesterday, as we were all watching the celebrations so that we do not forget what our vets did for us, I was watching the news late last night, and it was a descendant from the Japanese community that ultimately was the architect who put together the national war museum, and there is a little bit of irony because we are all familiar with what happened to the Japanese community. As it is pointed out in this resolution, the Italians, Ukrainians, Germans, the Japanese, the Sikh community, all of these communities have suffered with discrimination that is really hard and difficult for us to understand why it took place, and one can only attempt to try to put yourself in the position back then, and still it is difficult to accept that it took place. So when we see a resolution, when we see a government that is taking proactive approaches at trying to address these issues, I see it as a positive thing, and that is why we do not have a problem.

Having said that, there is room for us to reflect. You know, we talk about issues as if they are far in the past, Mr. Speaker. There are issues that we have that are not as far. You know, I can recall, for example, shortly after getting first elected back in 1988, I would go to visit the Sikh temple out on Mollard, and I had individuals who had told me about how the government, just prior to '88, had protested being in attendance at the Sikh temple because of the terrorism threats of the Air India and so forth in a letter that they had received from the national government. That had a very real impact on the community. It stayed with them. I can honestly say that it was definitely within the last couple of years, I was in a home from someone of a Sikh faith, and they had raised that particular issue.

These are issues that still occur today to a certain degree, and there are those that have occurred many years ago, and I think that it behooves us as legislators to do and play a positive role in addressing these issues in a fashion in which justice is ultimately served, and, as I say, I am pleased to see the resolution does acknowledge the efforts of the federal government in trying to address those issues, and we trust and hope that we will not only look to Ottawa to do some of the redressing, but there might even be some things that we should be focusing in on in the province of Manitoba. I did want to add, listening to the member from Thompson's comments about our Aboriginal people, and it is something that we cannot lose sight of.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to see it pass.

Mr. Speaker: Any other speakers?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

An Honourable Member: Question.

Mr. Speaker: The question before the House is the resolution moved by the honourable Member for Burrows (Mr. Martindale), Redress of Canadian Wartime and Immigration Measures. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the resolution?

Resolution agreed to.

Point of Order

Mr. Martindale: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could indicate that this resolution was passed unanimously.

Mr. Speaker: Is there House agreement that the bill has been passed unanimously? [*Agreed*]

* * *

Mr. Speaker: The hour being past twelve noon we will now recess and reconvene at 1:30 p.m.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, May 5, 2005

CONTENTS

ORDERS OF THE DAY		Bill 207–The Medical Amendment Act	
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Eichler	2399
Debate on Second Readings–Public Bills		Resolutions–Committee Selection	
Bill 201–The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act		Res. 4–Redress of Canadian Wartime and Immigration Measures	
Swan	2391	Martindale	2401
		Derkach	2405
Bill 203–The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Amendment Act		Ashton	2407
Maloway	2392	Eichler	2409
Reimer	2395	Maguire	2410
Faurschou	2396	Brick	2412
		Lamoureux	2412