

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
Friday, 11 April 1980

Time: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell).

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Peter J. Reimer and others, praying for the passing of An Act to Incorporate The Bethesda Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that he will be attending in Ottawa with officials from the city of Winnipeg to make further representations, have further discussions pertaining to rail line relocation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my office has been in communication with the Mayor's office, whom I believe is still away until next week. When he returns, I will be discussing this matter with him. A tentative date, I believe, has been established for a meeting with Mr. Pepin to discuss the status of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass and rail relocation. Provided that date is confirmed, I expect to be involved in the discussions with the federal Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister. In view of the city's present review caused by the concern pertaining to the spill a couple of weeks ago at the tracks, can the Minister advise whether or not the provincial government is presently reviewing its earlier position pertaining to the relocation of the rail line?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the administration of the city have completed, or almost completed an analysis of the most recent study done by the federal government on rail relocation, and I expect to receive that next week. I would like an opportunity to review that with the Mayor of the city and discuss that with him and determine, in fact, whether there is any change in the city of Winnipeg's position, Mr. Speaker.

But again, I must say that the federal government must take a position with respect to this matter, because there are still some obvious difficulties in proceeding with rail relocation or relocation of the yards. There must, Mr. Speaker, be a commitment from the federal government, if they wish to see rail relocation, to exercise their authority that they have under The Rail Relocation Act to order relocation. They must, in my view, Mr. Speaker, give a commitment with respect to determination of the cost to the various parties involved. They must make a commitment, Mr. Speaker, with respect to financing relocation over and above the

urban transportation program, and despite all of that, Mr. Speaker, I think there is an obvious difficulty that seems to be overlooked by many people, and I would expect that the Leader of the Opposition would be aware of that.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone thinks that they can move a rail line into the northern part of the city without any objection from the residents of that area, the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Selkirk, will be aware of the concerns, I am sure, from people in his constituency. I know the Member for Seven Oaks will be aware of the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the Honourable Minister's answer will be short.

MR. MERCIER: I know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Seven Oaks will be aware of the concerns of the residents of his constituency, and the Member for Rossmere will be aware of the concerns of the residents of his constituency.

I'm just suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be an easy task to proceed with relocation. But apart from those concerns, from the residents of the northern area of the city, there must be specific commitments from the federal government in the areas I have referred to. As well, Mr. Speaker, if those commitments are not made, there must be an effort made to deal with a very serious transportation problem to the northern sector of this city.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Attorney-General. He indicates the federal government must take a position. A question specifically to the Attorney-General, what is the provincial government's position that it will be taking to Ottawa? Is the provincial government prepared to cost-share what the federal government does?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as the city and the province have indicated in the past, the federal government must first of all make a specific commitment, financial commitment, with respect to rail relocation, over and above the urban transportation program before the provincial government and the city government can even consider relocation because of the massive costs involved.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further question, but dealing with a separate matter. Can the Attorney-General announce today, then, the questions which he took as notice last week pertaining to an inquest in Brandon, pertaining to the tragic death of one of the patients?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot do that today. I again requested further information on that yesterday, and I expect early next week I will be able to provide a response to that question.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Environment. Can the Minister now respond to the questions which he accepted as notice pertaining to PCBs and the storage of same in the city of Winnipeg, questions which he accepted as notice back last March 26th, I believe it was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I don't recall the question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if my honourable friend could just remind me of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question is related to, (a) whether or not his department had been monitoring, whether they were presently monitoring the situation pertaining to the PCBs at the warehouse, and secondly, whether or not his Dr. Yee in his Department had in fact been aware of the existence of the PCBs in October of 1979, in fact the PCBs had not been removed until some months later at the initiative of the city.

MR. JORGENSEN: I'm still not sure what my honourable friend means about monitoring. The PCBs are contained in 45 gallon drums and they are covered with plastic and as long as nothing untoward happens they are relatively safe. But we are keeping a watch on the presence of PCBs there and we have had discussions with Mr. Werier, with the intent of getting him to remove them out. Insofar as the knowledge of the presence of the PCBs, yes, we knew on October 11th, when we were first advised that they were there. And the knowledge came about as a result of a routine examination that is being conducted by the Federal Environmental Branch to determine the extent to which PCBs are in this province. They have been conducting surveys to attempt to determine just approximately how much of the material is located within the province of Manitoba. We will be endeavouring to supplement that survey this summer in order to get a more precise figure on the amount that may be in the province. And it was as a result of that particular survey that they were located at the J. Werier & Company.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to the questions which were asked back last March 26th, could the Minister then further confirm that the PCBs were not removed until some time in this year at the initiative of the City of Winnipeg Health Department. And secondly, can the Minister advise and it relates back to the earlier pattern of questions whether or not his department is satisfied that there was absolutely no leakage of the PCBs between October and their final transfer to more secure storage?

MR. JORGENSEN: With respect to the last question, Mr. Speaker, yes. We are quite sure that there was no spill of the PCBs from that particular storage of the material at the J. Werier & Company. We do intend to try to remove them out of the province, but I think my honourable friend will know that they are not our property, they are the property of Mr. Werier, and I'm not too sure that he would be agreeable to the province paying for the removal of the PCBs to either a safer storage space or destruction of the PCBs. I think that is a responsibility that Mr. Werier himself must fulfill. My honourable friend is probably aware that the present act does not give us authority to instruct anyone as to what the disposition of that material should be. We can talk to them. We can attempt to encourage them to do so and it is for that reason that amendments to the existing act are going to be introduced during the coming Session.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we proceed I would like to ask the indulgence of the House to join with me in welcoming in our gallery this morning 35 students of Grade XII Standing, under the direction of Mr. Ralph Swenson from the Thompson High School. This high school is in the town of Thompson, North Dakota.  
The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, being the MLA for Thompson, I was just wondering for a moment whether a bunch of young people had come to town that I didn't know about.

I was asked two questions by the Member for Brandon East yesterday: Was it a fact that the employment growth in Manitoba was somewhat less than the national average? The answer is yes, and the answer would have been yes for the last 15 years; Manitoba has had a somewhat slower growth over the last 15 years in employment. It's been a slow steady growth over the last 15 years in employment than the national average.

The second question was, were we in fact the lowest in full-time employment growth in Canada? The answer is no. We ourselves and British Columbia, of all things were equal, Quebec and Prince Edward Island were somewhat less.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the Minister of Labour, I wonder if in view of the fact that the United Firefighters of Winnipeg, Local 867, have publicly declared their distress at the city of Winnipeg's

action in respect to The Fire Department's Arbitration Act and in breaching the intent of The Arbitration Act, has the Minister or his department scheduled any meetings with the firefighters and with the city of Winnipeg to clear this matter up to the satisfaction of both parties?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, we're arranging a meeting with the firefighters the early part of next week.

MR. FOX: Can the Minister indicate whether he is also prepared to look at The Fire Department's Arbitration Act, to see whether it cannot be clarified so that there would be less opportunity for either party to create unfair bargaining practices.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Kildonan knows that it was the firefighters themselves that lobbied for and were successful in getting The Fire Department's Arbitration Act implemented in legislation in the province in 1954. The firefighters were given the opportunity again in 1972 to go under The Labour Relations Act and chose not to. They felt The Arbitration Act was the way to go. Just as a point of interest, the firefighters nationally have had in their constitution up till about 1968, a provision saying that, "Thou shall not strike," that was in their own constitution, not in the contract. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that it is good politics for any individual or any party to rush out and offer change of legislation, because of an isolated, what appears to be a frustrated situation. I don't think that is good legislation.

What I have said to you, Mr. Speaker, is I am quite prepared, and am in fact arranging now for meetings with the firefighters. I will be meeting with them in the early part of next week; we have been in touch with them. We appreciate their concerns, but through you to the Member for Kildonan, I should tell him, and I think he is aware of it, the fact that they are now, today, even in the midst of arbitration cases and in fact, court cases, so I have no intention at this particular time of publicly involving myself. I certainly will privately talk to, to particularly the firefighters, who have raised a situation which they deem to be frustrating.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I am sure the Honourable Minister would concur that final arbitration has always meant that, and that in this instance the firefighters are fighting against their own money when the city goes to court. That is the reason I asked if the Minister contemplated having a look at the Fire Department's Arbitration Act in respect to revising it to make it final arbitration.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I took as notice a question from the Honourable Member for St. Vital, where he asked specifically the time when my department first became aware that some school buses owned by H&S Transport were in breach of the regulations. I can report at this time that my department was first aware of that in May of 1979.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education then advise when that first knowledge on the part of his department was conveyed to the Winnipeg School Division No. 1?

MR. COSENS: Very shortly after, Mr. Speaker, my Director of Student Transportation contacted the Winnipeg School Division and arranged with them to have the vehicles go through the Motor Vehicle Branch Inspector Station, in May of the same year.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, was the communication conveyed verbally or in writing; if in writing, would the Minister table the written communication?

MR. COSENS: It was conveyed verbally, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAM USKIW: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what his intention is with respect to those accounts on the BIAP Program that are deemed to be non-collectible by his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JIM DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that the accounts that are collectible by the province will be collected.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, my question is: What is the Minister proposing to do with respect to those who refuse to honour those accounts on the basis of a legal opinion?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, it would be handled under the normal process of any bill collection.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has suspended the selling off of MACC lands, or if not, what is the logic of advertising the number of these parcels for lease purposes?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not suspended the selling of MACC land and any lands that are not being sold or have not been bid on, for example, have to be caretaked and are being leased for this year's use.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the last question. Could the Minister explain the logic then of a three-year term that is advertised with respect to those lands, given the fact that his intention is to sell them in any event?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet is maybe not aware of the longstanding normal sort of a practice that has taken place in rural Manitoba with farmers who are desirous of leasing land, that it has been a normal practice for as many years as I can remember to enter into three-year leases so that the individual leasing the land has an opportunity to go on the land and in fact make some money over the period of three years. It is a standard that has been acceptable, and that is the type of program that I think is acceptable to the farmers of Manitoba.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think that I should ask the Minister whether he is not aware then that it has been not the practice to lease for a period beyond one year where lands were subject to offer for sale on the part of the Crown. The policy, as I recall it over a period of years, has been that there were short-term leases covering those parcels that the department had some intention of disposing of.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that the honourable member is encroaching on debate rather than seeking information.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I took as notice a question some time ago from the Member for Rossmere with respect to a number of children who were apparently not in school in Winnipeg School Division No. 1. Mr. Speaker, the simple answer to the question is that under The School Attendance Act the trustees of every school district are required to appoint one or more persons to act as school attendance officers for the enforcement of this Act. My department assists school

attendance officers to enforce the Act by prosecuting parents or guardians who neglect or refuse to cause their children to attend school regularly. I can advise the member that, for example, last week there was a prosecution of a parent in the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, who was convicted and received a suspended sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Attorney-General and further to that answer, I am just wondering whether he can inform the House as to whether that type of activity by his department is in fact lessening the number of people who are on the streets and not in school; and secondly, whether he can inform the House as to precisely what it is that the Department of Education or his department or any branch of this government has done to improve the situation, as he had indicated previously that the situation was being improved?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I can't really answer the first part of that question. Again my department, their involvement is to prosecute offences brought forward by school attendance officers of the various school divisions. I believe, with respect to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, there were what were considered to be some improvements in the legislation that was tabled in the Legislature at the last session of the Legislature, which I believe the Minister for Education will be bringing forward at this session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the Attorney-General, could he then indicate, with this improved legislation, whether in fact there are fewer children on the streets as a result of that legislation?

One other question to the Attorney-General, and this is further to a question raised yesterday by the Member for Ste. Rose, dealing with alleged cattle rustling in the Dauphin area. Could he advise as to whether there was any report or recommendation received from the RCMP with respect to prosecution on that case, prior to the civil matter going to trial?

Also, could he advise as to whether the RCMP are currently investigating that matter, and further, as to whether a transcript of the civil case has been received or ordered by his department and by the RCMP?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on that question, the Member for Ste. Rose has, I believe, discussed that matter with my Deputy Minister, and as I've indicated to him, that matter is being reviewed. When I receive the report, I will attempt, not only to answer his questions, but the questions raised by the Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have answers to some questions that I took as notice from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface with regard to the inmate population at Headingley Jail. I would like to advise you, Mr. Speaker, that the average daily population at the Headingley Jail for the month of March, 1980, was 375. The average population for the same month in 1979 was 364.5, the same population for 1978 was 335.1, and the same population for 1977 was 353.6. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the winter months and the early spring months, the population always peaks at Headingley and in most of our institutions, and in fact during the past 24 months, five of those months the population was exceeding 375.

The other question that the honourable member raised was with regard to the number of program staff that were now presently employed at the institution. In 1980, the program staff complement is 28 SMYs. In 1978-79, the program staff complement was 30 SMYs. I might explain, Mr. Speaker, that the use of the Vaughan Street Community Release Centre has been changed in the past couple of years, where we do not have the day-pass inmates staying overnight; and as a result of the change in the centre, we have been able to transfer back staff to Headingley,

and during that transfer back, they were reclassified and that is the reason for the difference between the 30 and 28. The actual total complement of staff for Headingley in 1978-79 was 192.5, whereas in 1980-81 it's 196.5.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: I would like to thank the Minister. I wonder if he could complete the answer. He gave us the population for four years, and the program staff only for two years, 28 and 30. Would he have, also, 1978 and 1977 program staff?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I don't have those exact numbers with me, but I will get them for the honourable member. I believe they are in our annual report that was tabled recently by the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Does the Minister of Education have available statistics and analysis in Winnipeg as to what schools in the public system have sufficient populations as to be able to offer different languages than French as a second language of instruction, such as either Ukrainian, Hebrew, German, Polish, or any other language?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to get that information for the member.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable member for responding that he will get the information. I would be appreciative of knowing as to whether the information has been compiled by his department and is presently in his department's possession. I'm not talking about his immediate possession, but in the department's possession. Does the department have that?

MR. COSENS: I would expect that they do have that information, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to whoever is replying for the Minister of Health. In view of a study on the quality of milk in pouches that has been conducted by a researcher at the University of Guelph, would the member please tell the House how the department is following up this study, whether they are conducting a study of their own on the 20 percent of milk that is sold in transparent pouches, and the deterioration that occurs under fluorescent light, according to this researcher, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice on behalf of the Minister of Health.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. In light of the fact that firefighters are often the front-line defence in accidents involving hazardous products as witnessed by the recent spill in the city and the chlorine gas accident in Churchill, and in light of the fact that a number of seminars involving firefighting techniques are currently being undertaken by his department in the province, is the Minister prepared to direct the instructors of those courses to include in that course, in every instance, instruction in the handling of hazardous products and goods?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: To date, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis has been more on identification and how to deal with what you have identified. I think what the member is suggesting is something that the courses are working into, the handling in fact of the chemicals, or the materials that they're dealing with.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to that course, has the Minister's department initiated any ongoing educational programs such as bulletins, pamphlets, or updated circulars in regard to hazardous product handling for small, particularly for small fire departments that don't have the resources of large departments, but also for large departments and small departments alike who may be called upon to deal with accidents involving hazardous products and goods.

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're getting into that exact field right now. I think if the Member for Churchill would go back in his mind to the estimates, those types of discussions took place between himself and myself during that time and that certainly is the direction that we're going.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final question to the Minister responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization. In respect specifically to the chlorine gas accident in Churchill, can the Minister confirm that the Emergency Measures Organization has been in contract with officials in that community, and can the Minister indicate if the Emergency Measures Organization is compiling a report or recommendations on ways to prevent injuries and incidents of this nature in the future, such as alarm systems that will warn of chlorine gas levels that are particularly high?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, yes, Emergency Measures is doing some of those things. But, Mr. Speaker, let me take the opportunity to say that, let's keep some sense of reality and proportion about these things. I can foresee the day that Emergency Measures will have to be involved every time a patron at a gasoline station overtops his tank and dribbles a bit of gasoline on the pavement, which is a dangerous situation if you're smoking and you're close to tanks. I plead with members of the House, and particularly the Member for Churchill, that he keep some perspective in this whole matter.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this side of the House has added a perspective to the problem that was lacking before. I would ask the Minister in this instance if he has intended, unintentionally so, and I will give him the opportunity to correct the record, if he has intended to downplay the incident that has occurred in Churchill as to either its significance or its seriousness?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no intention of downplaying any situation where hazard, or possible injury in this case, some injury and some inconvenience to a particular firefighter was involved. We have done what I believe was proper and appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Acting Minister of Health. In view of the fact that earlier this week, the Minister of Health, when finally admitting to the house that bed closures of the Health Sciences Centre were indeed being caused by an acute nursing shortage, when doing that, he indicated this was a shortage unique and confined to the Health Sciences Centre. In view of the Minister's earliest statements to the House, can the Acting Minister of Health confirm that there are bed closures at the Victoria

Hospital in the intensive care unit because of an acute nursing shortage at the Victoria Hospital as well?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and convey it to the Minister of Health.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, a supplementary question to the Minister. In view of the fact that when the bed closures first occurred at the Health Sciences Centre some three weeks ago, Peter Swerhone, the President of the Health Sciences Centre, said that other hospitals were affected as well, and that there would be a number of bed closures across Manitoba because of the acute nursing shortage; can the Minister indicate which other hospitals will be having to close beds, either now or in the near future, in order for people to plan their affairs with respect to elective surgery more properly?

MR. COSENS: I will take that question as notice also, Mr. Speaker, and convey it to the Minister of Health.

MR. PARASIUK: Would the Minister also then confirm that the acute nursing shortage, which is rapidly becoming an epidemic in Manitoba, has indeed been caused by a three-year policy of Conservative government cutbacks in health care spending, which has led to a number of nurses leaving Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that questions of confirmation do not seem to elicit any information. Would the member care to rephrase his question?

MR. PARASIUK: Could I rephrase the question? I'd like the Minister to indicate why we, in Manitoba, are having an acute nursing shortage, as provinces to the west of us, when we are having a drastic population decrease in Manitoba, unlike those provinces to the west of us which are experiencing a population increase, which are experiencing a strain on their hospitals, when conversely, we are not supposedly having that strain because so many people are leaving Manitoba, including nurses. Will the Minister look into that matter as well?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, knowing the Minister of Health, I am sure he is looking into it at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could give us a statement, report on Judge Gordon Hall's report as it pertains to the remuneration paid to the Manitoba elected officials?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I take it my honourable friend is asking if the government expects to do anything this session with respect to the recommendations of Mr. Justice Gordon Hall on indemnities affecting all of the elected officials in this House, Sir. And it does give me the opportunity to report to the Chamber, Sir, that it would be the intention of the government to bring forward the necessary legislation, appropriations, and other action that is required to implement the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hall's report during this session and to take the other action that is appropriate with respect to matters that do not have to come before the House in order to give implementation to those recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Education will probably be getting paid more, I better address a question to the Minister of Education. There's an organization at The Pas, Mr. Speaker, that provides pre-schooling for physically and mentally handicapped children, and I wonder if the Minister has a proposal from the Marigold Centre at The Pas, if they have sent a proposal to him about the Marigold Centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. COSENS: Not to this date, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would be giving consideration to assistance to the Marigold Centre at The Pas, because they are, once again, in a financial crisis in terms of funding.

MR. COSENS: I believe that falls under the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Minister of Community Services, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour, and ask him, as the Minister responsible for the Fire Commissioner's Office, whether he gave special dispensation to the Minister of Corrections to put a ladder up against the building as an acceptable measure?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to tell the member how to ask the question, but he has to tell me where the ladder was and where the building was and what town it was in.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to tell the Minister which end is up, but I would like to ask him whether he, in fact, received a request, and gave in writing, a formal agreement to the expedient measure taken by the Department of Corrections, by which they have put a wooden ladder against a building and called it an acceptable fire escape. --(Interjection)-- Well, the building was in Dauphin.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to which end is up. He should know that for wooden ladders, it doesn't always really matter, they are built the same. You have a 2 X 4 on each side, with small boards in the middle, and the ends are somewhat similar, and both ends could really be up. As to what to relate to what the situation is in Dauphin, that's a matter that's been dealt with between the Fire Commissioner's office and the department that they're dealing with. I haven't been personally involved in it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: I would ask the Minister then, if he could provide the House with a set of new regulations or equivalences so that we could see whether, for example, a ladder is acceptable as a fire exit, whether a rope hanging out of a window is acceptable to him and the Fire Commissioners, whether some umbrellas can be placed by the window and people can jump out of buildings, or whether a short leap is equivalent to a main floor exit? Because that's what the Minister is telling us. I want to know whether he is accepting that sort of idiotic measure as an acceptable form of fire escape. He may think it's funny, but I don't.

MR. MacMASTER: I wasn't trying to be funny with the Member for Elmwood, Mr. Speaker. I was just trying to explain to him, on a wooden ladder both ends are really the same. There are no new regulations in place in the province of Manitoba. I would like to believe that the Fire Commissioner's Office is one of the most responsible groups in the province of Manitoba and I think they are dealing with the problem adequately.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for question period having expired, we'll proceed with orders of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return of the following information:

- 1) The names, positions, remunerations, and dates of appointment of all individuals to Boards, Commissions, Councils, Committees, Crown Corporations, or Task Forces appointed or named by the Government, since October of 1977.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we will accept this order. I should advise the honourable member that the information she seeks is already available. If she would search the appropriate public records she could find it herself. However, we will undertake to compile and collate this information for her. I should merely point out to her, Mr. Speaker, that it will take some considerable time and some considerable expense to do this, however, but we are prepared to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I might first of all indicate that the Public Accounts . . . Oh, pardon me.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, pardon me. I forgot to . . . It is agreed then to accept the Order for Return. (Agreed) The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I might just first of all indicate Public Accounts Committee will meet again next Tuesday at 10:00, and if their business is not completed, on Thursday at 10:00 also.

Mr. Speaker, would you proceed with adjourned debates on second reading beginning with Bill No. 2, and proceed as they appear on the Order Paper.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

BILL NO. 2 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE OPERATION OF SECTION 23  
OF THE MANITOBA ACT IN REGARD TO STATUTES

MR. GREEN presented Bill No. 2 - An Act Respecting The Operation of Section 23 of the Manitoba Act in Regard to Statutes, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a simple bill which may have some very interesting consequences in terms of the interpretation of law. The bill before us provides, Mr. Speaker, as to how judges will interpret the law in light of the fact that the bills of the Legislature are now to be printed both in French and in English and, Mr. Speaker, that of itself would be a rather simple matter to legislate. As a matter of fact, it would not even require a separate bill and would more properly probably be dealt with as an amendment to The Interpretations Act.

But I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the government has brought out a separate bill with respect to this piece of legislation because the bill is far more significant in its presentation than is its contents. First with respect to the question of interpretation, Mr. Speaker, there is one interesting change which the Attorney-General would want to monitor. As far as I am aware there is no previous rule of interpretation which goes quite so far as to give the courts the opportunity to deal with the true spirit, intent, and meaning of the act as a whole, which is required in this bill. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it's going to result in judges being able to look at the Hansard debate, or in other ways than exist at present, trying to determine the true spirit and intent of the Legislature.

That being as it is, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to indicate that the First Minister in his speech and the Leader of the Opposition and my friend, the Member for St. Boniface who spoke on this bill, have, and I think quite properly, not really looked at the bill itself but looked at the circumstances which gave rise to the bill. And I wish to, Mr. Speaker, immediately try to analyze those circumstances and indicate my own opinion, which has been a longstanding one with regard to that.

There have, Mr. Speaker, been people in Canada, both in the province of Manitoba and in the country, who have believed that the way in which we will protect the character of our nation insofar as the position of the English language and the French language and the founding nation, the founding groups are concerned - and I said founding nations which is a statement that Mr. Roblin used to use, a statement that is used quite often in Quebec and which has given quite some debate as to interpretation before the country as a whole. But let us refer to the English-speaking group and the French-speaking group or people who are of English-speaking origin or of French-speaking origin; there has been, Mr. Speaker, considerable debate as to whether the character of our country is something that will be retained by virtue of legal requirements, constitutional rights, other statutory enactments which are required to be followed not only by people but by legislatures throughout the country as being - there are people who say that those are the kinds of things that are necessary to protect the character of Canada.

And there are those, Mr. Speaker, and amongst them I wish to include myself, who say that it is not through statutes, it is not through laws, it is not through requirements of people being required to adopt a particular linguistic position through which the character of our country is to be preserved, but rather that it's going to be preserved, or can only be preserved, as a result not of people being required to do something, but of people wanting to do something or being urged to do something as a result of their self-interest in doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I say that with respect to this bill because both the New Democratic Party government and the Conservative government opposed in court the reversal of the 1890 statute which declared English to be the official language of the courts and of the legislatures in the province of Manitoba; opposed it throughout to the Supreme Court of Canada and took, Mr. Speaker, what it appears to be, the same position as the province of Quebec with regard to that particular measure. Because at the Supreme Court of Canada, two cases were heard; one determining whether French can be the official language of Quebec; one which was recently enacted, and my friend the Member for St. Boniface is perfectly right that Mr. Levesque was given an opener such as he could never have desired to get from any of his political opponents, who said that it took 90 years to deal with the situation in the province of Manitoba but took less than a year to get it before the courts with respect to almost a paralleled enactment of the province of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the government of Manitoba, both under the New Democratic Party administration and under the Conservative administrative, opposed this reversal. It is now the law and I, Mr. Speaker, am not going to challenge the legality of the decision, the reasoning of the judges in coming to their conclusion, but I will, Mr. Speaker, challenge vigorously the concept that the enactment of this law will go any direction, Mr. Speaker, in preserving the character of our country, or indeed, in preserving the French language in Canada.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that I came into this House in 1967 and at that time the Roblin administration was bringing in a bill which permitted the teaching of French as a language of instruction in the school. Mr. Speaker, I was

elected in '66; I came into the House in '66, that's true and in '67 the bill was presented to the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, that was done because there was a willingness and a realization on the part of the elected representatives of the province of Manitoba to see to it that the status of French as an official language in Canada was given some meaning to. It was a very small step, Mr. Speaker, I admit it, but in my respectful opinion, was a much more important and much more efficacious step than Bill No. 2, which is now before us, because it, Mr. Speaker, represented a willingness on the part of all of the people of the province of Manitoba to move in this direction; and move we did, Mr. Speaker. We did not need this bill to permit people to get up into this Legislature and speak French. The Member for St. Boniface has done it before 1966 and continued to do it between 1966 and 1980. We did not need it, Mr. Speaker; we did not need this bill in order to make French, not simply a permissive language of instruction in the school, but a mandatory language of instruction in the schools where there was a population which desired it. And I know, Mr. Speaker, that it is not completely implemented; that some people are resisting it; but what I insist on, is that the elected representatives of the people had a willingness to do it; wanted to do it and it is being implemented, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that my four eldest children did not have the opportunity to be brought up in the language of this country, as I did not, because I was brought up in English and the language of this country is English and French, and to that extent, our predecessors denied me literacy and denied most of us literacy in the language of this country. Whereas my fifth child, my youngest, was able, in a Winnipeg public school, to become totally and fluently bilingual in two languages, English and French - in a Winnipeg public school, Mr. Speaker, this was done and is being done on a more and more extensive basis.

Mr. Speaker, I consider - and I'm going to deal with this more extensively in a few moments - I consider the fact that Canada, as a country, is one which does not possess a nationalism, which moves us in the direction of having one type of cultural or ethnic character; I consider that to be the big advantage of being a Canadian. And that is something which can only be preserved, Mr. Speaker, if there is, in this country, a meaningful diversity of backgrounds and cultures and attachment to those backgrounds. And it's not something, Mr. Speaker, that we have brought about through some type of genius on the part of Canadians.

It happened as a complete accident and probably an unwilling accident. It happened as an accident that two peoples who lived north of the 49th parallel were English and French; it could have been any other two languages, but it happened to be English and French. And as a result of that accident, Canada has never striven to have the kind of thing that we have in the United States, about 100 percent Americanism; it has never attached its nationalism to a particular ethnic background, which is the case with most European countries such as France, Italy, England. Canada has had to consider duality of peoples and as a result, Mr. Speaker, that character of Canadianism has not stayed merely with the English and the French, it has overlapped to a consideration of the background of other peoples. And as long as the initial duality remains, there will, in my opinion, be a corresponding respect of one person for another in this country, regardless of their ethnic background.

And therefore Mr. Speaker, when I make these remarks, I want to tell you that I do not make them as a friend of the English language, nor do I make them as a friend of the French language. As far as I am concerned, most of the people that I grew up with from infancy, people in my own ethnic background, did not - or a good number of them, if I'm not exactly right with most - a good number of them spoke only Yiddish before they came into the public school system, and when they walked into school they were legislated into the English language. It wasn't voluntary. If the teacher had said "bonjour" when they walked in, they would have been speaking French. The teacher happened to say "hello", and continued in that way and they were legislated into the English language. The fact that we, in our country, had reached only the level of maturity that we legislated people into only one language is a fault which all of us, I am sure, feel has been to our disadvantage, not to our advantage.

So Mr. Speaker, I am urging the position, that despite the fact that the Government of Manitoba and the government under both the New Democratic Party administration and the Conservative administration opposed the passing of this bill, it

is not because they were in any way less committed to the principle of diversity in our country, of respect for people of different backgrounds and of the commitment to official bilingualism, than were the people who pursued this bill.

And as a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, it is my view that this bill and that is the danger of it, will not be an advantage to the promotion of that position, but rather will be a disadvantage. Because from now, on Mr. Speaker, and for the next little while, we're not going to be arguing about what we want to do in order to maintain the character of our country, we're going to be arguing about what we have to do; that's what we're going to be arguing about. The Minister is going to be bombarded with the question - and I want to say that I am not in full agreement with my friend, the Member for St. Boniface, who says that I have a right to speak, but I must also have the right to be understood and when I speak in French I cannot be understood and therefore, my rights are not full. I believe Mr. Speaker, that one has the right to speak. I believe that we cannot make people understand us, and I believe, Mr Speaker, that I am not understood many times when I speak in English, and therefore my friend cannot claim to be understood when he speaks in French.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Minister is going to be bombarded with the question: Do we have to print Hansard in French and English? Do we have to have simultaneous translation in the House, and then do we have to have it in Committee? Mr. Speaker, there is going to be considerable argument about these questions, and many of them, Mr. Speaker, are not arguments which can be answered practically. We are right back to where we were before this law was passed, except that the Minister has indicated he is going to print bills in French. But we are still, Mr. Speaker, right back to the question, as to what do we do in this province to give practical implementation to the fact that we are living in a bilingual country, and this bill is not going to help us, it is going to sidetrack us, Mr. Speaker. Because, in my view, and this is where I differ with the people who think that this bill is the best thing that has happened since cornflakes, that the bilingualism and the character of our country, Mr. Speaker, depends not on whether there are bills printed in French in the province of Manitoba. The character of our country depends on whether there exists in Canada a place where French is the language of necessity and of life in the same way as in Manitoba English is the language of necessity and of life. Because in Manitoba whatever steps that are taken to protect the French language and to give it legal status, every person who is of French ethnic origin will speak English, Mr. Speaker. He will speak English because it is the language of the province, and if there is no place in Canada where French is the language of necessity in exactly that same way, then Canada will not be a totally or truly bilingual country.

The only place, Mr. Speaker, that can happen, realistically, is in the province of Quebec. And to the extent that this bill is a counterpart to a political feeling, Mr. Speaker, to protect, not the rights of the French-Canadian living in the province of Manitoba, because in my view it will be do very little for them; the rights of the French-Canadian in Manitoba will depend on whether we live in a bilingual country, and whether or not we live in a bilingual country will depend on whether there is a place in Canada where French has to be spoken in the same way that English has to be spoken in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. And the only place where that can happen is the province of Quebec and therefore, Mr. Speaker, the rights of the French Canadian in the province of Manitoba and more important to me, the right of Sidney Green in the province of Manitoba, to live in the kind of country that he wants to live in, depends on whether there is a French-speaking Quebec.

The perpetrators of the laws of bilingualism are doing it more in the interests, I suggest to you, to protect the English-speaking minority in the province of Quebec rather than to protect the French-speaking minority in the province of Manitoba, and to the extent that this bill does make it possible for an English-speaking person in the province of Quebec to live in a French-speaking country, or excuse me, a French-speaking province - I don't wish to fall into that kind of slip of the tongue - to the extent that this legislation or the Supreme Court decision makes it possible for an English-speaking person to live in the province of Quebec and to live a full life in terms of business, politics, and everything else, without being fluent in French to the extent that happens will be, Mr. Speaker, a detriment to the people in Manitoba who wish to keep this

country or to make it more bilingual, and to the French Canadian in the province of Manitoba who feels that these kinds of laws are what will ensure his well being.

Mr. Speaker, I have said, and I repeat, that I hope that we will all co-operate in the spirit of the thing, but I know that the law, Mr. Speaker, can result in anomalies which will make it more difficult for those of us who are interested in maintaining this as the character of our country as bilingual, it will make it more difficult to defend it because it becomes, Mr. Speaker, a little unusual. My friend the Member for St. Boniface says there should be a translation from French to English. That will not give a *égalité* to the French language. As a matter of fact Hansard in Ottawa used to translate from French to English, and the French-speaking members properly said, why are you translating our French to English? That shows that somehow French is an inferior language and has to be translated - you must translate English to French, and of course Hansard is now printed in French to English and English to French; Hansard comes out in both languages. But if there is a translation from French to English, then there will have to be a translation from English to French, not to satisfy the English-speaking person, to satisfy the French-speaking person.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am totally committed to what all of us are talking about, and to the spirit of this bill. I got up in this House in 1967, I hardly spoke a word of French. I said that I would learn to speak the language as my commitment and, Mr. Speaker, I did learn to speak the language. I'm not perfect, but I believe that I am fairly equal to many Québécois who speak only limited English, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I tell the House that it is going to be unusual - Mr. Forrest - and maybe logically it works - said that he was going to restrain the Legislature from meeting this year because it wasn't going to be conducted in English and French. Now maybe according to this legal decision, maybe that's right. I heard a very learned constitutional lawyer say that we have no laws in the province of Manitoba because they were never in English and French. Now lawyers can say strange things but judges can perhaps find them to be the case. I don't know.

I indicated, Mr. Speaker, and those who have some knowledge of the French Revolution will appreciate it, that when Mr. Forrest said that he was going to restrain us from meeting in the Legislative Assembly, I said well if that's the case - I was asked the question what will you do - I said well if that's the case we will have to meet on the tennis courts. Because, Mr. Speaker, you will remember that when Louis XVI barred the National Assembly to the elected representatives that they met on the tennis courts, and if Mr. Forrest bars us, we will have to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am totally committed to what Mr. Justice Freedman referred to as the spirit - and I don't want to say of the legislation, because that is not what will move me - I am totally committed to the spirit of maintaining the character of our country. I question, Mr. Speaker, I question seriously whether this is going to be done by this type of law or by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and do not question the decision legally arrived at. I have no argument with it. As a desirable instrument of social policy, Mr. Speaker, I say that it could be one of Mr. Levesque's greatest instruments and greatest arsenal in the movement toward separatism, because if he says in Canada there is a law that says that Quebec cannot be a French-speaking province, then he has been given a weapon, Mr. Speaker, which he could not have invented for himself. If the answer to Mr. Levesque is, oh yes, but the law says not only that Quebec cannot be French but that Manitoba cannot be English, it will draw, Mr. Speaker, horse laughs from the people of the province of Quebec. Because no matter how much of a implementation this --(Interjection)-- Some people in Manitoba have appeared to have great confidence in the fact that all of Manitoba is going to be legislated into French-English equality. Mr. Speaker, it is not practical, it doesn't make sense. And the fact is that the only feature for more people in the province of Manitoba having both languages of our culture does not rest on this law. It rests on the success of Quebec in establishing itself as a French province, in the same way as Manitoba is an English province; and how could one, Mr. Speaker, argue with that concept.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did say that I tried to make myself literate in the language of this country, and I say the language of this country and I use the singular to convey a pluralism, the language of this country - English-French,

French-English, not either English or French. I am going to ask the members of the House to indulge me because I am going to put on the record the remarks which I made in 1967, which I believe are completely consistent with what I say today, in French, because there is no translation from English to French, nor is there a translation from French to English, and I would like those remarks to appear, Mr. Speaker, in both languages. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something which is a bit of an imposition and I won't blame members if they lose their attention in what I am saying, I am going to speak in French at some length. I don't know how time I have got, but I am going to speak in French at some length, to put these remarks on the record. --(Interjection)-- Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting thing that the Member for St. Boniface has said. He says I have got forty minutes of French, which indicates how you can go with these laws and what will be the arguments as to how the laws affect the province of Manitoba. But I am, Mr. Speaker, going to make certain remarks in French, which I wish to appear on the records of the House, and which further explain, and I am not going to translate, my position on this particular question.

Of course, I am going to support the bill. I certainly do not support the notion that this bill is a revolution in terms of the French language in the province of Manitoba. I want to say to my friend, the Member for St. Boniface, and to some of the people of French-speaking origin, that I do not regard the English language as being the property of people of English-speaking origin, and I do not regard the French language as being the property of people of French origin, it is my language. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most insidious - it is my property as much as it is theirs.

Some of your ethnic nationalists in the province of Quebec, which are the dangerous feature of that movement, do not regard the language question as being something, they are talking about an ethnic nationalism. The English-speaking person who acquires the French language is not looked upon by them as a genuine Québécois; and I am not going to generalize, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that there is that there.

It also exists in the province of Manitoba. The French language is the property of all Manitobans who wish to make it their property, just as the English language is the property of all Manitobans who make it their property.

J'aimerais tout d'abord expliquer ce que pour moi représente la forme la plus désirable de nationalisme au Canada. Lorsque j'emploie le mot "désirable", je veux par cela dire ce qui est désirable pour moi. Il n'y a rien dans ma prise de position qui a l'intention d'être altruiste pas plus qu'elle n'a été formulée pour le bénéfice des autres. Une chose qui me rend toujours méfiant c'est quand quelqu'un me dit qu'il prend position pour le bénéfice d'autres personnes que lui-même. J'ai toujours trouvé que les gens qui parlent ... eux-mêmes et pour eux-mêmes pas et qui parlent pas eux-mêmes et pour eux-mêmes communiquent plus facilement leurs idées et sont généralement les plus dignes de foi.

En 1967, la Législature manitobaine avait devant elle le Projet de loi No 59 portant sur l'emploi du français comme langue d'instruction dans les écoles du Manitoba. A cette époque, j'ai fait quelques remarques devant la Législature, remarques que je vais vous répéter ici ce matin. Elles représentaient alors et représentent encore mon opinion sur le nationalisme au Canada. Les remarques suivent, M. le président.

Maintenant, M. le président de l'Assemblée, je pense, je crois même qu'il est important que je mentionne alors que je passe au sujet précis, que je le fais en tant que membre de ce qu'il est commun de désigner sous les vocables de groupes racial, d'ethnies ou encore des minorités. Je suis une personne dont les traditions ne remontent ni aux Anglo-saxons ni au Français, les races fondatrices de notre pays. Je suis, vous le savez tous, de souches juifs et comme tel j'appartiens à l'un de ces nombreux groupes ethniques qui forment notre nation. Je représente, M. le président, cette circonscription dont la caractéristique principale est une population disparate englobant les différents groupes raciaux, ethniques ou minoritaires suivant l'étiquette que l'on voudrait leur donner. La circonscription d'Inkster se compose d'un grand nombre de gens d'origine ukrainienne, d'un nombre tout aussi important de Polonais, de Russes, d'Italiens, d'Allemands et d'autres encore dont il m'est impossible de donner une liste complète ici. Je pense que c'est de ce point de vue (inaudible) que j'aimerais à présenter mon cas sur le vote de ce projet de loi.

M. le président, au nom des gens qui essaient d'obtenir l'unité nationale, il a souvent été démontré que le meilleur moyen d'y arriver était d'éliminer les différences nationales. Par cela il faut entendre la suppression des différences émanant de passé culturel de notre nation, et je pense, M. le président, qu'un raisonnement de cette sorte a une certaine valeur. En effet, si rien ne venait nous diviser, nous serions tous unis.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson):       Ordre, ordre, s'il vous plaît, le député a cinq minutes.

MR. GREEN: Cinq minutes, merci. Pour être honnête, je dois confesser que dans mon jeune âge, j'avais, ou jeunesse, la conviction que si tout le monde parlait la même langue, que si tout le monde fréquentait le même genre d'école et que si tout le monde en poursuivre ce raisonnement jusqu'à (inaudible), croyait aux mêmes choses, il n'y aurait rien pourquoi se battre si bien que l'humanité serait en paix jusqu'à la fin des temps. Je m'aperçois maintenant, M. le président, que non seulement ceci est loin de la vérité mais que ça serait là la chose la plus abominable qui puisse nous arriver. Les résultats auxquels on pourrait par ailleurs s'attendre de ce genre d'homogénéité n'en découlent pas du tout, loin de là. Je me souviens alors que je discutais avec l'une de mes amis des causes de la guerre qui ayant émis l'opinion que si toutes les nations parlaient la même langue et étaient en mesure de communiquer librement l'une avec l'autre, il serait peu probable que la guerre n'éclate. Aussi vite que l'éclair, elle me répliqua que la guerre de Sécession avait entraîné des pertes en vie humaine dans l'une et l'autre temps que si ne mesurait à n'importe quelle autre guerre et que bien entendu, dans ce cas particulier les antagonistes parlaient la même langue.

A ces remarques, M. le président, je veux faire ressortir que je pense qu'il est à l'avantage de la population ukrainienne et je pense qu'il est à l'avantage de la population juive, de la population allemande, de toutes les autres ethnies que nous, au Canada, reconnaissons que notre pays s'épanouit dans la hétérogénéité. La raison pour laquelle nous pouvons faire cela, M. le président, la raison pour laquelle ceci arrive au Canada d'une manière si distincte de ce qui se passe aux États-Unis est un pur événement historique. Ce n'est pas là quelque chose qui a été préparée à l'avance; ce n'est pas là le résultat d'une laborieuse planification. Mais c'est quelque chose que nous sommes heureux d'avoir et je dis que nous, dans cette province, nous devons faire tous les efforts nécessaires pour la conserver.

Je crois que tous les Canadiens acceptent probablement le fait que la dernière élection fédérale, les Canadiens ont pensé que la réponse se trouvait dans l'élection de l'administration Trudeau à Ottawa. Vous devez me pardonner si j'engage sur un train politique qui vous touche, mais je préférerais vous provoquer même jusqu'à la colère plutôt que de ne rien dire. Je me rends très bien compte, M. le président, je veux conclure mes remarques et je passe quelque chose à la termination.

A mon avis, et je crois que mon avis est important car je suis l'un de deux parce que je suis un de ceux qui a le plus en jeu, peut-être même plus que les Anglais ou les Français dans le maintien de la caractéristique biculturelle de notre nation. Que la position de l'administration actuelle vis-à-vis de la province de Québec et des événements récents qui sont arrivés ne peuvent pas être séparés l'un de l'autre. La raison pour laquelle les gens parlent anglais dans ce pays ne vient pas du fait que l'anglais est l'une des langues officielles. C'est parce qu'il est important de parler l'anglais si l'on veut parvenir à la fortune, aux honneurs et tous ces prix que la société a à offrir. Les gens parlent le français tout autant non parce que c'est l'une des langues officielles, mais plutôt parce que ça sera important si l'on veut parvenir à la fortune, aux honneurs et à tous ces prix que la société a à offrir. Si de parler le français ou l'anglais et à ce prix, il doit alors y avoir des places dans ce pays ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member's time is expired.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just continue for three minutes to finish these remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)  
The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Si de parler le français ou l'anglais et à ce prix, il doit alors y avoir des places dans ce pays où l'on doit parler l'anglais pour ces raisons. Il doit aussi y avoir des places où l'on doit parler le français pour les mêmes raisons. Nous habitons la province du Manitoba. Dans notre province approximativement dix pour cent de la population appartient au groupe qui parle le français, l'une des langues officielles de ce pays. Nous au Manitoba, avons essayé de passer des lois qui protégeraient les intérêts de ce segment de la population dont la langue est le français. Nous avons passé des lois pour protéger leurs droits linguistiques, pour protéger leurs écoles et leur culture pour reconnaître leur statut en tant que groupe de langue officielle et d'autres indications tangibles de notre reconnaissance de ce groupe. Toutefois, si un membre de ce groupe veut devenir une personne prominente, une personne reconnue pour sa fortune, une personne vers laquelle on se tourne dans l'arène politique ou une personne de valeur dans un secteur quelconque de notre société, elle doit parler l'anglais et elle parle l'anglais. Il est de même dans dix provinces de notre pays sauf une. Dans chacune des provinces à l'exception de Québec, le groupe de la langue minoritaire, bien que ses droits soient protégés, se voit dans l'obligation, vu des circonstances, de parler la langue de la majorité. Dans la province de Québec le contraire est vrai. Le groupe majoritaire par la force des choses s'est vu obligé de parler la langue du groupe minoritaire. Aussi, lorsqu'il me demande ce que veule le Québec, je réplique: Le Québec veut être une province comme les autres. La seule question est de savoir si elle acceptera d'être une telle province dans le Canada biculturel ou ... qu'état séparé.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying, that if Quebec cannot be as French as Manitoba is English, then they will look for the way of becoming a country where they can be the majority of the population as they are now the minority.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank the members for their . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to indicate at this time that I am supporting this bill for many of the reasons that have just been indicated by the Member for Inkster. I am supporting the bill because the Supreme Court of Canada has told this government and all of us Manitobans to do so, and to disregard or even to think about disregarding that kind of instruction from the highest court of this land would have serious consequences in terms of our understanding, and our appreciation of and the necessity of living and working with the law, and allowing the rule of law to be paramount in the conduct of our affairs in this country.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster, through some telepathy which we sometimes have, has taken and expressed some of the very same concerns that I have had about this bill. Mr. Speaker, I suppose perhaps it is somewhat fitting that two members of that third group in Canada, and neither of us belonging to the founding group, the French or the English, but of groups that have come to this country understanding that we were coming to a country that had a duality to its makeup from the very moment this country was born. In the putting together of The BNA Act and in subsequent actions taken by different governments, federal government, the most notable one in our recent memory, of course, being the passage of The Official Languages Act by the Pearson administration in the early 1960s.

Mr. Speaker, I would also want to take this time to indicate what sometimes is lost on persons of other than French and English background, and in particular in this province and in western Canada, when German people, Ukrainian people, Italian or other ethnic groups confuse the issue of the rights or of the nature of this country by saying or by objecting to the nature or the status of French in our country, and saying, "If French, why not Ukrainian, or why not German, or why not Italian?"

Mr. Speaker, I think those of us who have some role of leadership in representing these different ethnic groups have perhaps been derelict in not expressing

that very clear understanding that I have that there is a substantive difference between the rights as accorded to the French and English founding groups within our country in the language sector, as compared to the rights of language with other ethnic minorities.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster is again dead-right when he says that by preserving that very unique feature of this country I have a better opportunity and my association of German-speaking people in the community have a better opportunity, and indeed we have witnessed the expansion of a fuller reign of freedom of expression, of development within our cultural background in our group, and the encouragement of that from government levels, as well as from an acceptance, and which is probably more important than anything else, but an acceptance level from society at large, that we have had in this past ten, fifteen years accepted the different type of cultural groups, their clubhouses, their special events, their coming together and being proud of those special events, at such occasions, particularly in this city, as Folklorama, where there is a degree of pride and acceptance in the diversity of our many peoples in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the concern that I have, and it goes perhaps a bit further, although I think the Honourable Member for Inkster touched on it, is that we will, by pursuing this kind of legislation, be more and more concerned about what we have to do, rather than what we feel we ought to do, and in fact what we have done. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has already referred to the significant step that was taken in that direction in Manitoba by the then Conservative administration under the leadership of the Honourable Duff Roblin, and that probably advanced the cause that this bill reputedly is supposed to enhance to a far greater extent than this Bill No 2 ever will.

Mr. Speaker, I will also say that another measure taken by this administration, and with this the Honourable Member for Inkster will not agree with me, but this administration legalizing the longstanding practice which was in effect during that 90-year period that we are talking about in this bill, of supporting private and parochial schools, did in a very significant way again, through the additional flow of some funds, help the cultural and language maintenance of the French community in Manitoba. The Honourable Member for Inkster would not agree with me, but the Honourable Member for St. Boniface will, and, Mr. Speaker, more important but leave aside the question of how schools and educational systems should be financed. We are now speaking solely about the maintenance, enhancement, enrichment of the cultural language, linguistic status of French and English . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply indicate to the Honourable Member for Inkster, it was a Conservative administration that did it both ways, that made it possible. It was a Conservative administration that made it possible for the Honourable Member for Inkster's fifth child to receive that instruction, to receive that training in a Winnipeg public school. It was our administration, it was our legislation that did it. But it doesn't matter.

Mr. Speaker, it does bring out the point, the other matter that concerns me is when you ask yourself why have we, or why are we dealing with this issue in this particular manner? Because of a parking ticket, Mr. Speaker? Because of taking, in Chief Justice Samuel Freedman's words, the law to the abstract extreme? Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that I have felt a considerable amount of disappointment, and I must indicate to you a caution and a warning that if the opportunity, by this kind of legislation, the opportunity this kind of legislation presents as a rallying call or degree or benchmark of measurement as to one particular party's performance and acceptance of it as compared to another, as regrettably, the Liberal spokesmen in this province have already undertaken to the point where they suggest that it's this administration's, and this Premier's reluctance and rigid opposition to the francophone concerns in the province of Manitoba that has led the Societe Franco-Manitobaine to recommend to their membership to vote "yes" in the Quebec referendum.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of exploitation of an emotional issue like this can only lead to very serious ramifications in this province. Mr. Speaker, surely this government and this Premier have acted, and the Attorney-General, with extreme dispatch. The judgement came down, there was no footdragging, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing with it at the earliest opportunity that this Legislature can; there is no footdragging, Mr. Speaker. But the suggestions by a struggling political party, ending in this province, to attempt, on the old and traditional lines, to

resurrect the French-English argument in political terms, has serious ramifications. Mr. Speaker, it should not go unnoticed that if that is the kind of politics that should be played, we could take our chances. But, Mr. Speaker, I must indicate, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface's contribution the other day did little to further the kind of co-operative, sincere, approach that is necessary. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the concern that I have, the concern that many constituents, and I would suggest from a lot of members in this House, on both sides of the House, is that it's this kind of legislation, and this kind of pressure, and this kind of militancy, if you will, by a minority group within the province of Manitoba, will have precisely the wrong effects, achieve the wrong goals, the goals that the Member for Inkster, the fears that the Member for Inkster quite correctly expressed.

We were moving, Sir, in a direction that held out and continues to hold out promise, the direction that can flare up with the kind of comments that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is now making from his seat, can change that overnight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable members have, in the past, on this issue, on both sides of the House, shown a remarkable degree of concern about the sensitivity of the subject and restraint in their public utterances. Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that this bill will tend to have us look and argue more mechanically as to whether or not we are now, or a government, any government, this government or another government, is living up to a letter of a precise bill. And we will find, Sir, that under those circumstances, the kind of progress that we're making is not satisfactory. So I can see the future amendments coming to this bill, pressures coming up to this bill to enlarge it, to enhance its scope. Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to you that the present action that the province of Quebec is taking with respect to the same subject matter, in referring it once again to the Supreme Court for further clarification, they want to have the Supreme Court rule that at every level, at the municipal level, at the school board level, this kind of legislation will have to be carried out in the province of Quebec, that every Quebec local school board district, local municipal district, English will be forced on the province of Quebec in areas that they have no need for it, and where they have no requirement for it. That, Mr. Speaker, is being done in a very willful way by those who wish to separate from this country and to give, as the Member for Inkster said, that tremendous clout, that tremendous lever in Monsieur Levesque's hands to now suggest to his broader constituents in the province of Quebec that there is no room in Canada for a French speaking province, for a French-Canadian homeland in the Confederation of Canada. Mr. Speaker, the kind of scenarios that can follow from that will have its consequences, not just in Quebec, but throughout this country.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Societe Franco-Manitobaine has to say about this government's reaction to the Supreme Court's ruling, contrary to what the spokespersons for the Liberal Party have attempted to inject a degree of politics on to the question, I have to commend the First Minister in the expeditious way that he has brought this bill forward; I have to commend the Attorney-General for the calm and moderate manner and way with which he is attempting to cope with the problems that it presents to him, both in the matters that bear on the conduct in this House in the preparation of bills, but of course, even more important, in providing the extension of the services in the judicial system through his court systems.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have worry and concern, and I put it on the record, the fact that we now legislatively have to do something does not, by any stretch of the imagination, pave the way for it being done with any greater understanding or any greater co-operation. Mr. Speaker, there are simply too many jurisdictions in this world. Perhaps the one that comes to mind most readily is the Belgian situation, who have grappled with a similar situation and just now at this time are facing very serious problems of unity within that relatively small community, in that relatively small country of western Europe.

Mr. Speaker, proponents for wishing to legislate by law do what we as a society of Canadians are not prepared to evolve into and do over a period of time, do the present status of Canada, linguistically speaking, no justice.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention to proceed with the rotation on the Order Paper?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 3, the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to - I don't know where the Member for St. Boniface went, but if we could just wait, because the other bills, I'm going to request the House that they stand except for Bill No. 21. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface is prepared to speak on that bill. If I could just have the indulgence of the House, I'll just try and get him back.

Mr. Speaker, on Bill 21, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

BILL NO. 21 - AN ACT TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION ACT

MR. DESJARDINS presented Bill No. 21 - an Act to Amend The Social Services Administration Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would say that we are certainly willing to let it go without any opposition, to let it go for second reading. I think it's a step in the right direction. It is something that was started by the former government, who set up the office to make sure that the public of Manitoba, the people that need this protection will receive this protection. We have nothing on the principle, that we don't oppose the bill at all, there is some question of details that we might want to ask on second reading, so we are supporting the bill, Mr. Speaker.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to Consider of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

We will proceed, Mr. Speaker, with just one Committee in the House.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kohnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 81 of the main estimates, Department of Natural Resources. We are on Resolution No. 108, clause 9, Wildlife, (a) Administration, (1) Salaries--pass. The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, just by way of general introduction to the item I think we could just briefly outline the general responsibilities of this branch and the general direction that it goes in. It is responsible for the administration and management and allocation of wildlife resources, basically so that viable

populations are maintained and that numbers are not allowed to slip to levels where recovery would be doubtful. Beyond that, we seek to insure that appropriate use is made of wildlife and that the resource is passed on to future Manitobans in a state that is at least as vigorous a state as it was received in by that generation. We want to promote the use of wildlife for educational benefits of Manitobans. We hope to strive to alleviate wildlife damage to property primarily, and to provide a variety of forms and amounts of wildlife use opportunities, in addition to recreational hunting for the recreational benefits and enjoyment of Manitobans; and specifically of course to provide a variety of types and amounts of hunting opportunities for recreational benefit enjoyment of Manitobans and beyond that which is required for Manitobans to provide some opportunity for marketing of recreation to non-residents.

Our fur resources form a fairly major role at this time in particular when prices of fur are high. Last year, I believe, that the amount of income derived from fur in the province is coming close to rivalling the total that is derived from commercial fishing in the province, and that in terms of net, I don't think there is any question that there is in fact a greater net return from the fur resource than there is from the fishery resource; that the amount of money which government puts into the fur industry is not as great as that which goes into the fishing industry.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, we have the estimates divided into a number of fairly distinct divisions, and I assume that the honourable members can either go through those division by division if they wish, section by section, or proceed in the general fashion that we have been. I can say that in the start of the administration item, in terms of the staffing, there are four staff man years in that section, the same as there was last year, and of course they're simply responsible for the overall supervision of the branch in the handling of its personnel and budgeting, financial control, legislation, etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that possibly I'll just make a statement prior to acknowledging the next speaker. The Honourable Minister has suggested that he would be prepared to answer questions on the whole of the item under discussion, Wildlife, which was the manner in which we handled Fisheries prior to that and it seemed to work out quite well. If that's acceptable, I think that we will proceed in the same manner.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest we proceed in that way, as that is the way I recommended we proceed in each preceding section that we've gone through and it seemed to work, as you indicated, rather well. It still gives the opportunity when we come to the specific items to have some specific questions on those items, in other words, we may discuss the general issues under administration, but that does not preclude us from asking a specific question when we come to the specific item. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would sit down at this point and carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have an opportunity to participate in this department, because I am one of those who is very distressed at the action of the Minister in allowing experiments on polar bears in Manitoba, which I think was an unmitigated disaster. And it's ironic that the Minister, who makes a quiet opening statement, said that his goals included no abuse of wildlife and that he would attempt to develop wildlife in Manitoba for its educational benefits. There's a lot of irony in that opening, Mr. Chairman, and also in the fact that this is National Wildlife Week in Canada, that at the very moment when people are talking about preserving this great resource, this is the week that was set aside by active Parliament in 1947 to focus attention on the value of wildlife and to pay tribute to Jack Miner, one of Canada's early conservationists; that his birthday fell on April 10th, yesterday, and that this is National Wildlife Week.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the experiment that was recently conducted was a black mark on this province, and although the Minister had perhaps good intentions in terms of that great umbrella which can justify almost anything, "science", I

think that the manner in which the experiments were conducted, the goal of the experiments and the results were all unnecessary and disastrous. There were apparently assurances given from wildlife experts, that the bears in the experiment would not be harmed in any way. Well, if those were the assurances, then the assurances proved to be completely hollow. I mention that the Churchill project was funded by the federal department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and conducted by a Dr. Nils Oritsland of the University of Oslo in Norway, designed to measure the effects of oil on bears' body temperatures and find ways to protect them from spills.

Well, it seems that almost anyone who has any knowledge of wildlife could have told the people conducting the experiment what the result would be. It seems that anyone who is familiar with wildlife knows that if you cover an animal with oil that the animal will attempt to remove the oil, that it will remove the oil generally by licking it off, that by licking it off it will ingest the oil and that that will result either in illness or in death. And yet for some reason, this apparently had to be done in the name of science. It also mentions in this particular article that the Minister revoked the permit for an earlier study in late 1978 after there were protests from Churchill residents.

Mr. Chairman, it's not surprising that people protested the experiments in 1978, that they protested the experiments in 1980, and that they will continue to protest this kind of an experiment which I think only achieves no useful purpose which results in a predictable manner. The outcome could have been predicted. I don't believe there is any need to conduct this experiment, either in its original cast or as it was revised or in any other form. And the original plan in 1978 was to feed the bears oil capsules, treat their fur with oil, put them in a wind tunnel, and then chop them up after they died or were destroyed, to analyze the results.

Well, you know, Mr. Chairman, I think that that experiment was deplorable. Clive Roots, who is the director of the Assiniboine Zoo, knows something about animals, and he said on March 27th, that it should have been obvious, "That if you make a living thing eat oil, it will die, but they, the researchers presumably didn't know that." Well, I asked the Minister whether anyone connected with that experiment was surprised when they discovered that the bears licked their fur, ingested the oil, became sick and then died. And I don't know the condition of that third animal. I know the first animal died; the second one was shot, and the third one may or may not survive.

Mr. Chairman, the province issued a scientific permit to allow the experiments and therefore they are on the hook. And it's interesting to note that Dr. Frank Juck of the provincial laboratory, said that there could be no final conclusions on the tests until tissue samples from the dead bear are analyzed. And that I think is a point that was debated in Question Period a few weeks ago between the Member for Churchill and the Minister, the question being whether or not it was an aim of the experiment to analyze the bears in terms of an autopsy. That certainly appears to have been suggested on March 28th when a Dr. Norman Snow, who was a project manager with the federal government, said that tests conducted at Churchill have shown that in the event of an oil spill it would be necessary to remove the polar bears. Well, I'll deal with that in a moment. But he said he didn't think that their death was too high a price to pay for information obtained in oil spill tests, and it would give information that will protect the bear population if they have to actually react in a spill situation.

Mr. Chairman, does anybody think - does anybody think - that there was a value in these experiments? I mean, what was the knowledge that was gained from these experiments, that if there was a massive oil spill in the Arctic, that it would harm wildlife? Is that what we were going to learn from these experiments? We know that. All you have to do is read the daily papers. All you have to do is read where an oil tanker disintegrates and what happens to marine life and birds in the area. In most cases I guess what happens is, all sorts of animals and fish are washed up on the shores dead or dying. And can there be any different effect, I mean, what does the Minister know now that he didn't know a month ago? Does he know that oil would be damaging to bears? Does he know that it would be a good idea if you could remove the polar bears from the scene of an oil spill? Is that the kind of information that we have gleaned from these kind of experiments? Because anybody in the business could have told him that before the experiment.

They could have told all these brilliant scientists, all these men of letters, who flew in from Norway and from Ottawa and from Manitoba and from Winnipeg, to pool all their collective scientific knowledge in this particular matter, when what is obvious by common sense and by scientific knowledge, and therefore was a complete waste of time. And you know, there's an easy cover for all of this stuff. This is something that has irritated me for a long time; it's called science. These bears were sacrificed on the altar of science and some people think that makes it all right; that as long as there is science, there is no moral obligation, no moral responsibility; that a scientist does not have to accept blame; that there is no such thing as good or bad in the vocabulary of science. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept that for a moment. I don't accept the fact that someone working on this experiment can just wash their hands of it. I don't believe that some scientist who's working on germ warfare can say, well, you know, I'm just working on something and what it's used for doesn't affect me, I'm not responsible.

The people who worked on the development of nuclear weapons, or napalm, or any of these deadly instruments of war - can they really say, well, you know, we're just building something here, we're just working on an experiment. We don't know what it's going to be used for, we don't have any idea, and if it's used, if millions are obliterated, or millions are destroyed - human or animal - it doesn't really matter, because I'm not involved, I just developed it, I just perfected it, I just made it possible. I'm a scientist, you can't hurt me, it's the politicians who do these things, you know, the politicians are the bad guys. They're the guys who make decisions, they're the people who are sometimes rapped for making decisions.

And I say to the Minister that he reminds me of something that his own Premier threw out a month ago, it was quite humorous. He referred to some old joke and referred to the Member for Inkster - I don't remember the exact context - but he said, the Member for Inkster is like a piano player in a brothel, he just plays away at the piano and he says he doesn't know what's going on upstairs, he's just an entertainer. And I say, to that extent, this Minister is a piano player at a house of science, or a house of experimentation. And I say that he cannot get himself off the hook, he cannot simply say that he plays the piano - takes his jacket off, opens up his vest, rolls up his sleeves, puts on his nightshade, his green shade, and puts on those things they used to wear - I forget what they call them - to hold up your sleeves --(Interjection)-- elastic bands - arm bands, they weren't elastic. The Chairman is confusing his state of poverty where he used elastic bands, or sealer rings. There are more elegant ones - I think my father had metal ones; very flashy in those days.

So I say that the Minister cannot wash his hands of this matter; he cannot say that, well, he just gave the go signal. And neither can those scientists; not one of those people. He set up a committee and did they ever strike out, Mr. Chairman. He set up a committee of people, including people from the Humane Society, who are going to preserve and protect the bears in this experiment. What a disaster. Two out of three dead, one dying. I mean, one bear that's been, maybe kept alive - well, we'll see whether he makes it or not; the bear didn't eat for over a month. It doesn't look like it's going to make it - maybe it'll make it and maybe it won't. One can say without being too harsh that when a bear hasn't eaten for a long period of time, that's sick and kept in a cage for weeks and weeks and weeks, one almost begins to wonder whether there's not now a study of starvation going on, because I think a lot of people would have made the decision already that it was more humane to destroy that bear than to let it suffer. That was the decision taken in the second experiment.

And I was shocked to see, Mr. Chairman, on television, a few days ago, that that bear is still covered with oil, that they're still washing that bear down, that after a month, a whole month, that animal is still being treated, in the sense of trying to save it, in the sense of trying to wash out this material, which led to it's illness and to the death of two others.

And you know, Max Ferguson - I used to be a fan of his, but I grew somewhat tired of him. I used to leave Winnipeg every morning - I tell this to my friend, the Minister of Education, in 1962-63, when I taught out at Stonewall, I used to commute to Stonewall Collegiate with several fellows from Winnipeg who taught out there, and every morning we listened to Max Ferguson. And he's fairly talented

and he's fairly funny and sometimes he has some pretty good stuff. I heard him for a whole year and after that I found it a bit much, but on occasion - he's now on the Don Heron Show - instead of doing a whole program full of skits he's on maybe once a morning, several times a week. And he had a skit on the other day about the Manitoba experiment and it was about grizzly bears and I don't remember whether, in the so-called humour - and I don't think he thought it was funny either, he thought it was absurd, which is a form of humour, Mr. Chairman. And you, as an occasional stand-up comic of great talent, great talent, in my opinion, would appreciate that description.

And he said that what they should do, or what - another experiment that was going to be proposed was - I don't know whether it was to take a group of grizzly bears and set them on fire, or whether they were going to put them in a contained section of a forest, build a fence around it and then set the forest on fire to see their reactions, to judge what they might do. I'll tell you what they might do, Mr. Chairman, I'm a city slicker and I'm not even sure. I think my colleague, the former Minister would know and the present Minister would know. I would suspect that some of them would run the other way and wherever the fire was, they would go the other way. And I'm not exactly sure what they would do if they were set on fire, if their pelts were set on fire, whether they would attempt to put out the flames, whether they would roll on the ground, or what. But I'll bet you this, that if you put oil all over them, if you poured oil all over a grizzly bear, assuming you could survive it, I'll bet you they would lick all that oil off their pelts.

And I say that experiments that are predictable and idiotic, under the name of science, is not a justification for those experiments. I don't care what the Minister says and I think it's too facile a defence. I also see that poor professor, William Pruitt, from the University of Manitoba, who is a zoologist and a specialist in northern wildlife, said that the public weakened the bear experiment. He is upset that the public reacted to this experiment. He said if we could have done our original experiment, fed them the capsules, shot them, chopped them up, we would have had a successful experiment. That's what he wanted to do. And he thinks that it's a shame that the public of Manitoba is upset about this, as are people all across this country. Well, I think it's a good thing that people have said that this is the kind of experiment which borders on the bizarre and is cruel and is unnecessary. And that I think is the main point, Mr. Chairman, that this experiment was not necessary, that this experiment was predictable.

And all one has to do is look at some of the letters to the editor that appeared as a result of this, and the national attention given to this issue. People were outraged, and I think that is not surprising, and that I would be disappointed if that was not the reaction of the public in general.

So I would be interested, Mr. Chairman, in hearing some of the reactions of the Minister because I, for one, deplore what was done. He was right, in 1978 or 1979, when he stopped these experiments, he was right at that point. He was wrong, more recently, when he approved those experiments. And I think that he has a bone to pick also with the committee that he appointed, which let him down in that regard. He apparently thought, or believed, that this committee was going to ensure that the bears would survive. But I think he will now have to admit, and I would expect him to admit, although I'd be surprised if he didn't, I think he would have to admit that the experiment was a failure and that it was not necessary. And I would also expect him to say that he would never again, as Minister, allow anything similar as long as he holds that position of trust.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Member for Elmwood has simply taken the occasion to deal with what is a highly emotional issue and attempt to further his own position by dealing with it in the fashion that he has. I think it's necessary to put some of the facts on the record, Mr. Chairman, so that the public does at least have some of the facts. Whether or not they choose to accept them is something else, because it is such a highly emotional issue. And I find it interesting though, how the Honourable Member for Elmwood is able to condemn the scientists that promoted this project and that backed this project; he condemns them, I assume, as idiots because he calls the experiment an

idiotic experiment. He sees the outside expert coming from Norway as being some kind of horrible, mad scientist that would ever undertake such an experiment as this. But yet, Mr. Chairman, let one outside expert come in to the province and pass an opinion on the effects of vinyl chloride, and the Honourable Member for Elmwood and his colleagues rallied around that one foreign outside expert, like one would never have believed that you could put that much faith in one outside expert.

But in this case, Mr. Chairman - after the fact, of course, that everyone deplores, everyone deplores, what has happened - but after the fact, after the bears have died, it's easy for any one to stand up and say that they were wrong to have recommended that that study go ahead, that the federal Department of Indian Affairs was wrong to have financed that study, that the federal Department of the Environment with the Canadian Wildlife Service was wrong to have supported that study, that the government of the Northwest Territories was wrong to have supported that study, that the Council of the local government district of Churchill was wrong to have supported that study. And let me just read that one item into the record, Mr. Chairman, because I think this is important, that here is the council of the local government district, the people who know something about these polar bears, they knew some of the scientists that were involved in the experiments, they knew what they were talking about, they knew what the possibilities were that might be associated with some kind of future oil spills. They passed this resolution, Mr. Chairman, they said;

"WHEREAS the council of the Local Government District of Churchill realizes the benefits and the necessity of the continuance of oil toxicological studies carried out on polar bears and;

WHEREAS these studies can best be carried out in the Churchill area;

BE IT RESOLVED that the council of the Local Government District of Churchill gives it approval for the continuance of such studies and research to be carried out in the Churchill area with the understanding that all studies and testing will be undertaken in as humane a way as possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there were other people who supported that study as well, the polar bear specialists in the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. They thought that that experiment was necessary. The Beaufort Sea Technical Group thought that such an experiment was necessary, because they could foresee that some time in the future there might be, in fact there will be, an oil spill in the Arctic and that the more information that is available to be able to deal with that spill, the better off we will be. They supported it. The Canada Council for Animal Care supported the study as well. Does the Honourable Member for Elmwood say that these people are idiotic in supporting this experiment, Mr. Chairman? He says they are, he shakes his head, yes, in the affirmative, all of these people are idiotic in the mind of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

That is fine, after the fact that is easy to see. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend, the Minister of Government Services, raises an interesting point, which doesn't detract from the tragedy of the polar bear experiment in any sense at all, but it does demonstrate the emotional nature of this issue. The tremendous outrage that people have felt about this experiment does not seem to have carried over into the cruel, inhumane situation that occurred in Montreal, where three dolphins were allowed to starve to death, to slowly starve to death, while their keepers were out on strike in order to gain further benefits for themselves personally, and they allowed those dolphins to die a slow death of starvation. We don't hear the same outrage against that sort of thing, Mr. Chairman. But in this situation where the top scientists involved with the management and study of polar bears around at least three-quarters of the world, in the area that polar bears occur, felt that this experiment was necessary, not in their interests, Mr. Chairman, not in their interests, but they felt that there would be some information derived which could be useful in helping to save the lives of polar bears later on.

The Honourable Member says it sure helped. As I say, after the fact it's easy to stand up and say "Well, anybody would have known that if a bear ate oil it was going to die". The fact is, Mr. Chairman, they didn't know that. They didn't know how much of an exposure to oil that bears would be able to tolerate. That is going to be quite a vital question when the time comes that there is a spill and there are bears that are going to be exposed. That will be a question and I'm sure that when that happens people will stand up and whatever minister happens to

be responsible at the time, they will say "Why weren't you prepared to deal with that spill?" Just as they said, why weren't we prepared to deal with every spill, whether it's chlorine or vinyl-chloride or methyl-alcohol or whatever. That's what'll happen and fine, that's . . . --(Interjection)-- . . . well I won't do anything differently, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Member for Elmwood asks me what would I do differently?

I just want to make it clear for the record that indeed, I issued the permit, Mr. Chairman, and I take responsibility for issuing that permit. But I don't want it to be misunderstood that this experiment was initiated by my department or that this experiment was funded by my department. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member asks me what more do I know about polar bears now that I didn't know before? I didn't set out with this experiment to find out anything about polar bears, because I didn't initiate it and I didn't fund it. I provided a permit for the project to go ahead because the federal Department of Indian Affairs was prepared to finance it, the Department of the Environment and the Canadian Wildlife Service was promoting it, all of the others that I listed, including the people, the elected representatives, the people in the Churchill area supported it; and on that basis the permit was issued. So that it's not an appropriate question to ask me, what do I know now that I didn't know before, because I didn't set out to find out anything from this experiment. The area where the information is likely to be made use of is not within the Manitoba jurisdiction, it's not in Manitoba, it's going to be in federal government jurisdiction and the Northwest Territories. It happened to be that Churchill was the base where a good deal of the polar bear research has been undertaken, and that's why it was allowed to go ahead.

Mr. Chairman, it was allowed to go ahead because a great many respected scientists felt that it was necessary to go ahead. I know from a purely political point of view, Mr. Chairman, that the easiest thing for me to have done would have been to say "No, it's not going to go ahead", because I don't stand to gain one benefit at all from allowing that study to go ahead. We know that it's a very sensitive issue, that the public cares very, very deeply about wildlife, and that they were going to be concerned that this would go ahead. --(Interjection)-- There's different levels of concern I guess, Mr. Chairman. It was allowed to go ahead because of the reasons that I've outlined - that it was thought to be a necessary experiment and I think that the remarks made by Dr. Bill Pruitt are indicative of that. Dr. Pruitt is known as an expert, and I mean an expert in the truest sense of the word, in terms of the northern environment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five seconds. The hour is 12:30, Private Members' Hour. Committee rise, call on the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I understand members opposite do not wish to proceed further so I move, seconded by the Minister for Government Services, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House adjourned until 2:00 o'clock Monday afternoon.