



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

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 129 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 3 August, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . 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

McKenzie Seeds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds. It is reported that Mr. McDowell, the Chairman of McKenzie Seeds, has had some knowledge for perhaps over a year now with respect to a possible conflict-of-interest situation at McKenzie Seeds. Can the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds advise the House whether or not he has contacted Mr. McDowell to make further inquiries as to the extent of his knowledge?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: I haven't had an opportunity to do that yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, just further to that question, I had contacted the Auditor's department, pursuing the matter raised by the Member for Turtle Mountain this morning. He had asked whether the interim report could be made public. The Auditor himself wasn't in. He will be in in a few days, and we'll discuss that then.

In the meantime, staff of the Auditor's department provided my office with a memo which had been apparently provided by Mr. Moore to the Board of Directors of McKenzie Seeds on March 15, 1982. The document, the subject of it is, "Greeting Seeds."

The fourth paragraph reads as follows: "It is possible for us to make arrangements to obtain the rights to use the U.S. company graphics. Because of the clinical type of surroundings required to package this product, we would subcontract all of the work involved except the seed packaging. The cards could either be printed by Leech or Murray Printing of Brandon, and the packaging could be done by either of them or by Arm Industries or by Agassiz, both Brandon companies. Agassiz is a company in which C. McEachern has a minority interest and they presently package our netting. Arm Industries is a rehabilitation workshop and do many subcontract operations for us."

I will table the document and, as well, I can advise that I've spoken to one director of McKenzie Seeds who could not find a copy of that in his files and does not recall having seen it. Mr. Moore says that he had presented it apparently to the directors at a meeting some time in March of 1982.

As the Member for Turtle Mountain knows, the reference to Mr. McEachern is somewhat misleading in that although he was a minority shareholder of McKenzie Seeds, the memo doesn't make reference to the fact that the other shareholder, Mr. Boisjoli, owned all of the other shares, so that between the two of them, two employees of McKenzie Seeds owned 100 percent of that corporation.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister providing that information and tabling it for the House. It confirms what Mr. McDowell has reported to the Winnipeg Sun; that indeed he did know over a year ago about a possible conflict-of-interest situation. He was informed that a senior member of management of McKenzie Seeds owned at least part of a corporation that was doing business with McKenzie Seeds.

My question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds: Does this not raise some questions in his mind about the judgment and the ability of Mr. McDowell to serve as chairman of that board?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that the document I have just tabled that there is some question as to whether or not directors had that document. Mr. Moore says his recollection is that they did. Certainly, at least one other director says they did not. I have read the article in the newspaper, but I would want some other evidence to indicate that, in fact, other members of the Board of Directors were aware of this, because they have been telling me - and I've talked to several of the directors - that they did not know that all of this came as a revelation.

So I think that it would be very premature on the basis of a newspaper article to go and criticize the chairman of that board, who, incidentally, when he received the interim report of the Auditor, moved expeditiously. He moved immediately with his Board of Directors to do what he felt was right in order to ensure the proper survival of McKenzie Seeds. I trust that he will continue to do that.

Now if there is any evidence that he has behaved improperly, then that will be looked at. But I don't think that it would be appropriate to simply go on the memory of one person as opposed to another person and say, well because one person says this, then therefore we have to accept that another person is doing something that's wrong.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, what an absolutely incredible statement to come from the Minister of Finance. Mr. McDowell has told a Press reporter that he had knowledge of this fact over a year ago. The Minister himself has tabled a letter in the House which

shows that the board was advised. Why is it up to us to confirm this, Mr. Speaker?

My question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds, why did he not pick up the phone and call Mr. McDowell? Mr. McDowell is his appointee. The Minister said this morning, he read the paper, he read the article. Why didn't he pick up the phone and call, and find out?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it's pretty clear that the Member for Turtle Mountain didn't understand my first answer. The document I tabled had been provided to the Auditor, as I understand it, by Mr. Moore not by the company. It was Mr. Moore's recollection that it had been provided to the directors. Several directors have informed - well, one has specifically informed me on this document that he did not have it, and did not recall ever having had it. Another director has told me that he doesn't recall any evidence of a conflict of interest.

I think that it is only fair that we await the report of the Auditor to determine what did, in fact, happen, or what can be proven. But to suggest, as the Member for Turtle Mountain has, that because I have tabled a letter, that the Chairman had that letter is a totally incredible leap of logic.

It may well have been that what the Chairman was referring to was something else. It may have been that he knew about some of the buildings which had been public . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . knowledge for a long time, so why don't we just wait and see?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have before me an article from today's Winnipeg Sun, which was written by George Stephenson. It says and I quote, "George McDowell said in an interview the possible conflict involving a senior executive was raised at a board meeting in early 1982.

"The board, however, did not think the matter was as serious as it has turned out to be, McDowell said."

Mr. Speaker, what is this government now trying to cover up? For a while, they proceeded with this investigation in an open manner. There is now evidence that the Chairman of the Board of Directors, by his own admission and appointed by that government, had knowledge of what was going on a year ago, and apparently failed to follow it up.

Now my question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds was: Does that raise any question in his mind about the ability and the competence of Mr. McDowell to continue as Chairman of the Board of McKenzie Seeds?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, we said this morning that we will check with the Auditor to determine whether we can have even the interim report released. We're prepared to do that immediately, providing that we are assured that it will not prejudice the rest of the investigation.

To the suggestion that somehow we are trying to cover something up is simply false. The quotation the member makes does not refer, in fact, to Agassiz. It could well be that had to do with the leasing arrangement on the buildings, or it could have had to do with the leasing arrangement on the computers, or it could have had to do with the card shop. We don't know what it was, and so for the Member for Turtle Mountain to connect that up with something that happened at a meeting in early 1982 is simply a flight of imagination because he has no evidence to put that together with this particular letter. We're trying to come forward with all of the items we get. I got this letter and I've produced it to the members so that they know what the allegation of Mr. Moore is based on.

I don't know what the chairman was referring to, but let's remember that this matter is currently under investigation by the Provincial Auditor and there will be a report completed by the end of September, and decisions will be taken. Now in terms of Mr. McDowell, I'm sure that the Minister responsible will have a conversation with him to determine exactly what it was that he knew and when.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds advise the House when he last had any conversation with Mr. McDowell about the operations of McKenzie Seeds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated previously, that we've had discussions obviously from time to time through the period of time in which Mr. McDowell was the chairman. I don't precisely remember exactly when, I think perhaps last week some time, but the point is, Mr. Speaker, that this government has acted expeditiously, it has acted properly, it's acted as quickly as it possibly could to have an investigation of the matter.

The honourable member is doing a lot of people a great disservice by a lot of questions. I appreciate the honourable member's interest and I'm sure we all have that interest, but we do have an investigation going on. As the Auditor himself has stated publicly, he is looking into all of these matters. He's discussing it with the senior staff. He is having discussions with the board. Incidentally, the board acted very, very properly when they received certain interim information and took certain actions. I commend them for their actions.

But, I also point out, Mr. Speaker, that when the report comes out, it will be very obvious that there have been problems which go back to the period of time when Mr. Don Craik was Minister of Finance responsible for McKenzie Seeds and when his Special Assistant, Mr. J.L. Burns, was a member of the board of directors of that company.

I repeat again, it's not a matter of who belongs to which party or what. Let's get the facts. Let's have the proper assessment. Let's have a fair assessment. Let's not hide anything. Let's put it on the table, and we'll do that.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we are seeking information about the government's handling or mishandling of this affair. They are reluctant to provide information. I have some further questions then for the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds.

In his investigation, did either Mr. Schulz, who is the Minister's Special Assistant, or the Provincial Auditor inquire into the amount of time that Marie Greeniaus, who was the Minister's official agent in 1981 and is a full-time employee of McKenzie Seeds, spends as a shareholder of the Carillon Card Shoppe in Brandon? She is a shareholder there with Mr. Moore, Mr. McEachern and Mr. Boisjoli, and they hire as a manageress a person who is also a full-time employee of McKenzie Seeds.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated before, the agency, the person that we have asked to do the investigation is the Provincial Auditor. The Provincial Auditor has indicated publicly that he is looking into this matter.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds tell the House whether or not one of the things that the Auditor has been looking into is the possible use of McKenzie Seeds trucks in transporting stock for the Carillon Card Shoppe?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Member for Turtle Mountain has certain information, and I would ask him right now and urge him to co-operate with the Provincial Auditor by providing that information to him so the Auditor can look into this.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. EVANS: I repeat, the matter's under review; the matter's under investigation, and we will get a report and we'll see what the report says.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister.

The First Minister will be aware, surely now, that his Minister and his chairman of the board at McKenzie Seeds have had some prior knowledge of these conflict-of-interest situations. The First Minister did not act; the Minister did not act in any significant way until the issue was raised in this House. Will the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services on a point of order.

HON. L. EVANS: The Member for Turtle Mountain has made a statement which is not true. I have denied it before; he continues to say it and I ask him to withdraw it. It's simply not true.

MR. B. RANSOM: To the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister would like to indicate which of my statements was untrue.

A MEMBER: Yes, tell him, Len.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe a disagreement between members does not constitute a point of order. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is that in view of this situation which has been going on for so long and because of the very close involvement of the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds with many of the other people, being personal friends and political acquaintances, and one of them being his official agent in 1981, will the First Minister acknowledge that the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds is simply too close to the situation in order to be able to act decisively to deal with what is clearly a very bad situation involving McKenzie Seeds? Will he remove that Minister and put another Minister in charge?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I do find regrettable is his conservative sense of justice: First, off with your heads; then on with the trial.

Mr. Speaker, it was this Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds that forwarded a request to the Minister of Finance, a request that the Provincial Auditor - Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that when a government acts openly and causes an inquiry by the Provincial Auditor that is responsible to this Legislature as a whole, is not responsible to the government but to the entire Legislature, and we act immediately and not with delay in order to undertake that, that we should still receive the kind of calls from across the way of cover-up because this is a government that has reacted very quickly to appoint that individual that is most directly responsible and can most fairly and most properly deal with a matter of this nature, and that is the Provincial Auditor of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the honourable members are concerned and worry themselves a great deal about the fact that the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds and Community Services is a well-regarded Minister in southwestern Manitoba. That bugs honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, when we obtain the report from the Provincial Auditor, that report will be evaluated by the Minister of Finance; it will be evaluated by myself; and whatever appropriate steps need to be undertaken will be taken at that time; but we will not be pursuing a policy of first off with their heads, then on with the trial.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, has the First Minister taken the opportunity to review the interim report which the Auditor has made available to the government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have had opportunity to peruse the preliminary report. I await the final report. I am satisfied on the basis of the preliminary report that the board of directors acted properly in dismissing the three employees.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Baby virus

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: My question is to the Honourable Acting Minister of Health. I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, whether there is any evidence that the very serious viral illness among newborns in the intensive care nursery at St. Boniface Hospital is in any way the result of overcrowding at that high-risk obstetrical facility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I have not received that advice from the department. I will certainly take that question under advisement, that specific question, but the reports that I have received from the department in no way indicate that was the case.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise or cause to be investigated and subsequently report to the House as to how many obstetrical cases have been shifted over this summer to St. Boniface from Seven Oaks and Concordia under the government's announced intention to phase out the Seven Oaks and Concordia units?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister investigate the extent to which there may be a cause and effect link between transfer of cases from other obstetrical units to the St. Boniface unit, and determine whether that infection and its spread could have been prevented, Sir, or at least could have been contained much more quickly if there had not been so many maternity cases admitted to the St. Boniface unit?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I said I would take as notice the question of whether, in fact, people were transferred over. As such, I'll take as notice the second part of the member's question, which asks if people were transferred over - and we haven't ascertained that yet - was there any cause and effect in relation to this particular outbreak, but certainly I'll take that question as notice as well.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the House as to whether an investigation will be conducted into this whole matter, and who will investigate the situation? Would he advise the House as to whether that investigation will be carried out by the Department of Health, by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, by the Manitoba Medical Association and/or by the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba, or indeed by an investigating team containing representatives of all those components?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I know that a specialist has been brought in from Ottawa. Three

specialists are being brought in from Atlanta. I think it's very important that the emergency be dealt with first. That, I believe, is being undertaken in a professional way and an expediting way by all people concerned. I would think that then the matter of looking into how this came about; whether in fact it has happened elsewhere in other parts of North America; whether in fact there was any causal relationships involved; or whether this was an accident, should be looked into.

At the appropriate time, I think the department will recommend on what would be the most appropriate way of having the investigation conducted.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will direct a question to the Honourable First Minister similar, I might say, to one that I put to the First Minister this morning, but more definitive, I would hope, in its implications this time. I would ask the First Minister whether the government will now re-examine its whole policy with regard to the consolidation of obstetrical units on the basis of this difficulty that has occurred at St. Boniface; and whether it will evaluate the factors that went into the making of that consolidation decision.

In other words, was it ever considered that one of the down sides to consolidation might be a problem of this kind, overcrowding which leads to easy cross-infection?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: What is most important is that we deal with this present emergency, and once the emergency is dealt with that we make an entire assessment pertaining to the question of the obstetric units in the various hospitals, and whether or not indeed this has any relationship to the larger question. First and foremost, deal with the emergency; secondly, to follow it with the overall assessment.

Bilingualism - proposed resolution

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways and ask him, given that a lady from Beausejour brought a petition to the Legislature yesterday with 320 names on it against the government's bilingual proposals, has he received a copy of that petition?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes indeed, Mr. Speaker. I did receive a copy. I also believe that she was not informed as to the substance of the resolve that is before this House.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the Minister whether he has received any petitions that are favourable to the government's policy, even if they were based on the erroneous and misleading pamphlets that have been distributed?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I am the Minister answering to this question, but I will tell

the Member for Elmwood that there are a number in society that understand the issue fully and understand the reasons why we have to deal with this question at this time. It's true that the vast majority of people are not certain as to why it has to be done, and there is a need to explain the issue.

School libraries - funding

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to then direct a question to the Minister of Education. Given that the lady from Beausejour revealed in an interview that she was concerned about the costs of the bilingual program, especially since her school had no money for library books this past year, could the Minister indicate whether she has provided sufficient funding for school libraries in 1982-83?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago there was a special library grant that school divisions received, and at that time they had to spend the money on library books. When there was a change to the Education Support Program, they moved towards consolidating a lot of the smaller categorical grants into block grants, which gave school divisions the authority to make decisions on where to spend the money; so that they are getting the same amount of money that they were entitled to, but it is not going to them in a categorical way that requires them to spend money on library books.

I can say that this is one of the areas that has been brought to my attention by others where there is concern that with the categorical library grant demise, there is a feeling that libraries may not be getting some of the money or as much attention and money as they should. That's one of the issues that we're looking at in the educational finance review, but the judgment on where to spend the money and where the needs are for libraries is with the school division, and they're getting adequate money from the province to do that.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question. Given the government's new austerity program, will library grants be restricted to 0 to 5 percent for 1983-1984?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we are still awaiting the making of decisions on the entire Education Support Program which includes all funding to school divisions and all grants. There may be some judgments made that some grants need to be increased and some others may not need to be increased, but those decisions will be made in the fall.

Manitoba Beef Commission

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Agriculture. I would ask the Acting Minister of Agriculture what percentage of Manitoba slaughter cattle are sold through the Manitoba Beef Commission? What are the numbers and the percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'll take that question as notice and provide the information as soon as possible.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, while he is doing that and taking that question as notice, I wonder if the Minister would find out what mechanism or what process the Beef Commission goes through to establish a price to make sure that the province is, in fact, getting the proper price for that product and the taxpayers aren't unnecessarily picking up a subsidy if those cattle aren't effectively being sold. Would the Minister, as well, find out for the House and as well, what type of package or what lots or style of lots are being offered to the packing house industry and how many packers are effectively bidding on those cattle and then are using them in the province?

Main Street Manitoba Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's announcement some two weeks ago, including Morden, Manitoba in the Main Street Manitoba Project; and in view of the fact that yesterday the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister of Highways made a joint announcement of additional funds for the heavy construction industry; and in view of the fact that in this joint announcement, Mr. Adam is reported that \$4 million to \$4.5 million will be targeted to projects that will be of a construction nature, namely, maintenance, replacement and resurfacing of streets, roads and sidewalks, my question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs is will he use a portion of that \$4.5 million to approve the reconstruction of Stephen Street in Morden so that he can further legitimize and make possible the completion of the Main Street Project that he announced two weeks ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I think I made it very clear when the honourable member raised the question previously that the agreement with the Town of Morden is based on a phased-in project, and we are prepared to keep our end of the bargain . . .

A MEMBER: Well, what do you know!

HON. A. ADAM: . . . and that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I will get to the question in a minute.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. ADAM: I'm going to take my time in order that he has the proper background of what we're dealing with, Mr. Speaker. There is a considerable amount - perhaps even up to half of the project could proceed now - I can't be definite on the amounts, but I know that a substantial portion of the project could proceed and we are prepared to go along with this. I advised the member when he raised the question previously that the mayor of Morden had requested for us to look

at the possibility of reconstructing the three-block portion which is connected to or adjacent to the main street project; and I advised him yesterday, I believe, or the last time that he raised the question, that I have asked the Minister of Highways to have his staff review this request of whether it would be feasible or not and we want to find out the cost.

Once we have that information, we will make a decision as to whether or not we can proceed with any reconstructing of that three-block portion of Stephen Street or not.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister has indicated today that they intend to live up to their part of the bargain, and part of that bargain was to see if additional monies could be gained from the Jobs Fund to undertake the street reconstruction in Morden to allow the main street project to proceed and now that that money is available, my question still stands: Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs announce funding under his newly announced \$4.5 million to reconstruct Stephen Street in Morden to allow the main street project to go ahead?

HON. A. ADAM: I just dealt with that question moments ago, Mr. Speaker. It is repetitive. I have just advised the honourable member that I have requested from the Minister of Highways to look at the possibility and the feasibility from an engineering standpoint of view as to whether or not we could proceed with the three-block reconstruction request that we have received from the mayor of Morden and until we have that information, it is not possible to make a decision. We have to know what the cost involves and a decision will be made on that basis.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Highways. Since he also has in this announcement and has now \$4 million from the Jobs Fund, can he assure the House and the citizens of Morden that he and the Minister of Municipal Affairs will finally get together and co-ordinate the Main Street Manitoba Project and both use part of their funds to enable the reconstruction of Stephen Street to take place so that at least the Minister of Municipal Affairs will not have made an announcement with much grandiose press coverage that he cannot keep his word on with the people of Morden?

HON. A. ADAM: On a point of order, he has put on the records that I am unable to keep my end of the bargain.

I have just announced that we are prepared to go ahead with our agreement that we have arrived at with the Town of Morden, and that is that we would proceed with the main street project on a phased-in basis, on a stage basis. Now the member is trying to put things on the record that are incorrect. We are keeping our bargain; we are prepared to proceed with it if the town is agreeable to go ahead under those conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Highways willing to answer whether he and the Minister

of Municipal Affairs can finally get together in the co-ordination of this project, and allow the Stephen Street to be reconstructed, so that Main Street can go ahead?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, again I want to remind the Member for Pembina that we are not inclined to let pavement contracts of \$1 million in scope out of the additional funds that have been allocated to the department. The reason being, that the construction industry emphasize a need for grade work, as opposed to a lot of pavement, in order to have more construction projects rather than just a few.

So given the fact that our dollars are limited, even though they are additional dollars, we are trying to spread them out over 11 or 12 projects. If we were to allocate them on the basis of this criteria, we would have four or five projects, Mr. Speaker, and we can't do that in light of the needs of the industry.

Mosquito fogging

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister responsible for EMO. Can the Minister inform the House as to the criteria the government used in arriving at the decision to spray the Town of Swan River for mosquitoes last Sunday evening?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, the same criteria was used generally that was used for all of the other communities; that is, that the counts of the particular mosquito that was thought to be carrying or potentially could be carrying the virus, the *Culex tarsalis*, counts were very high that were received on the weekend.

As well, there were in the area a number of isolations of the virus in chicken flocks. There was a sentinel flock in the Dauphin area that had a number of identified virus-carrying chickens. As well, other flocks that were used in a co-operative way, private flocks that have been in the area for a lengthy period of time, were also drawn upon through a bleed that is done to determine if there was virus, and it was also determined that there was virus there as well. So those two criteria were used to make the decision.

MR. D. GOURLAY: In view of the fact that the communities of Minitonas and Bowsman were within 10 miles of the spray pattern used for spraying Swan River, why weren't these two communities also covered in the spraying when they were at Swan River?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of balancing the threat with the ability to actually conduct a spraying program within a reasonable time frame and reasonable cost. There has to be decisions made as to cut offs. We have an alternative to go and do the whole province, or to cut it off at certain-sized

communities that are designated as high risk and where we are protecting the majority of the people of the province. So we have to make that kind of a decision.

What we did do is make that decision on the basis of communities of 1,000 and over, as opposed to the decisions that were made in 1981, where the criteria was 1,800 and over, generally. So we did go to smaller communities, but we did make the cut off at 1,000 residents within the confines and limits of the towns or villages.

So from that basis, Minitonas and the other community that was mentioned by the honourable member were not sprayed. It does not mean that there is not a high risk there, but again we have to have a cut-off point.

Jobs Fund - allocation of funds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the First Minister.

The press release dated August 2nd says that, "Jobs Fund is to assist heavy construction." There is eight or eight-and-a-half million committed to roads and municipalities. Can the First Minister advise whether that is allocated out of budgetary authority in the Jobs Fund or non-budgetary authority?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that would be from budgetary authority.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the referral motion with respect to the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it appears on Pages - I have this morning's Order Paper - but I imagine it's still on Pages 12 and 13 of the Order Paper.

DEBATE ON MOTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and subamendment proposed thereto by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

The Honourable Member for Arthur has 22 minutes remaining.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The resolution or the subamendment to the resolution, Mr.

Speaker, the one which was presented by my colleague for Gladstone, and the amendment which was introduced by my colleague for Fort Garry, of course, are very self-explanatory. In my comments earlier today, I tried to point out to the government precisely why we feel it's important to have this issue put before the people in an intersessional committee setting, but as well, to put a deadline on it, as has been done in the subamendment by my colleague for Gladstone, to deal with it in a certain period of time.

In going back over some of my comments, it is very difficult for me to understand, and our side to understand, Mr. Speaker, as to why the government wouldn't deal with it in a responsible, legislative manner. That is really the thrust of the whole opposition to what we are dealing with on this particular resolution. That is the process, the ramrod approach which has been presented to this Assembly, and to not deal with it in a responsible manner cannot be accepted by my colleagues or, I'm sure, by the majority of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with the content of the request for such intersessional hearings and the fact that we would like to deal with it within this particular time frame, let us look back as to why it is before the people of Manitoba at all. The content of this whole question, I think, has to be looked at to some degree. I know the Minister of Mines and Energy was referring to some of the content or why we weren't prepared to debate it, but we have to look, Mr. Speaker, as Manitobans, as to what has been our heritage and our background and how this whole province has evolved and the whole system of agreeing or disagreeing and self-governing of Manitoba in relationship to the rest of Canada.

As we have developed as a province, and one generation upon next generation grows and takes advantage or takes part in the opportunities that this province has afforded us, we have become, I would say, a very close province, a province of people who have found it very easy to get along. One only has to look at the numerous backgrounds of the people throughout, not only the rural area, but through the City of Winnipeg, when one travels on any of the streets and participates in any of the activities, particularly one which will be coming up in the coming week. That, of course, is Folklorama, where in fact we see a multitude of people from various backgrounds come together and really be one community pulling in the same direction.

That has been a credit to all those peoples, to the minorities and to the majorities but today, Mr. Speaker, we have brought before us by this present government, an issue which really didn't have to be. It didn't have to be the kind of an issue that it is, but when one watches and listens to the approach and the procedures taken by the Attorney-General and by the Premier and by his specific Ministers, it makes the people of Manitoba question really what is going on; not totally understanding it, but they have a brief feeling that something is happening that really isn't sitting the way it normally is done in the province.

Let's look at common sense for a minute, Mr. Speaker. There was a law supposedly broken on a parking ticket. There was further to that a law broken as far as the speeding ticket is concerned, but because of a technical

challenge by the legal authorities of this country, then the individuals who contested this particular charge were in fact no longer able to be charged under that particular section of the provincial act because it was non-constitutional. It didn't have anything to do, Mr. Speaker, with whether there was a right or wrong done, that's not the question. It's a matter now of a technical approach by our legal people.

Mr. Speaker, we're now in a "what if" situation. What if we'd gone to court, what would have been the results? Well, Mr. Speaker, I refer back to the Honourable Duff Roblin's comments which I think carry a lot of weight with the people of the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Great man, great man.

MR. J. DOWNEY: His recommendation, Mr. Speaker, is one which I think we can all, on this side of the House, agree with that the normal court process should have been carried out. You cannot second guess or not pre-guess what will happen in our courts. Because one case, Mr. Speaker, is now agreed to not be pushed further, what is to stop further cases from being put before the courts and judgments made. As a lay person, Mr. Speaker, I truly can't understand. Nobody from the government side has come forward and clearly said that we are guaranteed that nobody will push this issue. So we're changing, or being asked to change, the Constitution of our province, the content, the whole make-up and the get together of common social rule and lawmaking is in a "what if" situation. That, Mr. Speaker, is not sound ground on which to change the policies and the Constitution of our province.

It is a very very dicey situation because, Mr. Speaker, what if any other numbers of situations developed in the future, are we going to as legislators try and pre-guess "what if" this kind of situation happens? So it doesn't hold up very well with the people of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, and wrong is wrong is wrong. If someone does something wrong, common sense has to prevail. I don't see where we would be put into any chaotic situation with the lawmakers or the courts of this country. I believe we have responsible people holding those positions, and if we haven't, then changes should be made to that, Mr. Speaker, not to our Constitution to deal with it. So the advice of the Honourable Senator on how to deal with the judicial case before the law of the courts should be paid attention to, Mr. Speaker, in great depth.

Again, let us look a little broader than a court decision or the pending court decision that the government was nervous about. Mr. Speaker, what are they basing the need for change on? What are they basing it on? We have sat here for days listening and trying to find out why it is we are being faced with this question. We all can go back and say, yes, that we know at one time half the people were Franco-Manitobans and half were Anglophones in the province. Yes, that is true, our history tells us that it is so, but it isn't that way 100 years later, Mr. Speaker. It isn't that way and they still have the right to the service that was given to them. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out in spades by our leader and by every speaker on this side of the House that those rights are there, they're preserved by us, the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I have to speak personally about my family. I want my son, I want my family to be able to speak many languages and, yes, I want him to be able to speak French. I think it would be a great asset in the country of Canada. And I think, Mr. Speaker, the majority of people who are today protesting what the government is doing, if we're asked the question, by choice, would you like to be able to speak French and have that service offered? They would say, yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure I can speak for a lot of my constituents who would say, if given the choice, the freedom of choice, and it isn't going to cost a horrendous amount of money, then, I think, Mr. Speaker, that they would agree with us that we should by choice, as we were doing. But where this government have failed to act responsibly is to say that we are going to now become a bilingual province with both French and English as those official languages.

By force, they are telling my constituents and the constituents of their own areas that is going to be the way it is, not allowing them input, not allowing them a say on it, but that is the decision of government. The Attorney-General in his opening comments said that it is in stone that the wording can't be changed; an agreement has been struck and either has to go that way or the total thing will be scrapped, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: I would ask him to — (Interjection) — well, if he would like - to peruse Hansard on this. At no time did I say that anything was carved in stone, and for the Member for Arthur to use those words as purporting to quote me is fundamentally wrong. He knows it to be wrong and I think it's a shameful thing that he's doing, and he ought to make it clear that he is not quoting me nor even paraphrasing anything that I said.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding - and I may not and I don't intend to quote him precisely - of the Attorney-General's position that their decision was made. It was to proceed as it is or would have to be totally withdrawn, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's on Hansard. I'm quite prepared to go back and review it again, and if I am incorrect then I will stand up and admit that I am. That is more than what I've heard the government do at any point on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is this: Do not force it upon the people or you will pay the price, and it's not the short-term price that I'm concerned about. The short-term price for this government is the loss of the next election, and that is a given at this particular point. It is a given that they will lose the next general election on this issue alone. This issue alone will defeat them, but the longer-term concern of mine and my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, as I reiterated this morning, is what they are doing is wrong, wrong, wrong! It will destroy the social fabric that ties this province of minority groups

and majority groups together as one common force and one common group of people, and that's the destruction that they're doing, Mr. Speaker.

The First Minister last night made reference to the fact that we had to do this to unify Canada. To unify Canada, he's saying, is to divide Manitoba, that's what we're being asked to do. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, stand idly by and let that happen, and that's why my colleagues and I are determined to stand here to our end, defeat what this government is proposing that is wrong for the people of Manitoba.

I don't know when they are going to yield, Mr. Speaker, and agree to what we have asked for which is only a common sense approach, and that is the intersessional committees unless, as I said earlier, they don't want to hear what the people of Manitoba have to say. I'll say this again and again, they did not have the mandate to make this change. Their mandate was this - that nobody would lose their homes or their businesses; that they would have to have a year's notice before they were laid off; that the Hydro freeze would be continued, Mr. Speaker. All those falsehoods is what they were elected on, Mr. Speaker. Now what are they trying to do? They're trying to play games with the people of Manitoba. We will not tolerate it, Mr. Speaker, and we'll fight it to the end.

Mr. Speaker, what do we have? We have a provincial government who have proceeded, first of all, in secret, negotiating with the minority group and with the Federal Government. We know what their objectives are. We don't need to be told that over and over again, what Pierre Elliott Trudeau is doing. Of course, he is using the present-day Premier as a puppet. That is all that he is doing. He knows that he has a weakling in place.

I'll go back again, when the First Minister referred to my leader's reason for losing the last election was he had spent too much time on the Constitution. I again say, thank God, it was Premier Sterling Lyon that was negotiating the Constitution and not Pawley, Mr. Speaker, not Mr. Pawley, because the people of Manitoba trusted Sterling Lyon. They definitely don't trust Howard Pawley. It is a matter of trust.

A MEMBER: They sure showed it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, I indicated why the New Democratic Party are in office. If you promise people the world and then never intend on delivering it, you're going to get elected, but they are paying the price for those false promises, Mr. Speaker. They are paying the price, and will do so not only in the next election, but this NDP Government are doing a lot to remove the socialist and the NDP philosophy from this province for a long, long time. It is not only this next election they're going to defeat themselves, but they are going to go as the national NDP did, continue to slide in the polls, and won't be heard of for a long, long time, Mr. Speaker. That is what they're accomplishing. If that's what their objective is, we will help them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the unity of this province, as I indicated earlier, I believe it is the responsibility of a government to keep a balance in society, where they make sure the minority groups' rights are protected and where the majority in society are as well considered that they can't take advantage of those minority groups,

but in fact there is a give and take. But we haven't seen that under the New Democratic Party, we haven't seen that. We have seen them yield to the whims of certain people, who are in a lot of cases, Mr. Speaker, not reasonable with their requests in the overall picture of the longevity of a good and sociable province. That is where their responsibility lies, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope in their discussions in Cabinet, in caucus, that they take into consideration the longer term results of what they are proposing to deal with in this province. Surely to goodness, when you have in excess of 100 municipalities, the Cities of Brandon and Winnipeg, proposing to put the question to the public on this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, has to tell them something.

What happens with the results? You know, I hate to prejudge what the results may be, but I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, they aren't going to be in favour of what the government wants; in fact, very much the opposite. I believe that one could safely estimate that 90 percent of the people, given the opportunity if they supported the government on their proposal to make Manitoba a bilingual province, would be defeated by 90 percent. Ninety percent would oppose them. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe firmly that 90 percent of the people would vote against what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about what and why and how have they based the need for this change. Mr. Speaker, there has been not one speaker on the government side stand and tell this Assembly precisely what is the need for change. What is the need for change? Yes, they've made reference, Mr. Speaker, to a court case. What if the judgment was to go against the province, and we would have all this chaos in the province, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, what kind of government do we have? What if, Mr. Speaker, it would have been a more serious charge? Would we be as ready to negotiate away what has been the tradition of our province to satisfy a few?

Mr. Speaker, we are a province of opportunity. We have been a province of freedom of opportunity, but now we are now in the position of being forced to accept not a freedom of choice of what we do as a people, but a freedom of allowing or giving that freedom to the judicial system to make a judgment on what happens to the future of our families. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is our responsibility as legislators to protect the rights and freedoms of our children and those who are to be born, as was indicated by the Leader of our party. Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility. To turn that responsibility over to the courts of the land is an irresponsible action, and we cannot tolerate it and will not tolerate it.

Mr. Speaker, what happens and what if a more serious situation were to develop? Do we negotiate away more of the rights and freedoms of our young people so that we don't have to take the chance of what the courts are going to tell us? Is that the kind of long-term situation we are now into, where you and I as legislators give away our decision-making power of the future generations of this province to a judicial body who make judgments on their future and their freedoms? No, Mr. Speaker, we will not allow that to happen. We will sit here, Mr. Speaker, through long weekend after long weekend, whether it's hot or whether it's not, whether it's cold, because it is right that we defend our constituents on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen this government give us? We have seen the NDP Government have been creators of social unrest is what we have seen. They have as well, Mr. Speaker, given us nothing but economic chaos in the province.

I want to conclude my remarks by saying, Mr. Speaker, that if they continue to insist on being such an arrogant, a government that does not believe that they should deal with the wishes of the people, the way the people feel, they will pay the price. The short-term price for them, Mr. Speaker, is in fact the next general election. That is their short-term price, but the long-term price is the social unrest that the people of Manitoba, all the minority groups and the majority groups, will have to work together to mend back together again. It will take not only one generation, Mr. Speaker, but it will take numerous generations to gain back the kind of confidence that we have in one another; that we are all being treated equally and fairly by a government, and that one particular group is not getting a special treatment, Mr. Speaker. We will stay and fight this until the end, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

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

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I wish to correct Hansard, Saturday, the 30th of July, 2:00 p.m. On Page 4697, an interjection is identified as "Mr. D. Orchard: But they bought it." I simply want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, as is the problem with picking up interjections and attempting to identify who has made them, that I was not present at that Session.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTIONS Cont'd

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES Cont'd

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my comments to the referral motion and the amendment and the sub-amendment. In this particular case, I will address my remarks to the sub-amendment which was proposed by my colleague, the MLA for Gladstone; a sub-amendment which contrary to what the Member for Radisson would have us believe in his comment from his seat that we are wasting time. No, Mr. Speaker, this sub-amendment that we have proposed answers the kinds of concerns as to a timing deadline that members in the government and particularly the Attorney-General and the First Minister have told us that they are operating under.

First off, let our amendment in no way, shape or form give credence to the bad job of negotiating that the government did on this issue. They set their own self-imposed time limit; they negotiated badly without giving themselves sufficient time to deal with this very important issue in this Assembly with the members of the opposition, but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, they allowed themselves a time deadline within the

framework of which they could not properly bring this issue before the people of Manitoba to gain the people's concurrence, to gain the people's support and to gain the people of the Province of Manitoba's best wishes for success of this issue.

They negotiated badly; it was not us. Members in the government, and particularly the Attorney-General who is a rather newcomer to this House and to the parliamentary process, set for himself and his colleagues an unrealistic time limit within which they must have this matter resolved in the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. We believe they negotiated badly, very very badly. They did not negotiate with the best interests of the people of Manitoba as the bottom line of their negotiations. That's fine; we recognize these people cannot negotiate. We're thankful that the Minister of Energy and Mines had no portion of that negotiation because, as the chief negotiator that lost the mega project of the power grid, the aluminum smelting plant, the potash plant and the upgrading of Manfor in The Pas, we're certainly pleased that he had nothing to do with these negotiations and that he passed the incompetence ball on to the Attorney-General to negotiate their artificial time frame on this matter.

Taking aside so that the government may in no way, shape or form attach credibility to their bad job of negotiation by our sub-amendment which fits conveniently with the artificial deadline they set, I solicit, I urge and I implore members of the government not to take the sub-amendment as an endorsement of your bad negotiation; but since you have thrown that up as being a major problem with the amendment proposed by the MLA for Fort Garry, we sought to correct it for you, to make it easier for you to accept our amendment and now our sub-amendment, but it in no way endorsed your incompetent negotiating that was undertaken by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, various members in the House have referred to an article in the Winnipeg Sun of Friday, July 29, wherein one Jim Carr, a political columnist, has had an interview with former Premier Roblin, now Senator Roblin, on the NDP's dilemma over this language issue.

Mr. Carr and Mr. Roblin have laid out a very wise course of action that the government should have followed in this bilingual issue. But did they think of that? Obviously no, because they negotiated badly. They set themselves time frames they cannot live with and the people of Manitoba cannot live with. That is why we are at this current impasse in this Legislature, because we know the people of Manitoba are with us on this issue. It is not a lack of understanding as the Minister of Transportation said today in response to a petition of over 300 constituents from Lac du Bonnet.

The Minister of Highways and members in the government who are ramming this issue are treating Manitoba citizens who oppose it as either bigots, racists, red necks or mentally deficient people because they don't understand the issue. That is their common, bottom line, that if you do not agree with us on this issue, you're a racist, you're a red neck, you're a bigot or you're stupid. Good heavens, how can 900,000 people in the Province of Manitoba be red neck, racist, bigoted and stupid? That's impossible, but that's the bottom line they fall down to when they find public opposition growing to the unacceptable proposition they

are putting before the people of Manitoba; and in no small way, Mr. Speaker, that demonstrates the attitude of this current NDP Government to the people of Manitoba.

It perfectly exemplifies the socialist philosophy and the ultra left-wing philosophy as espoused by the Attorney-General of the fact that we, the government, are the masters and the people shall be the slaves. The people are the servants to us, the masters in government, and what we want, as government, we will impose our will on the people of Manitoba; we will not listen to the people of Manitoba.

There are countries in this world where that political attitude works. In Russia, I believe there's one name on the ballot because the political masters dictate to the slaves, the people, as to who shall be their elected people. These people have taken the mandate of the election on November 17, 1981, and translated it into an attitude exemplified by this incompetent government that whatever they propose is good for the people of Manitoba, is the right way to go and must be proceeded with.

On this issue, the vast majority of Manitobans are saying whoa, just a minute. We do not believe you are right, No. 1; we certainly know that you did not campaign on this issue and have a mandate, the elected mandate to carry it out; and No. 3, and more importantly, we don't trust you people. That's what the citizenry of Manitoba are saying. They have heard too many Ministers of this government stand up and give misleading answers, distort the facts, twist the truth and try to cover their incompetence with baffle-gab, balderdash and nonsensical statements and the people of Manitoba are fast becoming aware that this government, and this Attorney-General particularly, cannot be trusted; they cannot be taken at their word.

The Attorney-General got up on a matter of privilege, which wasn't a matter of privilege, demonstrating his knowledge of the Rules of the House once again, and he said that what my colleague, the MLA for Arthur, said in his last speech that he in no place said that this proposal was written in stone.

I have to give the Attorney-General credit for speaking half the truth again. — (Interjection) — My colleague, the MLA for Lakeside, says that is part of the technique. It's a technique that's used by agents of influence throughout the length and breadth of the free world.

Now, the Attorney-General in an answer to the Leader of the Opposition Friday, June 17, 1983, answering a question on whether the government is committed to the agreement or whether or not the government is prepared to modify, moderate, change that agreement with respect to bilingualism, that's the question put to him by the Leader of the Opposition. Here's his answer, Mr. Speaker, "The government," this is Mr. Penner, "has said that it will not call for a vote on the resolution until those hearings are finished because it is not, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination, a P.R. exercise or a sham, because it is open for us to do one thing, but one thing only. That is to reject the agreement completely. It is not possible at this stage, because the case in the Supreme Court merely stands adjourned. It is not possible for us to take an agreement that involves four or five parties and unilaterally start playing around texturally with agreement."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, who is the father of all wisdom in this House, the legal giant, the

mental master of the law and the half-truth, holds his whole case on unilaterally. Just what does he think this House is? This House can unilaterally change that amendment and he said, no, it cannot happen. He said this House cannot change this because we cannot go back to the four or five other parties involved unilaterally. The man is hoisted on his own petard. He is caught saying one thing and attempting to say that he didn't and that, in fact, if he did say, it he didn't meant that, he meant something else. He meant another obfuscation of the truth, he meant another distortion of the fact, he meant smoke and mirrors. Because, he told us in this House, Mr. Speaker, that what is there, and I will quote the Attorney-General once again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, the Member for Pembina is attempting to tell this House, in response to some earlier exchange between myself and another member of this House, the Member for Arthur, that I had said expressly or impliedly that this matter was carved in stone, reads a passage from Hansard in which clearly all I said was that an agreement, and that's elementary even for the Member for Pembina, cannot be changed unilaterally. Not that it can't be changed, but it can't be changed unilaterally. If an agreement is to remain an agreement, any change has to be consensual. That much is obvious and it should be even for that intellectual infant.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General for that explanation.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I trust that that non-point of order will be deducted from my time and not become part of it.

I'll quote once more because the Attorney-General is answering a question as to what the course of action is open to this House in dealing with this bilingual resolution. He said because it is open for us to do one thing but one thing only, that is to reject the agreement completely. There is no way that we can move amendments according to that statement from the Attorney-General. But that was Friday, June 17th, we are now sitting on August 3rd, Wednesday. What a difference six weeks makes, because not only has this Attorney-General, who had put to us the position that you take this, you swallow the pill, you say nothing, we change nothing, we see nothing, we hear nothing, and we speak no evil. That's what the Attorney-General said. Now he has gone from saying, well, because the MGEA come along and pointed out a flaw, maybe we'll listen to them. Well, because there's public pressure growing on this, maybe we'll listen to the people and we'll go out and have one-sided meetings and explain our position to them.

Now, I detect from what the First Minister said last night that there is a possibility that they might actually consider taking this committee to the people in rural Manitoba at a series of hearings outside of the City of Winnipeg. What a difference six weeks of public opinion has made on that written-in-stone Attorney-General. He now admits possibly, possibly, possibly we can

amend it, possibly we can hear the people of Manitoba, possibly all these things will happen.

But we are not convinced in this House, we have been betrayed in the opposition by the government on a number of times and we will not accept those little trinkets of innuendo, of possible solution, until we get one of the senior ministers of that government to stand up in this House, speak to the sub-amendment and say, yes, it is the government's intention to pass this so that we can go to the people of Manitoba. We will not pass this resolution until we have that guarantee on the public record where they cannot deny that they said it.

That's what we're waiting for, that's what we hope to extract from this reluctant government that doesn't want to face the people of Manitoba and take this issue to the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, when we get that commitment, then this amendment shall pass with a majority of the House. Naturally, we will support it. Hopefully, all members over there will support it.

So until we get those kinds of indications on the record from the Attorney-General, this debate shall go on and shall go on and shall go on, because we are being told day in and day out by the people of Manitoba that a number of us have opportunity to talk to when we're not in this House. They tell us, keep up the fight, don't let this government railroad that amendment through, stop them, use any measure you can. The people of Manitoba are on our side and those people want us to be here fighting this government, trying to ram an incompetently, poorly negotiated amendment, which causes more friction, more social disruption, more animosity, more hatred between the minorities than any action of any other government in the history of this province.

The people of Manitoba, French, Ukrainian, German, Icelandic, are telling us to keep up the fight and stop this government, stop the Attorney-General is what they're telling us. Mr. Speaker, as often happens politicians respond to public pressure. We in the opposition are making that response today; we have made it for the last week; and we will make it for the next several weeks if necessary, because we know we're right, we know we have the people with us, and we know that the government is wrong.

Now, does that mean, and I'll ask the Member for Radisson, because hopefully he at some point in time will justify what he's trying to ram through the House, if he were in our position, would he do any different? I'll tell you right now, if I was to receive an honest answer from the Member for Radisson, he would say, yes. He would do the same thing the opposition is doing, he wouldn't allow it to happen.

So don't sit there and complain and cry about the fact that this resolution is not progressing through this House according to your poorly negotiated time schedule. We are here representing the people of Manitoba, and we intend to represent the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Radisson on a point of order.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, is the member asking me a question? Do I have leave to answer?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Radisson will have the same opportunity to speak on this debate as any other member.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Radisson obviously doesn't understand the Rules of the House, which is not unusual. The question posed to him was rhetorical; that when he has his opportunity, he might offer us the advice. He might speak to this in an objective way, and not hide behind the cartoons that are in *La Liberté* that he agrees with; the one that my member, the MLA for Lakeside, so poignantly pointed out to him on Friday night of this past week, the kind of distortions that are there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson on a point of order.

MR. G. LECUYER: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Pembina is referring to a cartoon which appeared in *La Liberté*, and implies that I have been in any way related with that cartoon. Unless he can prove that, Mr. Speaker - and I will categorically say I am not involved with that - and unless he can prove otherwise, I would like the member to withdraw that remark.

I move, seconded, if that is necessary, that he withdraw that remark. The Member for Inkster will second that.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member did not have a point of privilege. He had a clarification to make.

The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I think I did make a point of privilege, and I did have a substantive motion at the end. My motion, Mr. Speaker, was that the Member for Pembina withdraw that remark, and I indicated that it was seconded by the Member for Inkster.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the honourable member send his motion to the Chair?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, might I speak on a point of order? Is not the Member for Radisson's matter of privilege a little premature? He is making a motion before he has had an opportunity to determine whether I will willingly, in full co-operation of the House, withdraw any innuendo that I have theoretically made to hurt his very sensitive personality. A motion is hardly in order at this stage of the game, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: They want to chastise you, Orchard. They want to throw you out like Lyon and the rest of them, so they can feed you to the Christians. Out, out. Orchard, they don't like what you're saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It might benefit all members of the House if you, Sir, would read out the motion of the

honourable member so that other members may be able to advise you on the correctness or incorrectness of his motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not accepted the motion from the honourable member. I've listened carefully to the remarks that he made in rising, to clarify his own position, as far as the remarks of the Honourable Member for Pembina are concerned. I find that our Rule Book states that a dispute arising between members as to allegations of fact does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege. Therefore, the Honourable Member for Radisson does not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Pembina may proceed.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you indicate, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have left on this debate?

MR. SPEAKER: One moment.

MR. H. ENNS: Forty minutes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your indulgence in this matter, and I will apologize to the Member for Radisson, without having to do so for attributing any artistic skill to him that he may have interpreted I had given to him.

I have yet to hear the Member for Radisson declaim that cartoon that was referred to by the MLA for Lakeside Friday night as being untruthful, misleading, racist, bigoted and very very divisive to the social fabric of Manitoba. At his next opportunity, I know that the Member for Radisson, being an honourable gentleman, will certainly want to clarify the record and disassociate himself from La Liberté, and that particular cartoon and a number of others, that have stirred the fires of racism in the Province of Manitoba on this bilingual issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this issue is of such importance, it transcends the temporary occupation of any political party in the office of government. This is simply too big an issue to introduce on the 1st of June of this year, in the latter part of this Session, and wanting — (Interjection) — the Member for River East says, that was the early part of the Session now. He's quite correct. That may well be the early part of the Session if the government persists in ramming it through. They will find this Session extending very many days more than they had anticipated.

But this issue is simply, Sir, too important to set a seven-month deadline for its resolution and passage by this Assembly. Other issues of major importance in the Province of Manitoba, issues of importance to the citizenry, to the lifestyle that they and their children and their grandchildren will enjoy, because of actions taken within this Chamber have been discussed, they have been given to the people of Manitoba so that they may adequately have an opportunity to express their views, to question the government on the need, the style, the process, the substance of what they are doing, but alas, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba shall have no such opportunity on this issue because - I go back to my original point - this government, this Attorney-General negotiated badly.

They set themselves an artificial time limit of December 31, 1983, to have this matter passed and resolved in this Legislature. That is an impossible goal for an issue of this magnitude and importance to the people today and of future generations of children and grandchildren yet unborn. This issue deserves full and comprehensive hearings by the people of Manitoba in all regions of Manitoba.

It is a far greater issue of importance than the Crow rate, which was an issue that this government, this province, this Legislature has no legislative authority to deal with to amend and to modify. No; but on the Crow rate, this government undertook a series of informational hearings in 1982 and a series of agricultural committee hearings that went to six communities outside of the City of Winnipeg to hear the people of Manitoba, to allow them an opportunity to express their views, pro or con. This issue of the Crow rate is of no more - pardon me - is not of equal importance to the bilingual amendment that is being proposed.

Yet, this government stands self-righteously in its place and says that the people of Manitoba, if they only understand the issue, will agree with them; but yet this government won't go to the people with a series of committee hearings such that they can listen to the people of Manitoba, hear their views, hear their comments, hear their criticisms and hear their amendments. That strikes me as a strange action by a government that claims that they represent the people; that they have an open-door government; that they wish to listen to the people of Manitoba, to hear their views and to represent the people of Manitoba better in the laws that they enact in this Legislature.

Yet they won't tour the Province of Manitoba with an intersessional committee. They use the feeble excuse that we can't do that because we have this time deadline which was badly negotiated by an incompetent group of negotiators and an incompetent government. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are caught on the horns of a dilemma. If we allow it to pass, we are not listening to our constituency that says do not let this pass. Do not let this government pass this bad amendment that will affect us for future generations. On the other hand, we have the awesome weight of a majority that will use their authority at each and every opportunity to quash the minority and the opposition of this province in this Legislature. They have done it time and time again.

How many expulsions have we seen from this House, including the expulsion of our leader yesterday? I think it's up to a half-dozen now. You know, in the time that we sat, and I was part of the Lyon administration, we had four Sessions and a mini-Session. Do you know, and I'll stand corrected, but I don't believe any single member of this House was ejected. No member of the opposition was ejected. My colleague, the MLA for Sturgeon Creek, who was here during the Schreyer years, believes there were two ejections during the Schreyer years, eight years of government.

Here we have this gang of incompetents, only in their second Session, with six expulsions from the House. What is the justice to their expulsions? The Attorney-General takes out his gulag justice book and he says for one colleague, it is a 45-minute suspension from the House; for another colleague, it is for the balance of the sitting. Yet, for the Leader of the Opposition, the

first time it was for two-and-a-half days; and for this time, it is for six sittings of the Legislature.

You know, here the Attorney-General has attempted via the weight of the majority, the awesome power of this majority temporary government, have used their numbers and their power to eject from this House the most intellectual, intelligent and knowledgeable voice on constitutional matters that this House has. They have ejected our leader. The Attorney-General has once again administered his gulag justice - six sittings.

I think it is their sincere hope and wish that by the time those six sittings are up, that they will have been able to ram through this amendment and not have to listen to the precise argument offered by the Leader of the Opposition in tearing apart not only the process of what they are doing, but the substance of the amendment to Section 23 that they are trying to railroad through this House. They have effectively silenced the most intelligent, knowing voice in this Assembly on constitutional matters by the Attorney-General's whim of an expulsion for six sessions.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how does an opposition attempt to represent the will of the people in a minority situation in this Legislature when the will of the people and the will of the majority of the people are strongly opposed to the government action, and strongly in favour of the opposition's stand? Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you are seeing how we can do it here and now.

I want to relate to my honourable friends opposite some of the steps that have taken us to this Session this afternoon. The House Leaders had an agreement that there would be no sitting Saturday and Monday. That agreement was reneged on, was denied. It was denied because certain members of the backbench - and if it was the Member for Radisson, I would expect it; if it was the Member for Inkster, I would expect it; if it was the Member for Springfield, I would expect it - but basically some of the radicals in the backbench said whoa, we're not letting those guys go home on a long weekend in August. We are going to force them to sit here in August on Saturday and on Monday if necessary.

For what purpose, Mr. Deputy Speaker? To ram that amendment on the language issue through while everybody is away on the weekend, not listening to the news, so they can hopefully slip it by the people of Manitoba so they don't know what happened.

So as a result, on Thursday night, we come to an impasse on this matter. On Thursday night, the bells rang. What happened then, Mr. Deputy Speaker? We had the bizarre situation of the bells ringing until about 10:30 or 11:00. The government refused adjournment of the 8:00 p.m., Thursday night sitting, which was our motion. That sitting continued to approximately 1:15 Friday afternoon.

Then what did the government do? They did not take up an offer by our House Leader to allow the House to sit from 2:00 to 5:30 p.m., Friday afternoon, while the committee on seat belts was sitting, to do what - to debate this constitutional resolution and the referral motion of it - they refused to debate it Friday afternoon. What was their comeback? That we sit Friday night and we debate it.

What did we do Friday night? I think we heard from one speaker on our side of the House, and the

government adjourned the House. They called it for 10:00 Saturday morning.

What happened then? Once again, there was one speaker from the opposition, we moved adjournment and we came back at 2:00 o'clock, and here is where it gets totally bizarre, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Saturday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. the opposition forewent their opportunity for a question period. They wished to have a vote on the amendment of the referral of this committee to intersessional hearings with a December 31st deadline, they wanted a vote on it.

What did the government do from 2:00 o'clock till 5:30? They filibustered their own resolution. Each and everyone that was available spoke on it Saturday afternoon; they held up the business of the province and this House by filibustering their own motion, the ultimate in bizarre and chaotic administration of an incompetent government. But the people of Manitoba witnessed that bizarre action by a majority that is incapable of ordering the affairs of this House in such a manner that we can get on with the business of the people of Manitoba. Utterly incredible and bizarre!

What happened then, Saturday afternoon? The House was adjourned then until 10:00 a.m. Monday morning and here's even a more incredibly bizarre circumstance. The reason, purportedly, that they were going to force the opposition to sit Saturday and Monday of the long weekend was to ram through the referral motion on the constitutional amendment. What business did they call on Monday morning? They called bills; they forgot about the referral motion on Monday morning and they called bills.

Can you think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, of any more bizarre a set of circumstances? There is only one government in the history of this province and, I would suspect in the history of Canada that is so chaotically organized as this ND Government that we are looking at today. First of all, they filibustered their own resolutions all Saturday afternoon and then Monday at the sitting, where they wanted to get on with the referral motion, they called bills. And to make bizarre even more bizarre, they did the same thing on Monday afternoon at the 2:00 p.m. sitting. What happened to the indecent haste of those radicals in the backbench, who said we're going to show the opposition, we're going to make 'em sit here Saturday and Monday and we're going to ram this through? What happened to the good advice they provided to the Cabinet who was here in the majority, except for the Attorney-General who was enjoying himself at the lake? He kept up his end of the bargain that we wouldn't sit Saturday and Monday. Where was the rest of the Cabinet? They were here filibustering their own referral motion and calling for debate on bills when members weren't even here to debate them, when Ministers weren't here to hear them.

It is a government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that has no leader, that has no game plan, that has no direction, that has no course of action they're willing to offer the people of Manitoba to justify their existence. This is truly, without question, the most incompetent government this province has ever seen. It is an incredible collection of individual incompetents, collectively administered by a leaderless, weak-kneed, unpopular First Minister, who cannot control his backbench, his Cabinet or his caucus.

It is beyond belief, Mr. Speaker, and I can understand why the MLA for Ellice is bailing out of that caucus and taking his shot at the mayoralty race. He wants no truck or trade with that gang of incompetents that he sits with over there. He's leaving the ship. We've already had one defector sit behind us; we've got one member, the Member for Elmwood, because of his principles, is ousted from the caucus temporarily - maybe permanently. This government is coming apart at the seams and they won't listen to some logical suggestions from, not only the opposition, but from the people of Manitoba on how they should proceed on this important issue.

They're listening to such people as the MLA for Radisson, the MLA for Inkster and other radicals in the backbench that say, ram it down their throat, let's get it through, let's pass it, let's force it on the people of Manitoba. We don't care if we weren't elected to do that; we're going to do it anyway because we're government; we've got the power; we're the authority; we are the masters.

This government really and truly, I think, believes they know better, but unfortunately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are running into a problem, a problem in this House and a problem with the people of Manitoba. The Member for Elmwood now has over 7,000 responses, many of them with several signatures per response. How many more people does this government have to have tell them that they disagree with them on this issue before they change their mind, amend it so that they can better reflect the will of the people of Manitoba? We don't know, but we're willing to stay here long enough to find out.

One of the bizarre arguments from a bizarre government that went through that scenario I just described to you, on the long weekend, the Attorney-General says, of course there's opposition to our plan, because people don't understand it. The Attorney-General has said on numerous occasions that his former colleague, the MLA for Elmwood, lacks intelligence, etc., etc., in his presentation of the issue to his constituents and to the people of Manitoba. The Attorney-General says the MLA for Elmwood is not presenting this issue correctly to the people of Manitoba, but the Attorney-General has never answered the question - and it's a simple question and I'll ask it today - he has not answered the very simple and straightforward question as to why, in all his propaganda he has sent out to the people of Manitoba, and in all of the ads that this government is paying for with taxpayers' hard-earned money, in the papers throughout the length and breadth of this province, the Attorney-General has never answered the question why he has not printed in full the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, which states, in Section 23.1, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba.

On one hand, the Attorney-General claims that the people are against it because they're not informed and he has done nothing to inform the people. He has put out propaganda sheets which my colleague, the MLA for St. Norbert, has said contained very questionable statements, very shady interpretations of fact. He has sent those out and says that is the knowledge the people shall know. The people shall know the half truths that we, the government, and I, the Attorney-General wish

to give them. That is what the Attorney-General's position is. But when it comes to giving Manitobans the true facts, the whole truth, the complete situation, no, they haven't done that in any of their ads, they haven't put an ad in the Dauphin paper which says Section 23.1 says English and French are the official languages of Manitoba.

Oh, no, but what they have done, Mr. Speaker, is take and send a letter out to many mayors and Reeves in the Province of Manitoba which purports to quote the old Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and in that old Section 23, it says either the English or French language may be used by any person in debates of the House of the Legislature in both those languages. Those are three key words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, shall be used in respect of records and Journals of the House, and either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under The British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the province. The act of the Legislature shall be printed in both those languages. What did the Premier send out to those people? He had a typographical error, he says, in which he changed the last sentence to read, "The acts of the Legislature shall be published in both official languages." He changed "those" to "official" and says it's a typographical error.

I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should the people of Manitoba trust information coming from this government, from the First Minister, from the Attorney-General, and others in this government; when typographical errors of that import emanate from letters to elected officials in the Province of Manitoba? It is bizarre, Mr. Speaker, that that could happen and it's only something that could happen with a front bench filled with the likes of the Attorney-General, the Minister of Finance and the Premier. People who will not necessarily deliberately mislead the people of Manitoba, but certainly will use the half-truth technique to not tell the whole story to the people of Manitoba.

So, I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has this government, this collection of incompetence, shown to the people of Manitoba that they are worthy of their trust and their integrity? Have they earned that by publications, media efforts, mailers and letters that have gone out from the Premier's office and the Attorney-General on this matter, which have not told the truth to the people of Manitoba? Why should the people of Manitoba believe this gang of incompetents?

They don't, they won't, and that's why we're going to be here a long time trying to make you people honest, and it may take us an awful long time to make you honest. But it is our hope and desire for the betterment of the Province of Manitoba and the people resident in it, that we do accomplish the job of making you honest; making you represent the people of Manitoba; and making you undertake the will of the people of Manitoba and not your master-slave relation legislation that you're trying to force and ram down the throats of the people of Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I just got my Hansard. On Page 4739, Monday, August 1, 1983 it shows that I voted Nay. I wasn't even here on Monday, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Well, you would have voted Nay.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I rise to speak in support of the amendment to the resolution; the amendment which says that this issue should be dealt with in an intersessional committee and reported back no later than December 31, 1983.

I see absolutely no reason why we should be hurrying this issue along. We have lived with this issue for 116 years and certainly another year or two, when we already have made so many changes, when these changes have been made by the previous government; there is absolutely no reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why we should be hurrying along and presently trying to ram this through in a matter of a couple of weeks.

I am certain that the government is beginning to see the error of their ways because they are beginning to make some changes. They're saying now that a committee is going to be established, which is going to be allowed to have hearings in various parts of the province. We have, however, no idea of how many hearings there are going to be. They say that the committee will be establishing this, yet we know full well that they are going to have the majority of people on that committee and that they are going to be in full control, as to how many meetings, where these meetings will be held, and what length of time they will be sitting, and how many people will be allowed to make presentations.

They are using this ploy I feel to get this debate out of this House so that they can deal with it in a much smaller committee. I cannot understand this government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when every day they are taking an unmerciful beating in this House during the question period, during debate, and when they want to come back day, after day, after day, in the heat of summer, to get more of what they had the day before.

Certainly the public is very much aware of the debate that is going on in the House at the present time, and there is no doubt about it that the popularity of the Government of Manitoba is going down day by day, and it will continue to go down day by day, the longer we are in here.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency that I represent has about 17 percent French, has about 70 percent German and the rest are a different mixture. We have always been able to get along very well, one with another. We have respected the French-speaking community, and they have respected the German-speaking community, and the English that live within that particular community - they have respected both communities. We have had no problems and I'm very proud to represent that particular constituency.

The relationship, especially that has been established between the French-speaking community and the German-speaking community, I'm sure is envied by many people. The French-speaking community at the present time is very embarrassed by the resolution that has been put forward by this government. It's difficult for me to try to get anybody that is willing to discuss the issue because, as they say, they are embarrassed

with it; they say that they have had the freedom to speak French whenever they wanted to; they've had the freedom to learn French, to teach French to their children in school; and many of the people who are within that particular community at this time really see no need for any furtherance of the French language in Manitoba.

The municipality have sent in a resolution, I believe, in which they are saying that they are in favour of entrenchment, but I was talking to one of the councillors the other day, and he said that it was really no big deal to them, he says; if we can get entrenchment fine, if not, it's fine, we're not going to worry about it. They really feel the previous government and the improvements that were made at that particular time really serve their purpose very well. Where they had access to the courts in French, where they had access to some departments in the government agencies, and those people who could not speak English, could be serviced in French and they were quite happy with the set-up the way it was.

We have had some problems with the amount of French and English within the school system, and every once in a while the people have to sit down and iron out the problems as to how much French is going to be taught in the classroom, and how much English, but these have been of minor nature, mainly, and all these problems have been resolved.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are spending our summer days over here, when we should be out with our constituents. We should be talking to them, finding out what their problems were, getting ready for the next Session of the Legislature; and yet we are spending our time in here arguing and we're going to spend a lot of time arguing, because we are not about to let this issue go the way that the government wants it to proceed in the present manner.

Now the government has spent hundred of thousands of dollars on advertising, and we can hold up document after document that has gone out into the community and you could see that all the money that has been going into advertising and to getting their side of the story across to Manitobans. Yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have heard in the last two days that changes are going to be made in the wording, that changes are going occur, and we have no idea as yet what those changes are going to be, but that's going to make all this advertising obsolete, Mr. Speaker, and it's an absolute waste of money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on one particular issue mainly. The government has been saying that it's not going to help only the French groups, but it's also going to be helping other ethnic groups. I wonder how they can say this. They say that this is also going to assure that the other ethnic groups will be able to retain their language. First of all, there is not too much of a problem between the English speaking group and the French group, because each one of them will have to learn only one other language. The English group will be learning French and the French group will be learning English.

Now, that's two languages, no problem, that can be done very easily. But when you start talking about the Italian community, the Ukrainian community, the German community, then all of those will have to learn three languages if they want to retain the language that

they have been grown up and the language that they want to retain, because many of them are just as proud of the heritage that they have and they want to also keep up and keep on promoting this heritage and pass it on to their children.

We have one group, however, and there are a number of members in this Legislature who belong to that group who will be forced to learn four languages: the German community, the Mennonite community in Manitoba, their conversation is Low German and the language that is taught in the schools and that used mainly in the churches is German. So this would mean that those people with Mennonite background would have to learn four languages. Now, that's going to be rather difficult, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because then that means that you're going to take a lot of time away from your reading, your arithmetic, from English, from all the other topics that you should be learning and you will be spending a lot of time learning French and learning languages.

I would just like to demonstrate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may. I believe we have somebody downstairs in Hansard who can translate Low German that can also translate the other German, and I would just like to demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that I can speak those two languages which are being used and I can also speak the English language, and I am also trying to learn some French.

Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Give us an example.

MR. A. BROWN: Okay. Me es daut shod dot die ondre Mennonitische junges nur joats nich hie benen sen daut siekunen hieren vot ech to seien hab. Die Plaut Dietsche sproak die vot mierendels jebrecht toem spitzeren and toem haundlen, and so wieda, wo die Mennoniten send. Its ne sproak vo mennschen sich sehe fien kenen dinga bereden, sich ourtrechen, do send fehl vied vot nich en die Englische sproak send oda en de Hurch Dietsche sproak dots nie sproak vo . . . do es kenne ondre sproak nich vo en mensch sich so ourtrechen kown ies he en de sproak kaun. So die sproak die vot noch ema fehl jebrecht, die vot en Deutschland jebrecht die vot . . . do es en pote fon France vo de jebrecht vot and do es en pote fon Holland vo de Plaut Dietsche sproak noch ema jebrecht vot, do es en pote fon Russlaund, do es en pote von United States, so do sen fehl landa vo de sproak jebrecht vot and daut es ne sproak vot hundede joren ema jebrecht es en Dietschlaund and die vot fo hundeda joren noch ema jebrecht vot and unse ellern and grottelern de vellen haben dot de Mennoniten de sproak de saul be aint blieven and daut sie voren de sproak ehre kinga lieren.

That was my contribution in the Platt Deutsche. Now I will demonstrate a few words in the German, which is taught in the schools, which is used in the churches and it was used for cultural affairs, and so on.

Ich wird noch etwas Deutsch sprechen. Die Deutsche sprache wird meistens in die Kirche gebraucht, im Gottes dienst und in die giestliche lieder die vir singen. Dies is die mutter sprache die die Mennoniten nicht vollen vorlassen. Deutsch wird in die schullen gelehrt und es ist die sprache das die eltre folk in Manitoba lieb haben und sie vollen diese sprache erhalten.

My French is mainly at the limit where I can ouvrir or ferme la porte, or I can comment ça vous or merci beaucoup or s'il vous plait.

But, I'm learning and I have no objection to learning French. As a matter of fact I wish that I could speak French, but there is a limit as to how far it is practical to learn all these languages, and this is really the point that I want to bring across that when you already are learning three languages, it's hardly necessary to have another language forced upon you. That is if you're going to be working for the Civil Service and there's no doubt about it that many many jobs will be required to be bilingual and certainly as we already have seen that the ads that are going out that say that French is not of a necessity, but it certainly would be helpful. So you know who is going to get the preference when we're hiring civil servants.

So, we're going to be denying a lot of ethnic groups the privilege of being hired into the Civil Service. There's another area of concern, which I would like to express, which has been related to me, especially in the French-speaking community. There is much more concern in the French-speaking community about the way that we refer to them. We will always talk about French Canadians; we will never talk about Canadians. We always hyphenate them as we do with other groups, the Ukrainians or German or whatever. This is one of the problems that this country is facing.

The Americans have done away with this a long time ago. It doesn't matter where you came from; you're in America. Whether you're of Italian background or whether you have Greek background or whatever, the minute you get your citizenship, you're an American.

This is one of the reasons why we have the problems in Canada and in Manitoba today, because we continuously keep on calling ethnic groups, French groups or German groups or Italian groups or whatever. That certainly is where a lot of this difficulty comes from, because we don't let people forget that they came to Canada to be Canadians. We still insist on putting the background that they came in from when we refer to them.

We have had a number of speakers. They have made reference to the fact that there is a problem in Quebec, and that the problem is the reverse of what it is in Manitoba, and that New Brunswick has tried to address themselves to that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the problem in New Brunswick is not done away with by making that problem officially bilingual. They have tried this now for a number of years, and I just would like to make reference to the "Atlantic Insight," the July edition of 1983, in which New Brunswick politicians like to hold the province up to the rest of the country as a model of amicable bilingualism, but it's far from that according to this particular article, "An Anglo Backlash is Developing."

I would just like to quote from that particular article, Mr. Speaker, if I may. "It is getting tougher to get a job in New Brunswick if you're not bilingual. For some Anglophones, that's causing resentment and fear.

"The difference strikes travellers the moment they cross the New Brunswick border. Roadside signs tell drivers circulation 'droite, as well as keep right. Highway 1 goes both west and east. For most Anglophone visitors, that's about as far as bilingualism ever goes; not for the people that live in New Brunswick.

"More and more often, many believe the ability to speak both of the province's official languages is the only test that seems to matter when they go looking for a job, or try to keep the one you have."

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have experienced when the Federal Government went into bilingualism, that is what New Brunswick is experiencing, and no matter what we say in Manitoba, we will not be able to get away from it. That is what is going to happen in Manitoba. So, certainly, we can learn from what has happened by what the Federal Government has done, and we can learn from what is happening in New Brunswick.

I will continue, Mr. Speaker, and I quote, "Judy Martinson, staff on Avis Car Rental Booth at the Fredericton Airport. She has been told to learn French, or lose her job. 'I don't think it's fair,' says her boss, Harold Tobias, 'to replace a girl who has been with us for 15 years, to say to them, because you don't speak French, you have to go.' But Tobias has received an ultimatum from Transport Canada. Car rental outlets at St. Johns and Fredericton Airports must be able to provide service in both French and English, starting in September."

A further example, and I quote, "A federal civil servant in Moncton says, 'Sometimes I feel like the token English person in middle management. We know French-speaking people are given jobs not on merit, but how can you say it without being called a bigot?'"

Now that is one of the problems that we have also been facing within these very Chambers over here. The minute that you start speaking on the issue, then you are called a bigot in spite of the fact that all of us over here, we have said that we have nothing against the French language. It was the opposition when they were government that really furthered the cause as far as French is concerned in Manitoba. I believe that both sides can pretty well agree as to how far we should be going in French. It's the entrenchment that is bothering us.

I continue on with this article. 'I have been looking for a job now for two years,' says an unemployed teacher with 11 years experience. 'Had I been bilingual, I could have stood a chance. If you have a French background, you are much better off.'

"Similar stories abound in New Brunswick, though most who tell them don't want their names used for fear of losing their jobs. A mid-level bureaucrat in Fredericton, normally one of the most mild-mannered of men, bent a reporter's ear for two hours over dinner about the purging of unilingual Anglophones from the provincial Civil Service.

"The Grand Orange Lodge, thus restrained, fulminates against the iniquitous progress of ruthless and arbitrary bilingualism."

I continue, "New Brunswick politicians like to hold the province up to the rest of the country as a model of amicable bilingualism. The policy of equal status for English and French is entrenched in the province's Official Languages Act and the later Bill 88, granting cultural equality to the language groups. Commitment to the policy helped secure Premier Richard Hatfield's resounding election win last October by delivering more than half-a-dozen Francophone seats to the Conservative majority.

"The Federal Government also is enthusiastic about applying its bilingualism policy in the province where nearly 34 percent of the population is French-speaking."

Now you can see when there is 34 percent of the population is French-speaking, that they probably had a problem that was much greater than what ours is where we have only 6 percent of the population which is French-speaking in Manitoba.

I quote: "But with unemployment topping 15 percent, no offshore oil and gas to light a fire under the economy, the tolerance of New Brunswick's Anglophone majority is showing signs of strain as bilingual ability increasingly becomes a criterion, sometimes the deciding one of hiring, especially for competent Civil Service jobs.

"When Transport Canada cracked down on inadequate bilingual service in New Brunswick airports after they failed a linguistic audit, threatening several unilingual Commissionaires with relocation, 3,000 people in Fredericton signed a petition demanding the policy be revoked.

"'You're going to find a lot of backlash,' warns Lieutenant-Colonel Stan Rodeneiser (phonetic), Commander of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island division, 'It's just beginning to surface.'"

It goes on and it cites various other examples of what bilingualism is doing in New Brunswick and how the backlash is developing.

Mr. Speaker, that is one thing that we certainly do not need in Manitoba. We have been able to get along with all the ethnic groups in Manitoba for well over a hundred years now. I certainly hope that we will be able to continue to work with all the ethnic groups and not force one ethnic group against another ethnic group and create a situation which could become a very difficult situation.

I would like to just pick up this particular paper which was distributed recently, "Constitutionally Speaking." It is published by the Department of the Attorney-General to inform Manitobans about proposed constitutional amendments. Mr. Speaker, by sending out this material to Manitobans, this is where some of the concern develops that we have on this particular side on this issue. I will just read some of this material into the record and let Manitobans know where our concerns are.

The article goes on to explain some of the history in 1870. I quote, "In 1870, Manitoba entered confederation as a bilingual province. Its status in that regard was the same as Canada and Quebec.

"Today, Manitoba is able to fulfill its constitutional obligation in a practical, just and economical way. Those Manitobans whose first language is French will be offered government services in that language if they so desire. There will be no unrealistic programs for Manitobans. The federal model of bilingualism will not be applied in this province."

How do you know? There is no way that you know. After you have entrenched the Constitution, you have given away all authority of this Legislature to deal with that issue. There is no way you can give any guarantees to anybody, that we are not going to follow along the same lines that bilingualism did in Ottawa. So what you are telling the people of Manitoba is untruths, because you are willing to give the control away on that particular issue to the Supreme Court, and we will not be dealing with that issue in this Legislature anymore, and that is wrong, because it should be the people of Manitoba, through their elected

representatives, the ones who should be determining an issue such as that.

I continue, Mr. Speaker. "French Language Services in Manitoba are being introduced in an orderly manner, to meet responsibilities, but will not incur wasteful expenditures through hasty action."

Mr. Speaker, what are we seeing? We are being inundated with literature, with advertising, and yet, over here they are saying that there will be no wasteful expenditures; and the waste is really going to come in when changes are going to be made, which the First Minister already has indicated, that there were going to be some changes made. The Minister of Energy today suggested some changes would be made, that instead of only having these few, very limited hearings that they had, that more hearings would be announced, so all this is sheer waste.

"Manitoba has rejected the Federal Government's approach. It is offering French Language Services in limited and specified areas only. Unlike the Federal Government, the Manitoba approach will not make French a language of work with the Civil Service."

Well maybe that will happen, but again, that decision-making is going to be taken away from this particular body, which is legislating language rights in the province at the present time.

"A limited number of jobs - less than 3 percent of the total, require French to serve the demand where numbers warrant. But that is it. Indeed, the Provincial Government currently has staff in place to fill the majority of their designated positions."

Mr. Speaker, as I already mentioned earlier, the ads going out advertising for civil servants, and so on; they may say that French is not necessary but that it certainly would be an aid. We know very well, when somebody applies for a job and he has no French, the other person is going to be chosen over that particular person and it's not going to be merit, it's not going to be how well educated that particular person is or how well he can fill that role; being able to communicate in French is going to be a very important factor and that is another area of concern. I think that we do want the most capable civil servants that we can possibly hire because, Lord knows, we need them in Manitoba.

"Translation of certain relevant provincial statutes will be continued over the next 10 years. In fact, we will be required to translate only 500 of about 4,500 statutes. Head offices of various government departments and agencies will prepare to offer limited French Languages Services by 1987. Certain municipal governments in areas of the province with a heavy concentration of French-speaking people will be invited to join the program on a purely voluntary basis. If they do, they will be eligible for cash grants. The program does not involve or affect any individual, any business, or any institution."

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that they can guarantee this, because they are going to give away the authority they have now, to deal with situations such as that, where they could make certain that some of these rights would be maintained.

"An agreement between Canada and Manitoba paves the way for these services. It calls for constitutional amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act and outlines the cost-sharing arrangements for the translation of all laws and the implementation of the

French Language Services." Mr. Speaker, I want you to get this. "It actually reduces our requirement to translate our laws. It also limits the threat of continued court action against the province concerning the validity of our laws.

"Up to \$2.5 million of federal money is to be granted for the implementation of this program, resulting in real cost savings to the people of Manitoba."

Now, who is paying that federal money? Do people in Manitoba pay no federal taxes? I would say that they certainly do and it doesn't matter which level of government is going to be doing the funding, it still comes out of the taxpayers' pocket, so again, it's a very misleading statement we see in this particular item.

Then we continue on with some important points in the proposed agreement between Manitoba and Canada. "This limited agreement applies to only limited designated areas of the province which will be significant Francophone population." How are we going to determine this? We have already have seen now where we have had court action on some driving offences, where a lot of changes had to be made and some of this possibly was necessary. But what is there to prevent somebody, when he comes to, let's say, the Town of Morden, or whatever, and he has a driving offence and the ticket is handed to him in English and he says, I'm not going to pay this because it's not in French. Manitoba is bilingual and I'm going to take this to court.

The Manitoba Government has given away all authority to deal with this; there is no way we can deal with it, so that particular issue is going to be taken to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada is going to say the Government of Manitoba has agreed, along with the Federal Government, that Manitoba is going to be officially bilingual. It's entrenched into the Constitution. And how are they going to rule? They're going to rule that it's every person's right to have that particular ticket in both languages. You just wait and see, that is exactly what is going to happen; and when you say that these things are not going to happen in those municipalities, they will happen.

We know it, because it has happened federally, where this has gone out of complete control and it is also going to out of complete control, as far as the municipalities are concerned, and we know full well that other areas are also going to be affected. This agreement will result in an overall cost saving to the province and then we go about the \$2.35 million which will be paid for by the Federal Government.

In 1986, new Manitoba laws and regulations are to be enacted in both languages. Without the agreement, we would have had to begin immediately. We don't know, because the court decision did not come down, so we don't know, it's a guess.

In 10 years, certain existing laws and regulations to be translated and enacted. Without this agreement, all of our laws could be invalid unless we translated them now and this is impossible. Again, we're going ahead on an assumption. There is no way that we know how that court ruling would have come down because the court ruling at the present time is not proceeding. It is highly unlikely that a court ruling would have come down which would have made all our laws within this province invalid.

In 1987, people who so desire may be served in French by specified provincial departments and

agencies. Additional language services will be provided only in regional government offices where there is significant public demand. Again, if somebody wants to be up to mischief, they can pretty well force every regional agency or government office to provide French services because we will not be able to control it. It will be controlled by the Supreme Court.

A MEMBER: That's a reasonable demand.

MR. A. BROWN: Canada and Manitoba to adopt this program before the December 31, 1983. Mr. Speaker, that is the part I think really that Manitobans are concerned about. We are talking about a constitutional change; it's a change that is irreversible. Once that change has been made, we cannot reverse that change. Why do we have to hurry this item along at the present time? Why can we not spend one year, two years, or three years studying this problem in detail and get the input of the people from this province so that every person in Manitoba has input into this and can express themselves, those that wish?

A MEMBER: We got along good for 116 years.

MR. A. BROWN: We have been getting along very well in Manitoba and we are going to create a lot of problems. Why the haste? That is why, Mr. Speaker, we are here at the present time and we are here on these hot days debating this particular issue, why we are going to continue to debate this issue. And if you people think that you're going to get out of there within the next two or three weeks, unless you're going to make substantial changes and you're going to be willing to withdraw the entrenchment of this particular item, at least the deadlines, and unless you're going to give all of us sufficient time to discuss this with Manitobans and have Manitobans give an input into this particular section, we'll be here for quite some time to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those words I would like to just adjourn my speech. I would like to say that if there's any problem with translation of the German which I spoke, I'll be willing to speak to the translators. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure what the honourable member meant when he said he wanted to adjourn his speech. Has he concluded his remarks?

MR. A. BROWN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak this afternoon in favour of the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Honourable Member for - Fort Garry. I knew his name but I couldn't mention his name, Mr. Speaker, because I know it's against the Rules of the House and the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

A little earlier today I was going through some of the Hansards and I see where one of the members of the government threw it across to the members of the opposition that the ball is now in your court. I wonder

if they think that we're playing a game, Mr. Speaker. It's a pretty serious game that's going on today and for the last little while since Speed-up has come into force and before that also. They're playing with the future of my children and all of the children of the Province of Manitoba. There's an awful lot at stake. The rules are very very simple, but I don't believe that we should be playing this game. We should be working to the best interests of all the people of the Province of Manitoba.

I have been told and I listened very intently when the Acting Government House Leader said we will not allow any more bills to stand. That's their privilege. I do not like to be threatened, Mr. Speaker. Don't threaten me, do something about it, but don't threaten me.

The Minister of Northern Affairs was making light of some of the things that have gone on where he kept repeating "stand, stand, stand, stand" making reference to the members of the opposition in the manner in which we conduct the business of the House. They seem to forget they have the majority. No, I guess they haven't forgotten, Mr. Speaker, because we've been threatened with that also. If they are threatening closure, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to comment on it. All I want them to do is just to remember that there are consequences with invoking closure. It's like the lemmings running over the cliffs into the ocean to their own destruction, Mr. Speaker. This government is rushing to their own destruction like the lemmings.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4694 of Hansard dated Saturday, July 30th, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources made a statement right near the closing of the House. It said: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the House that this House will sit at 2 o'clock this afternoon," which was Saturday, "and Monday at 10 o'clock." - which was the first time in the history of the Province of Manitoba that this House has ever sat on a holiday long weekend. The very first time, Mr. Speaker, and I did make some reference to it when I sat over the holiday weekend to suffer the vindictiveness of the Acting Government House Leader in saying, well, if you're not going to play our game, we will punish you. You will sit here and to heck with whatever arrangements have been made - and I'm paraphrasing - you will sit here and suffer because we will not allow you to spend this holiday weekend with your family. We are the government and when we say sit, you will sit - and that's what they did.

Mr. Speaker, I don't normally try to pick things out of what the opposition has said. I try to go on my own where I can express my own feelings, but some of the things that have happened in the last short time just brings me up-to-date where I have just got to make reference to some of the things that have happened in this House over the last short time.

I am going to quote on Page 4695, the Honourable Member for Radisson who, I believe, he and I have worked for the same results over the years. We take a different course to achieve those results, but I am not picking it just to find fault in what he has said, Mr. Speaker, but to prove a point.

Almost as soon as he gets started, it says, "We have given the people of Manitoba a chance to have their say on a number of occasions already, and we're willing to give them the chance to further have their say." - his statement.

He goes on to say, "But for that to happen, Mr. Speaker, we need the co-operation of the opposition, not this continued obstruction which is preventing the democratic and the parliamentary process from happening the way it should be happening."

He seems to forget, Mr. Speaker, that at a recent committee meeting where there were people prepared to speak, who were not in attendance at the time because of the short notice, and they were prepared to speak because they were coming from great distances. There was one particular person who had indicated that he was coming from a great distance to speak. There was another who could not make it because of short notice and could not be contacted, who was at work during the day and would have liked to have spoken. But, Mr. Speaker, there was heavy discussion, and these people were not allowed to make a verbal or an oral presentation at that committee meeting.

Is this how the government listens to the views of the people, by cutting them off when they wanted to make a presentation, but were not allowed to do so? Is it really what the Honourable Member for Radisson has stated; that they want the people of the Province of Manitoba to make presentations; or will they after a short time if it does not suit their purposes, Mr. Speaker, cut off their presentations?

The Honourable Member for Radisson imputes some motives. I am not asking him to withdraw his remarks, because they have already been made, but it says, "Mr. Speaker, we are in Speed-up but, instead of debating this resolution, we are debating amendments and sub-amendments which are put forth simply to obstruct the process. Don't kid yourself."

He imputes motives that we have brought in these amendments and sub-amendments strictly to delay the process. Mr. Speaker, that is not so. He is imputing a motive, and I would hope that he would reconsider his remarks. I just happened to get it; I kind of remembered when the debate was going on that these remarks were made, Mr. Speaker, but it just went over me before I had a chance to really take a firm grip on what was said. But after making these remarks, I would hope that you would take the necessary action at a later time after I finish with my remarks.

I can't understand the government, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks imputing the motives to the opposition. We are all working towards the same goals, except that we do not want to enshrine those rights that we all agree that they have into the Constitution. That appears to be the only difference.

I listened to the Honourable First Minister, and he spoke with true feeling concerning the differences between what has been proposed and what the opposition has defied the government, because we cannot allow those things to go through when we don't believe in them, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4696 of Hansard, also the Honourable Member for Radisson, and I will read another part of that particular speech. It says, "Let's not mince words, because that's what they are; as I stated before, what makes an official language is the languages which are recognized by the Legislatures, by the laws of that Legislature, and by the court system. Therefore, the provisions of the act, as it was passed in 1870, made or gave Manitoba two official languages."

Is he imputing that we do not accept that Manitoba has two official languages? I agree that Manitoba has two official languages. Mr. Speaker, how can he impute such motives? Yes, to the Honourable Member for Radisson, that's what's imputed; that we do not accept that Manitoba has two official languages. I tell you, we do have two official languages.

I agree that there are two official languages, Mr. Speaker, but to work in those official languages, there has to be some consideration. To entrench it into the Bill of Rights, into the Constitution is wrong. We must take our time so that we can proceed so that it will not be to the disadvantage of any group.

We have been accused of filibustering, Mr. Speaker. I really don't know what a filibuster is, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I have the right to stand in my place and to speak my mind. It might not always be the same as my group and it might not be in agreement with all of what the government says, but it is not a filibuster for me to be allowed to speak my mind, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking my mind, and to be accused of filibustering is ridiculous. It's the same as them, the government, speaking on Saturday all afternoon to not allow us to have the chance to discuss and to debate these subjects. To be accused of filibustering, Mr. Speaker, let the government look into a mirror if they are looking to someone who is filibustering. The proof is in the Saturday Hansard.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard a question from across the House. I was prepared to speak on Saturday. The question was, why didn't I speak on Saturday? I was trying to get in a word edgewise, and I have very much difficulty — (Interjection) — I have great difficulty when somebody has in their mind that they are not going to allow anybody to get the chance to speak. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to pecking order, I'm way down the line. It was Ministers and people of great great importance who were standing in their place, and I knew that I wouldn't be recognized anyway, and that's the reason that I didn't speak on Saturday, Mr. Speaker.

How does this bill turn people against one another? Mr. Speaker, I've claimed before that this bill does turn people against one another. It turns the Francophone against the Anglophone; it turns the Anglophone against the Francophone; and it turns the Francophone against the Francophone, and that is sad, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we are big enough to be able to accept a lot of other things, but to see one family fighting against each other in the same family, it's like the Civil War in the United States. It was a sad thing and that's what is happening here in Canada and to Manitoba; where one family, members of the same family, are fighting against one another and the proof is there, Mr. Speaker, because not all Francophones support this amendment that has been brought forward by the government of the Province of Manitoba.

I'm going to make reference again, and I did, in speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and now that I'm speaking on the subamendment, I'm going to make reference to the cartoons — both cartoons that appeared in *La Liberté*: the one with the Ku Klux Klan burning down the Société Franco-Manitobaine building and the hangman's noose and all of the Progressive Conservatives dressed as Ku Klux Klanners. I guess there was one where — I think it was Mr. Lyon — depicted as a Ku Klux Klanner and burning a Canadian flag. I

believe that La Liberté is the voice of the people of St. Boniface, and the people of St. Boniface and all of the people of the Province of Manitoba, the French community - it is their voice and this voice has spoken out the hate that is generated out of this cartoon. I'm not saying that they supported this cartoon, Mr. Speaker, but I'll leave that to just a little bit later time.

In addition to this cartoon, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that there was another cartoon with Mr. Lyon depicted as a big heavy dog, carrying a flag and there was a flag - the Union Jack as a matter of fact - and he wasn't carrying it in his paw or his hand, but it seemed to be protruding from somewhere near the back end of the dog, of which the dog does his jobs when he goes out, and that kind of irritated me. The consequences of what I read into these pictures. I tried to be as generous as possible and say, well, there's nothing to it but if you had seen the cartoon, Mr. Speaker, you would know what I'm saying, about how this flag is protruding from the back and if the dog happened to sit down, the flag would be broken, but I'll make reference to that at a later time too.

Mr. Speaker, years back, in my background, and I guess I have used my background to my own advantage when I'm saying to people, are you making those remarks because of something personal, or is it because of my background? I guess I've enjoyed trying to put people down, and particularly when I feel that they're a little bit prejudiced or they might be a bit of a bigot. I like to try and put them down, because I have gone through so many years where I have had to live with this prejudice, but not by enshrining anything in the Constitution, has this evolved into something which is most acceptable to me now. It has been because we have, by displaying that we want to get along with people, that we have been able to get along with people.

I'm going to cite a little while back about a motion picture that I had seen, it was called "Gentlemen's Agreement." "Gentlemen's Agreement" was the name of the picture. There were some famous stars in it. I don't want to go into too much, but — (Interjection) — a very very old picture, but really it does give me the example that I'm looking for, Mr. Speaker. It gives the example that I'm looking for, about where this writer pretended to be Jewish, and to live the life of somebody who was Jewish, so that he could understand what the discrimination was about. There was many things in the picture which brought memories about how the man was refused to go into a particular hotel - I've gone through that, Mr. Speaker - and how the kids went to school and were beaten up at school because they were of this particular nationality. Mr. Speaker, I went through that too. It's not pleasant memories, but you don't forget those things.

But in that, one of the girls in the picture was trying to show that she was not discriminatory and she was not a bigot. She made a remark about how she was at a dinner party, and at the dinner party somebody told a story about somebody of Jewish background. She stated, it made me sick, that was her remarks - it made me sick, Mr. Speaker. Not only did it make her sick, she had to leave, she said. The person she was relating the story to said well, what did you do about it? She said, well nothing, it just made me sick. He says, well the next time you have a chance to do something about it to promote unity - now I'm

paraphrasing, Mr. Speaker - do something about it, don't just sit there and get sick - do something.

Now let's get back to the La Liberté, that cartoon in La Liberté. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that every Francophone in the Province of Manitoba should get up and say, that is discriminatory, that is bad, that is wrong, it should never have appeared in La Liberté, and there should be an apology and a retraction. Then I would have the best of respect for all of the Francophones in Manitoba. Are they just sitting there and waiting for something to happen? Are they just sitting there so that they condemn the non-Francophones for everything that is happening?

I make reference to the time that there was an American flag burnt outside the United States Consulate. I'm not accusing any group, or anybody, or any Minister of the Crown in being involved in the burning of that flag, but did they lift one finger to stop or to hinder the person who was burning the flag? To my knowledge, no, Mr. Speaker, therefore, they must be, not only not condemning, but agreeing with it. I cannot assume anything else but, Mr. Speaker.

I do not like to be associated with the Ku Klux Klan, Mr. Speaker. I point a finger, j'accuse, those people at the La Liberté who were involved with the printing of that cartoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: It is with regret that I rise on a point of order, but I would like the honourable — (Interjection) —

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

HON. A. MACKLING: I would like the honourable member not to imply that members of the government caucus knew or witnessed a flag burning, and were in a position therefore to prevent that occurrence. That is not fact, and the way he presents the fact, is as if there was an opportunity for someone to have prevented that improper act of someone, who we don't know to this day. I would like the honourable member to correct that misstatement of fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Niakwa like to clarify his remarks?

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I don't think that I said, in fact, I think, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that I preceded those remarks, by stating that I don't believe that there were any members of that group or any Ministers of the Crown that were involved in the flag burning ceremony. I think that I did precede those remarks by so stating, Mr. Speaker, and to misunderstand my remarks - like I didn't say that, for instance, Mr. Speaker, I didn't say like the honourable Minister of Housing the other day, where he said I am not going to accuse that group of being bigots, was his remarks. He said I'm not going to accuse that group of being bigots, but inferred it, Mr. Speaker. I didn't take it as that and I would hope that the Honourable

Minister of Natural Resources would not have accepted it as that I was accusing anybody of being in a position to stop them. I just said I hope that they would have if they were in a position to do so, and that's all that I said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe the honourable member now has come close to fully explaining his words, but what he did say is that no member lifted a finger to prevent it, which implied that we were in a position to have prevented it. Now he's attempted to clarify that he didn't mean to say that. I'll accept that.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, honestly, I really didn't mean to imply that they were in a position to lift a finger to prevent it. I really didn't want to imply that, that was not my intention. I think that my motives really were just to condemn them for being there, but not for the burning of the flag, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I really intended to speak about 10 minutes on this subject, and I'm not sure how much time have I spoken, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 20 minutes remaining.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's fair enough, Mr. Speaker. I have just a couple of more things and I've really gone longer than what I intended to go, Mr. Speaker, but it's my intention to provide rights to all groups and by providing those rights, not to infringe on the rights of others. I believe that the rights that are expected and are the rights are deserving to the Francophones. I've always stated that, Mr. Speaker, but I've also got to back down just a little bit when those rights infringe on the rights of others, and that is part of the reason why I cannot support this amendment.

I want to take you back just a little ways, Mr. Speaker, when the previous Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs, Rene Prefontaine, was the Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs. I had worked with Rene on many occasions. He was very very supportive of my endeavours to be able to understand and speak French and he supported those endeavours, so that I would be a member of good standing in an area where I represent some Francophones. Not a great many Francophones, Mr. Speaker, but some, and they do have rights, as some of the others in different ethnic groups, and I'm not inferring that the Francophone is an ethnic group, because they're not, they are part of a group that are considered to be part of the country as far as the two languages are concerned.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking to Mr. Prefontaine and the support that he gave me, and the strong support he gave me, were all to the benefit of the Francophone in the Province of Manitoba, because Rene Prefontaine was working towards these rights and supporting the Francophones' rights for all of the things - and I'll use the words of the Honourable Member for Radisson - where an injustice had taken place over the last 100 years. I don't agree that an

injustice had taken place. It wasn't right, but if you want to make that into an injustice, well I guess you can do whatever you want with the words.

But Rene had also told me, he says you know, Abe, we should be going slow on this because the consequences of rushing into these things are everlasting. There's no need to enshrine these rights into the Constitution. As a matter of fact, I would say many of the things that happened that supported the French language rights were due, because of the previous Conservative administration and the previous Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs, Mr. Speaker, because Rene Prefontaine was a friend of all Manitobans, particularly the Francophone.

But, Mr. Speaker, where is Rene Prefontaine? As soon as there was a change in government, as soon as the New Democratic Party Government came into power, Rene Prefontaine is no longer here. The friend of the Francophone is no longer here. How could it happen that we say that this government is so supportive of Francophone rights when the first thing that happens is that Rene Prefontaine is gone?

Mr. Speaker, I was a little late for caucus this morning and I'd like to explain to my associates why I was a little late for caucus this morning. I had a meeting, Mr. Speaker, and this is for the edification of all the people here in the room. I had a meeting, Mr. Speaker, with a union representative, a French background union representative from Ottawa. He is aware of union negotiations in all of the provinces of Canada, in most of the ss that Rene Prefontaine is gone?

Mr. Speaker, I was a little late for caucus this morning and I'd like to explain to my associates why I was a little late for caucus this morning. I had a meeting, Mr. Speaker, and this is for the edification of all the people here in the room. I had a meeting, Mr. Speaker, with a union representative, a French background union representative from Ottawa. He is aware of union negotiations in all of the provinces of Canada, in most of the states in the United States and Northwest Territories. He has brought me up-to-date on French language rights in all of these provinces, not the United States, because obviously the United States has nothing to do with our language rights here in Canada. He tells me that in the process of his union negotiations, he has seen the expansion of French language rights, including Ontario, where I hear the honourable members of the government advising that Premier Davis, the Conservative Premier of Ontario, does not grant the rights to the Francophone that they deserve. I have heard those accusations, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure you that from listening to this union representative that these French language rights are being expanded, slowly and surely are being expanded.

It reminds me of a story, Mr. Speaker, of a rabbit and a hare, about how they were going to run in a race to see who was going to win, who was the fastest. The rabbit was by far expected to beat the hare in - but the rabbit was by far expected to beat the tortoise - I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I've got it just a little bit confused. It was a rabbit and a tortoise . . .

A MEMBER: That's better, that's better.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I would have hoped that there would have been a point of order brought to bear, Mr.

Speaker, because you know I don't think it's a story known only to myself. I would think that the Honourable Member for Arthur, who has a young son and he reads to his young son, because he is a beautiful family man. As a matter of fact, I think that he did spend the long weekend that I was sitting here because of the government action, I think that he did spend that long weekend with his son, reading him stories of some consequence, Mr. Speaker.

Anyways, the race took place and the rabbit who was by far faster than the tortoise came in second. Came in second, Mr. Speaker, because he took time to rest, he went all around, he did all things except run the race.

I think the point of the story is, Mr. Speaker, that slow and steady wins the race, slow and sure wins the race. That is what I am suggesting to the government, go slow and sure and steady and win the race. I am not about to say, Mr. Speaker, that they should lose the race. I don't want them to win the race, which is the next election, but I want them to have a better chance than they have now, because their chances now are almost nil of being re-elected. This is only one of the things that they have done, Mr. Speaker.

I am trying to be as friendly as I can with that group, Mr. Speaker, because I don't want to see them get beaten. That's not quite true, Mr. Speaker, and I know you mustn't lie in the Legislature. I do want to see them get beaten, but not badly.

Mr. Speaker, again I am going to have to ask you, because as I say I was only going to speak for ten minutes, Mr. Speaker, can you advise me how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has six minutes remaining.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Six minutes, oh, my goodness! Mr. Speaker, I was going to, if you would just give me notice at two minutes, because I've got one last little bit that I wanted to get in.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to read a little bit of the news release by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. I am not going to read it all, because it would probably take much, much, too much time, but I am just going to read this one part. It says: "A very significant majority of the members of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and also a very large percentage of the citizens of this province oppose the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as presented by the Government of Manitoba.

"It is not that we oppose French Language Services. Nobody opposes French Language Services . . ." At least I hope that nobody opposes French Languages Services, Mr. Speaker. " . . . when it is needed or requested, but we feel that the application of such a service should be entirely up to the provincial government to administer, and should not be entrenched in the Constitution." That is what I have been speaking for in the last 35 minutes, Mr. Speaker. " . . . should not be entrenched in the Constitution and left to the courts of law in Canada to enforce.

"We agree that the majority groups in our province should be protected from injustices by the majority, but not to the point where it could and will give the

minority the power to rule through the courts, thus destroying the democratic rule, Mr. Speaker."

This is the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, Mr. Speaker. The government keeps saying that they want the people to come and make presentations, Mr. Speaker. They have a list of somewhere in the area of 30 people that want to make presentations and I would imagine that it is some of the Francais groups that I know and respect, Mr. Speaker. There are some people that are going to be against this amendment, Mr. Speaker; some in favour, but I tell you now that if the Union of Municipalities is going to make presentations, there will be dozens and dozens more. Give us the chance to soften the blow, Mr. Speaker, because everything that is happening, Mr. Speaker, is against the best interests of the Francophone. Give us the chance to soften the blow. Allow us to have a non-party group that will tour the province and listen to the presentations throughout the province so that we can come back and give a report to the Manitoba Legislature.

Before I close, and I think that I'm down to the last two or three minutes, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to - not to try and upstage the Honourable Member for - I've got four minutes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, - but just before I close I just wanted to recite something in, I'm not sure of the language, I think it's German and it's in High German. The Honourable Member for Rhineland stated something and as I say I'm not trying to upstage him, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted to say:

In wunderschönen monat Mai when alle knospen springen,

Der ist in meiner herzen der lieber auf gegangen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that little poem that I've recited is significant, very significant, and I am going to tell you what it is in English.

In the wonderful month of May - I know that we're into August now - but: In the wonderful month of May when all the flowers are blooming, there is in my heart the most beautiful love.

Mr. Speaker, there is a beautiful love in my heart. I do not like some of the things that I see, the accusations, breaking of the Rules, the disregard for Speaker's ruling. I want to take this time right now, Mr. Speaker, to say that I respect the Chair, I will not do anything to dishonour the Chair and yourself also.

Just before closing, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make reference to the letters to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, because I do have copies here. I do have copies of the letter, Mr. Speaker, where some of my constituents, some people who have been supporters of mine and personal friends for a long time, have sent the Honourable Member for Elmwood some money to support his program. I am not quite as strong against and quite in accord with what the honourable member has stated, but you know he does speak some truths and I think that he, as a member of this House, should be allowed to speak his mind and not be accused of some of the things that I have read that he has been accused of, Mr. Speaker. He has every bit as much right to speak his mind and be here in the House as anybody else, Mr. Speaker. It is the people of the Province of Manitoba that have given him that right.

I want the government to know one thing just before I close, Mr. Speaker, because I am over the ten minutes that I suggested that I was going to be speaking. What

I want to give them a warning. I am not threatening, Mr. Speaker. I want to give them a warning. Do they think that they can ram this amendment down the throats of all Manitoba and the entrenchment into the Constitution? Never in a hundred years, Mr. Speaker! I close in repeating en français: Jamais dans cent ans!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise once more to speak with respect to the referral motion that is before us, the referral motion that seeks to refer to a Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections the matter of the French language agreement that has been entered into by this government, the Government of Manitoba and the Societe Franco-Manitobaine.

I rise once again, Mr. Speaker, this time to support the amendment to the amendment, that portion of the text which reads, as moved by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that the amendment be further amended by adding after the words "next Session of the Legislature," where they appear in the proposed amendment of Mr. Sherman, the words "and in any case, not later than December 31, 1983."

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that is a very significant amendment and one that should make this referral to an intersessional committee acceptable to members of the government, because as we debated the referral motion with the amendment by my colleague for Fort Garry, members opposite said, ah ha, but if you pass that referral motion to an intersessional committee, then you will eliminate the opportunity for us to meet our timetable. A timetable, I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we were not aware of.

You see, this is one of the problems, is that we're dealing with something that has been agreed upon behind closed doors by this government and the Government of Canada and the Societe. We had no idea that they had a hidden agenda, a timetable that said they must have it into the hands of the Federal Government by December 31, 1983.

So, therefore, when we suggested that we wanted it in the interest of having the full and open scrutiny of this, and the opportunity for public input and hearings throughout this province with no deadlines, with no pressure as we are under today, to try and get the business of the House and this Session to some sort of ordered conclusion before too long, because we are, after all, standing here in early August with the prospect of going well into the latter part of August, or indeed even September, in this struggle to try and achieve on both sides something for the benefit, for the betterment of generations of Manitobans, both today and in future, in this classic struggle of two different sides with different ideologies meeting head-on over important legislation.

Here we are late in August, and this just isn't the time; this just can't possibly be the manner in which we give the public an open opportunity to review, to give us advice, to present us their views, to get an understanding indeed of what is intended by this proposal and the accord that's been arrived at.

So our view was, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to therefore refer it to an intersessional committee, not a committee of this Session of the Legislature. So

members opposite said, well, you can't because part of our agreement with the other parties to the agreement is that it must be in the hands of the Federal Government no later than December 31, 1983, so that it can be dealt with in the next Session of Parliament.

Well, we weren't aware of that, Mr. Speaker. So, as a consequence, my colleague from Gladstone brought forth the amendment to the amendment that gives the assurance to this government that we will co-operate with them, that we will give them the opportunity to do it no later than December 31, 1983. We will still have the opportunity to accomplish both our purposes in giving all Manitobans an opportunity to really have their say, to make known their views, to indicate where they stand on this, and to have the full benefit of hearings to be held throughout the province.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be. This Legislature is unique in most of the world, I believe, in that it provides a mandatory opportunity on all legislation for public input. That system that we have of referring it to a committee and allowing for public input is something that we ought to be proud of, that we ought to cherish, and I know that all members of this House do.

So let's take advantage of that by taking it the further step and not putting severe time constraints on that opportunity for people to be heard, and refer it to an intersessional committee. In the interests of achieving the timetable that members opposite have entered into with their other partners, the Federal Government and the Societe Franco-Manitobaine, let us do it no later than December 31, 1983. That's all the amendment to the amendment says. — (Interjection) — That's right.

As my colleague from Turtle Mountain says, if that's too late, let us know because we will reconsider and give them an even earlier date if necessary, but to our knowledge now we satisfy all the requirements that have been indicated to us.

But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is in keeping with the views that have been expressed by so many different organizations in this province to this point in time. The Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities has gone on record as saying that this accord, that this agreement, that this proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act that will be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada has not had enough of an opportunity for review by them and by so many other important groups in Manitoba society.

The Union of Manitoba Municipalities has similarly indicated grave concern, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that this proposed entrenched amendment to the Constitution of Canada will not do a service for the people of Manitoba as they understand it. Again, all of us are limited in our understanding to what information we have, but as I indicated the last time I spoke, the interpretations by lawyers of this whole proposed agreement and the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is wide open for misinterpretation or for differences in interpretation.

As I said earlier, so many groups who have looked at it have said, how will courts interpret this? In fact, despite the indications to the contrary of the Attorney-General, of the Premier and others, there is no assurance, there is nothing that we have before us that we can all understand to the extent that we are at least talking on the same level and the same grounds.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the main amendment that is being proposed to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, let's start right in the beginning and look at all of the areas that have been questioned by various groups. I'm talking about the MGEA, I'm talking about the UMM, MAUM and all of those organizations.

Section 23.7(1): "Any member of the public in Manitoba has the right to communicate in English or French with, and to receive available services in English or French from, (a) the head or central office of any department of the government of Manitoba; (b) the head or central office of (1) any court" - I think that's pretty straightforward; I don't see any opportunity for misinterpretation of that - "(2) any quasi-judicial or administrative body of the government of Manitoba."

Well, I think that those now become open for interpretation. Quasi-judicial or administrative body of the government of Manitoba - there are many, and which are their head or central offices, and who is now going to be affected that wasn't affected before? I'm not sure, because I've heard different interpretations even in the discussion by various government Ministers as they've gone out in the process of the information campaign.

The Attorney-General's remarks, and I think that he understands what his interpretation of it is and has attempted to communicate it very effectively and thoroughly, but I heard his colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, at a meeting, and he placed different interpretations in responding to questions at open public forum meetings than did the Attorney-General. I say that is ample evidence to me that it's not understood universally, not even by members of the government.

Further, "Any Crown corporation, or any agency of the government of Manitoba established by or pursuant to an act of the Legislature of Manitoba; (c) the office of the Chief Electoral Officer; and (d) the offices of the Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba."

Chief Electoral Officer, Ombudsman - those are readily understandable; but the point was made by the President of MGEA, "What is the central office and what is the head office of various government departments?"

We have, for instance, a Highways Department office in Dauphin. Now I believe that that's a central office for that region, and I believe that the courts might well interpret that to be the case. We have in Thompson a central office for the northern region of the Department of the Environment. I believe that would be interpreted to be so by the courts.

Now, how do we limit the practical necessity of providing services in French language where the percentage of population in those given areas might be a small small fraction of 1 percent? I don't know. I believe, from what the Attorney-General has said, that the intention is to limit it to where it is practically demonstrable to do so, but I don't believe that courts may necessarily agree with the Attorney-General's interpretation of what is a practical application of that kind of section. So how are we going to go about limiting it? You know, the Attorney-General has repeated on many occasions that it is limited French Language Services, but whose definition or interpretation of the words "limited services" are we going to accept, Mr. Speaker? That is why I don't believe that this is in any shape or form under which it can be accepted by our

side or indeed the public of Manitoba at this point in time.

Okay, a little further on, it says under 23.7(2), and I'll skip a lot of this because I just want to highlight some of the areas of interpretation that I believe are going to just get us into court wrangle after court wrangle after court wrangle for generations to come. Item (2)(a) says where "there is a significant demand for communications with and services from that office in that language;" tell me what "significant demand" means. I don't know and I don't believe the government has taken any pains or any trouble to ensure that there is a definition of significant demand that is acceptable to all of Manitobans or to the majority, or at least is understandable. That's exactly the point that has been made by, as I say, very responsible people in this province who are not opposed to the principle of what the government is doing, but they are opposed to having something entrenched that is essentially a pig in a poke because they don't know the ramifications of it. They can't even explain it to their own people, leave alone the vast majority of people who have expressed concern and that is why it is premature to have this go to a committee of this Session of the House and be dealt with before any of us really understand what we're even dealing with.

That is why I believe that this amendment to the amendment ought to be supported and ought to become acceptable to both sides of the House so that we can deal with this in a calm, rational manner, not the way we're doing it now.

The other area is Section 23.8(1) which says: "Anyone whose rights under Section 23.7 have been infringed or denied may apply to the court for a declaration to that effect and, where that court finds that those rights have been infringed or denied, it may make a declaration to that effect." So we are saying, because we don't know the limits of the bounds of this legislation, we are inviting the courts to tell us what those limits should be. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in avoiding a court decision on the Bilodeau case, we are now inviting the courts for all time in future to be making all of our decisions with respect to what we shall do with respect to French Language Services in this province in future.

That may well be an acceptable alternative for many of the lawyers on the government side of the House because it ensures them, I believe, of all sorts of work for their colleagues in the legal fraternity for decades to come, Mr. Speaker. That's what they have done. Just as the Federal Government, when it brought in some of its very complex amendments to The Income Tax Act, ensured that chartered accountants and advisors on business and accounting were going to be busy for the rest of their careers in helping people to sort out the maze of provisions that they had enacted in their legislation on income tax, this government is ensuring that lawyers in Manitoba for all time in future will have all sorts of work to do and in fighting cases before every level of judiciary and on and on and on.

We are in for an incredible future. — (Interjection) — Yes, this, as the Member for Elmwood says, is legal aid for all of the lawyers in Manitoba, and I say that, telling you that some of my best friends are lawyers, and I don't deny them their opportunity to make a living, but this is an assurance of their future success.

Then we have the fact of the court's interpretation of the legislation and the court ordering a plan by which those services ought to be provided to Manitobans as a result of a court challenge; and then the submission of the plan to the court; and then the new order for variance of the plan and all of those things which as I say leaves so much open to interpretation by the courts.

I know that what I say is true. We've had it confirmed for us in recent speeches by members on the government side and that is that they now recognize that this agreement is not a good agreement, that as it stands it is so open to amendment, to misinterpretation, to challenges and so on and so forth that it will have to be changed.

The Minister of Energy said in one of his first speeches on returning to the House after having been away for a little while - he's missed a good deal of the discussion on this, but obviously he's caught up to it and he felt moved to make a presentation on it this morning - if we agree with the provision of French Language Services, let's go forward together and make it a bipartisan sort of piece of legislation and put it forth in a meaningful way. He said, "Put it to a committee because then we'll be able to try and tighten up this resolution." So he's acknowledging that the resolution is not adequate as it stands, that it needs to be tightened up. That's what he said this morning when he spoke.

Well, can you imagine us taking forth something and saying we agree with this and let's go, let's get it ready, let's get it through the committees, let's get it to Ottawa, when everybody acknowledges on both sides of the House that it isn't well worded, that it isn't properly presented, that it's open to misinterpretation, that it's going to cause court wrangles and everything else? He says, that's okay, as long as we both agree on the principle of it, let's go together and let's tighten it up. Well, that's the kind of ad hoc working that you have. You know, people on a tablecloth or a napkin on the back of a match cover coming up with agreements that are going to be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada for all time in future which will make it almost

impossible to change them, and we're going to do that because we're in some rush to meet somebody else's deadline on a hidden agenda that the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada and the Societe Franco-Manitobain have. I say that's a shameful situation that we find ourselves in, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, the response that we have to make to this is: slow down, take it easy, give some time. Don't tell us that you're going to tighten it up along the way, that you're going to amend it, that you're going to change it. Slow down. Put in the time now before it's too late, before we go too far and we can't change. Take the time now to make sure that people in Manitoba understand what you're doing, to make sure that all the important groups in our society are at least receptive to the principle and are willing to sit down with you and work out the final wording, the final agreements and so on, because there may well be an opportunity for consensus. I don't think that our side has suggested that there may not be an opportunity for consensus.

Heaven knows, and the Attorney-General has confirmed by what he has said, that we were working along the path to bringing in French Language Services, to expanding the use of the French language in Manitoba in accordance with the Supreme Court decision on the Forest case in 1979. We were committed to it. The Attorney-General took great pleasure in reading back to us our news releases and our commitments to the Civil Service to make sure that they were working along that path that we were committed to. So if that is the case, then why not try and find some way of working towards that together without imposing this in an entrenched amendment to our Manitoba Act, Section 23, that will be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this motion is next before the House, the honourable member will have 20 minutes remaining.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.