



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. 114 - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 25 JULY, 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 | Rossmore | 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

Monday, 25 July, 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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement. Mr. Speaker, On Friday, July 22nd, I stated that I would report to the House and to the province on the status of the aerial spraying operation to combat a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis.

During the weekend aerial spraying was conducted over the City of Winnipeg, including Headingley and the communities of Steinbach and Ste. Anne.

Aerial spraying was not carried out this morning to allow the officials of Health, Environment, Agriculture, and Government Services to examine preliminary monitoring results of the spraying operations.

I am pleased to report the preliminary tests indicate that aerial spraying achieved a very good mosquito kill with no known adverse effects to health or environment.

My colleagues, the Minister of Health and the Minister of the Environment, will expand on the preliminary results of health and environmental monitoring.

Technically, the aerial spraying operation has been functioning exactly as expected.

Due to the encouraging results received this morning, the aerial spraying operation will continue with the communities of Selkirk, Stonewall, and Stony Mountain this evening - weather conditions permitting.

The communities of Morden, Winkler, Carman, and Portage will be considered as alternates for this evening.

As encouraging as today's news is, I must also report that the spraying has also affected the honeybee population, as expected. The Minister of Agriculture will be making a statement on this today.

Of course, we must not lose sight of the real purpose for the aerial spraying operation; that is to protect as many Manitobans as possible against contracting encephalitis.

The Emergency Information Centre has answered over 5,200 telephone calls since becoming operational last Wednesday afternoon.

I would again like to invite any Manitoban with a concern or question regarding Western Equine Encephalitis or the Aerial Spraying Program to call the Information Centre at 944-4844, or toll free 1-800-362-3305.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of members on this side of the House, I would like to thank the

Minister for his statement and his update on the situation.

I am very pleased to see the strong statement contained in his report to the effect that preliminary tests thus far indicate that aerial spraying achieved a very good mosquito kill with no known adverse effects to health or environment. That's an important message to Manitobans, and it's important in the context of the battle that we have fought against the vector mosquito in this province for many years.

Mr. Speaker, we are unhappy, of course, with the disappointing news with respect to the honeybee population in the province and the effect that the spraying has had on that population, but it's not unexpected news. It's disappointing, it's regrettable, but it's not unexpected; and it's our understanding that the government intends to introduce a program of compensation for bee farmers, honey producers, and also is taking pains to advise bee farmers and persons engaged in the honey production business very carefully and very conscientiously of the spraying schedule, both times and locations. That is about the only assistance that the government can give to that particular sector of our economy in conditions such as these. So we would simply urge very conscientious attention to the relay of that kind of information to honey producers.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, we accept the government's statement with satisfaction, but still raise the question as to where precisely the strongest indicators for spraying are occurring and, in question period, we'll want to ask the government about the presence or the indication of any human or animal cases of the disease.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have a statement also. It might answer some of your questions now, Bud.

Preliminary information received today from the Department of Entomology, University of Manitoba, indicate that the aerial spraying program conducted in Winnipeg on Saturday evening and Sunday morning was "satisfactory" and "equivalent to Baygon in its effectiveness."

In a period 36 hours after the aerial spraying operations on Saturday evening, it was found that 72 percent of *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes were killed and 83 percent of another species (*Aedes*) were killed.

In a period 24 hours after the spraying operations on Sunday morning, it was found that 83 percent of *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes were killed and 95 percent of the *Aedes* were killed.

I would like to say that although no human cases of the disease has been confirmed there are 70 cases under investigation. To give the statement some perspective, I would emphasize that in 1981 there were 850 cases which were investigated of which 25 cases were confirmed to be Western Equine Encephalitis.

Officials of my department have contacted the Heads of Emergency Departments in Winnipeg hospitals and

in Steinbach, and these hospitals have indicated no increase in their normal activity as a result of the spraying program. I would add, however, that two patients in Winnipeg who felt that they had some adverse effects to the spray were detained for observation.

I am advised by officials of my department that viral activity continues to be identified in chicken flocks and this factor is being monitored very closely.

Based on this preliminary information, I have recommended that the aerial spraying program be continued in the areas identified at risk in the province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister of Health for this statement on the incidence and the situation with respect to the public health emergency at the present time. We will continue to wait further reports from the Minister and his colleagues on this situation as the battle against the danger continues. We're pleased to support the government in its position at this point in time which calls for continuation of the spraying program while the danger exists.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make as well.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement to the members of the Legislature in order to update them on the Provincial Government monitoring efforts for the aerial spray program that has been put in place to combat a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis.

Today's reports are preliminary in that a large part of the monitoring program includes scientific and laboratory analyses that would take further time to complete. However, I can inform you that all test results to date are within anticipated parameters. The specific data, of course, will have to be put in the context of the overall program. My colleagues have and will continue to provide you with more detailed information on areas within their own departments.

Efforts to date include:

All communities with surface drinking water supplies on the list of communities to be sprayed have been sampled. Post-spray samples have been taken in areas that have been sprayed.

Spot samples of some natural surface waters have been taken in selected areas on a pre and post-spray basis.

Background vegetation samples have been taken in all affected communities. Post-spray samples have been taken within one hour of the actual spray times.

Tests are being refined for an analysis of the effectiveness of the various ways of preparing edible fruits and vegetables that have been exposed to the spray.

Birds have been live-trapped before spraying. Caged birds have been exposed in spray areas. No ill effects

have been observed. Information Centre calls are being monitored, and follow-up is being taken on complaints regarding reported effects on birds. To date, no ill effects have been noted in that area either.

Tests on caged bees have been conducted, and my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, will be providing more detail.

Droplet size, distribution and air monitoring tests have been conducted during actual spray periods and will be continued throughout the program.

Sentinel flocks are being expanded to test for sero-conversion in chickens. Wild birds are being tested for viral activity.

Tests have been conducted on the effectiveness of the spray. As reported earlier, these indicate a very good mosquito kill rate.

The Department of Health, as suggested, is working closely with the medical community and hospitals to monitor for any reported health effects.

I also wish to advise you that the Monitoring Steering Committee that was announced to you on Friday is meeting today to further review our monitoring efforts and to make recommendations.

I also wish to take this opportunity to publicly thank all those individuals who have given much of their time over the past few days to ensure that proper monitoring procedures are developed and implemented. I am certain, and I speak behalf of all members of the Legislature when I say that their hard work and their long hours are appreciated.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for this further statement and just make the observation that he has taken several paragraphs to repeat parts of the statements that were contained in the first two statements, and a good deal of the information is not of an urgent nature, but of a long-range nature describing things that are in place, upon which we will receive reports perhaps six months from now.

I would think that unless there are any urgent new developments from the environmental side, that it wouldn't be necessary, other than to send over the odd message, to take the time of question period for such a statement in future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a very short statement to make.

Mr. Speaker, due to extensive spraying programs now under way for mosquito control, there has been a concern about the effect of malathion on bee populations. Monitoring is being conducted by the Department of Agriculture in all areas where spraying is taking place. Results indicate that where caged bees have been placed in the open, in the path of aerial spraying, 100 percent mortality occurred. Similar cages, where the insecticide was not sprayed, no mortality occurred.

Preliminary reports from beekeepers, hives in sprayed areas indicate high mortality rates. If beekeepers wish more information, the telephone number given by my colleague, the Minister of Government Services, 1-800-362-3305 is available for them to call.

Compensation will be available to beekeepers who experienced losses, but beekeepers should be aware that they should document as fully as they can all their losses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for the statement with respect to bees. I appreciate that the honeybee is perhaps one of the more sensitive species of insects or life that is in difficulty when these spraying programs are undertaken. One can't help but also think that perhaps because the number is relatively small, in terms of the numbers of beekeepers involved, whether or not with some foresight and planning, that mortality could have been reduced. There are practices that can be undertaken that would, in effect, close off the hives. There would of course be some loss, but with the government's intentions expressed in advance, with the known effect of the spray on the honeybee, I might choose to ask at a different occasion of the Ministry of Agriculture whether or not such efforts could have and indeed should not have been undertaken.

I suspect the Minister at this point has no way of knowing what the cost of compensation may run to, but I suppose it's prudent upon us that we add that to the overall costs of entering into a program for public health reasons such as the one that we're presently in.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file the report of the Attorney-General's Committee on Impaired Driving.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to table the Annual Report of the Fire Commissioner's Office, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions I have a statement to the House. On July 19, 1983, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stood in his place to raise a point of order regarding words spoken in debate by the Honourable Member for Radisson. Following the remarks of several honourable members the matter was taken under advisement.

I have studied the relevant issues of Hansard and have considered carefully the words of the honourable members.

The words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in alleging the imputation of motives raised two additional questions: Firstly, the suggestion that the point of order was not raised at an early enough instance is not valid since the English translation did not appear in Hansard until it was distributed on the afternoon of July 19th.

Secondly, is the wording appearing in Hansard an accurate translation of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Radisson? Since the Honourable Member for Radisson makes no claim of inaccuracy we can accept that the words appearing in Hansard are an accurate representation of his remarks and that they, and the point of order, can be judged on the basis of the printed word.

The point revolves on the words of the Honourable Member for Radisson when he says, "We have to ensure that these limited rights are a part of an amendment to the Canadian Constitution in order that persons like the Leader of the Opposition do not, again, bring down upon us such setbacks as we had in 1890 and 1916 in order that our rights are not diminished to privileges which oblige us to live in fear and conflict, nor that our rights be subject to the political moods of the day," and whether these words constitute the imputation of motive.

The Honourable Member for Radisson cannot be making a personal charge of actions taken by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in 1890 or 1916 since the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was not a member of the governments of 1890 or 1916. The Honourable Member for Radisson is clearly referring to possible actions which may be taken in the future when he uses the word "again." He explicitly states this on July 15th, and reiterates this explanation on July 19th. The allegation of some hypothetical action is both unspecified and unsubstantiated.

The charge of imputation of motives is more accurately stated in Beauchesne's Citation 316 (e) which says a member may not "impute bad motives or motives different from those acknowledged to a member."

Since the Honourable Member for Radisson does not ascribe any motive to persons that may have in the future, he cannot be imputing post motives. There is clearly a difference of opinion existing between two members on a hypothetical matter, which should be debated in the normal manner.

The second matter referred to by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is merely a difference of opinion and I am unable to discern what point of order is being alleged. I therefore conclude that no point of order exists for the Chair to decide.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingual agreement - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I believe it was, the Union of Municipalities issued a press release through its president, Mr. Dave Harms, with respect to the bilingual resolution which this government presently

has before the Legislature. In that statement, Mr. Speaker, the following words are used referring to the amendment being proposed by the NDP Government of Manitoba to Section 23: "It is one of the most dangerous steps any government has contemplated under existing conditions and could leave a never healing scar on the citizens of Manitoba, regardless of their ethnic background and nationality."

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to lay on the table of the House for the benefit of Members of the House who may not have received it, and for the press, a copy of that press release.

My question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is this: That in view of the strong stand that has been enunciated by the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, in view of the strong position which has been taken by the Manitoba Government Employees Association asking for very substantive amendments to Section 23, in view of the fact that there is growing concern in the total Manitoba community about this government's actions on this matter, would the government not consider it advisable now to refer this whole matter to a committee that would sit after prorogation of this House and report at the next Session of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a repetition again of the questions which were posed in earlier days pertaining to holding over for an intersessional committee. The Attorney-General has introduced a motion this past Friday, which I draw your attention to, dealing with the referral of this particular resolution to a committee of this Chamber to receive briefs from the public, so that indeed there is a motion that is presently before you, Mr. Speaker, dealing with this very subject matter, to receive briefs from the public at this time.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I realize there may be an element of repetition on some of the questions, if not the answers, that we're getting on this point. But in view of the fact that that repetition is being occasioned, Sir, by the ferment that is growing and growing among the people of Manitoba about the dubious actions of this government, will the First Minister not reconsider and appoint this matter of a proposed amendment to Section 23 to the Statutory Orders and Regulations Committee and empower it to sit after recess, after prorogation, during recess, and report to the next Session of the Legislature which could be as early as December of this year, realizing of course, Mr. Speaker, that the House of Commons, which must also pass this matter, will not even be sitting again until the 15th of September of 1983? Why is he so intransigent?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I've already indicated that there is a motion which was introduced on Friday that provides for the opportunity for public input insofar as a committee of this Chamber. In addition to that, we've had four informational meetings, in Thompson, in Dauphin, in Brandon and in Winnipeg with varied reaction, I must say - not fervent, but with varied

reaction to the resolution. The motion pertaining to a legislative committee will provide further opportunity for public input and I, for one, look forward to that motion proceeding through this Chamber, so there can be further receipt of public input.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, another question to the First Minister with respect to the same subject matter. In view of the fact that there is growing suggestion among municipalities, and indeed perhaps some of the cities of Manitoba, that they would like to avail themselves of the amendment which this government is putting through to The Municipal Act to permit referenda to be held on matters which do not fall within the jurisdiction of the municipalities or cities, will the Government of Manitoba be supportive of those municipalities which wish to place as an item of referendum before their electors this fall the question as to whether or not Section 23 of The Manitoba Act should be amended in the manner in which this government is proposing?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that pertains to the decision-making of each and every municipal council. It's not a question of support or non-support, but a matter that involves the discretionary-making that is involved in respect to reeve and members of council in each given municipality.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, reverting to the First Minister's response to the second-last question, is he aware of the fact that there are now some 30 people waiting, 30 delegations waiting to give representations on the seat belt legislation alone and that other contentious pieces of legislation, The Law Enforcement Review Act, to name only one, still have to pass through the committee stage; that this Legislature is going to be engrossed in its present timetable in dealing with legislation that this government has, in some cases negligently, brought before the House during the last week or two of this sitting? Will he not reconsider his stand about referring Section 23 to an intersessional committee in light of the fact that this House, Mr. Speaker, is going to be fully engaged in doing the regular business of the people of Manitoba without becoming engaged on the constitutional amendment which can be dealt with equal facility after prorogation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that which is regular and that which is irregular. Certainly the resolution that we're dealing with in respect to constitutional matters, whether it be the aboriginal issue or whether it be the French language issue, is important matter by way of resolution. The fact that there may or may not be some 30 waiting to present briefs in respect to the seat belt-helmet legislation, I think, is indicative of the health of the democratic process, that there is adequate interest. In fact, I would have thought there might even be more than that, Mr. Speaker, but that is a reasonable indication of public interest. I expect that there'll be further briefs in respect to other measures that have been introduced in this Chamber. Rather than shying away, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to carry on to do the business of this Chamber in the proper and in the usual format and to complete - not to leave incomplete - the business of this Chamber.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the First Minister's new found concern for the health of the democratic process, would he not agree, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I see no question of "shame" at all. If the First Minister is really concerned about the health of the democratic process, he would follow suggestions that are coming to him by the dozens from all parts of Manitoba. He would listen to public opinion in Manitoba as he adjures the Prime Minister of Canada to listen to public opinion on nuclear disarmament and the Cruise.

If he is so concerned about the health of the democratic process, will he then agree that this matter, the first constitutional substantive amendment that this House has ever dealt with, should be put over until after this Session has prorogued in order that the people of Manitoba may truly tell this government what they think about that amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's line of questioning is becoming somewhat repetitious.

HON. S. LYON: And it will continue, don't worry.

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

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think the record should show that the Leader of the Opposition is constantly repeating the same question. In the guise of asking questions, he is making a speech. This is not the time to debate it. I am very much anxious to debate this with my honourable friend. Furthermore, he is saying that when you suggest that this was repetitious, that he'll do it again; he'll do it tomorrow and the next day and so on. I don't think that should be allowed, that one person should be allowed to act like a little dictator in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: On the point of order, if indeed there was one, Mr. Speaker, I found that my questions today which are allegedly repetitious, upon a news statement issued by the Union of Municipalities representing all of the elected officials of Manitoba at the municipal level, which statement was given out on Friday at 11:00 a.m., that was the foundation and the basis for my renewed question today. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend may get his jollies out of referring to those on this side of the House or, indeed, any legitimate citizens of Manitoba as being a lunatic. Mr. Speaker, we are not lunatics when we are asking that the people be heard and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. No member had a point of order in that exchange.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

HON. S. LYON: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. There was a point of order, or wasn't there?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition state his point?

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface presumed to raise a point of order and I spoke to it. Have you any comment on it, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is no point of order before the House.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. — (Interjection) — The Speaker just ruled and recognized me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has the floor.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm sorry, I wasn't aware of that.

Western Equine Encephalitis

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's difficult to get the floor these days.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health, and I would ask him whether there have been any cases of Western Equine Encephalitis reported among the horse population in the province to date? His statements today did not refer to that population.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, there are no reported cases.

Mosquito fogging

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

In noting the targets that he cited for the current and next round of aerial spraying, I would ask him whether, as reported in some of the media, communities like Gimli and the Lake Winnipeg Beach resorts are included in that program? I notice they are not mentioned in his statement, but they are reported by some of the media to be imminent target sites.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, according to the information we have from the Department of Health, they are designated as higher-risk areas and have been listed previously in our statements earlier, I believe on Saturday at a news conference. I have not mentioned them today simply because I have given an update for the spraying that will take place tonight and tomorrow morning. From then on, we will give further updates, but they are included.

Bilingualism - proposed resolution

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether he can confirm that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has been given the task of hearing briefs on the bilingual resolution, must report at this Session of the Legislature, namely, the next two to four weeks?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: In giving the Member for Elmwood all due credit for probably missing on Friday - the resolution has been tabled, and the Member for Elmwood, upon referral, will find that the resolution deals with that question.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the question was based on the fact that I thought the impression was created that that committee might meet after the Session; and that's why I ask the question, because it's the next couple of weeks, in fact, that that committee must report.

My second question is this, Mr. Speaker: In view of the importance . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Do you know how long the Sessions last?

MR. R. DOERN: Yes, I've been here 17 years; longer than you have.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to then direct this question to the Attorney-General and ask him why, since the government feels a resolution on bilingualism is so important, how is it official bilingualism? Why is it that the government has not called that resolution since July 18th? When is that resolution going to be called next? Are we expected to debate that resolution at the end of the Session until three in the morning, or are we going to have an opportunity to speak on it now so that we can have some decent debate and not ram it through at the end when everybody's tired?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The government has been calling business in consultation with the opposition in a measured way, and will be calling this resolution and other constitutional resolutions now in terms of the scheduling of the House, which will be unfolding from today forward once we've dealt with the so-called Speed-up Resolution. There is no problem. I know that the Member for Elmwood has been straining at the leash, and I can assure him that the leash will be unsevered and he can rise to his feet and bark away very shortly.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say, on a matter of privilege, I resent that type of smart-ass comment that's coming from the Attorney-General about barking dogs and leashes.

I want to now put a specific question to him: When is he calling this resolution? There are members in this

House who have been prepared to speak for weeks, and I would like a specific indication of what day that resolution will be called.

HON. R. PENNER: Shortly.

North of Portage - development

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Following along questions I asked him last Friday, I would like, Mr. Speaker, the Premier to indicate how he and the government approve in principle a plan to reroute Portage Avenue without knowing the details of the plan, without having an estimate of the costs of rerouting Portage Avenue, without having yet received the report from the North Portage Task Force.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that question was dealt with at some length by the Minister of Urban Affairs on Friday.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that question was not dealt with. That question in fact is unanswerable and undefensible by the First Minister.

Government polls

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the First Minister took as notice some questions from me with respect to government polls. He undertook to provide details of government polls and the costs of same. Does he have that information now?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we'll be putting together that information, we'll be providing it to the Chamber.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. G. MERCIER: A supplementary question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Has he, or his officials, completed their analysis of the government poll with respect to bilingualism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: No, it hasn't been completed. I expect it will be before the end of this week.

Pension reform legislation

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, one further question to the Minister of Labour. The Minister of Labour undertook to provide me with a copy of the recommendations from the Pension Commission. She has now tabled The Pension Benefits Act. I would ask her if she's prepared to provide us with a copy of the recommendations from the Manitoba Pension

Commission subsequent to the public hearings which they held?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Pension Commission made that report public. I will check on that and see but I believe that their recommendations to the government were made public sometime after they came to us. I'll undertake to verify that and let the member know.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Pension Commission did make a series of recommendations public, and then held public hearings, and the Minister of Labour undertook to provide those further recommendations to us. Those are what we would like to have, and require to have, in order to debate the bill which she's tabled.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I understand what the member is talking about. He's talking about the recommendations following the public hearings, following the Green Paper, which is what was discussed at public hearings, and that is the group of recommendations that, I believe, the Pension Commission made public sometime after they gave it to the government. They normally wait a certain period of time and then make their recommendations public. I will ascertain whether that happened and have an answer for the member tomorrow.

Hay-cutting rights

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, last week the Member for LaVerendrye asked a question in the House in respect to the cutting of hay for forage in the Red River floodway. The Honourable Minister of Co-operatives and Consumer and Corporate Affairs took that question as notice on my behalf.

I want to advise the House that the department has under consideration the reservation of some areas of the floodway, particularly in the lower slopes, or the low flow channel with a view to consideration whether or not it's possible to develop suitable habitat for wild fowl. However, in view of the difficult hay and forage conditions in the Red River Valley this year, we are not going to proceed with the reservation of those blocks, but we are going to develop a suitable plan for consideration for next year, all other things being equal.

Moose hunting

HON. A. MACKLING: While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to answer the concerns of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa in respect to a season, in respect to big game. He was concerned about whether or not there was accuracy in a notice he had about advertising of a special moose season, and had indicated that perhaps the date was incorrectly indicated on the material he had.

Mr. Speaker, the season was a special season for moose and the closing date was July 8th. The special

season applicability was well advertised in both the Winnipeg Free Press, the Brandon Sun, and the Flin Flon Reminder, on June 18th, June 24th, June 18th to 23rd, and June 22nd.

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.

Several weeks ago I raised a question, in the House, about a possible conflict-of-interest situation involving Mr. Moore, the Chief Executive Officer of McKenzie Seeds, as well as other senior officers at McKenzie Seeds. Can the Minister advise the House, at this time, whether or not there have been any further developments with respect to that situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There have been some further developments. I have received an interim report from the Provincial Auditor with respect to that particular circumstance. The board of McKenzie Seeds has, as well, received that report. They had a meeting on Friday, and they are currently, this afternoon I believe, having some further discussions with the people involved as well as lawyers on both sides.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Provincial Auditor is, of course, an employee, a servant of the Legislature, can the Minister of Finance advise when information provided by the Provincial Auditor will be made available to members of the Legislature?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ziprick and I had discussions with respect to that matter and it was agreed that it would be most convenient if that report would be made available when the final report comes down. He has indicated to me that he expects that it could take some time. There will be some interim action taken which, I expect, will be made public within the next several days, and I would appreciate the co-operation of the opposition in waiting for a couple of days until the decisions arrived at, by the board on Friday, can be completed and at that time there may be further activity which we would be prepared to discuss.

Brandon University - senate

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

Has the Minister of Education yet been able to determine who is the government's appointee to the senate of Brandon University?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, there is, what I would call, a pro forma designation. The Deputy Minister is

the designate to the senate. It is pro forma, the Deputy is also the designate to the other University senates. He does not act as a member of the senate; he does not attend senate meetings; he does not communicate with the senate on decisions that they are making.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the Minister of Education. Why does the government have a designate to the senate of Brandon University, if that person doesn't attend the meetings of the senate?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member for Turtle Mountain has raised a good question, that he might - and I'm sure is aware that it is handled the same way as it was when they were in government. The Deputy Minister was the designate. So what we're talking about is something that has gone on for a number of years and, as sometimes happens, the reasons that were originally there may no longer be the case. I must say, having thought about this since the Member for Turtle Mountain raised it, and realizing that the Deputy does not act as a member of the senate, does not attend senate meetings, that it does seem to raise the question of why bother, and we're going to look at it.

Bilingual agreement - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a further question flowing from the press release from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities tabled by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon, for the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, on the second page of this press release, reference is made to, and I'll read the full sentence because I'm not sure if the Minister has had an opportunity to read the press release at this point: The claim that the proposed program is not like the federal bilingualism program and is not creating a bilingual province is unfounded, with evidence of action already taken by the Provincial Government, as stated in the press by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, that agriculture representatives hired now will have to be bilingual, as well as the issuance of this year's driver's licences, etc.

I am wondering if the Minister can either confirm or deny this allegation in this press release that there has been a change in departmental policy and that all ag reps must now be bilingual. Is that the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, certainly there's been no change in departmental policy. In fact, it should be noted that there are over 40 staff people within our department who have bilingual capabilities in our department, and that no change in the policy occurs. When vacancies will occur, those positions which have been designated as requiring bilingual positions, they will be encouraged and they will be filled on that basis.

But there is no move to change the policy that was put into place by the former administration.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, a further question on the same press release for the First Minister. Similarly on Page 2 of the same press release and, Mr. Speaker, if I may have your indulgence, I'll again read the sentence because I'm not sure if the First Minister has had a chance to review the press release. The first sentence in Paragraph 2 reads as follows: As already pointed out previously, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act should be left intact and, if amended at all, it should be amended to include The 1890 Manitoba Provincial Languages Act that has formed and shaped our province into what it is today over the last 93 years.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the reference was not correct. I believe it should have been to The Manitoba Official Languages Act of 1890 as it was then called.

My question for the Premier, Mr. Speaker, is: In view of the fact that the Supreme Court of Canada has declared The Official Languages Act of 1890 to be ultra vires, is the First Minister of this province seriously going to consider a return to that statute by virtue of a constitutional amendment, as is being recommended by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, no, and I'm certainly disappointed that such a recommendation would have been made from an organization that I have the greatest respect for.

Income tax refunds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Finance, and would ask him: In view of the fact that thousands of Manitobans have not yet received their income tax refunds, even though many filed sometime in February; and since a lot of the members of the Legislature are receiving many calls daily from constituents who are very annoyed and very angry, and I may say are very anxious to receive these funds and require these funds to meet certain commitments that they have made, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would consider using his good offices to contact his federal counterpart and see if something cannot be done to speed this process up. More importantly, if we're too far down the tube with regard to this year, is there some mechanism that can be brought into place so this can be processed a lot quicker next year? I would ask the Minister if he could not use his good office and contact the Federal Minister and see if this couldn't be speeded up somewhat?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that's an excellent suggestion. I have asked my department already to check to see what is the delay. The proposal made by the honourable member seems quite reasonable. I don't think that it's acceptable to

Manitobans to have this kind of delay year in and year out. This year, I understand they did have some problems in terms of some statute law that came into place during the time when the returns were being processed. But it is frustrating for many who legitimately expect that when they have prepaid and overpaid their taxes, that the government ought to be prompt in repaying the amount that is owing to the taxpayer.

MR. R. BANMAN: I appreciate any effort that the Minister can take to try and help these people who require those cheques to carry on their daily business.

Judge Jewers' report on Lotteries

MR. R. BANMAN: I would ask a further question to the Minister in charge of lotteries, and would ask him whether or not he is contemplating holding any public meetings or public hearings with regard to Judge Jewers' report and the possible policies which the government is going to be implementing with regard to that report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There certainly will be meetings held. It'll be mostly when the new policy is announced. I wouldn't say that there will be general meetings as such. There will be meetings with different groups affected, individually. I think this will be more conducive to better organization of the whole system.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Since Judge Jewers stated in his report and I quote, "Obviously, any changes can and should only be made after the fullest consultation with all of the parties involved," can the Minister assure the House that before the government implements any policies, all groups involved will be asked to participate in discussions, realizing, of course, that there are certain changes that will flow from that? But I guess my concern would be that the participation by all members that will be affected is indeed part of the process which the government will be undertaking.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, there certainly will be meetings - many meetings. To confirm or to guarantee that there will be meetings with everybody affected would be impossible, because everybody in Manitoba will be affected by the lottery and by the report.

Construction industry - funds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a week has passed since members of the government met with representatives of the heavy construction industry that is facing extremely high unemployment. It was indicated to the House at that time that active consideration was given by the Chairman of the Jobs Fund, as well as the Minister of Transportation, that some additional construction

projects may be in the offing. Could either the Minister of Transportation and/or the Chairman of the Manitoba Jobs Fund indicate to the House whether the government has made any decision to free up some additional funds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting with the representatives of the heavy construction industry Friday afternoon. There will be some announcements flowing from that meeting which will be of some assistance, but I want to, in all candor, point out that the announcement may indeed not be adequate nor to deal with their overall difficulties, but there will be an announcement that will provide some degree of assistance.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, allow me to correct an error on my part. The words that I meant to use, of course, are some "restoration of the funds" that were taken away from the Highway budget that could be considered under these circumstances. But the urgency of the question and I ask that to the Minister, and particularly to the Minister of Labour as well, who must recognize that many of these construction workers are going to have difficulty in getting their necessary weeks in that would enable them to benefit from Unemployment Insurance benefits when the normal time for layoff comes up unless some projects are scheduled immediately.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's for that very reason that some few weeks ago we provided to the City of Winnipeg \$3.2 million which the City of Winnipeg was able to match for a total of \$6.4 million for street repair work within the City of Winnipeg. It's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we've increased the sewer and water allocation insofar as rural southern communities are concerned by some 50 percent. It's for that reason also that we've held the meeting on Friday afternoon to ascertain what further steps we could undertake. We're quite mindful of the difficulties that are confronting many within the construction industry as well as those employed within that industry, and we are presently assessing what we can do in order to help that particular segment of the industry.

Baton twirlers - St. Boniface

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

Recently at a national competition of baton twirlers in Eastern Canada there were eight young ladies from Manitoba who won the right to represent Canada at an international competition in Italy. It consisted of a team of seven from the St. Boniface area and an individual who did win the right to represent Canada. I was wondering whether the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sports will advise whether there will be any funding for these young ladies to go over to Italy to represent Manitoba and Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the members of this House. If there has been a request for such funding, it would have to be looked at. I think it would not be proper at this time to make a statement. I think that we'll have to see if we have any programs, and if so, it could be considered; if not, unfortunately that can't be done. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that there are many athletes that are travelling outside of Manitoba that are competing, and it's impossible to fund all of these, so there has to be - with the limited fund that we have - certain rules, and we'd have to check to see if they apply.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, a supplemental question to the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

I was wondering whether in fact he would take it on himself, considering that these young ladies are from St. Boniface and we have a special feeling, both he and I, to people who do represent St. Boniface, to see whether there was any funding through his department, or whether in fact we could get some funding for these young ladies through either the Department of Cultural Affairs or the Department of Tourism - almost anything - if it doesn't come under the auspices of the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very tempting suggestion. I think the honourable member would be the first one to take me to task if, for instance, that I give any privilege or if we did any more for people of our own constituency, so I think maybe we should forget that he made that suggestion.

Regional Services Branch appointment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Education.

Currently her department is in the final stages, as I understand, in the process of appointing a person to the position of Director of Regional Services Branch. I wonder if she can give the many applicants, who have put forth applications for the position, the assurance that the selection process will follow closely the requirements of the position as advertised and will not circumvent the normal process to simply confirm a predetermined applicant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly can confirm that to all of the people who have applied for the position of Director of Regional Services, that is, that they will follow the selection process. They will follow all of the normal procedures and they will follow the criteria that was established for the position and upon which the people that applied for the job and upon which the board is making the selection. I'm hoping that the announcement will be made very soon and it will be based on all of those requirements.

MR. G. FILMON: Can the Minister confirm that applicants who had not submitted applications were

solicited and sought out after the interview process and asked to come to the department under special consideration, even though they had not applied for the position?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY SPEED-UP MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance:

THAT for the remainder of the Session the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., in the evening from 8:00 p.m., and each sitting to be a separate sitting and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and the rules with respect to 10:00 p.m. adjournment to be suspended and government business to take precedence over all other business of the House;

AND THAT for the remainder of the Session, the operation of Sub-rule (3) of Rule 88 of The Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the House be suspended, but the report stage of any bill should not be taken into consideration prior to 24 hours following the presentation of the report of the standing or special committee with respect thereto.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution normally referred to somewhat colloquially as Speed-up. I would like to stress, first of all, that this motion is being moved by agreement between both sides of the House. It is being moved in an attempt, we hope - I think we all hope - a successful attempt to deal with the balance of the business on the Order Paper in a reasonable way.

I'd like to stress, and I think all members would agree with me, that there's no magic in Speed-up. Indeed, Speed-up, if improperly used, we all know can lead to what the First Minister has called "a government by exhaustion." Speed-up, in fact, the effective use of the resolution which is here placed on the Order Paper and which I am now moving and which indeed has been moved for I believe every Session back for 10, 12, perhaps more years, depends on co-operation.

For example, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out today during question period that there are a substantial number of persons waiting to make submissions, public submissions to one or another of the committees. Normally, committees are called to meet when the House is in Session on a consensual basis. My hope is - I don't think I'll be disappointed

in this - that as was the case last year, there will be no problem in scheduling committees so that we can keep the Sessions of the House and of the committees, which now have very substantial business on referral, meeting in a reasoned balance. That I think can be done and must be done by day-to-day conferencing between the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader.

I would like also to stress, Mr. Speaker, and this is agreed to, that there is no relationship between this process as encompassed in the motion before you, and differences of opinion which obviously exist on the timing of debate with respect to Bills 3, 48 and 95 and the government resolution on the constitutional amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. There is no relationship between those differences which will be debated and this motion which is now before you.

I have no other remarks to make, other than to stress that it's a consensual motion, as I believe it should be, if it is used at all, and that we come to it in the hope and, indeed, I think those expectations will not be dashed, that it can be used reasonably by reasonable people to keep the business of the House going in good balance to bring it to an early conclusion without at any time trampling on the rights of those citizens who want to make representations to committees or trampling on the rights of members of this House.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a few comments with respect to this resolution. The Honourable Attorney-General suggests that this resolution is before the House by agreement between the government and the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the first time in the history of the Legislature, I think, that repeated suggestions and requests for Speed-up have been made by the opposition to the government to bring it in to deal with the business of the House; as New Democratic Party Governments in the past, Progressive Conservative Governments in the past, probably Liberal Governments in the past a long while ago, using this motion, as every government has in the past, to wind-up the business of the House. It can be done, as we all know, in a very reasonable manner.

It is required, however, to expedite the business of the House. Mr. Speaker, the Estimates ended in the middle of June. It is now July 25th when the motion for Speed-up has been introduced. The motion for Speed-up should have been introduced a long time ago, a very long time ago, Mr. Speaker. We find ourselves now meeting, Mr. Speaker, on the 25th of July with an Order Paper some 16 pages long; with significant matters left on the Order Paper; with a large number of committee meetings which have to be held to hear the views of the citizens of Manitoba in the middle of one of the warmest summers that Manitobans have enjoyed for some time.

Mr. Speaker, you only have to go to one of these committee meetings in the morning or the evening as they've been held, to realize what an uncomfortable situation that is for individuals who are being called upon to comment on bills before committees. It is

certainly, Mr. Speaker, not something that we should be particularly proud of, to call upon Manitobans at this time of the year and under these conditions to come before a committee. I know, Mr. Speaker, that we did it in 1980 and that will certainly be the suggestion from members opposite.

I want to point out to them, Mr. Speaker, those who were here at the time will recall how critical they were of our government going into July in 1980, and I accept that criticism; but having made that criticism, why are we here on July 25th and why are we going to be here until the end of August or into September, Mr. Speaker? They established a set of criteria when they criticized us in 1980 and they have failed to deliver, Mr. Speaker. They failed to deliver in a much more significant way, because more than likely we will be here all summer and into September, unless the government takes some action to withdraw some of the matters before this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government and I don't want to put the entire blame on the Government House Leader, because I don't know what went on in Cabinet when they decided when we met prior to Christmas when the House was going to resume debate, but somebody made the decision not to come back until February 24th, well over two months from when the debate on the Speech from the Throne ended. I consider that was a wrong decision; we voted against that decision at that particular time, and that is one very significant reason why we are here at the end of July.

Mr. Speaker, unless we can, on this side, support as we do the motion for Speed-up - we have, in fact, I think asked for it to be brought forward. We think it can be dealt with, handled in a reasonable manner so that people will continue to be able to make representations with respect to the matters before committees, and the public will not be unduly, we hope, inconvenienced; but the government is going to have to consider, if they want this Session to end some time before the end of August or the end of September, what they are going to do with Bill No. 3.

I raise, Mr. Speaker, the Charter of Rights argument with respect to that bill that the Minister of Agriculture, when he spoke on second reading, rejected; but the association which the Attorney-General is funding, the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, have now made a strong argument with respect to the validity of that bill under the Charter of Rights.

The government, I think with that kind of argument having been made, Mr. Speaker, should seriously reconsider Bill No. 3 and whether they should proceed with it. I think they should withdraw it and have that bill examined by independent legislative counsel, Mr. Speaker, because there are very serious constitutional concerns about that bill. That would go a little way, Mr. Speaker, towards speeding up this Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, they should seriously contemplate The Election Finances Act, because we are going to debate that bill for a long time. We're not going to allow, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of Manitoba to have another burden cast upon their shoulders, as the government is suggesting, that the taxpayer pay 50 percent of their election expenses.

Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 95, The Pension Benefits Act, is a very complicated matter to be introduced at what

the government may feel is the end of the Session; but that requires a lot of consideration by members on this side, by members of the public, by the industry, and the government should seriously contemplate withdrawing that bill, deferring it until the end of the Session.

I remind the Government House Leader, I believe it was in the 1980 Session, close to the end, we introduced a brand new Builders' Lien Act, which was a very complicated matter. We tabled it and held it over till the next Session of the Legislature. In view of the complexity of this particular bill, I would suggest the government should consider taking the same sort of action.

Last, but not least, Mr. Speaker, as we've argued for a good number of days, we believe the legislative committee with respect to bilingualism should sit after the end of this Session and report to the next Session of the Legislature, which can be, Mr. Speaker, solely at the government's choosing and as early as they wish in the fall. The House of Commons is not sitting until the middle of September. They can't deal with it. So it is not going to delay anything if that committee were appointed to sit intersessionally, Mr. Speaker. If the government would take those steps, Mr. Speaker, this House could end much much earlier than it will otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, reminded of another argument that the First Minister has made all during the months that this Legislature has sat, that unemployment is the biggest problem in the minds of the government in this province, and it is in our minds and we have certain solutions. I wish the government had some solutions, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the private sector.

I ask the members of the government, sitting here in this Legislature at the end of July, virtually their full attention going to be required to the business of the Legislature that we've referred to, how are they going to deal with the problem of unemployment, which they regard as the most serious problem in this province, when they're going to be sitting in this Legislature for a long long time yet, unless they take some of the action that I have suggested to them, Mr. Speaker?

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we can support, as we have requested, the Speed-up Motion. We think it can be handled in a reasonable way, but it's going to take a lot more action on the part of the government before this Legislature ends, if it is indeed going to end before the end of August.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Speed-up Motion in one particular section. I have done this before, and I have always been totally opposed to the concept of the past 10:00 p.m. or past midnight sessions. During the normal year, it seems to me adequate to meet for an afternoon and evening session, but in Speed-up to have three sessions a day, the morning one at 10:00, then an afternoon session and an evening session, and to have people staggering out of the Chamber late at night or in the early morning and then attempting to properly debate crucial legislation, it seems to me is not a good idea.

Now, I am now looking at this adjournment. I have to ask for clarification here, Mr. Speaker; but I simply

say this - that three sessions a day is too long, especially when you have a late night session. I, too, like the Member for St. Norbert, am worried about the fact that there is a lot of crucial legislation that may get debated on weekends or in the evening or after an exhausting session. We have some of the most important legislation to ever come before this Assembly in the bilingual debate, and a lot of people are interested in the seat belt item. I think that to talk about grinding this through, Mr. Speaker, is something that all of us should be concerned about.

I listened to the Attorney-General on one occasion, or saw his quote in the newspaper that when the hearings on the bilingual question came up, he was prepared to have those hearings go until one or two or three o'clock in the morning. Mr. Speaker, we know why that particular approach is being taken. We know that there is always the hope on the part of government to exhaust the public, to make them lose interest and encourage them to go home. Similarly, when it comes to debate in the House, the idea is that it is rather by physical attrition and exhaustion over a prolonged period of time that members will grow weary of the debate and throw in the towel and head for the beaches like everybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I've been here a long time, and I have seen debates go until 5:20 in the morning and 4:30 in the morning, and 3:20 in the morning and 2:10 in the morning and so on. Then members are expected to reappear at 10:00 in the morning in good nature, with clear minds, and willing to tackle the business of the public. It just strikes me that that is a very poor approach to attempting to get good legislation.

The other complaint I make, I've made before, namely, that this building is not air-conditioned; it's very uncomfortable here in the summertime. This Chamber is uncomfortable right now, and the civil servants who work in this building, several hundred, three or four hundred, have to suffer through this heat. It's great if you're outdoors, but painful if you're indoors.

So I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't object to three-times-a-day sittings, but I do object to long, late night sittings and Saturday sittings, and public sessions in which the public, which is perplexed and puzzled enough by the procedures of committees, has to come and sit around for endless hours in committee waiting to be heard. I think that given those facts, the Speed-up Resolution should not contain a late night provision.

I also think, in view of some of the heavy legislation in terms of its importance to Manitobans, that we shouldn't be in any rush, particularly on the bilingual question. I think that should be pulled and that should be held later on. The Leader of the Opposition made that point today, and others have made it and I have made it, and I think that there is no need to have a public committee now, a committee to hear the public on this question and ram it through this Session. If we're going to debate something that's an amendment to the Constitution of this province, we should take a lot of time; we should look for a consensus across the province before we proceed. We will not get that if the government rams that through in the next couple of weeks.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried, on division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Would you please call the resolution introduced in my name, as it stands on Page 10, with respect to the referral of the amendment to Section 23 to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General . . .

MR. G. MERCIER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Could the Government House Leader indicate when he proposes the Speed-up Resolution to take effect? As of right now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I took the wording of the resolution literally, although some people think that perhaps it shouldn't be - "RESOLVED THAT for the remainder of the Session" - I took it that, when passed, it took effect.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just to clarify my question, Mr. Speaker, to the Government House Leader, that sometimes in the past, the Government House Leader has chosen to bring the Speed-up Resolution into effect a day later or two days later; but if it's in effect now, that clarifies the situation.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

HON. R. PENNER: Just on that, I did talk to the Opposition House Leader, and that wasn't necessary since, by leave, the committees are as scheduled, and I'll be making a brief announcement about a committee change. Perhaps I can make that now.

The committees as scheduled for today and tomorrow will meet as scheduled, and then the Opposition House Leader and I will have a chance to meet on the other committee meetings.

Just on that point, Mr. Speaker, The Law Enforcement Review Act Bill and The Police Act Bill stand referred to Law Amendments, and there are a large number of delegations that are appearing tonight.

I would move, by leave, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines, that the bills stand referred to the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations. That is, it will continue to meet at the same time, same place, but a smaller committee. This will give an opportunity between now and 5:30 for anyone on our side or the other side to make any committee changes they see fit to accommodate that change.

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Attorney-General, standing on Page 10 of the Order Paper, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General, before us at the present time, places in my view, Sir, a very heavy and undesirable burden on the people of Manitoba because of the time constraints contained within the wording of the resolution and within the ambitions of the Attorney-General and his colleagues on this point.

I would enter the debate at this juncture, Sir, to appeal to the Attorney-General to consider the reasonable request that has been made by a number of commentators, including most prominently my leader, for intersessional study of this very important resolution.

The resolution itself, as it appears before us at the present time, calling upon the committee in question to report to the Assembly at this Session of the Legislature, injects in my view, Sir, an element of discoloration and discord into what is a very historic and crucially important chapter in Manitoba's history. It's an element of discoloration and discord that I believe can be avoided, and that I sincerely believe the Attorney-General, given the opportunity, would like to avoid.

I think the Attorney-General should be considering the judgment of history on this point, and I think that he is a person with whom issues can be discussed in the context of the historical perspective, the judgment of history. I think if there is one thing he would have to admit he has witnessed in the various public information meetings that have been held on this proposed amendment to Manitoba's Constitution so far, it would be that there is genuine disagreement over the course being proposed by the government. I'm not arguing that a clear consensus has emerged, either at those public meetings, or in any of the debate and discussion on the subject that has been held inside or outside this Chamber up to this point in time.

I'm proposing rather to the Attorney-General the precise opposite. I'm proposing that a clear consensus has not emerged, Sir. I'm proposing that the one clear discovery at this point is that there is genuine and sincerely held and profoundly held disagreement over the course of action, which the government is proposing in the resolution that would amend our provincial constitution.

As a consequence of that, Sir, I firmly believe that it not only would serve the best interests of Manitobans, which must be paramount here, but serve the best interests of the conduct of the affairs of this Legislature, which is a very important matter when considering the public interest, but also serve the best interests of the Attorney-General, if I may put it that way, and I see no reason why his best interests, in this case, should not be considered, along with the best interests of all of us. Also serve the best interests of the Attorney-General, if he permitted Manitobans to reflect upon this very important course of action, this very important proposed change to our constitution, and permit all Manitobans to evaluate that proposed change, soberly, conscientiously and deeply over the next few weeks and months.

I see nothing wrong with my suggestion, Sir, that that course of action would serve the best interests of all

the parties that I have mentioned. Why should not the best interests of those who serve on both sides of this House be considered, where very important legislation is concerned, just as the best interests of the public should be considered. In fact, I do not separate those two ingredients. I believe that those of us who serve here, on whichever side, were sent here through the conscientious and deliberate action of constituents, who believe that their best interests would be served through our being here.

So I equate best interests in this case, Sir, and I say that the best interests of the public, the best interests of this legislative body, and the best interests of the Attorney-General would be served by taking a sober second look at the urgent time limitations placed upon this Legislature where this resolution is concerned, in the proposal that is now before us and permitting some flexibility and permitting some opportunity for all of us, inside and outside this House, to study this profoundly important question very deeply, very extensively, and very widely over the next period of time. That period of time should not be a period of days, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of all parties that I have mentioned, that period must necessarily be several months.

No one on this side is holding out for undue delay, or for deliberate obstruction, or for an examination that would run to some indefinable period of years. What we are asking for is the reasonable amount of time that would permit digestion of the issue by Manitobans generally and proper assessment and evaluation of the government's proposal by Manitobans generally. And that reasonable time, Sir, would appear to be the time between now and the time that this Manitoba Legislature is next called into Session, presumably the spring of 1984.

So what we were talking about really is a period, Sir, merely of months; but those months, in our view, are crucial for proper comprehension on the part of Manitobans generally, of what is embodied in the government's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks at this point in time thus become an appeal to reason and an appeal to a conciliatory attitude on the part of the Attorney-General and an appeal, in fact, Sir, to common sense. We face in this House at the present time an extremely important and an extremely heavy workload. Intensive study is necessary during the remainder of this legislative Session of a wide number of bills, of wide-ranging interest and impact for Manitobans.

Some of them have been mentioned in debate this afternoon, relative to the Speed-up Motion and in question period. The evidence of that interest to which I've referred can be seen in the sizes and number of the various public and professional delegations and interest groups that are appearing these days and nights before different committees of this House, on a number of these bills. There are, for example, Mr. Speaker, some 40 delegations, I believe still waiting to be heard on Bill 60, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2); and some 15, I believe, waiting to appear and make their representations on Bill No. 2, The Law Enforcement Review Act; and these are only examples.

There are many other bills that will be addressed by wide numbers of delegations. My colleague, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, reminds me of Bill 90 and the numbers of cattle producers who will want

to appear at committee stage and make representations on that legislation.

But it's not my intention to proceed through a litany of the numbers of controversial and very important proposed pieces of legislation that are at committee stage right now, on which substantial numbers of Manitobans want to make their representations. It was merely my intention, Sir, at this juncture to cite two or three of these bills as examples and they are fair examples of a current situation. They reflect the current legislative workload and they reflect the preoccupation of members of this House and members of the general public of Manitoba, the preoccupation of Manitobans, generally, with important, far-reaching pieces of proposed legislation in a range of subject areas.

Faced with that reality, Mr. Speaker, it seems unreasonable, to say the least, and in fact, imprudent and unwise in my view for the government to propose that the committee which is to review the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, namely, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, should report to the Assembly at this Session of the Legislature. I don't see how that can be practically possible, Mr. Speaker. I don't see how that can be constructive or productive. I don't see how that can add to or enhance the exercise on which the government is embarked at the present time with respect to Manitoba's cultural and linguistic makeup.

Here is a government, Mr. Speaker, which said that it would listen to people, which from time to time insists, I think, with some reasons for argument, some reasons on which it can be challenged, but nonetheless from time to time insists that it does listen to people. Well here, in one of the most important areas of our makeup and our being of our present and our future, the government seems either unwilling - or if not unwilling - insensitive to the legitimate rights of the people of Manitoba to be heard on the subject before conclusive and definitive decisions are taken. It may not be, Sir, that this government is as opposed to the course of action that has been proposed by my leader as it is uncertain of where it wants to go itself and uncertain of its own correctness.

It may well be that this government feels that it has made some errors in judgment along the way, put itself in positions of compromise and public criticism in its one-and-a-half years in office, appeared to be irresolute with respect to some major issues in the past 18 months, and therefore cannot take the chance of appearing irresolute or uncertain on an issue as important as this.

I do not know what the precise motivation is for the haste in bringing this issue to a conclusion, the haste that is obviously the desire of the government here, but I suggest that if there is to be any credibility afforded its ambition or its claim to be a government that listened to people or that aspires to listen to people, it must, Mr. Speaker, be willing to listen to the people of Manitoba on this resolution of such far-reaching impact for this province.

That cannot be done without permitting study of the resolution to go to an inter-sessional committee, and that committee to report to the Legislature at its next Session. Any attempt, any demand, to have the committee report to the Legislature at this Session will abort that very necessary exercise.

Wherever I go, Mr. Speaker, I have people speak to me very sincerely and very passionately on this subject.

I believe that the Attorney-General and his colleagues would have to concede that they have persons speak to them sincerely and passionately on it too. I don't believe for one instant that all those who are making representations either privately or publicly to the Attorney-General are articulating the same course of action any more than all of those who speak to me about it are voicing the same position, the same course of action. Manitoba's society is split on the issue, and it's split passionately and sincerely.

It is the opportunity for Manitobans to digest this matter properly and to think about it soberly and to come to a well-considered conclusion that we plead for, Mr. Speaker, when we ask the Attorney-General to permit this committee to go into intersessional public hearings and public study of the resolution and take the time to do the job properly and be permitted to withhold its final conclusions and its final report until this Legislature next meets at its next Session.

It is because we feel that that opportunity is not being provided to Manitobans to see the issue clearly and fully, to think it through clearly and fully and to express themselves to the government clearly and fully on the matter that we are so concerned. It is that point and one other on which we are deeply concerned, Mr. Speaker.

The other point being the move to entrenchment which is contained in the resolution, the move to entrench this extension of officialdom of the two languages in Manitoba. We are not concerned with extension of language services. We are not worried about our capability and capacity as well meaning members, all of us, of a mosaic of one million Manitobans of a variety of cultural backgrounds to achieve a reasonable, fair and equitable extension of services in the French language alongside the English language in this province, but what we are concerned about is the move, implicit in the government's action to entrench those services in an official way and take administration and consideration and adjudication of them out of the hands of the elected representatives of the people, out of the hands of the members of this Legislature and place them for all time beyond the reach of the people, place them for all time in the courts.

Those two issues: The issue of the proper opportunity for Manitobans to thoroughly digest this question and to allow themselves to be heard on it; and the issue of entrenchment of the extension of official language services are those that have prompted us to take the position that we have taken thus far on behalf of our party and a great many Manitobans from all walks of life who have come to us with their concerns about the government's position. It is those two issues in particular, those two concerns in particular, that lie at the root of the speeches and commentaries that my leader has offered on this important subject, both inside this Chamber and outside it.

If the committee charged with dealing with this resolution is given the opportunity, Sir, to consider it in the public arena, and the public is given the meaningful opportunity to make its views known over a sufficiently reasonable period of time, then I sincerely believe that all of us can come to peaceful and positive resolution of this question.

If, on the other hand, there is the feeling in anybody's heart that Manitobans are being pressured and that

this Legislature is being pressured and that the public is being denied the right to express itself for the sake of achieving a politically expedient initiative then the results will be negative and damaging with implications beyond our measurement and our assessment in this debate today. Rather than positive results for our province, we will face negative and damaging results for our province.

The Attorney-General has the opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, to make a significantly greater contribution to the progress and the unity of Manitoba than perhaps he even imagines is contained in the resolution in its present form. He has that opportunity because it is available for him to say that notwithstanding the objectives contained in the resolution in which he believes, he has come to the conclusion that Manitobans in general have a great deal to do in the way of thinking about this resolution and a great deal to say about this kind of a move, and that they deserve the time in which to say it.

That kind of contribution to this debate would be, I suggest, an historic one, and I make that appeal to the Attorney-General because I don't doubt for one moment that he is amenable to that kind of evaluation of a legislative question. He has shown some willingness to be conciliatory where other controversial legislation is concerned.

He has made some adjustments and revisions to his government's position on Bill 18, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Act. He has made some revisions and adjustments to Bill 2, The Law Enforcement Review Act. There is no question in my mind that the government's decision to withdraw the bill that would have amended The Payment of Wages Act was a decision that felt the impact and influence of the Attorney-General in very large measure, and that being the case, Mr. Speaker, if he has seen room for a conciliatory attitude or a more flexible attitude, a more understanding attitude, where some of the unsatisfactory aspects of those pieces of legislation were concerned, how much more should there be a willingness on his part to be flexible and to be conciliatory on this important legislation? How much stronger is the argument for him to be flexible where the very fabric of the Manitoba mosaic and Manitoba's culture is concerned?

Many commentators, many interest groups, have spoken up vigorously in opposition to the government's intention embodied in this particular resolution, none of them, Mr. Speaker, any more emphatically or effectively than the Union of Manitoba municipalities in this statement which it made this past Friday. That statement has not seen very much exposure in the media, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's important that some references from it be read into the record at this time, because what the Union of Manitoba Municipalities has had to say in this particular statement is of very profound importance in the debate on which we are engaged.

That statement from the union clearly enunciated in its opening paragraphs that it felt that the matter of entrenchment was a severe and extreme course of action which could not be supported, and I quote from that statement, Mr. Speaker: "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 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 and left to the decisions of the courts of law in Canada to enforce."

The union, Sir, as you know speaks for municipalities all over this province and municipal governments and elected municipal officials, as you know, speak for the individual men and women on the streets and towns and highways of Manitoba all over this province. There is no closer contact that one has in a government electorate sense. There is no closer contact between the citizen and elected office than that which exists at the municipal level. Here is where the very roots of a government, the very roots of administration, exist and are felt and are affected by the people in society who work at the grassroots levels.

So, comments, commentary, opinion, coming from municipal spokesmen, from those who serve at the municipal level of government, are of enormous importance I suggest, to those of us in this Chamber when we're considering legislation that will have the impact on our province that this particular resolution proposes to have.

The statement by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities goes on, Mr. Speaker, to argue that the proposal of the government is arguable and challengeable constitutionally and legally and also financially, that the program is too costly in the words of the union, is not practical as a dual language program, is cumbersome and unworkable and, "most importantly, it is not needed in Manitoba. The most important reason for not implementing such a program is that it is going to and already has created hurt feelings, and our legislators should have realized this. Not a single community in our province is made up entirely of one ethnic group, but most communities have representations of three or four ethnic groups. It has also created the same hurt feelings within the ethnic groups even on the family level. So, instead of uniting, it is dividing the entire fabric of the community spirit that already existed in our province."

I put those comments on the record, Mr. Speaker, because as I say thus far, to my knowledge, that statement coming from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities has not received media or public attention. It deserves media and public attention. It deserves consideration and recognition in this Chamber and it deserves to be on the record in this debate.

My main point for referring to it, Mr. Speaker, other than the justification that I've already offered is that it reinforces the position that my leader has attempted to make, that I think I referred to a few moments ago, that a great many concerned interest groups in the province hold profound and sincerely felt feelings on this question, some in favour, many opposed, but nonetheless deeply and sincerely felt and profoundly held feelings that cannot be addressed and examined and cannot be explored by all the various relevant interest groups in some kind of hasty, hothouse atmosphere that the Attorney-General and the government may envisage under the procedure they

have proposed in the resolution before us at the present time.

There is strong concern and anxiety and strong disagreement insofar as any consensus is concerned, and for that reason in the interests of the people of Manitoba and the other parties to which I have referred we consider it vital, and I think the statement by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities reinforces that position of ours. We consider it vital that proper study and evaluation be afforded. That opportunity can be provided by the Attorney-General very easily, Mr. Speaker, very easily, by permitting this committee to hear from the public, permitting the public the time that it needs to make the kinds of reasoned presentations that are desirable here, and by permitting the committee to report to the next Session of the Legislature rather than the current one.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me leave that as an appeal to the Attorney-General to make a very important and positive contribution to this chapter of Manitoba's history by injecting that note of reasonableness into the study of this question. What is the rush, after all? What is the rush? As my leader has pointed out, Sir, Parliament is not in Session, will not be in Session until the middle of September, will face a heavy agenda of business when it reconvenes and is not likely to be in a position even to touch this matter for some considerable time.

What is wrong with intersessional study of this issue? What is wrong with the suggestion made earlier for a joint parliamentary legislative committee to look into it between Sessions of our Legislature? Why should not federal representatives in Manitoba be drawn into the examination of this question too? Their expertise, their involvement, their relationship with their constituencies surely is crucially important in the determination of this question too. Surely that is as important as the consideration of those of us representing provincial constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, an extension of time for study and examination of this question would permit that kind of an approach. It would permit a joint parliamentary legislative study and it would permit the kind of examination to be completed that would then enable both Parliament and this Legislature to look at the course of action proposed by the government on the basis of all the facts and on the basis of all the feelings, and surely in an area such as this all the facts are crucially important and all the feelings are crucially important.

So, Mr. Speaker, we ask the Attorney-General to make that positive and constructive adjustment, to seize this opportunity to contribute very very substantially to the growth of the unity of Manitoba and Manitobans and to the protection of that unity against prejudices, biases and emotions that can be fueled in a very unfortunate way by legislative pressures and by political pressures and time constraints.

One thing that one very quickly learns in the legislative arena, Mr. Speaker, is that it helps very nearly always on very nearly every question which legislators confront, it helps to take the time to listen to opposing views. It helps to consider what the other person has to say. It helps to weigh the different perspectives and draw reasoned conclusions. You cannot do that under a sense of urgency and you cannot do that under a workload

pressure, such as exists for members of this Chamber at the present time, at this stage of our 1983 Session, Sir.

With Speed-up, with committees meeting at various times of the day and night, with a heavy range of provocative and controversial legislation, with a long line-up of interest groups wanting to participate at committee stage in the examination, as mentioned, of so many controversial bills, there is simply not the time or the opportunity either for members of this Legislature, members of the committee that is referred to in this resolution or, more importantly, members of the general public to make the considered representations and go through the important examinations of the government's proposed course of action with which we are confronted in this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

We cannot do that in 10, 15, 20 days under the pressures of Speed-up and under the pressure of heavy legislative examination. There is no way that a responsible report can come back from that committee to this Session of the Legislature. If we want a responsible report, and heaven knows we must have one, and heaven knows we want nothing other than a responsible report, then we must permit the committee and the public the time, free of those other constraints and pressures of work, to bring in that kind of a report

A MEMBER: That sounds reasonable to me, Bud.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . and that means reporting to the next Session of the Legislature, Sir.

In that vein, I therefore take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "Committee" in the second paragraph of the operative section thereof, and substituting the following: "sit during recess after prorogation and report to the next Session of the Legislature."

MOTION presented.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak in support of that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the Member for Fort Garry, and I think that was a very effective contribution to the debate. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to proceed with a constitutional amendment, that there should be a provincial consensus.

The honourable member suggests that there is a division of opinion in the community at large, and my impression is very clear that it is overwhelmingly opposed to the proposal put forward by the administration, overwhelmingly. — (Interjection) — No, it's not based on my survey alone, Mr. Speaker.

My survey came in at 93.3 percent, and I am willing to bet that in a referendum across Manitoba, the numbers will be very very similar. They will certainly be at least 70 percent, and they might hit 80 or 90 percent. My own thinking is 90 percent or better, but

we'll see. We'll see, first of all, in the referendums that will be held throughout the province in October. We'll see at the next provincial election and we'll see at the next federal election, because if this goes through this Chamber, if this resolution goes through unamended, is rammed through over the dead bodies of a lot of Conservatives and a few other people, Mr. Speaker, it will then go into the federal arena; and every single member of Parliament, including seven New Democrats, five Conservatives and two Liberals, are going to have to take a stand on this particular matter.

No matter how much pain it causes to each member of Parliament, as in the fact that federal New Democrats are going to have to think about opposing the provincial administration, and federal Conservatives are going to have to think about Brian Mulroney, and federal Liberals are going to be tied to this no matter what they do, I think that every political party federally is going to have to sweat over this particular issue.

Then, of course, in a couple of years we will get a report from the people of Manitoba about the Provincial Government's actions on this matter. Mr. Speaker, I can only believe that will be a disaster for anyone on this side of the Chamber who supports that policy as it presently exists.

Mr. Speaker, the question here really is as follows; it was referred to by a number of members, including the Member for Fort Garry, and I have said so many times, and that really is: What is the rush? What is this undue haste and this obsession and this determination by the Provincial Government to get this legislation through this Session?

When you read the original motion, you know it sounds very interesting. They're going to hear the views of Manitobans and they're going to look into this particular momentous amendment to the Canadian Constitution. This is no ordinary resolution. Maybe; I don't know. Maybe it's the most important resolution that has come before this House in the last 20 years. Certainly, it's one of the most important, and I wouldn't want to prioritize them. The Leader of the official Opposition says - certainly one. I don't know whether he would rate it as No. 1, but it certainly is in the front ranks of those important issues; certainly those that affect the province on the basis of a harmony that has existed for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be quick to add that people who opposed this resolution are not opposing it because they don't like French-Canadians or they don't like the French language, which is the easy cheap shot and the scare tactic that comes sometimes from the supporters of the resolution. People who don't want this resolution are concerned about introducing bilingualism on an official basis into the province and into the Civil Service, and we don't need that kind of nonsense in our province. We don't need a policy that'll strain the kind of harmony that exists in this Legislature and the harmony, I should say, that exists in the province. I don't want to confuse it with the "disharmony" that exists in the Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, the first question is: What is the rush? Why is the Attorney-General and the First Minister so determined to get it through this Session in the next couple of weeks?

Adlai Stevenson once said in a debate that he was prepared to wait for an answer from the Soviet delegate in the United Nations until hell freezes over. I guess,

in this case, the two honourable gentlemen in the front bench, they are prepared to get this through even if all of us melt in this particular Chamber and in this particular building in a very hot prairie summer.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speculate on motives. I have heard some very interesting speculation as to the motives of the honourable members, but I wouldn't care to put that on the record. I simply say that in the month of October, since the administration is unwilling to hold a provincial referendum, you know, Mr. Speaker, my advice to the Pawley administration is as follows: Hold a referendum and that way you could get off the hook. You could take the results of the referendum and act according to those results. Follow the wishes of the people; listen. This is a party, Mr. Speaker, that listens to people. That was the slogan in the last election: "We listen to people."

Mr. Speaker, I think that if the province doesn't want to hold a referendum, it doesn't have to shell out, as one Minister suggested - I don't know if it was the Minister of Urban Affairs - but somebody suggested it would cost \$2 million and they weren't going to put up that kind of money; but somebody suggested that. Mr. Speaker, that would be a lot of money, but you know the municipalities are going to do it free, not a cost, not a penny — (Interjection) — right. They're going to have two ballots: one on nuclear weapons and Cruise missiles and disarmament; and one on bilingualism.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what the question is. I spoke to somebody who is a reeve or a councillor, and he said, well, we have to really think about what the question's going to be. I said to him, you know, it doesn't matter what the question is. You can have any question that you want. It can be a long question or a short question, any question that you want. That isn't important because it's the debate and the pros and cons put on that resolution that's important.

You know, in Quebec, the P.Q. spent a great deal of time framing a question that anybody in Quebec would have to support. They took time, they gave themselves the best possible wording and the most favourable light possible to put a question before the public so they would vote "yes." But, then, all of a sudden, some people decided to organize a "no." So there was basically a "yes" and basically a "no." A "yes" to their question of separation or a "no" to the question of separation.

In this case, it's very simple. Take any wording that you like. You know, the members, my colleagues on this side of the House, said to me: You took a poll and that poll stinks. You had a loaded question that was designed deliberately to elicit a response and you got it. It was a crooked poll with a crooked result and it doesn't reflect what the people of Manitoba think.

Mr. Speaker, I've said many times to colleagues on this side of the House, many times, and I say it them today: You've got a better question, let's hear it; you have a question that the people can give an objective opinion on, let's see it. So, I haven't seen one yet.

I can think of a dozen different ways that you could word a question and it doesn't really matter because you can take your question and then the government can go out and sell its whole program on bilingualism, and the opposition, formal and informal, can oppose

it and point out what's wrong with it. Then the people will vote. They are certainly going to vote in two years. They certainly are going to vote in the next provincial election on this question, you better believe it. But, they can also vote right now, and the municipalities are going to give them a wonderful opportunity, free, not a penny's cost, to the Provincial Government, have a referendum in October.

You know, Mr. Speaker, if the Provincial Government doesn't listen, the Provincial Government refuses to listen to the people now, I've got news for them. The MPs are going to listen to them in October, because about the time this is being discussed in the House of Commons every MP is going to get the results from that referendum - you're not going to get it now, because it's going to be held in October, but you're going to get it in October - and it's going to reflect federally and it's going to reflect provincially.

Mr. Speaker, just as in the last few federal elections the popularity of the Lyon administration was reflected in the federal results in Manitoba - there is obviously some correlation, it's hard to be exact and hard to be precise - but obviously the programs and policies of the Lyon administration to some extent were reflected in the federal results in Manitoba. Similarly, when the federal election comes, it will be both a reflection on the New Democratic Party across Canada, across Western Canada, on the individual MPs in Manitoba, and it will also be an opportunity for people to indicate what they think of the Pawley administration.

There are seven seats at stake, and I've heard estimates of how many seats there are going to be after the next federal election and the estimates that I hear - these are not necessarily what anybody else hears, these are what I hear - is the range is between zero and two, out of seven. Those are the estimates. Now, maybe there'll be 9 or 13 or 14, but at the moment there are seven. — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Lakeside, he knows politics when he sees it. He says, it's a popular issue. If you grab on and ride it off into the sunset, you could score heavily, much to the surprise and the chagrin of the present speaker and the members opposite. We would be taken by surprise of the depth of affection on the part of the people of Manitoba for this particular policy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say, if we're going to have a referendum in October on nuclear weapons, which is not a bad idea, it's not a bad idea, I'm against nuclear weapons. No way would I vote in favour of the Cruise missile and other things like that - no way. I'm too deeply committed against that kind of a program. But, on the other hand, this ballot could also have on it a question on bilingualism, and there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Cruise results will be, I don't know what that'll be, that'll be a bit of a division. If you put a question on abortion, you'd get a pretty big split there. But, you put this question on and you're going to get an overwhelming landslide against.

Mr. Speaker, the deadline for this resolution is December 31st. So, if this went to Ottawa in October, November or December, that's good enough. You know, if it never went to Ottawa, that would be fine too. Who cares? You know, we hear all this talk, well, we cannot renegotiate because we have to go back to our partners the Société Franco-Manitobaine, and by God, they may not approve it. What are we going to do then?

Mr. Speaker, decide on your policy, go back to your partners. If your partners don't like it, they can lump it. You don't need your partners. You don't need the Federal Government. You don't need Pierre Trudeau. In fact, if there's anybody you don't want, it's Pierre Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada. That is the kiss of death. Anybody who gets into bed with him is finished, politically.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Franco-Manitoban Society is regarded as a partner - why? Why are they a partner? - because the Federal Government made it a condition of negotiation that the government had to negotiate with the Franco-Manitoban Society.

Mr. Speaker, I will save some of remarks on that until later. I will speak more on that particular aspect later, but I say that when the government decided to have its public information meetings - those weren't hearings, those were meetings. My view was from Day One, and still is, that we should have extensive public hearings throughout the province, take a crew around - the Member for Fort Garry and others are correct when they said that committee should contain federal members - because either way, it's going to contain federal members. Either way, the federal members are involved. No matter what you do, the federal people are going to have to be involved, they're going to have to know what to do, they're going to have to speak to their people, they're getting letters and phone calls, too.

Mr. Speaker, I found it somewhat amusing that the First Minister answered me when I asked him a question the other day on the question of nuclear weapons, when he said that any astute politician will listen to the public on a matter of concern, any astute politician will listen to the people; and he advised people to put pressure on the Prime Minister of Canada so he would then reverse himself on the Cruise. So I said, "Well, if that's true there, what about you?" Well, the First Minister said, "That's a different story. How could you; how could anybody compare nuclear weapons with bilingualism?"

Mr. Speaker, he said there's nothing in common. I'll tell you what they have in common. They're both explosive. They can both injure and kill politicians; but, of course they're different issues. Of course, I understand that one thing is a bomb that explodes and has fallout, and the other thing is a policy related to bilingualizing the Civil Service and introducing French as an official language in the Province of Manitoba. Of course, I know that.

The point is if he says that the Prime Minister should respond to the public and people should pressure him and send letters and phone calls and walk around with placards and demonstrations, and he suggests that to the public, then I say that the public should also do that in terms of his administration and of himself, and he should then respond the way he says Pierre Elliott Trudeau should respond. I mean any politician, Mr. Speaker, who knows anything about public opinion knows that the public is overwhelmingly against this particular issue, and they are phoning and writing letters, and so on, everyday to all these politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I got a petition the other day that is being sent to the Minister of Finance - 300 signatures - I don't know, perhaps the opposition got it; they got it too - 300 signatures picked up at random in Rossmere;

99.5 percent, according to the person who gathered them; 99.5 percent signed it. Does that tell you anything? It should. I can tell you, if I got a petition in my riding signed by that many people on an issue, I would think about it very carefully. I wouldn't just laugh it off; I wouldn't say, well, what do I care! I would think about it very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, today, as you know, I put an ad in the Free Press and the replies are starting to come, just starting to come, doing fine. I expect that they're going to come by the thousands tomorrow. They're going to start rolling in on Tuesday. One fellow spoke to me in front of the steps. A fellow stopped his car in front of the steps; 25 people between 10:00 and 12:30 p.m. came into my office in person to deliver theirs. They don't trust the post office, and they don't want their money lost or their ballots lost. One guy stopped his car right in front of the steps. He was a New Democrat, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: You better make sure that the mail all gets to you, Russ.

MR. R. DOERN: Right, you're not kidding.

A MEMBER: It's not going to the caucus office.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to open my mail. Mr. Speaker, this fellow stopped his car, he turned around and he jumped out of his car and he came up to me. He was about 60 years old . . .

A MEMBER: But did he embrace you?

MR. R. DOERN: No, he wasn't a French Canadian that I could tell. Well, French Canadians are inclined to hug people and a kiss on each ear sometimes in official ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, he came up to me and he was quite annoyed, just like the Minister of Health, and he said to me, "Scott is my member." I said, "You should have a talk with him." And he said, "I'm going to get hold of him." He said, "Where is he?" I said, "Well, he's maybe in his office, or maybe he's in the caucus room. Go and have a talk with him." He said, "Listen, I'm telling you; I've talked to hundreds of people in the area and they're all against." He said, "I'm a New Democrat. If they go ahead with this, I'm sending in my membership card." I'm telling you that a lot of New Democrats are saying that. I don't like to say that in public, but I'm telling you that that is a fact. That is a fact.

The administration is out of touch with the party. The administration is not in touch with the grassroots New Democrats, and you take a poll among New Democrats, not a phony poll - not this thing that the Attorney-General has concocted. That's going to be a laugh when we get that poll. Everybody should be here, because it's going to be fun time when he releases his question and when he releases his numbers and when he releases how the poll was taken and so on. It's going to be very interesting to find out how that worked, because that was a 70 percent in-favour poll. I'm really looking forward to seeing that poll.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government decided not to have public hearings at first, but to have public

information meetings. Public information meetings very well structured; very carefully structured meetings. Jack London, the Dean of Law was the M.C.; no clashes with the Attorney-General at the mike, he's the M.C.; and some staff is there with charts and maps and documents. Nice brochures are handed out at the meeting, and the Attorney-General starts every meeting with a 30 minute or more presentation and then questions are taken from the floor. Now, Mr. Speaker, I went to two of those meetings, two of them; one in Brandon, which I think was probably fairly representative; one in Dauphin, which was probably fairly representative; one in Thompson I didn't see. I didn't see the one in Dauphin either. The one in Thompson seemed to be a peculiar meeting. I don't know much about it, but I was also at the one at the International Inn.

Mr. Speaker, let me read you the results of those meetings as seen by the media. Here's the Winnipeg Sun, Friday, July 8, 1983: "Penner strikes out in Brandon, Dauphin." That's what the Sun said, and listen to this quote in the middle: "In voices crackling with suppressed anger, speaker after speaker rose to denounce the bilingual amendment to applause and cheers from the crowd." Mr. Speaker, boy, if that isn't a warning! I mean that sentence is incredible. It was written by Andrew Coyne. Let me tell you, if you studied that sentence carefully, it is dynamite. That's dynamite. Suppressed anger, crackling voices, speaker after speaker denouncing the amendment, and the crowd cheering and applauding that particular approach. — (Interjection) — No, I'm not exaggerating. I'm reading a verbatim quote from the Winnipeg Sun.

Well, the Member for Urban Affairs, he laughs, you see. He's new and he laughs; he thinks there's a lot of support for this, right? Go out there in his riding, door-to-door, nine out of ten in favour of the government. That's not true in my riding, but in his riding there's big support for this, right? The Ukrainian community's behind you all the way? — (Interjection) — You don't lie to the people, but let me tell you, you're going to be lying on the ground after this particular amendment.

Mr. Speaker, you tell your story to the people in your riding and I'll tell my story, and everybody else will tell their story. They'll all tell their story and we'll see how the people react.

A MEMBER: I thought the Sun went through your points one by one.

MR. R. DOERN: Oh, he's talking now, he wants the article that somebody leaked to the Sun, the five points about my sins. I have my letter in the works, it'll be in the Sun, I hope you read it. It's in draft form right now, every point is rebutted, but you'll judge whether they're effective or not.

Mr. Speaker, here's the Free Press, July 8th, "Little support voiced for bilingualism deal," that's written by Gary Hunter, "15 of 19 speakers were highly critical," etc. etc. Then it quotes teachers and reeves and so on. The majority of the people were not impressed - not impressed.

Here's the Free Press, Friday, July 15th, Dave Roberts. This is on the meeting at the International Inn. Now let

me describe that meeting very briefly, Mr. Speaker, because that was a laugh. That really was a laugh. I have never in my life seen a meeting that was stacked or packed before. I've never seen that before in a big way, and when I went in there I heard before the meeting that people were being bussed in for that meeting.

When I went in there and I heard the applause, Mr. Speaker, most applause is about like this (clap, clap), that's most applause. This applause was (CLAP, CLAP). I mean I never heard people slapping their hands together harder and in a more enthusiastic way in my life. I'm sure that based on what these people were told they had a right to applaud like that because they were told that their rights were going to be taken away from them and only if this legislation would go through could French Canadians hold their head high in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, that is misleading and that is not the truth. That is a lot of garbage, and yet people went to that meeting thinking and believing, a lot of Franco-Manitobans, that, by God, they better get out there because the bigots were going out and everybody was going out to try to smash them into the ground. That's the phony line that's being put out. If you are against this legislation, you're a bigot or you're a Tory. Which one are you? Or else, if you're a New Democrat, you don't understand. That is what is being put out, ladies and gentlemen. If you are a New Democrat and you don't support the government's resolution, it's because you don't understand, you misunderstand, you do not comprehend. The Attorney-General will explain it to you. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact; that the people on this side of the House have been literally brainwashed into believing that the people are for this resolution and that if anybody opposes it either they don't understand it, they're a bigot, or they're a Tory. Those are the three categories.

No matter what evidence you produce, particularly a lot of my friends in the back bench have been sold on that phony interpretation. They're told that in a short time, Mr. Speaker, it'll blow over, don't worry, it'll blow over. The people are not going to think about this issue in a few months. By the time the election comes they won't even remember a bloody thing about it. It'll just be zapped out of their minds; it'll just be ripped out of their minds. There won't be any remembrance, any recollection whatsoever; that in the month of July in the Manitoba Legislature a bunch of silly MLAs were making a big stink about this issue. It's going to be forgotten. Well, that's an interesting interpretation.

What does the Press say, Dave Roberts say on July 15, 1983? He says "Penner receives mixed reviews on French plan." That meeting, Mr. Speaker, was stacked and packed. Now, I don't deny that there may have been stacking on packing on both sides. It's probably true. It's probably true that there were a lot of Conservatives out there hoping to put the boots to the government, that's probably true. It's probably also true that the Liberals were all out, all three or four of them, Lloyd and Bob and a couple of others, all out there hooting and hollering in support of the government. There were certainly a lot of New Democrats, Mr. Speaker; boy, I sure saw plenty of civil servants from Deputy Ministers down. I won't name them, and I will give them the right. Mr. Speaker, I give the New Democrats who were there the right to be

there, and I give them the right to bring out their supporters, and I give the Civil Service New Democrats the right to be there, and anybody else the right to be there. But what you really want is an accurate reflection of public opinion. If you want it, go up and down the streets and ask people what they think, and they will tell you in no uncertain terms what they think of this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, again a column, an article in The Sun, June 17th, "Rural councils bash bilingualism." You'd better believe it; they're not going to have this stuff. They're not going to listen to Serge Joyal and all this nonsense about first we get the feds, then we get Manitoba, then we get Ontario, then we get Saskatchewan, then we get Alberta, then we'll get the rural municipalities - they're next.

Then we get other headings on the municipalities. Free Press, July 7th, "Municipalities firmly reject language deal"; another heading, "Municipalities back on the warpath." They came off the warpath, they met the Premier, they went away, and then they put on their war paint and started circling the building again, because they went back on the warpath when they had another look. Winnipeg Sun, July 13th, "MGEA refuses to support bill as is." And then another one, Free Press, July 13th, "Civil servants want changes in French bill." -- (Interjection) -- Minor changes. Well, now you see the Minister of Labour says that these are only minor changes. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that it is going to take more than minor changes to make this a good bill. It's going to take fundamental changes at the beginning and fundamental changes in regard to the Civil Service, not minor changes, not dusting off a word, not a synonym, but fundamental changes on this particular bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say in regard to this amendment and in regard to this particular proposal that we have to have hearings that give the public an opportunity to express their opinions, not the kind that the Attorney-General mentioned till 1:00 or 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning.

You know, the Attorney-General said in Brandon - I wish he were here - something that I thought was quite striking. He said, you know, it's very hard on me, it's hard to explain this to people who aren't constitutional lawyers and aren't history professors. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not a history professor and I am not a constitutional lawyer. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Constitution in political science and I have taught history for a long time in Manitoba, and I can read legislation and I have been in this House a long time. Mr. Speaker, for the Attorney-General to say that only he and a small handful - I mean he sure as hell is not a constitutional expert and he was a professor of law. I won't make any judgment on his ability as a politician; I'll reserve judgment on that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say that if you think that the average guy on the street, if you think the average person is dumb, then you're in the wrong business. If you think that the guy living in the north end of Winnipeg and in Elmwood - and I grew up in the North End and I've lived in Elmwood and in East Kildonan, I know those people - if you think that they don't know what this legislation is all about and whether or not it's going to be good for Manitoba and whether or not they want to pay for this kind of nonsense, I'm telling you they

do. They understand perfectly, as well as any constitutional lawyer and as well as any history professor that ever walked the face of this earth.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for a long time. I have material to go on by the hour. I have six letters I wanted to read, but I won't be able to read them, of just samples out of about 75 letters I have. I could read a hundred or a couple of hundred comments from ballots that I have received; and by the end of this week or the end of next week, I am going to have thousands of coupons from people from all over Manitoba who don't want this particular policy.

I simply say, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that I think the level of debate has been very high - very high indeed. There have been a few low blows; there have been a few hits below the belt. Some may be deliberate, some accidental, but I have heard some pretty good submissions made in this House. I don't want to single people out, but I want to say that I have heard some of the finest speeches I have ever heard on this subject. I have also seen some of the biggest garbage in my life appear in the cartoons in La Liberté. I am shocked and offended by the quality of the cartoons and some of the editorials in La Liberté, which presumes to be a journal that talks about liberty; to see cartoons that portray myself, the Leader of the official Opposition and the members of the Conservative Party as Ku Klux Klanners burning down the Franco-Manitobaine Society building, a noose in one hand, ready to lynch somebody; the desecrating of Riel's grave. They say that to me, Mr. Speaker?

I'll show you my speeches. I've got tons of speeches made in this House calling for Riel to be recognized as the founder of Manitoba, calling for a monument to be built in his honour, and then I had the privilege and the responsibility of caring and maintaining for Riel's monument once it was constructed. So nobody is going to tell me that I'm anti-French and that I am one of those who had no use for Riel, because I'll put my record on Louis Riel against anybody in this province because I can prove it in black and white.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude by saying that I think that the government, if it was smart, if it was determined to get re-elected, if it was interested in what the people think, then it should have public hearings throughout the province and it should give people an opportunity to have some input, because this isn't a bill, this isn't some kind of bill that we're debating, No. 1, 2, 3, 102, 103. This is not a bill; it's an amendment to the constitution, and if you are going to do that, you surely need an input from people all across the province; and then, and only then should you proceed to make an amendment.

So I heartily support the amendment, and I say to my colleagues on this side of the House: Be careful, because if you ram this through, you may live to regret it.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I have some committee changes. For the Industrial Relations Committee, the Member for Osborne to replace the Member for Wolseley; the Member for Burrows to replace the Member for Inkster; and the Member for The Pas to replace the Member for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, would you please Bill No. 48.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the second reading of Bill No. 48, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I was concluding some remarks on the initial stages of this response to the bill, Mr. Speaker, I believe I had reached the point where I was talking about the advisory committee which the bill proposes to establish in place of the present election commission under the existing legislation.

I was pointing out, Sir, that there were dangers inherent in this procedure, but either my honourable friends opposite hadn't apprised themselves of, or indeed, were wilfully knowledgeable about and were still proceeding ahead with the advisory committee, notwithstanding the reckless impact that this might have on the public interest and on the conduct of elections in Manitoba.

I pointed out, Sir, that under the new provisions, if a party, any legitimate party or any party that was just created for the purpose, whether it was Marxist-Leninist or Maoist or Rhinoceros or Flat Earth Society or John Birch or whatever, all they have to do in order to win a seat on the advisory committee is to run five candidates in a provincial general election.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take much imagination to realize that any desperate group in the province, any fringe group, any non-representative group can put up five candidates; particularly under the system that the NDP have brought in where there is no deposit for candidates to run, no measure of responsibility that a candidate represents something other than his own movement, and thereby they can achieve a seat on the Elections Advisory Board. So appointing representative to the Advisory Board is one of the outcomes of this change in the act which my honourable friends are proposing.

Mr. Speaker, a second outcome is that they would be enabled to receive money and to give tax receipts therefor. Under the present law, fringe parties have to meet a certain test, namely, they have to have a petition

signed by, I believe it is 2,500 people, unless of course they are represented in the House by some four members of the House. I believe there was a grandfather clause built into the 1980 bill, which was piloted by the Member for St. Norbert when he was Attorney-General, a grandfather clause which acknowledged the fact that while the Liberals did not have four seats in the House - they had I believe one seat in the House at that time - that they were taken for granted to be a registered party, for the purposes of receiving money and giving receipts under the act.

So I merely point out that by the device of running five candidates, any fringe group, be it subversive, be it a frivolous group, or whatever, can achieve a seat on the Election Advisory Committee and then can start to give and receive money and give provincial tax receipts for it. Because the entrance requirement, in order to be designated a party under this legislation, is so watered down. And as I say, my honourable friends may have reason for that, because they may have extremist groups in the left that we know nothing of, who give them support at the present time and they want to afford some recognition to Marxist-Leninists or whatever kind of way out group from time to time, which joins with the NDP in some of their wilder ventures. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party as well, is mentioned by the Member for Inkster.

Mr. Speaker, a third category, a third result of this is that this party under this legislation, any of these fringe parties, may become eligible to receive half of its election expenses as a party, or half of the election expenses for each candidate, if either polls more than 10 percent of the provincial or constituency vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, I readily admit that based upon the figures in the last election, and I take for granted the figures that the statement made by the Attorney-General is accurate, that only the NDP and the Progressive Conservatives, as parties, would have qualified for the 50 percent cost of elections to be paid for by the taxpayers and only a handful of Liberals and one Independent, I believe it was, would have qualified as individual candidates. But, Mr. Speaker, we've made new rules under this legislation, or we're attempting, or the government's attempting to make new rules and who can foretell who's going to qualify for taxpayers' support after the next election? I don't know. I don't know at all and I merely say, Mr. Speaker, that the watering down, the opening of the floodgates to all sorts of real or imagined or ersatz parties, be they legitimate or subversive or crazy or fringe groups, or whatever, is not in the public interest. It does not serve the public interest.

What does the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, say about this? How does he justify it? Well, he says on Page 2 of his remarks when he introduced the bill, "This new registration option recognizes that the activities of political parties are focused on elections and it provides a fast and effective means for a political movement to offer its ideas to the voters."

Mr. Speaker, I've never heard of anything at all that is quite so naive, if indeed my honourable friend, the Attorney-General, can ever be branded as being naive. I often believe, Mr. Speaker, there is a purpose, very often undivined by his colleagues, in some of the things that he does and it would be readily admitted, Sir, he

has, in his lifetime, had much more affiliation with parties of subversion and parties of the left than perhaps any other member in this House.

If we need any testimony in that regard, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, I'm sure, can stand in the House any time and tell us about the previous political affiliations of the Attorney-General and he'll tell us in either English or in Polish, because he did it very brilliantly and he did it very effectively at his nomination meetings - and very successfully - when he defeated the Attorney-General for the nomination. One of the persuasive parts of his speech was to remind the delegates at the NDP meeting in St. Johns, of the past political affiliations of the Attorney-General. So how can you imagine the Attorney-General of Manitoba making such a naive statement as that, that it was a fast and effective means for a political movement to offer its ideas to the voters?

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the whole business of political parties and democracy and parliamentary democracy and so on is not set up in order to provide, in the words of the Attorney-General, a fast and effective means for a political movement to offer its ideas to the voters. Up until now, Mr. Speaker, in this democracy which has served us pretty well in Canada for the last 117-odd years, that's been up to the individual and up to the movement, not up to the taxpayer to subsidize every riffraff party that comes along and says we are a new movement and therefore we qualify because we run five candidates, we become automatically eligible (a) to sit on the advisory committee that's going to run elections in Manitoba? - that's outrageous - and (b) to receive money and to give tax receipts just because we ran five candidates? Mr. Speaker, you can run across any mad dog group in the community who could probably put up five candidates, especially where they don't have to have any deposit for them and we'll be getting around to that a little bit later on.

So this kind of ingenious comment by the Attorney-General is beyond belief. It reflects, if I believed that he believed what he said there, on his intelligence. I think he knows very well what he's attempting to do under this legislation. He's attempting to broaden out to fringe groups, that perhaps only he knows of, the control over the advisory committee, the control for purposes of having election expenses returned and indeed, Mr. Speaker, political parties under this definition and under previous legislation that we were talking about are also going to be enabled, if they have members in the House, to receive propaganda money and constituency office money as well.

So I think that there could well be an ulterior motive in this section which I ask my honourable friends opposite to take a very serious look at. Is this what you want to be the author of in 1983 in Manitoba? Because if so, it will be engraved in stone on your political tombstones, I can assure you, because I'll be one of the ones going around with a hammer and chisel, making sure that the people of Manitoba know how you're trifling with this legislation, has encouraged fringe and other groups in Manitoba to become part of the advisory council and to become part of the active machinery of elections in our province.

Mr. Speaker, there's another group of sections dealing, as only Socialist legislation can, with de-registration. I admit that the previous legislation,

according to the Attorney-General's statement was, as he said, no de-registration procedure for political parties unwilling or unable to comply with the obligations involved in being registered. But, Mr. Speaker, this Attorney-General is making the whole procedure of being registered, blowing it up into something that it never was before. The procedure of being registered before enabled you to receive money from the public and to give tax receipts for it, period, paragraph. The procedure for being registered now, under this proposed legislation, gives you a seat on the Advisory Committee that will be advising the Chief Electoral Office, and gives you other entrees into the workings of government, and into the taxpayers' pocket that were not available, Mr. Speaker, under the previous legislation.

So in typical socialist fashion my honourable friends, having complicated registration procedures, now have to build up a whole system of deregistration in order to deregister people from the great freedoms that were given to them, the great rights that were conferred, to use the abused word "rights", conferred under the previous part of this legislation. It's another maze of bureaucratic red tape; it puts decision-making into the hands of the state which is often best left to free decision.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the necessity of there being some form of compliance legislation in place, and that is something that members on both sides of the House could work at; but to put in this complicated maze of deregistration provisions, and being able to control them for tax purposes goes beyond, I think, the bounds of reasonableness.

Mr. Speaker, you can see though, as I've said, why deregistration is so important, in my honourable friends minds, because they are going to rob the taxpayers' pocket and pay, to any candidate, or any party that gets over 10 percent of the vote, taxpayers' money which previously they never qualified for. So you can see in their tunnel vision why deregistration takes on a meaning and a form of its own in this socialist beehive that they're building up under the guise of extending democracy. Public disclosure is there as before, and public disclosure is a principle that is not an argument in this bill, either on this side of the House, or on the other side of the House. They go on to say the limits for overall expenditures and advertising must be controlled; overall expenditure, as well as advertising.

Mr. Speaker, listen to the words of the Attorney-General in that regard. I quote him from his opening statement. "The democratic process is enhanced if all legitimate candidates, and political parties, have an equal opportunity to present their policies to the voters." You see how the reasoning moves. First of all, you let the fringe groups in because if they're a political movement, why, they're entitled - what was his previous quote? "A fast and effective means for a political movement to offer its ideas for the voters", that's the first proposition.

Then the second proposition is that you must control their overall expenditures, Mr. Speaker, if - to use the Attorney-General's words - the democratic process is enhanced, if all legitimate candidates and political parties have an equal opportunity to present their policies to the voters. That is just an euphemism, Mr. Speaker, for saying that the taxpayers should finance,

and everyone should be equalized as to the amount they spend in total; that's the bare fact. The euphemisms and the propositions surrounding it are not as clearly stated by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, let's just examine that process for a moment. "The democratic process", he says, "is enhanced if all legitimate candidates, and political parties, have an equal opportunity to present their policies to the voters." Well, first of all, he is by this act purporting to legitimize candidates, and political parties, in a way in which they have never been legitimized before; legitimize them by making them eligible to receive taxpayers money if they get a certain small percentage of the vote, either provincially or in each constituency.

So you see how this skewed, distorted reasoning proceeds from one false assumption to a second false assumption, that once you have opened the floodgates, and made available registration for every kind of political party, or everybody who walks down the street, saying that he, or she, is going to be a candidate, then the democratic process is enhanced once you've got all of this motley collection in. The democratic process is enhanced, says the Attorney-General, if you can make their chances all equal in terms of money and that's why, of course, the state has to move in and pay for every kind of disparate group that might wander down the road.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to say it several times during the course of these remarks. You're looking at a political party, in this House, that doesn't want any of that money at all. We've done very well as a political party since confederation, since 1870, without robbing the taxpayers' pocket for a nickel support in an election for constituency offices, for paying for our propaganda, or anything at all, and we will continue to hold that position, Mr. Speaker. And I'll be coming later on to a reiteration of what I said about this law, if it is passed, it will be repealed retroactively by the Conservative Government that will be formed after the next election. That is not a threat, Mr. Speaker, that's a solemn promise to the people of Manitoba. We'll guarantee them that if the NDP are crazy enough to pass this legislation there will never be a nickels worth of money flow under it to any grasping socialist anywhere in this province; nor will it flow to any Conservative; or to any Liberal; or to any Communist; or to any Maoist; or to any Marxist-Leninist; or to any anti-nuclear group; or to any pro-nuclear group; or to any pro-Cruise group; or anti-Cruise group; or any other pressure group which could move forward under this wide open legislation and declare itself and become registered as a political party by the mere device of running five candidates.

Mr. Speaker, you could have the Labrador Retriever Association run candidates under this group. Mr. Speaker, let me be the first to say, I think that's an honourable association, I really think it is. They have a good public cause that they serve; they encourage the breeding of good dogs in Manitoba. But this is the kind of foolishness that this legislation is opening up to any legitimate, or illegitimate, pressure group of the day, or the hour, or the minute.

My honourable friends opposite see that as democracy. Some of us see that as a form of anarchy, and the present system which permits anyone to run, permits any movement to be heard, so long as it isn't

subversive, Mr. Speaker, is the right system. But to say that they should be financed by the taxpayers, just because they are registered by the NDP, is perverse, contrary to the public interest and will not be tolerated, either by the people of Manitoba, or by us when we form the next government.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General moving as he does from one skewed piece of logic to a second skewed piece of logic asks, why is it that in our time, under the guidance of the Member for St. Norbert, the then Attorney-General, we limited only advertising expenses? Well, Mr. Speaker, we did that because they are easily delineated, because they are open and above board, and because they are, admittedly, the most expensive area of election expense for any party in Manitoba today unless, of course, you're the Flat Earth Society, or some other group that is there merely to cause disruption, or to cause some kind of mischief in the system.

Mr. Speaker, why did we not control the other areas? Because often these are not so easily delineated. In any event, some freedom must be left to the individual candidate, and to the individual parties to make their own decisions about deploying their own resources in the way in which they feel is best and, Mr. Speaker, so long as they are deploying their own resources - not the taxpayers' - that is a very sound principle to leave to the individual candidates, to the individual party, the right to spend their own money as they properly see fit. I don't think too many people on the other side of the House would disagree with that, but you see how they flaw that same reasoning. They say, ah, but the state is now going to pay 50 percent of your costs, so the state now is going to have a right to move in and tell you how you will spend the taxpayers' money. Well, we don't want, Mr. Speaker, to spend the taxpayers' money and we would like to feel that the individual candidate and the individual party can make its or his or her own decisions about the party, or the candidate is going to spend his or her or its own money, not the state's money.

The real reason, Mr. Speaker, that we see this section in, is the kind of sort of thoughtless leveling that is favoured by my honourable friends opposite, when they get into their more philosophical moods plus, as I've mentioned, the taxpayer funding of 50 percent, which gives a false lever of economy, a false justification, if you will, for the state to move in and say we've got to control all of it because we're paying half of it. Mr. Speaker, we don't want the state to pay half of it, therefore there's no reason - my honourable friend's logic fails and falls - that all elections expenses should be controlled. I think there should be some decision-making left to the individual candidate and party.

Mr. Speaker, we were talking about strained logic. My honourable friend goes on on Page 3 of the introduction to this unfortunate piece of legislation and says this: "If it is fair to enact a maximum level for election expenses, then equally it is fair to provide a basic minimum level of financial support for these candidates and political parties receiving a significant degree of electoral support." You see the third toadstool of almost distempered thinking, of skewed thinking of, you know - what is the opposite of the mainstream? - it's almost fanatical thinking. If you're willing to take logic and twist it into something resembling a bedspring,

then you can come up with this kind of series of illogical premises that the Attorney-General is apparently moving along. He and his political thinking and his philosophy comes from a quarter of the compass, Mr. Speaker, that is at least 180 degrees. If there were 5,000, he would be 5,000 away from me but he's at least 180 in terms that we can understand.

I know from whence he comes. I know from whence he comes in this kind of thinking; I know that this kind of thinking flows from the kind of a mind that believes that the state should do everything and that the state owns everything or should own everything, and that if the state would only tell the political parties how to operate, wouldn't it be great? And if the state does this and if the state does that and if that state registers, it must deregister and so on and so forth. I know where that kind of cluttered, myopic, false thinking comes from and my honourable friend has been afflicted for a lifetime with that particular disease. But there's no reason, Mr. Speaker, to inflict that disease on all Manitobans.

We're spraying today, Mr. Speaker, for mosquitoes that will cause a particularly virulent disease in Manitoba and not to make light of that - I only wish that we could spray my honourable friends opposite, so that we could cut out some of the virulence of their distempered thinking when it comes to matters of this sort that affect the public interest. I am being extremely gentle, Mr. Speaker, when I talk about the skewed thinking of my honourable friends opposite.

Let me read that again, ". . . if it is fair to enact a maximum level for election expenses . . ." Nobody said that until the Attorney-General came along. He said it was fair to elect a maximum level because it was fair in the first proposition, it was only fair that all political movements should be able to be heard equally. You see how the reasoning moves from one stupidity to another. "If it is fair," he said, "to enact a maximum level for election expenses, then equally it is fair to provide a basic minimum level of financial support for those candidates and political parties receiving a significant degree of electoral support." And that, Mr. Speaker, becomes the philosophical and the rational justification for robbing the taxpayer of 50 percent of the costs of running the next election campaign for the NDP, the Progressive Conservatives, perhaps even the Liberals - who knows? - the Flat Earth Society, God knows, you name it, they'll all be eligible to run and, Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with this a little bit later. Not only eligible to run, Mr. Speaker, but they'll have a vested interest in running from this point on, a vested interest in running and if they get enough votes, if a candidate gets enough votes in the constituency and you may say that this is tortured reasoning and I suggest that the reasoning may be a bit tortured, but listen to it for a moment - not only do they become eligible to get the taxpayers' support if they run a candidate in a constituency, that particular candidate, if he happens to come from a group that has no particular morality or ethics and so on, can go around and say, as a matter of fact if I get enough support then I'm going to take the divvy that the taxpayers give and I'm going to spread it out among my supporters.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1935 I think there was a party called the Social Credit Party which said, if you elect us - and they weren't asking the state to pay their

election expenses - we'll give \$25 to every voter in the Province of Alberta. So it may be strained, but my honourable friends would do well to think for a moment upon human nature; to think for a moment upon the areas in which the human mind can conceive of ways in which to spend other people's money. In fact, Mr. Speaker, all they have to do is go to a caucus every day and they will see a myriad of reasons, usually bad ones, as to how the human mind can devise bad ways of spending the public's money, because they're doing it almost every day of the week.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that is a weak-kneed justification for robbing the taxpayer. Why not with as much logic as the Attorney-General has failed to display here, could you not reverse that partial syllogism and say, if it is fair not to enact a maximum level for election expenses, which is the law at the present time, then equally it is fair not to provide a basic minimum level of financial support for those candidates and political parties receiving a significant degree of electoral support. That's what the law is at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and all the Attorney-General is doing is taking two propositions, turning them on their head, and saying now that becomes logical because I've done it.

A MEMBER: The usual tactic.

HON. S. LYON: Well, in the eyes of Socialists, I know, Mr. Speaker, what's up is down, what's left is right, what's black is white, what's round is square, and so on. They try, through the big lie, always to convince people that the opposite of the situation is the case. They're now, as the Member for Elmwood just pointed out to me, they're now trying to convince the people of Manitoba that an amendment to Section 23, which will entrench functional bilingualism into this province, is going to be very limited. At the same time they admit, Mr. Speaker, that they're going to turn over policy-making on that to the courts and give it over from the hands of the government and they expect people to believe that. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's incapable of belief and as the Member for Elmwood said, you don't have to be a constitutional lawyer, you don't have to be a law professor, you just have to have a little bit of common sense, a quality that is not in great supply, may I say, Mr. Speaker, among my honourable friends across the way.

So, I give them that return, partial syllogism. If it is fair not to enact a maximum level, the present situation, for election expenses, then equally it is fair not to provide a basic minimum level of financial support and so on. That makes just as much sense as any argument that has been advanced by the Attorney-General.

Mr. Speaker, there is a further proposition advanced in this rather revealing document. The further proposition is that candidates should be assured of reasonable means to finance the communications of those policies, and that's the fourth piece of skewed reasoning that we find, Mr. Speaker, in this bill. Just listen to this particular proposition. "It should be pointed out that as electioneering becomes more sophisticated," said the Attorney-General, "and (technologically oriented, the deployment of costly media campaigns and polling methods can favour the wealthier over the poorer political parties." You see what he's

building up to. Then he says, "Where the policies of a candidate or a political party are supported by a significant number of voters, the candidate or political party should be assured of having reasonable means to finance the communication of those policies."

You see how he has very easily moved along from one false proposition to a second, to a third and to a fourth where he attempts now to justify pillaging the taxpayers' pockets in order to help his own party or any left-wing, kook group that may wander along and qualify under his watered-down provisions; not only left-wing, kook group, there may even be a few right-wing, kook groups that will be qualified. But, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he's willing to accept a couple of right-wing ones if he can get four or five left-wing ones in to cause mischief to the whole operation and to the whole system.

Did you ever hear such a series of false propositions, illogically argued in your life, the final one being, "Where the policies of a candidate or political party are supported by a significant number of voters, the candidate or political party should be assured of having reasonable means to finance the communication of those policies. Have you ever heard such a patently fraud piece of logic in your life, Mr. Speaker? It is not difficult to imagine the mischief and the prejudice and the harm that can come to the public interest and can flow from such an obviously flawed and skewed argument. It really means, Mr. Speaker - and let's put it in street terms that everyone will understand - it really means that a subversive party preaching revolution, preaching class war, attacking religion, attacking the family as the basis of our society, promoting pornography and other so-called freedoms or any form of hedonism that it wishes, that is contrary to the will and to the way of life and to the standards and the morality of our province, that any such party, which attacks the moral foundations of any settled western country can, merely by the mathematical device of luring voters to the polls and becoming registered by the equally silly advice of having only five candidates to run for them - who knows? - by offering, as I've said before, offering to split some of the taxpayers' loot if they get over 10 percent, can now be potentially supported in its evil endeavours by the taxpayers even though 89 percent of those taxpayers may well despise everything for which that candidate and group stand.

Mr. Speaker, that is not democracy, that is tyranny and that should not and will not be permitted in this province or in this country. That may be all well and good, Mr. Speaker, for some pledging Marxist society in Europe with no tradition or history of parliamentary freedom such as we have but, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't wash here. We don't need it here. We don't need that kind of hothouse false irrigation and phoney fertilization of subversive political parties of the right or of the left in this province.

Those four phoney propositions enunciated by the Attorney-General will do just that, potentially. I'm the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that they still have to get the votes. That's what they said about Allende in Chile, he still has to get the votes, and he got a minority of the votes and then look what happened. That's what they said, Mr. Speaker, about Lenin; that's what they said about Hitler; that's what's they've said about all of the tyrants who have used the democratic process

in order to subvert whatever form of democracy there was in whatever the country was. Practically every tyrant has started that way by precisely this kind of stupid, silly legislation which confers respectability upon groups that the public otherwise would pay no attention to whatsoever.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I repeat it again, none of these parties, none of these candidates has to worry because they're not going to get a red nickel - and it would be a red nickel - of money from the taxpayers of Manitoba, because we won't permit it, we won't permit it to happen. My honourable friends, as I said the other day, they don't know much about the public interest, but they should know a little bit about their own political self-interest.

If they'll put their ears to the ground - as the Member for Elmwood was attempting to get them to do today on another issue - and ask the taxpayers of Manitoba whether they want to fund the NDP or the Conservatives or anybody else for their election expenses, they'll be given a darn short answer. The very short answer, Mr. Speaker, in street terms, is the hell you do, you're not going to take our money for it. I've tried the question on dozens of taxpayers. I've had dozens of taxpayers phone me, write me, or stop me on the street and say, what are these crazy people up to, asking that we should finance their election expenses? For heaven's sake, what form of perversity is that? Have we not gone far enough in this province, having a government who are incompetently managing our affairs without at the same time, putting their hands into the pockets of the taxpayers and asking them to finance, Mr. Speaker, to finance their election expenses? That's an outrage, and it will not and cannot be tolerated.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is as I've described it, with 89 percent of the people opposed to a candidate or a political party, he becomes theoretically eligible and it becomes eligible to receive money, this is a form of minority electoral tyranny carried to an outrageous extreme. If such fringe parties, new and old, responsible or irresponsible, left or right, round or square, whatever way you want to describe them, Mr. Speaker, want to run, let them run. That's the right that our democracy confers upon people and groupings of people. You've got the freedom to go before the people of this province and to make your case known and to run. But to say that 89 percent of the taxpayers who don't favour these people should be forced by the NDP tax collector to subsidize them potentially is perverse, undemocratic, and cancerous to the true public interest and wholly unsupportable by people of conscience.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why we're upset about this bill. That, Mr. Speaker, is why we intend to use every parliamentary device that is legitimate to stop this bill in its tracks in this House, if my honourable friends don't have the good grace and the honour to withdraw the bill. Talk about a bill needing sober second thought - here's one that needs sober second thought.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a confession. If I wanted my honourable friends across the way to be sure that they would defeat themselves in the next election, you might say, well, you wouldn't be standing up making that speech, you'd let them go right ahead into the cutting knives. Mr. Speaker, I make a confession, my honourable friends have already gone into the cutting knives. They've already lost the election. They're losing

it further on Section 23, and this, Mr. Speaker, if they go through it will just be a superfluous nail in their coffin. It's already gone. They couldn't win an election in this province, Mr. Speaker, if there was divine intervention, and God knows there never will be on behalf of the Socialists.

Mr. Speaker, I'm giving them some good advice. I'm saying instead of going from 18 down to 13 seats, you might be able to rescue 15 seats if you hold back a piece of legislation like this. You're gone anyway; you're finished anyway, but don't for a moment think that you can get away with this even though you're finished, because you can't. We'll stop you at every street corner in this province, city, urban, small town or whatever, and we'll say those are the people who stuck their long grimy hands into your pocket to pay for their election expenses. We know what the figure was last time, Mr. Speaker, it's no secret; both the major parties in Manitoba spent close to \$1 million each in running the election campaigns last election, and the NDP, by this bill, are saying - it's going to be more next time around and advertising will be the biggest cost of it - they're saying, that's fine, don't worry, the taxpayers are going to pay for over \$1 million. Mr. Speaker, in the old Wild West, Jesse James and his brother and a few of the others used to ride around and hold up banks and they, at least, had some mild, saving grace to them that some of that money went back to the people, to some of the depositors or some of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, what we're facing today are the NDP Jesse James of Manitoba and they're taking from all of the taxpayers in Manitoba, and giving to whom? To themselves and to the movement. The modern-day Jesse James, the NDP, robbing from everybody in Manitoba and giving to themselves. Boy, do they want to go on to the hustings with that one?

Mr. Speaker, I'll campaign in any election anytime, anywhere on that topic, anytime, anywhere and beat the pants off any socialists, off any NDPer, off any other ne'er-do-well who says that is good and in the public interest of the people of Manitoba. Let's just examine those figures for a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker. When I talk about the NDP being Jesse James in Manitoba I think I know whereof I speak.

Under the present system, Mr. Speaker, where parties can go out and seek voluntary contributions from private citizens, and give tax receipts for tax credits for those contributions, the party has to go out and work for it. I think it's generally agreed, even by my honourable friends opposite, that the people who give that money, by and large, tend to be the better off people or the better off businesses, leaving unions aside, the better off businesses or the ones that are still functioning - and God knows there are fewer of them today in Manitoba than there were 18 months ago when my honourable friends came into office - but, by and large, I think it would be a fair proposition to say that those companies, those co-operatives, those partnerships, those trade associations, those individuals who give money to political parties around Manitoba, tend to come from what my honourable friends would describe as the rich or the better off in our society.

If that isn't a fair proposition then let my honourable friends dispute it from their standpoint. We're willing to admit that if somebody in Manitoba comes and buys a ticket to a dinner and lays out \$225 for two people,

that that person very probably has enough spare income that he or she can afford to do that.

Mr. Speaker, now, under the system that my honourable friends are proposing, 50 percent of all of those election expenses are going to be paid for by the taxpayers, and about 80 percent of all of the money that the taxpayers of Manitoba pay into the coffers here come from income tax. When we look at the figures on income tax in Manitoba, what do we find? My honourable friends should know this; I'm sure that they know this. They would know, Mr. Speaker, that 37 percent of the money that is paid in income tax by all Manitobans comes from people earning 0 to \$20,000 a year, 37 percent; and in the next grouping, \$20,000 - \$30,000 a year, 31 percent of the taxpayers come in that group; and then \$30,000 or over, and my honourable friends aren't concerned about them because they're the rich, the \$30,000 or over, 31 percent in that group, but leave them out.

Mr. Speaker, it's the low income person who is going to be hit by this taxation more than any wealthy fat cat in Manitoba, and that's why I justifiably called my friends across the way the Jesse James' of 1983 in Manitoba. They're robbing the poor; they're going to take 50 percent of their election expenses out of the pockets of the people who pay from 0 to \$20,000 a year, 37 percent of the money's going to come from them, and they say that they're the party of this province that's concerned about those who are on low income, those who can't look after themselves.

Every senior citizen who pays taxes in Manitoba will have to pay into this nefarious fund to pay for NDP election expenses. Never, Mr. Speaker, never will we permit that to happen. So I say to my honourable friends, lest they think this is some joking matter that they can pass and it's going to be forgotten in a month or two; no, no, it's not going to be forgotten in a month or two, we'll make sure, as I've said before, that the story of their Jesse James tactics, of their holdup, their grand larceny from the people of Manitoba, is told on every street corner in this province and in this city, so that the people of Manitoba will know that they're being done in, their pockets are being picked by the NDP for their own nefarious purposes. So much for the compassion, the heart; so much for the concern of the First Minister and that tawdry group that bring in this terrible piece of legislation at a time, Mr. Speaker, when they're increasing taxes, increased the sales tax in Manitoba.

Consider this situation. There are people in Manitoba who don't pay any income tax because they can't afford it; they pay sales tax and they'll rob those people of money to pay for their election expenses, Mr. Speaker. That's what this law means; that's the kind of people we have sitting on this side of the House. They'll stick their long grimy hands into the pocket of a senior citizen who can't afford to pay income tax, and take from him, from the sales tax that he pays, take from him money to pay for their election expenses. Well, Mr. Speaker, we won't have it. We won't have it and my honourable friend, one of the fanatics across the way who's now been caught with his hand in the cookie jar, now caught with their hands in the cookie jar - you can hear the whining starting, Mr. Speaker - one of them says, oh, it's only \$2 a voter; that's \$2 too much to finance socialism here or anywhere.

If my honourable friends want to parade their crazy doctrine around this province let them do it at their own expense, not at the expense of senior citizens, not at the expense of persons earning 0 to \$10,000 a year and paying income tax on it. Let them keep their grimy hands to themselves; let them collect from their compulsory union check-offs; let them collect from whomever else is silly enough to want to support them; but let them keep their hands off the taxpayers' money and let them not have, Mr. Speaker, the kind of compulsory checkoff that they want to put on every taxpayer in Manitoba. It won't wash; it's bad in the public interest; it's a form of thievery; it makes Jesse James look like a kindergarten student compared to what they're trying to do in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I've got more to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this bill is next before the House it will stand in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a few committee changes. On Industrial Relations, the Member for Fort Rouge will replace the Member for The Pas. On the Statutory Regulations and Orders, the Member for St. Johns replaces the Member for Gimli; and the Member for Logan replaces the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently on Friday there was an error made. We have the Member for St. Norbert's name appearing twice on the Law Amendments Committee so I would like to change, Mr. Speaker, one of those Mr. Merciers, the Member for St. Norbert.

The Attorney-General says one is too much; I think that he is probably worth two of another particular stripe, but I'd like to change the Member for Emerson for the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair will accept the motion to adjourn the House.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, that the House do now stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. There's an agreement with respect to committee meetings tonight and tomorrow morning.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned, with an agreement with respect to committee meetings tonight and tomorrow morning, until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon (Tuesday)