



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. 126 - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 2 AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 2 August, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motions . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Grants re universities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

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

In view of the government's new 0 percent and 5 percent restraint policy, will the government's grants to Manitoba's three universities be limited to an increase of 5 percent this coming year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be clear by this time that the process of determining budgets for all groups in Manitoba is going to be exactly the same, and that is, that all organizations and institutions are being informed that they are to prepare budgets based on the guidelines, and they are to communicate to us the effect of those guidelines on their programs and on their institutions, and then we will have a look at them.

I could not, in all conscience, try and justify the exclusion of school divisions or universities, as important as they are, in this process. They're going to have to do the same as the rest of us and, in fact, I don't think they disagree with it. I think they expect to participate in the process and expect to have the same guidelines apply to them as are going to be applied to others.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Minister has indicated that there will, indeed, be a cap of 5 percent increase on the funding for universities, and in view of the fact that the Minister seems to think that all would be alike; but in view of the fact that the universities, as most post-secondary institutions are at the present time growth industries, one of the few growth industries in Manitoba with enrolments expected to grow by at least 10 percent; and, in view of the fact that tuition fees only represent about 12 percent of the cost of a person going, does this mean that the Minister is going to suggest that limitations on enrolments will have to be placed on courses at the universities?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that the question is premature. The universities are just in the

process of preparing their budgets and getting the information to the Universities Grants Commission. That information will include enrolment projections, projections of revenue needs and program requirements. They will pass that information on to the Universities Grants Commission who will then give it consideration, then the government will give it consideration as we will all other institutions and organizations.

So his suggestions of numbers and enrolment increases or limitations is premature. There is no information in hand to date that communicates what the projections are of the universities this year.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, surely they would have to do it on the basis of certain guidelines. They would have to be preparing their budgets based on certain guidelines. Is the Minister telling me that it's premature to project a 10 percent increase in enrolments for this year, because the universities have already told us that's the case? Given that information, how will this affect tuition fees at the universities?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, as I said, it's premature for all of those questions. The universities will be preparing their budgets with the same guidelines as will all other institutions, including government departments and our own government department and, looking at the guidelines, will be communicating information on what the impact of the application of those guidelines will be on those institutions, at which time the government will be giving consideration to all that information.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last year the government's guideline for the universities was 9 percent, whereas government spending increased by 18 percent to 19 percent and tuition fees went up by between 10 percent and 15 percent, what is the government communicating to the universities in terms of its intention? Surely there must be a bottom line; otherwise, there can't be a rational budgetary process.

Manitoba tourism industry

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Minister responsible for Tourism. A full month-and-a-half ago, I posed a question to the Minister regarding whether the government had made any decisions at all regarding the Destination Manitoba Program, specifically Program 3. I'm wondering if she has anything to report to the House at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there's nothing definite to report at this time, except to say that the analysis

of the proposal that I know the member opposite is enquiring about is proceeding, and we have been consulting with the people responsible for museums to get their view on the future costs and pros and cons of developing particular museums, because we don't want to find ourselves in a situation of supporting a development or expansion with one program and not being able to sustain it with another. So we're building in co-ordination for whatever projects we do approve.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister can give us any idea whatsoever as to when some of the early decisions regarding some of these applications will be made, specifically the Morris Museum, Sir, has applied, as of November 4th, 1982. Again, I think it's incumbent upon this government to give groups such as that some idea as to whether a decision is going to be handed down quickly so possibly the decision may be made.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there have already been quite a few announcements made on proposals, quite a few of which came in before the initial application by the Morris Museum. I can only assure the member that things are proceeding and there should be a decision one way or the other within the month.

Jobs Fund - advertising

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. This morning the Minister of Finance indicated that all of the budgetary authority for the Jobs Fund has actually been applied and been allocated at this point in time. The government continues a massive advertising campaign, both in the press and on radio and television. My question to the First Minister is: Where is the money coming from to pay for this advertising if the budgetary authority of the program is already bankrupt?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there will be a number of projects that will be considered. For instance, in case the honourable member is not aware, there was an announcement some two, three weeks ago pertaining to a municipal program by which we will be receiving applications from municipalities and community groups throughout the province, based upon those applications that are submitted, their viability, the amount of labour that is involved, projects of that nature will be announced over the next number of months as they are submitted.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my further question to the First Minister is, if all of the budgetary authority has been allocated, where is the money coming from to continue this massive advertising campaign?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, these items have been already allocated, including the allocation of matters pertaining to communication of the programs.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise then how much of the Jobs Fund authority has been allocated towards the media plan?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought that we had accepted an Order for Return only last week pertaining to this, and we agreed to provide the honourable members with that information. That is presently in process.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, another question to the First Minister. Surely, if all of the budgetary authority has been allocated but a portion of it has been retained to deal with this massive advertising program which says that jobs aren't just created, don't just happen, they're created by government, can the First Minister not advise the House and the public of approximately how much money is being spent? The public certainly notices this massive campaign and I'm sure are interested in knowing how much money has been expended.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it was only a few weeks ago that there were complaints that the public were not sufficiently conscious or familiar with the programs that were being advanced. That situation is being remedied by way of advertising that is taking place, ensuring that there is an awareness and a consciousness pertaining to the public in regard to the operations of the Jobs Fund.

We have accepted an Order for Return and we are dealing with the Order for Return in respect to the various aspects that we committed ourselves to respond to, and that will be responded to as soon as we have all the information together.

Weed control program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways and Transportation.

Can the Minister indicate whether in this year's funding for the department that funds were provided for the spraying program for noxious weed control along provincial right of ways?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there was no change in that program.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then would the status quo mean that there are funds or there are not funds?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the member knows that there's been an ongoing program for many years with respect to weed control on rights of way, Highways Department. That is ongoing as it has been for a good number of years.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then perhaps I should phrase the question this way then, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister

of Transportation indicate whether any funds have been spent this year for chemical weed control of noxious weeds along provincial right of ways?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, again I want to re-emphasize the point I made a moment ago, and that is, the program that has been there for many years is intact. There has been no change of policy.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's answer or lack thereof, could the Minister explain to the municipalities who are involved in weed control districts and spending local ratepayer money in control of noxious weeds along municipal road right of ways, how that squares with the Minister's department's lack of noxious weed control in many areas where weed districts are undertaking their fair share of the bargain in controlling noxious weeds along municipal roads, and the Provincial Government is not?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, whatever the status of that problem is, it is one that has been with us for at least the last decade, and it's a policy that was unchanged from the one that existed when they were the government.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Minister of Transportation.

In view of the fact that during our administration many members on this side of the House who are now government complained of the use of various herbicide weed control measures by the Department of Highways; and in view of the fact that we had implemented different chemical control methods which were successful, can the Minister indicate to us now whether the department and the various districts throughout the province are able to undertake chemical weed control programs this year within the next few days, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the spread of noxious weed seeds from those weeds that are growing out of control along the provincial highways and provincial roads throughout the province, aggravating a weed control problem for the adjacent landowners who are paying land taxes towards weed control programs funded by the various weed control districts in the municipalities?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did check with the departmental people about a week ago. They had advised me that we were relatively on schedule with respect to weed control in the Province of Manitoba.

Wayside parks

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, last week I asked a question of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources about the removal of picnic tables, outdoor toilets and barbecues at Lake of the Prairies. The Minister said now that may all have happened in the past under the previous administration, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't happen at this time.

Can I ask the Honourable Minister if he would recognize now that it did happen? Can I ask him, have

the picnic tables, the toilets and the barbecues been replaced?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any pit privies or other very necessary features of camping equipment having been removed from the Aseissippi Park. If there have been, I'm sure it's because of the need to provide for proper control of camping in specified areas and, as I've indicated, our department has had ongoing discussions with the municipalities to provide a co-ordinated effort to meet the very large demands for camping facilities at Aseissippi Park.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I raised last week - I told him the reeve was there camping at the time when the equipment was removed. Can I ask him again, has he replaced them?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm in no position to confirm that the reeve was in or around a pit privy at the time it was removed. I know that our department does its very best to ensure that the mayors and Reeves are accommodated in their concerns about these matters and I would be quite surprised if there wasn't some effective consultation before those changes took place.

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. Can the Minister advise the House whether or not Mr. McDowell, the Chairman of the Board of McKenzie Seeds, had been advised of a possibility of a conflict-of-interest situation involving senior members, senior staff of McKenzie Seeds Ltd., prior to my having raised the issue in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: I wouldn't have that information.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. As Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds, has he not discussed this issue with Mr. McDowell?

HON. L. EVANS: I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister. He is the Minister; does he know whether he had any discussions with Mr. McDowell?

A MEMBER: Good question.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that one would have discussions with a chairman of a board

from time to time on various matters. That's been the case ever since that gentleman has been chairman.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schulz, the Minister's politically appointed special assistant, was asked by the Minister to undertake a study inquiring into some possible conflict-of-interest situations involving Mr. Moore, the Minister's long-time friend and political associate. Has Mr. Schulz's report been completed and is it available to the House? Did he speak with Mr. McDowell?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Schulz collected some information, Mr. Speaker, but once we called the auditor in, further work by that person would be obviously redundant; but any information he had gathered was forwarded to the Minister responsible for the Provincial Auditor.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. Did Mr. Schulz complete a report as such or not?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schulz completed the report to the point that he had to complete it, inasmuch as - I'm repeating, Mr. Speaker - the Provincial Auditor was brought in. It was certainly not necessary for him to carry on in a great deal of detail duplicating the work of the auditor, but that information has been transmitted and the auditor will take that into account. I'm sure the auditor is doing a very thorough job. As we have indicated before, when the Auditor has completed his report - the Minister of Finance has indicated this as well - that will be made public.

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds, Mr. Speaker. There has never been any question about the auditor doing his report. The question is whether or not the Minister has been doing his job. Will Mr. Schulz's report be made available to this House?

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the information gathered by my special assistant, Mr. Schulz, has been forwarded, and that would be subsumed or integrated or incorporated in the analysis and observations of the Provincial Auditor.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can he determine before the House whether or not Mr. Schulz had spoken to Mr. McDowell and ascertained whether or not Mr. McDowell had any knowledge of the possible conflict-of-interest situation involving Mr. Moore and others at McKenzie Seeds prior to my raising it in the House in early June?

HON. L. EVANS: I'll take that matter as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Flood damage - northern communities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs.

Can the Minister confirm that the government either has or is about to grant some \$50,000 to \$55,000 to the Manitoba Metis Federation to study or investigate the effects of northern flooding?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: No, I can't confirm that. What I can confirm is that we have granted \$55,000 to the Northern Association of Community Councils to study the appeal mechanisms available to them, and other mechanisms which are available to them to bring claims forward for damages accruing to Northern Affairs communities as a result of flooding, yes.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch that it is yet unclear whether or not the very comprehensive Northern Flooding Agreement may well not be included in what will be entrenched in Canada's Constitution as a result of the aboriginal clause that this government is bringing forward, my question to the Minister is: Is the Minister second guessing the very comprehensive terms and conditions contained in that Northern Flood Agreement that sets out the procedures, the appeal mechanisms, etc., with respect to northern flood damage to those communities that he is now granting \$50,000 to study again?

HON. J. COWAN: I certainly appreciate the opportunity to correct the misconceptions of the member opposite. The Northern Flood Agreement does not apply to non-treaty Indians and Metis in northern communities. The grant which we have provided of \$55,000 is directed specifically to non-treaty individuals and would therefore have no impact and would not be impacted upon by the Northern Flood Agreement.

MR. H. ENNS: One final question. I am trying to recall the Minister's first answer. This has been made to the Northern Association of Community Councils. It has been customary, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba Hydro, as the initiator of most of the projects that involve flooding, has always played a very substantial role in the provision of these kinds of funds as indeed they are under the terms of the Northern Flood Agreement. Does Manitoba Hydro share in the grant that the Minister speaks of?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Hydro is not sharing in the grant to look at the effects; but if there are damages, then Manitoba Hydro will certainly pick up its fair share of those damages.

User fees - health care system

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable First Minister. I would ask him whether the government has been advised by Ottawa that the Federal Government intends to impose so-called dollar-

for-dollar penalties in its new Canada Health Act as a means of attempting to outlaw user fees and extra billing?

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

MR. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister of Health, I'll take that question under advisement.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Acting Minister of Health. I would ask him whether in light of those talks and conversation and discussion that has already been generated around the new Canada Health Act and around this controversial question of dollar-for-dollar penalties, has the government in Ottawa not been in contact with the government here on this general subject, regardless of whether it's in the preserves specifically of the Minister of Health? Is the Acting Minister suggesting that all members of the Executive Council are unfamiliar at this point in time with this kind of initiative by Ottawa?

HON. W. PARASIUK: We're not unfamiliar with the initiative; we're not unfamiliar with the crisis that Medicare is facing across the country when we have situations where wealthy provinces are imposing user fees on Medicare. That obviously is the thin edge of the wedge that in fact could provide for a situation where Canadians will have different access to health care across this country; a state that I would believe that no one in this Legislature would want to see exist. So, to that extent, people in the Executive Council are in fact acutely aware of the strains that certain provinces are putting on the Medicare system in this country.

With respect to the specific question that was asked by the Member for Fort Garry; namely, whether the government has been contacted by the Federal Government with respect to their proposals, I said that I would take that question as notice. The Minister of Health is away for a couple of days on government business, but I, as Acting Minister, will certainly look into that matter.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the light of reports of impending federal-provincial meetings on this subject, can the Acting Minister advise whether the Minister of Health is, in fact, engaged on that business at the present time, or other government business?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is engaged in other government business, and I'll certainly look into whether in fact there are specific meetings being scheduled at this particular time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Health or the First Minister: In view of the fact that a federal policy paper on this subject of imposing dollar-for-dollar penalties was apparently released last Monday, one week ago, eight days ago now, is the government advising the House that it has not had that kind of contact, that kind of communication with the Federal Government on this subject?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that I want to find out from the department what notice has

been given by the Federal Government, what contacts and consultations have taken place. I think that's only a natural thing for the Acting Minister to do with respect to the department he is responsible for on an acting basis. I said I would do that, Mr. Speaker; I certainly will conduct that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In other words, what the Acting Minister is saying is that if there is any communication of that kind, it has not been considered important enough to be discussed in Cabinet. It has not been addressed by the First Minister, the Finance Minister and other members of Executive Council. If it is in existence somewhere, it may be in the office of the Minister of Health, but nobody else in Executive Council has even heard of this threat from Ottawa. Is that what the Acting Minister is saying?

HON. W. PARASIUK: As I said, we have been concerned as a province and as a government about the threats to Medicare. If the Member for Fort Garry is somehow saying that the threat to Medicare is coming from the Federal Government, when in fact we've had situations right across this country where provinces - and these are provinces of a Conservative persuasion, Mr. Speaker - have been imposing user fees on Canadians going to those hospitals seeking needed necessary medical care, if that isn't a threat to this country's health care system, which I believe is the best in the world, if that isn't acknowledged to be a threat by the Member for Fort Garry, then obviously he views Medicare and the health care system from a different perspective than people on this side of the House.

It is a concern, Mr. Speaker. I think it's very important these changes that are taking place in certain provinces be modified, that we come back to a universal health care system all Canadians have equal access to. That is a concern that we in this government have about Medicare, Mr. Speaker, and we are concerned that all parties, federal and provincial, get together to ensure that objective is maintained.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the situation in other provinces is not at issue here. What I'm asking for the government is what is happening vis-a-vis Manitoba? Is Ottawa saying that because there is some controlled manageable extra billing in Manitoba, because there are some and always have been some user fees in effect in the health care system, for example, the per diem in the personal care home field, that Manitoba is going to penalized on a dollar-for-dollar basis? That's what I'm asking. Apparently nobody in Executive Council has even discussed this.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that Manitoba's health care system is the best health care system in the country. There are many provinces in this country . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, it was the New Democratic Party Government that made the health

care system the best in Manitoba and the best in the country, not the Conservatives. Mr. Speaker, we believe that we have the best health care system . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm asked a question by the opposition and the Conservative Party doesn't want to hear the answer. If they want to ask a question, I'm quite prepared to take the question under advisement if I don't have the information, because it is a department for which I am the Acting Minister. I'm prepared to look into the matter, get the information, and bring it back to the House. When I'm asked a general question, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to make a general answer. That's what the opposition has asked, Mr. Speaker, and they don't want to hear the answer.

We have the best health care system in the country. We intend to keep the best health care system in the country, but we do believe that it is important for Canadians and for Manitobans that everyone in this country has equal access to health care right across the country. We will do everything within our power to ensure that continues to be the case.

Constitutional amendment re aboriginal rights

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader. When the First Minister addressed the constitutional resolution dealing with aboriginal rights, the First Minister stated that that proposed amendment would be referred to a Standing Committee of the Legislature for discussion. I do not see the resolution on the Order Paper. My question to the Attorney-General is: Does he still intend to proceed with that undertaking given by the First Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm prepared to discuss that further with the Opposition House Leader during the course of this week.

Bilingualism - proposed resolution

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this morning I asked the Minister of Government Services a question because of his concern that he expressed for ringing of bells. Could he now confirm, Mr. Speaker, that he received a petition from a constituent in the Dauphin constituency with respect to the bilingualism resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, clearly that is not within the jurisdiction of my responsibilities as Minister of Government Services, and the answer is no.

Mosquito repellent

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Government Services. Could he advise when the free "Off" will be available in the government offices and on what criteria will free "Off" be supplied to residents of Manitoba?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we were advised by the makers of "Off" that they had a number of surplus cases of "Off" that they could not sell because it was aged due to shrinkage, so it didn't meet the requirements for sale, but it was still usable and could be used; so therefore they had offered it to Manitoba to use during the health emergency because of the supplies running low in many rural communities. For that reason it has been made available through the health offices and that was indicated publicly last week. The honourable member will be aware that through the public health offices it is available, and if people want to avail themselves of the product they can pick it up there at no charge, as long as the quantities last.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise as to how much the "Off" cost the government and on what basis will it be supplied to residents of Manitoba? Is it first come, first serve, or do they have to indicate some need for the free "Off"?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: The honourable member's colleagues are all talking at once, Mr. Speaker, and it's very difficult to hear his question. However, as I understood it, I believe he was asking who would get it and in what order. The point is that people would get or be able to use the "Off" or avail themselves of it upon request as long as the supplies last and we've indicated that. It's free. We received it free and it was under those conditions that we decided to make it available to Manitobans where we were under the understanding that supplies of repellents - not that particular brand - but all repellents were low and therefore it was made available to Manitobans in those rural communities when they feel they would like to come forward and ask for it, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly not something that we have purchased and it is available as long as supplies last.

Clean Environment Commission - appeal

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: My question is for the Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment. Two years ago this month, I believe, an appeal was made with respect to an order of the Clean Environment

Commission to allow the Town of Warren to discharge treated sewage effluent into a tributary of the Sturgeon Creek. When will we expect a decision on that appeal, or when may we expect a decision on that appeal by the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: That matter is presently under review. What I can do is provide a more detailed response to the member in one of the following question periods in the very near future. I can't give him a detailed status report at this time, but can have that available to him shortly.

Water - radio-activity

MR. G. FILMON: Last week, Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, the reeve of the R.M. of Lac du Bonnet suggested that one of the causes of the radiation that is becoming evident in water supplies in and around Lac du Bonnet was the possibility of faulty isotope probes leaking radiation into ground water supplies. Has the Minister's department looked into this?

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, the department, several weeks ago as a matter of fact, upon receipt of the information that there was some levels of radio-active activity in the water supply that exceeded the guidelines, conducted a resampling program. The purpose of that program was to identify the specific isotope which was responsible for the radio-activity. We are of the opinion that it is a natural cause. However, that can be confirmed or not confirmed, as the case may be, by this further testing. We are now currently awaiting the results of the more intensive testing program which was undertaken some time ago. It will most likely be available in the near future.

Again, I must reiterate that every indication we have now is that it is natural radio-activity that is prevalent in some areas of the Precambrian Shield, but we certainly want to make certain that that thesis is correct and can do so by this more intensive testing.

MR. G. FILMON: Has the Minister conveyed that information to Reeve Ylonen who expressed concern and is of the opinion that it is leaking radio-active isotopes that are the cause of the radio-active activity in the area?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, in our public statements, we've made it very clear that is our opinion and that we are undertaking the further testing. As well, a public meeting was held in the area with a number of concerned residents. At that public meeting the entire process was explained, including the fact that we are undertaking more intensive testing. There were some concerns expressed about the length of time that testing would take. However, we made it very clear that we felt it was necessary to test the thesis which had been put forward that in fact it was a naturally occurring source.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the resolution standing in my name with respect to the referral of the proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to a Standing Committee of the Assembly on Privileges and Elections, now standing with respect to a sub-amendment in the name of the Minister for Municipal Affairs, as that appears on Pages 12 and 13 of the Order Paper.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has 31 minutes remaining.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, last week, Saturday I believe, we spoke on this particular resolution. I was commenting on the fact that there had been considerable delay in trying to get this resolution before a committee so that we could hear the people of Manitoba come forward and let their views be known as to what their opinions would be on this particular resolution.

I did indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we have perceived that there has been some delaying tactics on the part of the members opposite. They appear to be stonewalling this issue, Mr. Speaker. They feel that they have the answers, the solutions to how this should be proceeded with. We feel that the position that they take is one of delaying tactics. They suggest that we should go on an intersessional committee, and we feel that we should get on with the business of getting this resolution into committee so that we can hear the many groups and individuals that want to come forward and express their views on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I pointed out some of the tactics that were used by members opposite, such as bringing up throughout the Session not only on that particular issue, but I believe that there has been many delays on how the business would be conducted in the House, and I believe that it is beginning to cost the taxpayers a great deal of money because of the way things have been delayed in this House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of backup staff that have to back up members sitting in the House, and we've had a number of delaying tactics such as even phony points of order, but I wanted to be fair and say that the odd one comes from this side as well, not only on the opposition side; but the most difficult thing that we have to contend with is the fact that the members of the opposition have resorted to allowing the bells to ring on points of procedure and as well on substantive motions, Mr. Speaker. It has become a favorite ploy for the members opposite to allow the bells to ring,

Mr. Speaker, every time that the bells ring or any other delaying tactic, and I'm sure that throughout the Session you are aware of how many times that has happened, procedural wrangles and challenges to the Chair and all the other tricks that the members opposite can come up with to delay what are the normal operations of the House.

I wanted to be fair because I mentioned last week that even phony points of orders were being raised from time to time. I want to be fair before the House Leader in the opposition and say that the odd time that there's phony points of orders that are raised here as well. So, Mr. Speaker, every time that the House is delayed a half an hour or an hour, it's costing money. It's costing a lot of money . . .

HON. S. LYON: Your salary is costing money too, but there's not much people can do about it.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . and you know, they know it too, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I spoke to an audience, a very sparse audience last week. When we spoke here in the Chamber, there were substantial numbers on the governments side, but I had a very sparse audience as far as the opposition went. Mr. Speaker, I'm not referring to any individual person who is away. I just want to say that there was a spattering, or a pepper of people here and there around the House. Mr. Speaker, the idea was to try and hold down the government with 25 or 26 members on this side with half a dozen people or so. That was the strategy on that side of the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't count them, but I would say there were approximately half a dozen bills that were stood. Members opposite would not debate with the bills; they refused to debate the bills. There were no members opposite to deal with them, Mr. Speaker. They could have got up and spoken five minutes and adjourned; that would have been acceptable. We could have had a couple of people stand up and speak on the bills and adjourn; that would have been acceptable, but to sit silently, Mr. Speaker. The one good thing about the sparse audience I had is that for the first time in this Session there was no heckling. There was no heckling, Mr. Speaker, it was very very mute and quiet . . .

A MEMBER: We can't hear him anyway, Pete.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . we couldn't hear at all. There was a very subdued crew, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the House last week.

Mr. Speaker, they have problems over there. They have a split caucus, obviously, in the last two sittings. Not even half of their caucus have been there . . .

A MEMBER: Oh, you dummy.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . so there must be a split in that caucus.

A MEMBER: Oh, we sure are.

HON. S. LYON: Why don't you talk about the split in your caucus?

HON. A. ADAM: There are some problems there, Mr. Speaker. That is not the only place that they have problems.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ADAM: They are in a very difficult situation in regard to this resolution because they have a federal leader who is fluently bilingual and who supports the position of the government.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ADAM: They are supporting the resolution, the extension of French Language Services in the Province of Manitoba . . .

A MEMBER: Don't try and ram that through, Pete.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . Mr. Speaker, they have a problem because their leader is supporting the position of the government now, and they're very very uncomfortable with that position because I'm not sure what motivates them. Maybe we're still fighting the British-French wars. I don't know what all the concern is about the members opposite, why they will not allow this resolution to proceed to committee so we can hear the views of the people. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether they're still fighting the British-French war of the past.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the tactics of the opposition. We have been badgered for weeks on end to move into Speed-up and once we had moved in we were prepared to accommodate, we were prepared, by leave, to meet on Wednesday evenings for committee; to meet on Friday afternoon, by leave; to meet on Saturdays, by leave, to accommodate, to speed up the business of the House without having to go into the grueling way of doing business under Speed-up which everyone agrees is a difficult thing to sit here until 2 or 3 o'clock in morning. We were prepared to accommodate that. No, we had to have Speed-up, that's tradition; we had to have the Speed-up Motion. You know, we were badgered for weeks on end on that and, Mr. Speaker, after having gone in through Speed-up, what do we have? We have some tantrums, we have members opposite developing tantrums because things don't just operate the way they would like to see them operate. Mr. Speaker, they act like spoiled brats from time to time.

I have never heard, Mr. Speaker, when pairs would be withdrawn for Ministers who were away on government business, and I find that difficult to understand.

A MEMBER: Go to your former Whip and ask him about that, Pete.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, they were anxious to go into the Speed-up Motion. I recall

very well when we were in the Agriculture Committee dealing with bills on agriculture, they did not want to sit, Mr. Speaker, they moved adjournment while we were in Speed-up around midnight, and we said, no, we're in Speed-up, we are going to deal with these bills. We heard a great lament, Mr. Speaker, that's what we heard. They were tired, they had been there all day and they were fatigued. Mr. Speaker, we know that you get fatigued in Speed-up. We know that if you're going to stay here night after night until 1 or 2 o'clock you're going to be tired. We know that, and that is why we were trying to operate without have to — (interjection) — You know, the Speed-up Motion shouldn't come in until you're in the third reading and getting rid of everything, that's when it should be brought in, but for them to ask for Speed-up and then stall on legislation, as we've seen in the last couple of days, is certainly irresponsible, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they have a very serious problem with their leader, and their federal leader — (Interjection) — well, they have a problem with their provincial leader as well. Mr. Speaker, the other day I got this - I call it junk mail - in the mail here addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I forget what the guy's name is — (Interjection) — no, I think his name is Peter Alzinga and he's a national president of some organization. Mr. Speaker, he's asking for funds. It's sent on behalf of the new leader of the Conservative Party who is bilingual, who supports the Government of Manitoba in the programs and they're asking for money, they're asking for contributions to put forward the ideas of the Federal Conservative Party. I find it interesting, Mr. Speaker, that in one of the sections here, one of the clauses says that they would like to have money so they can break the Liberal-NDP power clamp that is clamped on the public of Canada, on the Canadian public.

MR. D. BLAKE: Actually the NDP only got a paper clip, Pete, not a clamp.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, the fact is, you know, I would like the members opposite or Mr. Alzinga to explain why is it that the Conservatives and the Liberals vote more together on issues at the Federal Parliament than do the NDP and the Liberals? I would like an answer to that, but be that as it may, here we have the federal leader asking for funds to proceed with his programs and one of those programs is to have bilingualism throughout Canada. He supports what we are doing, extending a French Language Services in a limited way, as is proposed at the present time.

So, I think members opposite are in a very difficult position. They don't know how to square away with their Federal policies. I think the proposition that we have before us should be proceeded with as soon as possible. We should be forwarding that resolution, passing it in this Assembly here, and let all members speak. Let them speak; let them not let the bells ring, let them speak; let them put their ideas forward; let them put their comments on the record. That is what we are asking them to do. We are not bringing in closure, Mr. Speaker, we're only asking them to speak on bills that come before the Assembly.

I want to say that, and the Member for Lakeside, when he made his comment, he said, you know, it's

us that done it, we are the ones that started the extension to French services in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, first of all it is not them that done it, it was the courts that done it. If the courts hadn't made a decision, nothing would have ever changed, Mr. Speaker. We'd have the same thing as we've had since 1890.

I want to just go back to some of the comments that were made by members in order to indicate to them what kind of a game they were playing, because, yes, after the court decision was rendered in the Forest case, yes, rightfully, rightfully so, the Leader of the Opposition began to implement the laws of the country, as required by the Manitoba Act of 1870, and they did begin the process of translation of bills; they began the process of implementing the French Secretariat, reluctantly though, very reluctantly, Mr. Speaker.

I say this because I want to comment on a submission to Treasury Board by the previous administration on French Language Services in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I just want to quote from this, so as to get it in the record. "The memorandum of October 6, 1980, on the subject which was signed by the Premier was discussed in Cabinet, and the document outlined certain policy directions flowing from the Supreme Court decision on Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. It also discussed certain measures to provide French Language Services to the public. Ministers will recall that the document was favourably received but that because of certain other factors, such as the Federal Government's desire to push for the entrenchment of minority language rights, it was agreed not to announce any new policies in this area."

Mr. Speaker, that statement is very, very clear. It is, yes, the government was going to proceed with the laws of the land, but they were very reluctant to do it because of the fact - and they wanted to take a very low key, a very low key, and a very low profile on implementing these services even though the First Minister did make a statement in the House at the time, the First Minister who is the Leader of the Opposition at the present time.

The fact is that they were concerned that the Federal Government was pushing a two official language policy across Canada and they didn't want to be perceived as getting on the band wagon. So, therefore, that was an embarrassment to them, and they were trying to play a very low profile, take a very low profile key on this issue. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we never heard a boo from anyone.

No one complained when the previous government was starting to implement the laws of the land as a result of the court case. We never heard complaints from anyone. It's because they were trying to keep a low profile on the whole issue. It is only when the present agreement that we are working on at the present time to extend French Language Services in a limited way that we are now hearing a lot of concern begin expressed on one side of the question or the other. We do know, Mr. Speaker, that almost every day now people are coming forward and are asking to have their views known and be heard and they want to come before a committee of this Legislature to express their views. I deplore the actions of the opposition to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, well, the Honourable Member for Gladstone is saying - that we're not. Well, let's pass

it today. Let's get it to a committee. Let us vote on it. Let's have the vote on it and we will see whether they will allow us to go to committee. They will allow the bells to ring, Mr. Speaker. They will allow the bells to ring, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Come on, Perfect Peter, call the vote, and do what the people of Manitoba want to do for a change. Do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. A. ADAM: We will vote on the sub-amendment, we will vote on the amendment, and we will vote on the resolution.

MR. H. ENNS: Tell us how to vote. Come on, Perfect Peter, you've got a chance to be a great Manitoban, one of the few chances you are going to get.

HON. A. ADAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could have that in writing . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Here, I will write it out for you.

A MEMBER: Write it out in French, Harry.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . that we're going to vote on this issue today, I would be prepared to sit down and . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Write it out in French, Harry.

HON. A. ADAM: You better right it out in bilingual . . .

MR. H. ENNS: I'm writing.

A MEMBER: That's not what the people of Ste. Rose want. They know what they want. We've seen their resolution.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . because I can read both languages. I can read English and I can read French as well, Mr. Speaker, and if they want to write in Spanish I'll read that too.

Mr. Speaker, I am urging this Assembly to pass this resolution and get it into the committee, so that we can get on with the hearings. Let us have the people come forward. There are over 30, it's my understanding, and I know that there are some that are going to come forward that haven't yet contacted the Clerk's Office, but there are many people out there who want to come and express their views. I suggest to this Assembly, let's get on with the work of this Assembly, let's get the resolutions into committee, so that we can hear the views of the people of Manitoba so that we can come to a conclusion on this resolution and other business that's before this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, speaking on this issue, because I have had something to do with the Minister of Municipal Affairs over the last month on various

centennial celebrations within my own constituency. It's quite interesting, because at those various meetings the Minister did seem to be somewhat confused from time to time, and I know just last weekend, in St. Lazare, he made an incorrect reference to myself. The reeve of the municipality said, well, that's easily forgiven, he's a kindly old gentleman. I think the people appreciated that, because they recognized the fact that the reeve was trying to be very very kind and generous to him.

It's also rather amazing too, Mr. Speaker, there was a centennial celebration in Archie municipality, at which the Minister was there and he presented a bronze plaque. He also presented a cheque to the community for their centennial celebrations.

Then we went to Miniota and they had their centennial celebration, and the Minister again presented a plaque and then he presented a cheque to the community for their centennial celebrations. Then last weekend, we went to St. Lazare, which is the home of the office of the Ellice municipality, and once more the Minister presented his plaque, but this time he presented four cheques.

So I just wanted to point out that the Minister is trying to do everything he can to get his name in front of the people and to make it known that he is the benefactor, the person that they can come to when they're presenting their needs, and he will be nice and kindly. He'll be the kindly old gentleman that they can listen to and he will provide them with fatherly advice, sometimes incorrect advice, and I would suggest at this particular time that maybe the Minister is giving us some incorrect advice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we're speaking to a sub-amendment to a motion that has had a great deal of concern in this House and throughout the province and there appears to be a great deal of rush on the part of the government. So I suppose we should deal with it immediately, but it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that when this issue was last called before this Assembly, last month was the last time it was called. This House sat all day yesterday, they chose not to call it, but there seems to be a great deal of rush on the part of the government to get this before a committee and to get back immediately to this Assembly. For what reason?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the reason that has been put forward by this government is at the best partially true. I don't believe it's totally untrue, but I believe it's partially untrue. The arguments that have been put forward by the Attorney-General, by the Premier, who apparently on every occasion, whenever he gets in trouble, refers to the Attorney-General and seeks advice from the Attorney-General, so it would appear that this is the Attorney-General's push and not the Premier's push.

Those things the public recognize, Mr. Speaker, and they recognize it for what it is, and I believe it is a push on the part of the Attorney-General. But then I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it is done for very different reasons and this is where the NDP are somewhat covert. The Conservatives are very open in their business and we have a Leadership Convention coming up and we'll tell the whole world, it's happening the second week in December of this year, but I suspect that the Attorney-General is covertly seeking the leadership of the NDP in Manitoba and he is going to use this as the key weapon to show that he, and not the Premier, is the real leader in this province.

When they do that, Mr. Speaker, they leave themselves open to some rather severe criticism from time to time, because if the Attorney-General is the real person who is seeking the leadership of the ND Party, then why is the Member for Transcona sitting so quiet in this thing? I think that the Member for Transcona is the one that's really playing it smart, because he realizes that the Attorney-General is going to self-destruct on this issue and he's going to take the Premier down with him and that leaves the field wide open for the Member for Transcona to step in and gather up the tatters. I think the Attorney-General has very effectively killed any chances that the Member for Elmwood had . . .

MR. R. DOERN: I came third last time.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . so we have to assume that the Member for Transcona will not become too involved in this debate because he realizes if he does, that it's going to jeopardize his chances, and I think he's playing it smart and sitting there smiling, very quiet, just paying no attention to it at all.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's get on with the issue that is really before us and the issue is a proposed amendment to the Constitution and in specifics, a change to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

This government has put forward numerous arguments, Mr. Speaker, about how it will affect government and government agencies and what the realities will be here in the Province of Manitoba. It will also, Mr. Speaker, and for the benefit of the member, it will also reflect on boards, commissions, but so far everything the government has dealt with in this has dealt with government and its various boards and agencies. They have said nothing, Mr. Speaker, absolutely nothing about what the effect will be on the private sector in Manitoba. They have said nothing and they have tried very skillfully, Mr. Speaker, to divert attention away from what will happen in the private sector when these amendments come into effect.

What is the first proposed amendment? The first proposed amendment, and I will read from it: "The Manitoba Act, 1870 is amended by adding thereto, immediately after Section 23 thereof, the following sections: Section 23.1, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." I will stop right there, Mr. Speaker. All of the rest of the amendments pertain only to how it affects government, but Section 23.1 says English and French shall be the official languages in Manitoba. That, Mr. Speaker, affects every single person in Manitoba, every single one - the private sector, the schools, business enterprises, transportation, communication. It affects everyone and that, Mr. Speaker, no one to my knowledge so far in this debate has really addressed that question.

That is very similar, Mr. Speaker, to what happened in 1968 when the Federal Government said that English and French shall be the official languages in Canada, and they have kept that for quite some time only as it applies to the Federal Government, but now they are starting to move into the private field.

We saw a case not too many years ago when a Mr. Hechter (phonetic) in this province placed, advertised and sold antifreeze which was labelled in English only.

He was ordered to remove it. He was told to put the necessary French and English on it, which he did. He also, in order to accommodate his customers, put various other languages - Ukrainian, German, Hebrew - whatever his customers were used to using, all in the interest of making sure that his customers knew if they couldn't read English or they couldn't read French, they could read the directions and not improperly use the contents of that can. Well, what was the result of that, Mr. Speaker? The Federal Government took him to court and won the case because he did not print the directions on that can in English and French only.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was looking in the Parliamentary Guide the other day, and out of curiosity I looked up the representation in the House of Commons and I came to that of the Honourable Serge Joyal who was first elected to the House in 1974, re-elected in 1979 and 1980, and he was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board in 1981. He was sworn into the council and appointed Minister of State on September 22, 1981. Subsequent to that, Mr. Speaker, he was appointed Secretary of State on September 30, 1982. Now this is the Secretary of State, the man that entered into negotiations with the present Government of Manitoba and the Franco-Manitobaine Society to draft the present amendments that we are dealing with.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if any single individual had an input into those negotiations, that it would have to be the Honourable Serge Joyal. I believe he personally, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, influenced this government to change several of its proposals. I have no proof of that, Mr. Speaker; I was not present or privy to the negotiations that went on, but I believe that, because I know of some of the activities of this same Minister of State. Remember, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joyal was appointed Minister of State on September 30, 1982.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a press article of October 8, 1982; that's just eight days after Mr. Joyal was appointed Minister of State, and this article appeared in the Toronto Sun. It was written by a Mr. Derek Hudson from the Ottawa Bureau and I would like to quote from it, if I may, Mr. Speaker. He says, "Canada's freshly sworn in Secretary of State advocates a U.S. style affirmative action program for companies dealing with the Federal Government." It says nothing to do with the government; this is for companies that are dealing with the Federal Government. "This would mean a quota-type employment contract for private companies aimed at ensuring minorities" - in this case Francophones - "would be employed with any company dealing with Ottawa."

Now that was just eight days after this Minister was made Secretary of State. This is the Minister that negotiated with this government an agreement and these are the stated intentions of this Minister. So I have to ask the question, Mr. Speaker: Is it the intent here in Manitoba, if this agreement goes through, for this government to put into effect, policies similar to those that are stated by the Minister of State in Ottawa?

Again, I repeat that question, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is fundamentally important to this debate and it's fundamentally important to every single citizen in Manitoba that they understand the possible implications of this agreement going through. Unless it is changed,

I would urge every single Manitoban to make a presentation before the committee when this issue goes to committee, it is that important.

Again, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the intention of Mr. Joyal is that private companies dealing with government would be required to have a quota-type employment of minority people on their payroll. Would that mean, Mr. Speaker, that if I, as a road contractor, entered into a contract to build 10 miles of road on any given highway on which the Minister of Highways wants construction, would it require me to have a certain percentage of bilingual employees working for me on that particular contract or else I wouldn't get the contract? Is that the intention of the government? We have seen that happening at the federal level.

Mr. Speaker, does it mean that because I, in a service station, employing 12 employees and operating a 24-hour service station, does it mean I must have so many employees who speak both languages because I am serving the customers that are using the Queen's highway? Is that what it means, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I have heard nobody, absolutely no one from the government side who has been speaking on this issue and we heard speaker after speaker on Saturday - they spoke all afternoon, one after another - and not one ever addressed the implications that this bill would have on the private sector. I listened to the Honourable Member for Radisson, muttering from his seat, there are none, there are none. I happen to believe the Honourable Member for Radisson, but I don't believe that there are too many people other than myself that would believe him and that is probably a difference.

Mr. Speaker, you can go on and look at what has happened in the federal scene, wherein they have brought in this program. I have been told, Mr. Speaker, for example, that rent-a-car firms that book space in federal airports and are running a private business, renting cars to customers of the airline, because they have rented space in federal airports are now being advised that they must have so many percentages of bilingual people on their payroll. Mr. Speaker, I do not have the documentation for that, but that has been communicated to me. That is, Mr. Speaker, a direct interference in private business, as far as I'm concerned.

So far, Mr. Speaker, that is happening on the federal scene. It cannot happen here because so far Manitoba has not been officially declared a bilingual province. The present Section 23 of The Manitoba Act is very clear and everyone in Manitoba - at least everyone that I have talked to - agrees that French and English should be used and available in the courts; should be available in this House; and that the Journals of the Assembly be printed and the statutes be printed in both official languages, and that is what Section 23 of The Manitoba Act states. There was no controversy, at least I didn't hear any, when in 1979 the province began to comply with the wishes as expressed by the Supreme Court. The judgment of the Supreme Court at that time, Mr. Speaker, overturned another act of this Assembly, which had been lived up to, as I understand it, for some 90 years and nobody really complained about it until after the Federal Government declared in 1968 that Canada was officially a bilingual country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you look back on the history of our country, if you look back at the union that existed in Canada for its first 100 years, there were differences

of opinion on numerous occasions. There had been changes to The BNA Act on many occasions, but I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion I know of no group in society that were able to sit down and prepare a framework for people to live in within that framework in relative harmony for well over 100 years, and that's what the Fathers of Confederation did in 1867. Mr. Speaker, I would challenge any member of this Assembly to be able to do a job today that would serve for the next 100 years as well as those Fathers did in 1867, and I admire them for the work they did.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is in this country only one official bilingual province at the present time, and that is the Province of New Brunswick. New Brunswick has in the last several years been trying to live up to the true spirit of bilingualism and they are having considerable trouble in doing so. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to an article in the July issue of this year of the *Atlantic Insight* - and I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside made some reference to it the other day - but, again, it must be repeated how the policy of implementation there is causing concern. There are cases stated where a teacher said, "I've been looking for a job now for two years," and this teacher had 11 years experience, "had I been bilingual, I could have stood a chance. If you have a French background, you are much better off."

Mr. Speaker, we find that case could very easily be here in Manitoba because we find right now the Minister of Education is bringing forward legislation that takes away from the school board the rights on hiring and firing of teachers. So that teacher that had a problem in - (Interjection) - thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to worry - New Brunswick could have the same problem, or another teacher in a similar situation could have the same problem here in Manitoba, if this bill goes through, and if the Minister of Education succeeds in getting her proposed changes through. So I quote those things, Mr. Speaker, just to indicate what could happen here in Manitoba in the private sector if this bilingualism proceeds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to an article on May 4th in the *St. Catherine's Standard* on the issue in Fredericton and it starts out, "Mr. Earl Ricard is losing his job at the Fredericton Airport and a lot of people share his complaint. It's a hell of a way to treat an old soldier. Bilingualism is finally coming to the small airport on the outskirts of Fredericton that serves this officially bilingual capital, but the manning has generated considerable turbulence in relation to Canada's language policy. Ricard, 60, is one of four commissioners who have been told they will not be able to continue working at the airport because of Transport Canada regulations that make bilingualism a requirement of employment."

In that particular case, Mr. Speaker, it is again the federal area that is causing concern, but we also have other cases which cause trouble. In that same article Federal Commissioner of Official Languages Mr. Max Yalden was peppered with questions about the airport situation during a recent visit to Fredericton. He said the men may not be able to stay at the airport, but they will be relocated.

There are two key points I would like to mention: First, the airport is under federal jurisdiction; and secondly, Fredericton, as the provincial capital, has been

officially declared bilingual. So when you have that official declaration of bilingualism, then I would presume, Mr. Acting Speaker, you probably have a direct interference by Mr. Max Yalden as the Commissioner of Official Languages. So you could have direct interference then in provincial affairs.

And what are we about to do, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with this proposed amendment? The very first amendment that is proposed is that Section 23.1, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba; Section 23.2 talks about the Legislature; Section 23.3 talks about the Legislature; Section 23.4 talks about the revised statutes; Section 23.5 talks about municipal acts; Section 23.6 again talks about the Legislature; Section 23.7 talks about the various agencies of government, court, quasi-judicial; Section 23.8 talks about the procedure that any individual who is affected by 23.1 can use. Section 23.8 talks about the procedure that can be used by any single individual who has been affected and can apply to the courts if this becomes entrenched. And that, Mr. Acting Speaker, is one of the fundamental problems that happens when you entrench in a Constitution things that have been understood and agreed to for years.

We have the case in the Province of Quebec, which for 100 years lived as part of Canada in relative harmony, but in 1968 Canada was declared officially bilingual, and three years later we have the War Emergency being invoked in the Province of Quebec. Is it coincidence, Mr. Acting Speaker? Is it coincidence?

I realize times change, attitudes change and we see a polarization has occurred. I happen to know, Mr. Speaker, because I lived and was raised three miles from the French community of St. Lazare. Before I went to school, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know the difference between French and English. Unfortunately, as the years progressed and the need for the use of French language diminished in the areas in which I was personally active and interested, I lost the use of the French language and for that I have always regretted that. I admire those that can use both languages. I have lived for many years with many friendships in the French community and have enjoyed their hospitality and their business for many years but, Mr. Speaker, as this change is being proposed, I can see changes in attitudes developing, changes which I consider not to be in the best interest of harmony and good relationship.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I don't believe that what we see happening in that small community is any different than what is happening across this nation. I have before me a summary report put out by the Council for Canadian Unity dealing with Canadian attitudes on national and regional issues, dated April 29, 1983, from Ottawa, and they had just completed a national survey. The results are very interesting. "Generally, there are a number of encouraging signs that Canadian attitudes are evolving positively towards a national consensus, but the survey indicates there still exists numerous sources of tension especially between regions and linguistic groups in Canada," said the President of the Canadian Council for Unity, Joseph R. Mullie. "The Federal Government

is blamed most for inflation, unemployment and energy problems. There would appear to be a continuing and ever-growing source of tension with regard to English and French-speaking Canadians," the report goes on.

"In 1977, 39 percent of Canadians believed that French Canadians tried too often to impose their views on the rest of Canada. Today that figure stands at 54 percent. Similarly, in 1977, 19 percent of Canadians felt it was the English-speaking Canadians who tried too often to impose their views. Today, that figure is up slightly to 24 percent; thus these views have become more polarized since 1977."

Mr. Speaker, polarization is not what we are seeking. What we are seeking are changes to the Constitution that will allow all people in our province to live in harmony one with the other and be able to do their business with government and their own private business without undue influence, especially when it comes to the influence on the use of language as being necessary to transact business in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, when this issue goes before committee, it is any wonder from any member on the other side why we need the time to sit down logically and in a rational manner to discuss issues that are potentially explosive and we need that time to do it intersessionally. We have made a major commitment when we asked for an intersessional committee that we were prepared to meet the deadline that was set down by the agreement, signed by the Honourable Serge Joyal, the Honourable Attorney-General of this province, and the Franco-Manitobaine Society. So we are prepared to meet that deadline of December 31st, but we plead with the government to take time to do this with an intersessional committee. I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those hearings not be held only in this building. I would like to see that committee hold hearings actually in every constituency in the Province of Manitoba. So if you're interested in people at all, at least you go out and you talk to the people and give the people the opportunity in their own environment to make their presentations heard.

Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I have been waiting for the opportunity to speak on this amendment. I heard the comment from the Deputy House Leader when I was listening to the radio over the weekend, and I have come to the conclusion that he's an imbecilic madman.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a disgusting display of a person in a House in my life as the way he handled the situation in this Legislature and it's a disgrace to his constituents and the people that he works with. Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms about saying that publicly, directly, and to him to his face at anytime he wants to have it said.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say the advice that he has received from the Member for Springfield, who was a Clerk in this House, who has tried to use the Rules to bludgeon the opposition to its knees, is also a disgrace to the people of Manitoba. He laughs at it, as he laughs at everything else. He should not really be proud of his actions that he has displayed in this House at the present time.

That is the attitude of the members opposite. You know, the attitude of the members opposite is that they believe - I'm sure they believe in a totalitarian government - where they don't want the opposition to have anything to say. I heard the Member for St. James say last night on television that we don't present legislation to withdraw it. Well, I wonder why 54 was withdrawn? I wonder why there's been amendments to different acts; I wonder why there have been times when they did listen to the people; but on this particular resolution, Sir, they have no intention of listening to the people.

The reason why they don't want to listen to the people is because they know the people are opposed to everything they are doing - 90 percent of the people in this province are basically opposed to what is being presented by this government. Can you imagine being a Premier of a province, the head of a government of a province, who is going against 90 percent of the people? You know that probably will go down in history somewhere. I would hate to be walking around myself saying that I am a person that is elected to government and I am the government in power and I am going against 90 percent of the people.

Mr. Harms, the head of the municipal group in the Province of Manitoba put it very clearly when he said, "What is democracy coming to in the Province of Manitoba when the government will not listen to the people of Manitoba?" Isn't that a shame? The government will not listen to the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, because they're afraid to. They don't believe in a system where people should be heard. They believe in ruling, not governing. That is the way they operate. We are here; we will do it; we will do as we please, and we don't care if we listen to the people of the Province of Manitoba. They try to use the Rules of the Legislature in every possible way they can to stop the opposition from speaking and stop the opposition from bringing to the attention of the people of Manitoba how bad they are operating on several pieces of legislation and this resolution especially.

The Member for Transcona, he's pretty famous for reading these days. I noticed the other day when he was in committee, a man drove 260 miles and he said you know when I come to be heard in committee, I expect to be heard, but that is the attitude of the members opposite. They've made up their mind, they don't really care

Then you have the Attorney-General today - I've written it down today to look up in Hansard, but he said something about the resolution but he said, "And I'm sure it will pass." He has spoken in Dauphin and when he walks out on the steps and he's interviewed in Dauphin, "When the people get to know what it's all about and it's passed, they will understand it then." They won't have anything to say about it before then, but they'll understand it then. Then he has the gall to say on television the other morning that there's no reason to have a referendum on this subject or it wouldn't be desirable, was the inference he gave, is because the people don't understand it.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, there was a man in St. James who was once mayor, who said the people don't understand what the municipal government is doing when they were talking about bringing Metro into Manitoba and he was defeated the next election.

The members opposite know well that they will be defeated, many of them in the next election, on this issue. The Member for Transcona will not survive this issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know people in Transcona; I know the makeup of Transcona; I have called on areas of Transcons on business many parts of my life. They won't accept what is being put forward unless you continue to mislead them as you have.

The Minister of Urban Affairs speaks on this subject, and he says that the reference made to other groups in society in the Province of Manitoba, to other culturalist groups, is that if the minority of the French is not held up, it will harm the position of the other minorities within this province. Mr. Speaker, when you read 23.1, it doesn't mention any other minorities in this province. It says, "English and French will be the official languages." Mr. Speaker, it's exactly the opposite to what the Minister of Urban Affairs says.

I guess, I happen to be what is regarded as a WASP. I am fully aware of the fact that English is regarded as the language that is used most of all in this province but you know, Mr. Speaker, Section 23 does not make any language the official language of this province. As Mr. Wells said today on the radio when he was referring to some letters to the editor, if they had done their research, they would have found out that those rights of the minority were protected and given back by the Supreme Court in 1979. Mr. Wells knows more about constitutions than most constitutional lawyers, and certainly more than any members on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if we are planning on passing some legislation next year. I don't know if we are planning on passing some legislation next year to take in other cultural groups or other languages, but if we don't, all of the cultural groups - other than two in the Province of Manitoba - will be discriminated against by this resolution. You know, I don't think that's right.

I think I am less of a radical than the Member for Radisson, because if I'm a WASP and he's an Anglophone, I am saying that I don't want to see it happen. I don't want to see Section 23.1 go in that says, "English and French are the official languages of the Province of Manitoba," because we have given services in this province to all languages that have come to this province in a very efficient way.

As the Attorney-General so kindly pointed out that we were doing what the Supreme Court instructed us to do, we were working towards it, and I have in the case here that has been given to me from Mr. Pawley or from Mr. Decter, "Government boosts agencies' French Language Services." There is a group all set up to see that the French Language Services are carried out in the Province of Manitoba. There is a letter signed by Mr. Pawley, "The policy of French Language Services." One of them says, "Government offices serve an entire metropolitan Winnipeg area or the province as a whole." I put a note here. How does this square with 23.7 where it says only in head offices? Then you go through all of this that has been put together for French services in the province, and I don't disagree with it, but you don't have to entrench it. You don't have to say English and French are the official languages of this province.

Mr. Speaker, the government makes a big issue about the fact that they came to government and this problem

was here. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the problem was here before they came to government. Mr. Bilodeau had taken his case forward. They knew it when they ran in the election of 1981 in November. They knew it, and I didn't see one piece of literature, nor did I hear one peep out of any member on the other side when they were running for election in 1981, saying when we get into government, we will examine the Bilodeau case and we will make Manitoba officially bilingual, French and English. I didn't hear it said once, because they don't have the guts to say it, and they don't have the guts to go out and talk to the people right now. They don't have the fortitude to go and talk to the people. They knew then that Mr. Bilodeau and his case had been taken forward. I didn't hear one peep from the Member for Radisson that that was what his program was when he ran for election. No guts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. SCOTT: He can't read.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I heard somebody say he can't read. I didn't see it anywhere, and that's a comment from the "Firefly from Inkster." Maybe he could show me in literature where it was. Otherwise, I would challenge him to show me, or keep his stupid mouth shut.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the honourable members opposite that along comes a gentleman driving down the street after the Supreme Court decision of 1979, when the government was moving to do what the Supreme Court had told us to do, and he gets a speeding ticket. He says that because the law that I got this under is not written in French, I don't think that I should have to pay the ticket. This gentleman all of a sudden has enough money to go to the Supreme Court of Canada, and anybody with any common sense whatsoever - in fact, I'm sure that even if it was the Attorney-General or the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Resources, they would go before the Supreme Court representing the Province of Manitoba, and they would say there was a decision in 1979 and we have been doing what we were instructed to do; that is, to translate the laws of Manitoba.

We have got translators involved. We have put out directives to the government, just the same as this government has put out directives to their departments that I pointed out and held up. That is the government policy right now, and we are doing it, they would say to their honours. Their honours would say, well fine. Maybe you've got to do it faster, or maybe you've got to get this one done faster or name some faster, but to throw us into chaos.

That's what the brochure that the government puts out says, "It could be chaos." I got a kick out of that brochure, "It could be chaos." If it happened, I guess it could be chaos, but all of your advisors, your legal people have told you that it is very unlikely that would happen. Anybody in their right mind, any layman that I have spoken to and said what I said just now, they'd say, well, nobody would be that stupid.

But this government when they ran in 1981, that case had been brought forward, and not at any time during their election campaign did they ever say that they were going to make an arrangement with the Federal Government, and the Franco Society, to make this province officially bilingual, French and English.

As I said, I am regarded as a WASP, and I am less of a person that's against languages and other cultures than the members opposite. Certainly than the Member for Radisson, because he is a Franco and I'm a WASP. I'm saying I am against that section. I am against that section because I think it will harm all of the other cultural groups within this province. — (Interjection) — Not so, the member says. Tell me why it won't be so when I just referred you to the Premier's letter to all of the departments.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to have a co-ordinator in the Manitoba Government that is going to be called Departmental Co-ordinator for French Language Services? Are we going to have one for Ukrainian and German? Are we? I doubt it. "Co-ordinators should be senior enough to be effective and be able to intervene in sections of the departments which are normally not within their sphere of responsibility." Isn't that nice. And it goes on about these co-ordinators. I'm sure all the Ministers have them, and all the members have them. I guess they think that we wouldn't have them. They have the ones we put out and we're rather proud of the fact that we were doing these things.

I see nothing wrong with you moving forward to do what the Supreme Court insists you do. I see nothing wrong to seeing that French services are given, in this province, when they are needed; not just where they are needed, I say when they are needed anywhere. I say that those services should be available to many other ethnic groups within this province. By passing this, you don't do that. So we have a Premier who doesn't represent or goes against 90 percent of the people of the Province of Manitoba.

Then we have, in Section 23 of the resolution or the amendment that is being recommended to the Federal Government, that somebody can walk into a municipal offices, and if they are not satisfied that their services in French, and I guess in English too, are not what they should be, they can take it to court and the judge will rule if the program they present is good enough.

Now if there is a man in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, who has enough money to go to the Supreme Court of Canada, I assure you there will be people in Manitoba that will make issues within the municipalities and different areas of our province. I assure you that they can make that issue in hospitals, and they can make it anywhere where there is government institutions. But they talk about the word "institutions", but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities and cities in this province are recreation of the Provincial Government. They are there because of legislation that has passed in this room and under that circumstance is five to 10 years from now, or even three years from now in 1987, when this comes forward, there could be, and nobody knows what any judge will rule. For anybody to start reading the rest of the amendment and say, oh, no, that won't happen, I assure you there is nothing there that says it can't happen, and there can be court cases all over this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, we haven't solved anything by this particular resolution. We have basically put it into a worse turmoil than we have at the present time. We were working well. We have Folklorama in this province; we are famous for our cultural mix; we are famous for them all getting together and working together. And for the Minister of Urban Affairs to stand up and say

that this type of legislation will make them closer, he is really backwards. He knows in his own mind that it can do nothing but tear people apart.

They can go out and they can talk to the people in the other ethnic groups as much as they like, misleading them continually, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs misled a group of municipal people when I was sitting at the meeting, when he said we have to go back to the 1870 agreement which made Manitoba official in both languages. You and I know, and we all know in this room that that's wrong. We even have typographical errors coming forward, typographical errors from "those" to "official."

I asked a secretary if that was possible. She didn't think it was possible for a secretary to type "official" instead of "those" unless the word "official" was there or something close to it was there. So I wouldn't blame that secretary for a typographical error; I would blame whoever submitted that to her to type, which is definitely a misleading situation.

The official languages of this province are not French and English; there is no official language in the Province of Manitoba; there is no official language in the Province of Quebec; there is no official language in any other province, except New Brunswick, at the present time in Canada. Canada is an official bilingual country, but there is only one province with an official language.

Manitoba, it says that our Legislature, our laws, and all of the courts will have that service. It was done because there was a French fact and population back then that had to be respected. I guess there was, and I believe there was something wrong done in 1890, and the Supreme Court decided it was wrong. As Mr. Wells said this morning, the rights of the minorities were predicted in 1979 through the court system and there is no need, no need whatsoever to entrench languages in our Section 23.

The talk about how costly it will be. None of them sat down and negotiated at any time. It would seem that the negotiations that just went on talked about maybe which ones should be translated first, whether there were ones that were really not being used that should be translated at all. There wasn't that much discussion on what translations should come first or whether it should be done at all. No, we just had closed-door sessions with the Societe Franco and the Federal Government, I guess. All of a sudden we get presented to us after there was an indication made near the end of '81 or the beginning of '82 that there was something being looked at regarding the Bilodeau case. Then we have presented in June of 1982-83 in this Legislature a resolution to the Federal Government to make this entrenched languages within the Charter of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that if somebody is going to change your charter at any time, I think the people have the right to vote on whether their charter should be changed. But at the very least they should have the right and the respect from their government - and I repeat that word, Mr. Speaker - they should have the "respect" from their government, that the government would come forward and say we are going to have a lot of hearings, so that they can be heard before a constituted legislative committee in this Legislature, one that is sanctioned by this Legislature to go out among the people and have hearings on the changing of their Constitution. I don't think that's too much to ask. In

fact, I think it's very little to ask, so you wonder why they don't.

Well, I wonder what this government is getting from the Federal Government. They've been at odds with them on the Crow; they've been at odds with them on six and five; they've been at odds with them at many things lately. But I imagine if Mr. Joyal got this through in Manitoba, there might be something coming. There might be something coming. This government has got in the resolution that it will become law on January 1, 1987. They will go out among the people and they will say, well, you know, it was passed in 1983, and you haven't had any effects. Well, there will be some effects, Sir, because I read what the Premier's memos are to get the co-ordinating done. But, you know, they'll say what effect has it had? Of course, it doesn't take effect until 1987, and they are rushing very fast to see that it gets into the federal House before the end of the year.

Then, of course, we have the members on the other side, and I've only heard the one speech but I'm sure others have mentioned it, and the Attorney-General telegraphed his thoughts when he said I hope that Mr. Mulroney is elected and in the House when this resolution is in Ottawa, so that we can have his opinions on it, which is a typical socialist way of trying to divert things, change the subject, try to make it an issue in this House, in the federal House because they know that they are wrong. First of all, before it goes to the federal House the people of Manitoba should have the opportunity of making their opinions and their feelings known to their government, Sir. It's their government and they won't listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, when we think of the House of Commons in Britain, who did not want to be involved or were very leery about being involved in the Canadian Constitution because there were eight provinces opposed, now we have a situation where we might have something in our federal House from Manitoba that we maybe have a 100 municipalities opposed.

I say to the members opposite that when it gets to the federal House, I would hope that the federal members have more integrity than is being shown by the NDP members - except for one - than they are showing at the present time. I fully expect that the members in the federal House will stand up and they will say the Manitoba Government has sent us something that 90 percent of the people are opposed to. They will say there are resolutions in municipalities across Manitoba that say they are opposed to what they've sent us.

There will be referendums held in Brandon, possibly Winnipeg, and many other areas in this province - well, if I'm wrong fine - that I believe will say that the people of Manitoba don't want this. I believe you can talk as you like about the federal members, I believe federal members, whether they're Liberal or whether they're Conservative, will display more integrity than is being displayed by this weak-kneed, lily-livered Premier in the Province of Manitoba, who is being run by the Attorney-General and maybe other members.

I picked up the paper three Saturdays ago and on three places within the paper what did it say? Mr. Penner has decided not to do such and such; Mr. Penner says that he may do something else - or the Attorney-General, Sir, I guess I shouldn't use names, but the

paper said Mr. Penner; and a third place, Mr. Penner thought that he might withdraw something in one of his bills. It seems what Mr. Penner says goes.

A MEMBER: Whatever Rollie wants, Rollie gets.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Whatever Rollie wants, Rollie gets, the member says from the other side. When the Attorney-General has trapped his defences, being a smart aleck to make smart aleck quips, his attack on the member in the NDP that is opposed have been absolutely disgusting, smart aleckish and unbecoming to a person that is elected as an Attorney-General and who is a lawyer and was a professor of law in this province. This is a theory thing when he stands up and he says, oh, that can't happen, this won't happen, and, no, that might not happen, the rule of law. Let's start talking about the rule of common sense.

The rule of common sense says 23.1, "English and French will be the official languages of the Province of Manitoba," and I defy any judge in this province to go against that when somebody comes before him on an issue. He doesn't have to read any farther than that section. I hear, not true. He sounds like the Attorney-General, "Not true." How does he know it's not true? — (Interjection) — How does he know it's not true? Maybe I heard somebody say that I couldn't read, maybe the Member for Radisson cannot read Section 23.1. It's very clear, and it's very clear that the Attorney-General, the Premier and this government think they are superior to the people of Manitoba. This is the government that says we are the people's government, we work with the people, and yet they believe they are superior. They are superior because the Attorney-General says he is superior. He says, I understand it, and all of those Manitobans out there don't understand it, and that's why I can't let them have a referendum, and that's why I can't have hearings. The only thing that I can have is when I stand up at four meetings within two days that took probably two, four, six, eight, ten hours at the most, stands up and tells them what he thinks is going to happen and what he knows is best for them.

I'd say that's kind of looking down on the people of Manitoba. They have a right to decide if their Constitution is going to be changed. As a matter of fact, any line in that Constitution that is changed in that Manitoba Act, any recommendation that would come from a Manitoba Government to the Federal Government to change that Constitution should not be done without the sanction of the people of Manitoba. Any government that does it is acting superior, high-handed, and have no regard for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, but it's typical of NDP who decide that when they get in power, they won't govern, they will rule; that is the philosophy, and then we have a situation where they try to divide and conquer. Peter Warren once read something over his program and it said - as a matter of fact I think I have it in my desk. When I speak on this again, Mr. Speaker, I may read it. He read out one time a list of things the Communist Party would do or do to take over and one I really remember is, "Tell the people anything and gain power as fast as you can."

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I hear somebody say that's right. Well when I take a look at the election goods that come out from this government, the promises of a better tomorrow, those downright lies that were given to the people during election, I wonder. Another one of those, and I think it's in there and they're all numbered, there's 10 of them, it says, "Confuse the people and divide and conquer them." Strange, when I think back at that thing that Peter Warren read one day on his program and then I know that the Attorney-General once ran for the Communist Party and then . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable member is aware that the term "lies" is an unparliamentary word. Perhaps he would wish to rephrase his statement.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would only say that the program that has been put forward by the government during the election campaign leaves a lot to be desired and anybody that reads it will realize the statements in it are not factual, not true, and were misleading to the people during that election campaign.

When the Attorney-General, who ran for the Communist Party, stood up in this House to answer a question or answer my colleague from Woodlands, my colleague from Woodlands said, I'm pleased to see that the Attorney-General had changed his road to Damascus. The Attorney-General got up and spoke in this House and said, I have not changed my road to Damascus; so when I read that list of things that will confuse the people, that will divide them so that people can conquer them, I sometimes wonder really what is going on, on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, we know that this government has decided to put this through. I assure you, Sir, we also know that we're going to fight it. We're going to fight it because the people of Manitoba have indicated to us that they're opposed to it. Mr. Speaker, I was in Swan River on Thursday, I didn't hear one person tell me not to fight it; they said, fight it. I moved down to a group of people, some from Camperville and some from Winnipegosis, in a coffee shop, when the bells were ringing on Friday and I was driving back to Winnipeg. Do you know what they said in the coffee shop? Let them ring and fight it.

In Ethelbert, Manitoba, four people in a grocery store said, let them ring and fight it; in Sifton, Manitoba, as small as it is, two people in the store I was in, said fight it; and in Dauphin, we now know that there's 300 people or more - and I wish the Minister of Government Services would have the fortitude to table those names - but when I was in Dauphin, moving through town and when I was watching the opening of the Ministers opposite over there, doing their thing, before I carried on, on my way and everybody said, fight it. But if they didn't say fight it, Mr. Speaker, what they did say is, we should have the chance to be heard. We have the right to be heard as Manitobans. We are having our Charter changed, is what they believe and we think that we should have a say, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that they should have a say. They shouldn't be looked down upon by their government. They shouldn't be tread

upon by their government. They shouldn't be looked at by their government as people who don't understand and because they think they don't understand, don't have the right to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we will fight to see that the people of Manitoba will be heard.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, debate be adjourned.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I never thought that we'd see the day that a government in this province, under the banner of Howard Pawley and who call themselves New Democrats, would bring closure into this House and to the people in this province on such an issue as this. The first time that the Constitution in this province has ever been amended or will ever be amended and we're facing closure. We're facing closure in this House, where he refuses to allow me to adjourn the debate, so I can go home at suppertime and get my papers and properly prepare myself to speak on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few documents that arrived in my mail today I would like to put on the record in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I do apologize to you for the fact that I have spoken on the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and today I'm addressing this subject on the excellent sub-amendment that was introduced in this House last week by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, who put an excellent amendment on this resolution that's before us which said: THAT the amendment be further amended by adding the words after the words "next Session of the Legislature" where they appear in the proposed amendment of Mr. Sherman and the words "in any case not later than the December 31, 1983."

So what my colleague, the Member for Gladstone, was saying, we in the opposition are prepared to discuss this matter, take it around to the public and will bring you back the wishes of the people not later than December 31, 1983. Mr. Speaker, what's wrong with that? Do you have to put closure in on such a motion? We're offering the government a chance to get out of a heck of a mess. They've got themselves dug into a hole I don't think they'll ever get out. I don't think a New Democratic Party will ever be elected in this province again after the mess they made on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable House Leader, the Minister of Natural Resources, stands up in this place and accuses us of filibustering. My gosh, it's our resolution. You're the ones that should be talking on it, but they don't want to talk because they have nothing to say. They don't want to deal with the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I'll go further. I sat here and listened all day Saturday afternoon to honourable members opposite, one after the other, and not one member addressed themselves to her sub-amendment. The honourable member here rose in his place and I had to stand in my place and ask him to at least speak to the amendment proposed by my colleague. They are scared to deal with the amendment and what it says. They refuse to deal with the amendment that's before us which says we will go and talk to the people across this province and come back not later than December 31st and give you the answer, and they put closure, closure, closure! Can you believe that?

Mr. Speaker, do you know what the First Minister of this province said when he went to the people at election time? Here's Howard Pawley's picture, there's his signature, loud and clear, he says great people, great future. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what a future the people in this province have with a government like that who absolutely refuse to go and take this first amendment to the Constitution, ever in this province, to rural Manitoba, to Ethelbert to the Ukrainians, to Pine River, to Camperville to the Metis, to the Metis in San Clara? They refuse. They have no courage, Mr. Speaker, they have no understanding of the needs of the people of this province. They don't know what government is all about.

What does Howard say? He says Manitobans are great people. They certainly are great people, but they don't deserve the treatment they're getting from this gang of so-called bureaucratic monsters that are sitting across, Mr. Speaker. He says together we can build a great future. What a bunch of garbage! Together we can build a great future, but he refuses by closure today to allow me to speak and says we're not going to go to Roblin, we're not going to listen to the two Indian Bands in your constituency, McKenzie. We're not going to listen to the Metis people in your constituency; we are not going to let the people of this province have their word on it, that's what he said this afternoon. Howard says that's not true, he says together we can build a great future. Where's the togetherness in this government? There's no togetherness; they don't know what they're talking about - the spirit of togetherness.

We've been trying here for the last two weeks to get together with members opposite on this issue, the first time the Constitution in this province will ever be changed, and we've been trying for weeks to get some agreement on it. What do we get? Mis-truths, misled, half-truth, quarter-truths and a lot by the First Minister of this province, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister says - and here's his signature - that's a promise we can guarantee. What a bunch of crap! Absolute crap by the First Minister of this province. The most misleading statement any First Minister has ever put on the record of this great Province of Manitoba. He says that's a promise we can guarantee that we're going to work together.

Mr. Speaker, it's not what the people of this province want. Let's look, the rural municipalities in this province have come out loud and clear in telling you opposite. Hold the hearings, as my honourable member said, so that people in this province can find out what it's all about or find out why the First Minister in his wisdom sent letters to Swan River, the Municipality of Swan

River and to the Municipality of the Town of Grandview and put the word "official" languages by mistake and then said it was an error. Well, we'd better go back or I'd like to see what letter the First Minister sent to those municipalities and apologize, because I think he's got his mind made up. The official languages are already on the desk, the deal is made, it's cooked, it's sealed.

What kind of a government have we got in this province in this day and age, Mr. Speaker, when they stand up and say we're stalling, we're filibustering? All we're asking them is what they offered, go out and let's listen to the people in the country. Let's go to all of the constituencies in Winnipeg. Let's take the time of all of the members of the House to deal with this very very important matter - the first amendment that's ever been made to the Constitution in our province.

Mr. Speaker, why? They don't give us any reason. They just stand up there and mumble like a bunch of monkeys. Why will they not go out to the people and hear the people, Mr. Speaker? Why are you against Mr. Greenslade and the Urban Association who said let's delay this thing a little longer and see if the people in the province have an understanding of it? What about the municipalities that have already said they're going to have a referendum in October. Are you not going to stop and listen to those municipalities all across this province, towns, villages and cities who are holding a referendum? They have already indicated they're holding a referendum. Are you not going to - this government across there - wait and listen to what the people said in those referendums?

What's the Member for Brandon East say? He's half asleep. Of course, he's still trying to digest McKenzie Seeds. What are you going to do about it? Do you think the people in Brandon have a right to hold a referendum on this matter and should we not wait and listen to what they say?

A MEMBER: The man is gone.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: The Minister of Energy, maybe he can answer. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe it, where those kind of indicators - the Manitoba Government Employees Association. Well, of course, the Attorney-General comes out of the wings on that and said we've got a bunch of amendments for the MGEA people, we'll deal with theirs under the table.

Of course, that was the allegation that the Honourable Member for Elmwood made the other day, that the Minister of Cultural Affairs is sending out letters to the arts and cultural groups in province and telling them, in other words, if you don't toe the line on this issue you won't get any more grants. You won't get any more grant money from this government unless you march behind. Isn't that a wonderful way to amend the Constitution? Now, that's what the Honourable Member for Elmwood thinks is going on. I haven't seen the letters yet. Maybe somebody will surface one to us one of these days of these so-called allegations and letters or whatever they are that the Minister of Cultural Affairs is sending to the arts and cultural groups. That's how deep this government's dug in on this matter, Mr. Speaker. That's how deep they feel that they're right.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't found anybody yet, not anybody in my constituency that says they're right on

this issue. I've wrote in my column, which I write in the paper, I said, all you NDP people, send me your opinions on this. Those I'm getting - I've got some to read into the record here today - are pretty damning to this government, people that have been staunch, long-time supporters of the New Democratic Party are going to tear up their membership on this issue, because of the fact that the government won't listen and it won't come out and explain to them what's going on. I bet there's a lot of people in the gallery this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that really don't understand this issue; and that's another job that we haven't done, a sead into the record here today - are pretty damning to this government, people that have been staunch, long-time supporters of the New Democratic Party are going to tear up their membership on this issue, because of the fact that the government won't listen and it won't come out and explain to them what's going on. I bet there's a lot of people in the gallery this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, that really don't understand this issue; and that's another job that we haven't done, as legislators, to read this thing into the record what the government proposes.

I'll read it, just for the benefit of the people that are sitting in the gallery today. Here's the resolution proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General who said, "On a motion for a resolution to authorize His Excellency, the Governor-General, to issue a Proclamation respecting amendments to the Constitution of Canada,

"WHEREAS Section 43 of The Constitution Act, 1982 provides that an amendment to the Constitution of Canada may be made by proclamation issued by the Governor-General, under the Great Seal of Canada, where so authorized by resolutions of the Senate, the House of Commons and a Resolution of the Legislative Assembly of the province to which the amendment applies."

It goes on and says,

"NOW THEREFORE the Legislative Assembly of this province, Manitoba, resolves that His Excellency, the Governor-General, be authorized to issue a proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada amending the Constitution of Canada as follows."

Amending the Constitution of Canada as follows - remember that; that's what they're not telling us. They say that certainly the amendments may go in there or they may not, it depends on the Supreme Court case with Bilodeau. That's not what the resolution says, Mr. Speaker. The resolution says that they be authorized to issue a proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada amending the Constitution of Canada as follows, and under the first subsection, the Official Language of Manitoba, 23(1) says, "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba," if we pass this in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder where the government went wrong on this issue. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon said the other day that the people in Flin Flon are not interested in this issue. Do you believe him? He said they're not concerned, about the people in Flin Flon. He's a Minister of the Crown. The Minister of Government Services said this morning, there's no problem in Dauphin with this resolution. The Dauphin people are accepting it in its present form and yet, within an hour, I see a lady out here with a petition, telling the Honourable Minister of Government Services,

the MLA for Dauphin, it's not so rosy in Dauphin. Then I hear from my colleague, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who was travelling through that area and he doesn't tell me everything's well in Dauphin.

So why would the members opposite, today, say that they're going to vote against this amendment that's been posed by my colleague, the Member for Gladstone, which all we ask is that this matter be not heard until December 31, 1983?

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand. I certainly would plead with all the words that I have in my vocabulary, with bended knee or whatever manner to get the committee struck from this House to come to my constituency, Roblin-Russell, and give the people there a chance to express themselves. We have two Indian bands in my constituency. I hope both of those Indian bands have a chance to express themselves, not only on the change in aboriginal rights. I want to hear those Native people speak on this constitutional change that we've got right in front of us right now, Mr. Speaker.

I want the Metis communities of Camperville, who I represented for years, and San Clara and Boggy Creek to be heard. They are very very important. Those are some of the earliest people that came to this province and I want to hear what they have to say about this matter that's before us. Mr. Speaker, the constituents that I represent are a mosaic of people from many many lands and I think they all should have a chance to be heard and express themselves on this matter. Poles, Rumanians, Ukrainians, Germans, Russians, why shouldn't they be heard? Mr. Speaker, this stubborn, socialist government, headed by the First Minister and his Attorney-General, are not going to go out to Roblin; I'm sure they're not.

I raised it one day; he said, it's in the hands of the committee. We unfortunately, on the opposition, haven't got a majority in the wishes of the committee so whatever the committee says, we will have very little say, if any, Mr. Speaker, because they'll have more members on the committee than we will. So whatever we say, I suspect, will be set aside by that committee, because I doubt very much that committee wants to come to Roblin and hear the wishes of those people on this very important matter. I doubt very much if they want to go to Winkler and hear what's going on in Winkler on this subject matter. I doubt very much if they want to go up to Swan River and hear what this is all about.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon says, there's no problem, it's not a problem in Flin Flon, the people are not concerned, or the same in Dauphin. I can assure the Attorney-General, and I can assure you and the people of this province and this House that this resolution that's been raised and put on the Order Paper by my colleague, the Member for Gladstone, is one of the most important resolutions we'll ever have in this House this Session to try and deal with this matter rationally, fair, square and to give the people of the province a chance to express themselves.

Of course, the socialists don't believe in that, they don't believe in that, no. All they believe in is class warfare, or class distinction, or trying to divide the people so they can conquer them with their dogmas, traditions and philosophies. Mr. Speaker, they're not going to conquer us in the opposition. I think they're learning some lessons the last few days about how they

should deal with this matter. We're going to stand here toe-to-toe, Mr. Speaker, until this matter is resolved to the satisfaction of the majority of the people in this province; and if we do anything less, as we, elected people, do anything less than that we don't deserve to be sitting in this House as legislators and members of the Legislative Assembly, on the first occasion where the Constitution will be amended by amendments proposed by a government in this province and we're not going to listen to the people, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure when I finish you'll pat me on the back for saying that because we've got to listen to the people; we've got to. There's no way out.

Mr. Speaker, I tried my best to see the shooting war that's going on over there by the Member for Elmwood and his colleagues. That is an historical benchmark in this place. It was interesting here on Saturday; it was really interesting, when the Honourable Member for Elmwood rose in his place, a veteran, longstanding member, former member of the Schreyer Government, . . .

A MEMBER: A brilliant Cabinet Minister.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . rose in his place and now has spent thousands of dollars of his own money or with money he's collected, he's got thousands of names on petitions of people who support the position that he's taking, which is quite close to the position that we're taking, and here it looked like they were going to try and wring his neck before he got finished, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden, the Minister of Urban Affairs was up there waving papers at him and challenging him and the Minister of Northern Affairs, on the other side, trying to block his view with some book or something. Then there was a big meeting around the First Minister's desk and it looked like to me he was going to get the heave-ho before he even got his speech finished. Mr. Speaker, lucky we were here, cooler heads prevailed. I think the opposition was eight strong on that day and so the Honourable Member for Elmwood was allowed to finish his speech.

Are the members opposite not concerned that a member of that long-standing in this House, one of your own, one of the great socialists of the province came into the Legislature the same time as I did, in 1966; who, for whatever reasons, but regardless of what, is standing there alone on this issue and you can't see it. Mr. Speaker, why can't they see it? Is he an outcast because of the fact that he stands before the people of this province today on bilingualism and these proposed constitutional amendments that are before us and says, I'll have no part of it? Is that what's wrong, Mr. Speaker?

Well I don't know; I'm concerned; I'm confused; I'm extremely unhappy because it doesn't seem to matter what we put before this government, they won't accept it. They are going to vote this amendment of my colleague, the Member for Gladstone, down. They are going to vote it down as sure as we're standing here, Mr. Speaker. They are also going to move the amendment proposed by the the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. They are going to move that one out of the way too, they are going to vote that one down.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be likely over some of our dead bodies that they're going to do all these things,

because we're going to continue to amend this thing until finally they come to their senses and recognize the seriousness of this subject matter that's before the people of the province at this time. The first time in our history that constitutional amendments are proposed and we have a government here, so stubborn, and for whatever reasons why, refuse to go out across this province and go to all 57 constituencies and listen to what the people say. I don't know why, but even if they don't, I hope that the Attorney-General will use all his expertise and his power to make sure they come to Roblin-Russell constituency; so I can listen to what the two Indian bands in that constituency have to say, and to what the two Metis communities - especially the Metis community in San Clara and the one at Camperville - which I don't represent at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I also want him, I want that committee to come and talk to the municipalities in my jurisdiction, who have come out violently opposed and have told the First Minister and the government as much, Mr. Speaker. Municipalities such as the R.M. of Russell, opposed; the Town of Russell, opposed; Silver Creek, opposed; Bolton, opposed; Binscarth, opposed; Birtle, opposed; Shellmouth, opposed. What is going on in this province, Mr. Speaker? What is going on?

When elected governments at the municipal level, when there's well over a hundred right at the present time, have voiced their sentiments and voiced their opinions and expressed the desire to have more debate and more discussions on this subject matter, and the government and the Attorney-General and the First Minister turn their heads to one side and refuse to listen. Mr. Speaker, either Howard Pawley was lying to the people of this province when he made these proposals, or else he's lying right now, because these people have no great future under what he's offering at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I believe the honourable member is aware that he has used a word which is unparliamentary and has been mentioned even to the previous speaker. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his comment.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I said either he's lying to the people of the province, or else he didn't mean what he said on this election manifesto, because he did say we can improve the quality of life in small towns and rural communities. He says Manitobans are great people; together we can build a great future . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The point at issue is not whether the statement was correct or incorrect. It is the use of unparliamentary language which is at issue and the honourable member should not use unparliamentary phrases.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the unparliamentary language that I raised in this matter. But, Mr. Speaker, before I close, I am again standing here today in full support of the subamendment as proposed by my colleague, the Member for Gladstone, who asked that we carry on until December 31, 1983

to deal with this very important subject matter that's before us.

If this government will not allow us to do that, Mr. Speaker, they better start burning these messages from Howard Pawley that have been scattered all across this province, because this province has no future with that kind of government. He says, great future; I say these people in this province have no future under these conditions. Mr. Speaker, Manitobans are great people the Premier said; he goes on, he says together we can build a great future. There is no togetherness on this subject matter, Mr. Speaker. There is no togetherness in this government; there is no compromise; there is no co-operation. It's a foregone conclusion. They're going to ram it through and to heck with everybody. Do you think the people of this province have a future with that kind of a government, Mr. Speaker? Never, never - that's a promise Howard Pawley says that we can guarantee. God bless Manitoba.

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

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few sentences to this debate and if you'll pardon me, I'm going to have to use some notes here to refer to from time to time. In the resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act deals with the translation of the statutes of the government services in French as well as in English. I think maybe we've lost sight of that through all this business that's been going on for the last few days. This was the intent in the first place. It is the view of the opposition side of the House that the people of Manitoba are entitled to be heard on this most important resolution.

The opposition side of the House is willing to extend the services but we oppose the entrenchment that is proposed. The position that the previous government led by the Honourable Sterling Lyon was and still is in keeping with the spirit of the Supreme Court decision in the Forest case.

I, too, come from a background of one of the groups of people that were not among the founding culture of the day. My ancestors arrived a few years later. They came by choice or by necessity, seeking a new life in a strange country. They came with their books of learning and their dreams of a better life than what they had left. They suffered great hardships in the colony called New Iceland. They soon assimilated into the cultural picture, but retained their ethnic and cultural origins, and to this day the Icelanders celebrate with a three-day festival at Gimli called Islendingadagurinn and the purpose of that whole exercise is to retain some of the language, the customs, and so on of their native country.

Likewise, the Icelanders are not the only community that does this. The Ukrainian community, the Mennonite community, and many others, including the Chinese community, for instance, who just last week had a festival in Chinatown and were furthering their beliefs of their origins; they've done many things and all these are Manitobans and Canadians that have done many things without benefit of entrenchment of minority rights. The things that minorities are able to do under the system of government that we have enables various

groups of people to engage in cultural and educational furtherance of their heritage.

I don't think any one of the opposition side has denied that French linguistic rights were written into the bill when Manitoba entered Confederation. It must be remembered that there have been many changes since that time. The Francophone population at that point in time was probably the majority, they were predominant at that point, but times have changed. People from all parts of the world have come into Manitoba, immigrated here, and settled here and the French population is probably in a minority situation.

The letter of the law, their rights under the Bill of 1870 have been agreed to by the official opposition and the opposition is supportive of the Supreme Court decision on the Forest case. The request of the opposition to have this resolution referred to an intersessional committee is logical. There isn't any need for great haste. Appropriate time for consideration must be taken. The government hasn't established a case for haste. Progress has been made since 1979.

The decision of the 1979 Supreme Court decision translation of official documents is under way. Translation facilities have been established right here in this House to accommodate those of French background who wish to make their contribution to the Provincial Legislature in their native tongue.

I fail to see why, Mr. Speaker, why the government is so hot to trot on this resolution. Surely the citizens of Manitoba have a right to be heard, and the only way that they can be heard is by an intersessional committee. I think that the government is not listening, and I urge them to listen to what is coming across, not only the opposition from the opposition side, but from the citizens of Manitoba.

The municipalities are voicing their concern, the Manitoba Government Employees Association President is voicing a concern, citizens are responding to the news media, the open-line shows, and there is a very vocal and concerned citizenry out there that is asking to be heard. I think it's only responsible for the government to hear them out. Unless the resolution is referred to an intersessional committee, the public will be unable to make representation.

So, as others before me have said, why the rush, why the hurry? It's an important decision, probably one of the most important decisions that will face us in this Legislature, and it's important to the people that they are able to contribute. On a subject as important as the amendment to the Constitution, and of language entrenchment, we on this side want the best for Manitobans, and we would like to see this done in a thorough and just manner with ample time for debate and input and ample time to study the feedback that we get from our constituents.

It's important that we make the right decision as we are dealing with an amendment to the Constitution, and that amendment when it is made, it's irreversible.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that bothers me about this is the manner in which the information meetings have been held. It appeared to me that the Attorney-General and his staff have gone out to Brandon, Dauphin, and Thompson, and Winnipeg, held their meetings, but really didn't listen to the people. They told them what they were going to do.

It just kind of reminds me of 1970-71 when the previous government, the Schreyer Government, had

decided that they were going to bring Unicity into being. They came out and I recall very vividly the night that Mr. Cherniack and his staff came out and laid it on the line to about 1,000 people in the St. James Civic Centre, and they didn't listen. They didn't listen, their minds were made up, they were going to put it through come hell or high water and that's exactly what they did. I'm just afraid that this is just exactly what is happening again in this instance where they're just going to ramrod it through regardless of what anybody or anyone says. They are not going to listen to it.

If I could read from the interview that Mr. Jim Carr had with the Honourable Senator Duff Roblin on Friday, July 29. Mr. Roblin has contributed a great amount to this community over the years. He says that the language question in Manitoba must be seen from the terms of 1983 as well as what has gone before. If I can read from this document, I'd be prepared to lay it on the desk.

"In Manitoba context," he said, "it would have been wiser to allow the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with the case of Mr. Bilodeau in order to set the issue at rest. The fear that the Supreme Court might invalidate all the laws of Manitoba since 1870 is an academic legalism that should have been put to one side. It is not likely that the Supreme Court would lend itself to such a questionable conclusion."

He goes on, and again in the Manitoba context he continues, "The legal language question carries the burden of 100 years of history; therefore, it is wise to prepare public opinion, especially when constitutional changes are involved. Public opinion is particularly important in this case for two reasons.

"Firstly, it is the first effort to amend our Constitution, and secondly, it deals with a problem so difficult for Manitobans to agree upon. This means that the debate shouldn't be limited to discussions between MLAs, particularly where a constitutional change is not supported by a political mandate. The people of Manitoba deserve the opportunity to have some means of bringing the issue to an acceptable conclusion."

Going also to another from New Brunswick, I think what we are possibly more concerned with in this legislation than anything is what's going to happen beyond. If we just stick with what is written in the resolution, that's fine, but I think everyone believes that it's going to go beyond that. From the backlash from the Atlantic Insight, the July issue of 1983, there's quite an article and I just would like to touch on a few sentences in it. The difference strikes travellers the moment they cross the New Brunswick border. "Road signs tell the driver circulation à droite, which is keep to the right, and the west and east in the two respective languages. People that live in New Brunswick many believe the ability to speak the province's official languages is the only test that seems to matter when you go looking for a job or try to keep the one that you have."

I know the former speaker from Sturgeon Creek, I think, has read probably the same article with regard to the girl or the school teacher that had 11 years of experience but could not find a job because she was not bilingual.

The policy of equal status for English and French is entrenched in the provincial bill, the Languages Act, and the later bill, 88, granting cultural equality to the

two language groups. So here we are following the same path as what the Government of New Brunswick has done and it's not all that happy a situation there.

It goes on here, Mr. Speaker, "Bilingualism has not relieved Acadian fears of assimilation into English majority. The degree of assimilation is absolutely incredible, says Paul Landry, Director of the Societé Culturel Dieppe Moncton. It's great to see the Anglophones becoming bilingual, but we're seeing our kids coming out of high school, they can't speak their own language and they're not adequate in English.

"In a report released in 1982, a Task Force on Official Languages in New Brunswick observed a certain allergy with respect to French among the province's English speakers. A year later, Bernard Poirier, one of the authors, feels attitudes are changing, they are more open-minded. He blames occasional flare-ups of resentment, such as that focused on the crackdown at airports, on bad handling of bilingualism effort, but even Mr. Poirier doesn't claim that New Brunswick's Anglos are embracing bilingualism with much enthusiasm. The government has decided New Brunswick will be an official bilingual province. Most people have decided they might as well live with it and make the best of it, but such solemn fatalism is a far cry from the enlightened notion that a second language gives man a second soul, but then that thought was voiced by Charlemagne, a Frenchman."

Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the Government of the Day will give greater consideration to what we are attempting to do and what they are attempting to do. I think for the betterment of the province and the proud people of Manitoba that they have to listen to the people of the province.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

A MEMBER: Never.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, on the sub-amendment that she was moved to the referral resolution that is in front of us and is the subject of debate at the present time. But in doing so, Sir, I must say that I have some regret and some disappointment that sub-amendment should even have been necessary.

If the government were willing to approach with reason and with understanding the urgency and the importance of the issue that it has placed in front of this Legislature it would not have been necessary to move to the procedural stage to which we have moved and to be in a situation where we now must attempt more thoroughly than ever before to make the government see the reason and the reasonableness of our position.

I would have thought that argument would have been clear to members on the government benches during initial debate on the referral motion and then subsequent debate on the amendment that was moved to that motion, Sir. What happened is that the government failed to see reason; failed to see the

eminent fairness of the arguments that were being advanced from this side of the House for consideration in the public interest to public participation and public input on this question and made it necessary for us to move beyond the stage of a single amendment to this resolution to the point where we're now looking at a very important and a very effective sub-amendment, a very important and a very effective one, but one nonetheless which, as I say, betrays the fact, reveals very clearly the fact that Manitobans, who had concerns about the course of the government on this issue, and members on this side of the House, who have tried to articulate those concerns, have failed to strip the blinkers and the stigmatism away from the vision of the government and to make members on the government side see the importance of what it is we are talking about.

It may be necessary to continue much much further in this vein, Sir, on behalf of Manitobans, until the government opposite relinquishes its stubbornness, retreats from the very high-handed and authoritarian position they have taken on this subject and concedes that it is the people of Manitoba who are the important decision-makers in all legislative matters which come before this Assembly, but in particular, Sir, in matters of such profound import as this one, with the impact and the ramifications for our society and its future shape and its future course. So I say, Sir, that while I am pleased to be able to stand and speak in support of the sub-amendment moved by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, I think that the fact that we have reached a point in this debate where it is necessary for us to have advanced a sub-amendment and to be pursuing very wide-ranging and very far-reaching debate in support of such a sub-amendment is a reflection of the unfortunate condition of government and administration in this province. It's a reflection of a government and an administration in this province which will not apparently listen to reason, which will not apparently consider fair play and equitability, which does not apparently understand the right of the people of Manitoba to be heard on this issue.

That's why I say, Sir, I am somewhat disappointed that the debate has reached the point to which it has now come. I would have thought looking at a government that laid claim in its election campaign during the weeks in which it was campaigning in 1981 to be elected government to be a party that listened to people, I would have thought that addressing an issue with the government that has claimed to be an open government, I would have thought that in addressing a government that has claimed to speak for ordinary Manitobans, claims to which we would bring great challenge and bring question, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless claims which are on the record, both inside and outside this Chamber, that its members would have responded with some compassion and some understanding, some sensitivity to what it is we are talking about here; and that long long ago in this debate and in this Session we would have had concurrence, acquiescence, agreement on that side, on the government side, to our very reasonable request to permit this issue to go to the people properly, thoroughly, and conscientiously before definitive government action is demanded.

Sir, as I say, that has not been the case. There has not been that sensitivity, that understanding, and so we've moved now to another procedural stage in attempting to wage this battle, which we wage sincerely and conscientiously on behalf of the unity of Manitobans and on behalf of understanding and sympathy between the various components that make up our society. We wage a battle here for unity, for sympathy, for understanding, and a battle against divisiveness, and against extreme authoritarian legislation that will encourage, unfortunately and regrettably, declamatory positions and declamatory statements which we sincerely fear and a great many Manitobans sincerely fear, Mr. Speaker, can do irreparable damage to our society and our province.

I think the position that we advanced in debate on the referral resolution was eminently reasonable. I think that the position that we advanced in debate on the amendment to the referral resolution moved under my name, Sir, was eminently reasonable, and how much more then do I think is this sub-amendment eminently reasonable? How much more, Sir? A great deal more.

I believe that if there was a legitimate reason for the government to be suspicious of and wary of the position we were taking on the referral motion and on the amendment to that motion, all justification for that suspicion and that wariness is removed in the sub-amendment proposed by my colleague from Gladstone. For what that does in its wording, Sir, is say clearly and distinctly, for members opposite and all Manitobans to see and understand, is that we acknowledge the difficult situation into which they have got themselves through the deadline which they have imposed, not quite unilaterally, but certainly without the consent of members on this side of the House and without the knowledge of members on this side of the House, and without the knowledge or consent of the general public.

It's a deadline that they have imposed without the mandate of the general public, without the acquiescence or support of the general public, and without the knowledge of the general public. It would be accurate to describe it as a unilaterally imposed mandate, except that it would not be precisely correct to say that it was unilaterally imposed, Mr. Speaker, because it was done behind a closed door in concert with their two partners in this activity; the Federal Government and the Société Franco-Manitobaine. Going beyond that there was no concurrence, no acquiescence, no mandate from anybody, and so they have created for themselves a grave difficulty with that deadline that they and their partners have constructed.

It could have been argued that they perhaps were frightened of the position that we were advancing in the original debate on the original resolution and equally frightened of the position we were advancing on the amendment. There is no justification or support, Mr. Speaker, for any fright or fear on their part, or any particular wariness or suspicion on their part where the sub-amendment is concerned, because the sub-amendment addresses that very difficult corner into which they have backed themselves. It addresses the deadline. It says that we will ensure that the process that we have recommended will enable a report from a properly constituted and properly functioning committee to come back to this Legislature no later than December 31, 1983, no later than the deadline

that they imposed on themselves and on the people of Manitoba in the deal that they made unbeknownst to all of us with their two partners.

So, Mr. Speaker, it becomes extremely difficult for those of us on this side of the House to understand the blindness and the stubbornness of the government, and particularly its chief spokesman and chief architect in this issue, the Government House Leader, in this instance. How is it that they expect to be understood by the people of Manitoba when they are being confronted with a solution and a proposal that is not only eminently reasonable from the point of view of the interests of the people of Manitoba, but is eminently fair from the point of view of helping them out of the difficulty into which they've got themselves, eminently fair from the point of view of helping them in their self-imposed strait-jacket. I don't know how the government is going to explain their intransigence on this point to the people of Manitoba, and expect themselves and their position to be understood, Sir.

We've tried to be reasonable on this matter throughout. In fact, from the start of the debate on this issue, from the position advanced and developed at all stages of this debate by my colleagues, I think any fair-minded review would support my claim that our position has been reasonable throughout. It becomes extremely difficult to understand, in fact, virtually boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker, to comprehend why the government is taking the position it is taking. Why does the government want to force declamatory action, and declamatory statements, and declamatory debate, on a subject as sensitive as this one? One can only conclude that they're taking the position they are taking in order to cover up their own inadequacies in other areas. They are not at all sure, self-assured, or certain that the course of action that they're pursuing here will be acceptable to a majority of Manitobans or even to any kind of a consensus among Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, but more than that it suggests to me that they want to divert attention from the glaring inadequacies that they have displayed throughout their administration, and particularly throughout this current Session of the Legislature.

If one looks over the litany of inept, incompetent, and unacceptable measures that the government has proposed since this Session was convened last December, Mr. Speaker, one is mightily impressed by the provocative and uneven and contentious legislation that confronts us, one can't be but mightily impressed and somewhat saddened by the array of unacceptable and divisive legislation confronting all of us in here, and, in fact, confronting all Manitobans, as a result of the inept administration offered by that government opposite since their election, and particularly since this Session of the Legislature convened.

One can run through a list of proposed bills, proposed pieces of legislation which would work to the enormous disadvantage of Manitobans in terms of their economic and social being, and in many cases would work to the fragmentation and the serious damage of our cultural mosaic in Manitoba when you consider bills like The Farm Lands Ownership Act and the proposed amendments to The Cattle Producers Association Act, and the proposed amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act, The Elections Finances Act, The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of

Interest Act, and The Municipal Council Conflict of Interest Act - and the list goes on, Mr. Speaker - when you consider legislation of that kind which is so fractious and divisive in nature, which is so unacceptable from the point of view of fair and reasoned and necessary legislation, you have to conclude, Sir, that this government needed some other focus of attention for the public, for the media and, most of all, for the opposition in order to take the spotlight off that sad and sorry record.

I am persuaded to that conclusion at this stage of the debate, Mr. Speaker. I can't see any other reason for their stubborn refusal to acquiesce or to accede to this proposal to permit the public to participate fully and to offer its input fully at intersessional public hearings into this important proposal, and to report back within the deadline that they imposed upon themselves. Why is it this government insists on carrying through the pressure play that they have applied to this particular proposal by demanding that the committee meetings that are being implied in their resolution be concluded and that a report be brought back to this Session of the Legislature? Why, Sir? Because they believe that they can work their way and effect their ambition more easily if Manitobans do not have an opportunity to acquaint themselves fully with what is at stake.

Secondly, they believe, Sir, that by focusing on that kind of an unacceptable legislative ploy and drawing the response of the opposition that they have drawn and generating the attention of the media and the public that has now been generated by the fight that the opposition has put up, they successfully take the spotlight off that sad litany I just recounted in part of their mistakes and their ineptness in other realms of legislation.

They have offered this province, Mr. Speaker, nothing but divisiveness, nothing but economic difficulty, and nothing but social misery since the day they assumed office. They have lurched from provocative bill to provocative bill; from contentious measure to more contentious measure; from unacceptable legislative proposal to more unacceptable legislative proposal from the day they assumed office. This Session of the Manitoba Legislature, this 1983 Session will go down not so much in history, Mr. Speaker, but in infamy in the annals of this province as an episode of disaster for the well-being of the people of our province.

As a consequence of that, Sir, they have, I suggest to you, determined the best way to try to shake off the image of incompetence that they have acquired for

themselves, and to divert the attention of all of us from those other unacceptable pieces of legislation, many of which should be withdrawn right now, many of which should be shelved and discarded once and for all right now, they need an issue of this kind which will occupy the energies and the time of this side of the House to the extent that our energies and our attention have been devoted to it since the referral resolution appeared on the Order Paper.

They knew that we would not let this kind of thing slide easily through. They know that this kind of proposal is unacceptable to many Manitobans. I'm not sure how many, but I can suggest to you, Sir, that it is a great many. Certainly it's unacceptable to a great many Manitobans until those Manitobans have a chance to digest it, understand it and thoroughly address it, and it presented the government with that escape route, I think they have been looking for, for some time, because of the difficulties they have created for themselves in the earlier months of the Session.

Mr. Speaker, there is no intention on this side of the House to fall for that kind of strategic or tactical ruse, to fall for that kind of legislative pressure play. We have a responsibility here, and our debate on the referral motion, our proposed amendment, and now our proposed sub-amendment lay out that responsibility in very clear terms that I believe most Manitobans understand. Regardless of where they stand on this issue of entrenched extension of French Language Services, they stand clearly in comprehension of the position that we've taken with respect to allowing proper public input.

The argument that the public has a right to be consulted on this issue and to make its views known is an argument that is widely accepted and widely understood across the length and breadth of this province, Sir, and we intend to continue with that argument until the government is prepared to see reason on it. Where the intransigence stems from, I suggest, is from that position of concern and trepidation and worry about their posture and their image as a government because of the bad legislation they've introduced up to this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this motion is next before the House, the honourable member will have 18 minutes remaining.

The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 8:00 p.m. (Tuesday).