



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. 154A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 5 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. 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	Virten	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, Hon. 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

Thursday, 5 January, 1984.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: By Resolution of the Legislature passed on August 18, 1983, which reads in part: "WHEREAS the Government of the Province of Manitoba has proposed a resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which amendment concerns the translation of the statutes of Manitoba or some of them and the question of government services in French as well as the English language; and WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba deems it advisable to hear the views of Manitobans on the subject matter of this Resolution;" your Committee met for organization on Thursday, August 18, 1983, at 3:00 p.m. and agreed to hold public hearings on dates and at locations as follows:

WINNIPEG - September 6, 7, 8 & 9, 1983
Room 255, Legislative Building
450 Broadway

THOMPSON - Monday, September 12, 1983
St. Joseph's Ukrainian Catholic Parish Hall
340 Juniper Drive

SWAN RIVER - Wednesday, September 14, 1983
Legion Hall
6th Avenue N.

STE. ROSE - Friday, September 16, 1983
Ste. Rose Community Centre on Gulf
Street

BRANDON - Monday, September 19 and Tuesday
September 20, 1983
Victoria Inn, Salon 1 and 2
3550 Victoria W.

MORDEN - Thursday, September 22, 1983
Community Hall
Second Street N.

ARBORG - Monday, September 26, 1983
Arborg Community Hall
North end of Ingolf Street

STE. ANNE - Tuesday, September 27, 1983
Legion Community Centre
Arena Road

Representations from organizations and private citizens were made as follows:

WINNIPEG, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Messrs. Eric Maldoff, Michael Goldbloom,
Geoffrey Chambers & Laurent Marcoux, Alliance
Québec.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Alliance Québec was continued.
Messrs. Léo Letourneau & Jean-Bernard
Lafontaine, Fédération des francophones hors
Québec,
Mr. Maurice Prince, Association des pro-
canadiens,
Professor Donald Bailey, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Professor Bailey was continued.
Mr. Terry J. Prychitko, Ukrainian Community
Development Committee,
Mr. Danny Waldman, Manitoba Association for
Bilingual Education.

WINNIPEG, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Danny Waldman, Manitoba Association for
Bilingual Education,
Ms. Sybil Shack & Mr. Abe Arnold, Manitoba
Association for Rights and Liberties.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Manitoba Association for Rights
and Liberties was continued.
Mr. Ken Reddig, Concerned Mennonites Group.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Concerned Mennonites Group
was continued.
Dr. Yantay Tsai, Chinese Community.

WINNIPEG, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Presentation by Dr. Yantay Tsai was continued.
Mrs. Una Johnstone, Private Citizen,
Mr. Sidney Green, Manitoba Progressive Party.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Mr. Sidney Green of the
Manitoba Progressive Party was continued.
Mr. Georges Forest, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Olivier Beaudette, Conseil de la coopérative
du Manitoba,

Mr. Michel Roy, Conseil Jeunesse provinciale,
Mr. Maurice Laberge, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gary Doer, Manitoba Government Employees
Association.

WINNIPEG, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. Stephen Scott, Professor of Constitutional
Law.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Gary Doer, Manitoba Government Employees
Association,
Mr. Gilles Lesage, Société historique de St.
Boniface,
Mr. Raymond Clément, Alliance chorale.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Florent Arnaud, Danseurs de la Rivière
Rouge,
Mr. Raymond Poirier, Fédération provinciale des
comités des parents,
Mr. Paul Fort & Ms. Linda Asper, Educateurs
franco-manitobains,
Mr. Jean Taillefer, Private Citizen.

THOMPSON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Jack Brightnose, Private Citizen,
Mr. Guy Lacroix, Société franco-manitobaine,
Mr. Arvind Aggarwal, Manitoba 23.

2:00 P.M.

Ms. Farideda Dharamshi, Thompson Muslim
Association.

**SWAN RIVER, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14,
1983**

10:00 A.M.

Ms. Gwen Palmer, Swan Valley School Division,
Mr. Leonard Harapiak, Private Citizen,
Ms. Alice Allen, Private Citizen,
Ms. Allen also presented a brief on behalf of
Ms. Olga Wowchuk, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jim Robertson, Private Citizen,
Mr. Joe Beer, Private Citizen,
Ms. Madeleine Beaudry, Private Citizen,
Ms. Irène Garand, Société franco-manitobaine,
Reeve Harold L. Ellingson, R.M. of Swan River.

2:00 P.M.

Reeve J.M. McIntosh, R.M. of Minitonas,
Mr. Murray Wenstoeb, Private Citizen,
Ms. Liona Painchaud, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jack Fleming, Manitoba Metis Federation,
Inc.,
Mr. Fleming also presented a brief on behalf of
Manitoba 23,
Mr. Ken Fransoo, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ron Richards, Camperville Community
Council,

Mayor E.A. Hart, Village of Minitonas,
Mayor Fred Sigurdson, Town of Swan River,
Ms. Debbie Dilts, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Alice Allen, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ed Carrière, Private Citizen.

STE. ROSE, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Louis Molgat, Jolly Club and as a Private
Citizen,
Mr. Jacques Peloquin, Private Citizen,
Reeve Joe Van De Poele, R.M. of Ste. Rose and
as a Private Citizen,
Ms. Adeline Furkalo, Private Citizen,
Mr. André Saquet, Private Citizen,
Reeve Bjarni Sigurdson, LGD of Alonsa,
Mr. Daniel Boucher, Société franco-manitobaine,
Reeve Phillips, R.M. of Dauphin,
Mr. Gus Arnal, Private Citizen,
Ms. Alice Saquet, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ronald A. Simard, Private Citizen,
Father Tessier, Private Citizen,
Rev. Jack McLoughlin, Private Citizen,
Sister Mona Lewandowski, Private Citizen,
Ms. Isabelle Archambault, Private Citizen,
Mr. Arthur Milette, Private Citizen,
Ms. Gisèle L'Heureux, Private Citizen,
Mr. David Grey, Swan River Indian & Metis
Friendship Centre Inc.,
Mr. Louis Saquet, Club d'âge d'or de Laurier,
Ms. Rose-Anne Verley, Private Citizen,
Mr. Roy Laycock, Private Citizen,
Mr. René L. Maillard, Village of Ste. Rose,
Mr. Gilbert Rioux & Ms. Claudette Savard,
Commissaires d'écoles franco-manitobains,
Mr. G. Wachsmann, Private Citizen.

7:00 P.M.

Ms. Jeannine Archambault, Private Citizen,
Soeur Hélène St. Amant, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ovide Pelletier, Private Citizen,
Mr. Hervé Molgat, Private Citizen,
Ms. Claudette Gingras, Private Citizen.

BRANDON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Joseph E. Magnet, Société franco-manitobaine,
Mr. Dennis Heeney, R.M. of Elton.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Mr. Dennis Heeney of the R.M. of
Elton was continued,
Reeve Manson L. Moir, Director, Western District,
Union of Manitoba Municipalities,
Reeve Art Cowan, R.M. of Cameron,
Mayor L.W. Waters, Town of Carberry,
Father Art Seaman, Private Citizen,
Reeve J.C. Ashcroft, R.M. of Birtle,
Ms. Hazel Allen, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Ernest Buhler, R.M. of Hamiota,

Mayor John Rankin, Mayor of Hamiota,
Reeve John Mitchell, R.M. of Rosburn,
Mayor Ken Carels, Town of Melita,
Mr. Mervin Tweed, R.M. of Brenda,
Reeve Kenneth Rapley, R.M. of Strathclair,
Reeve Sydney J. Lye, R.M. of Portage la Prairie,
Ms. Margaret Hammel, Group of Concerned Citizens.

BRANDON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Rev. Michael Skrumeda, West-Man Multicultural Council,
Mr. Aaron Berg, Private Citizen,
Reeve Einar Sigurdson, R.M. of Lakeview,
Gene Nerbas, Councillor, R.M. of Shellmouth.

1:30 P.M.

Ms. Maud Lelond, Private Citizen,
Reeve Barry Dixon, R.M. of Morton,
Mr. Ross C. Martin, Brandon & District Labour Council,
Mayor G. McKinnon, Town of Virden,
Mr. Alfred Rogosin, Private Citizen,
Reeve Fred Kolesar, R.M. of Minto,
Mayor Omer Chartier, Village of St. Lazare,
Mrs. Lucille Chartier, Private Citizen,
Mr. Mathieu Deschambault, Private Citizen,
Reeve Willard McFarland, R.M. of Oakland,
Reeve Jack M. Hanlin, R.M. of Miniota,
Mr. Albert Hodson, Village of Elkhorn,
Ms. Janet Goertzen, Manitoba Metis Federation (Southwest Region).

7:00 P.M.

Mr. W.H. Ryan, Grand Orange Lodge of Manitoba,
Mr. H.H. Young, Private Citizen,
Mr. David McConkey, Private Citizen,
Mr. Dave Campbell, Private Citizen,
Ms. Gail Campos, Private Citizen,
Reeve Allan M. Rose, R.M. of Whitewater,
Mr. Terry Penton, Private Citizen,
Reeve Albert Chapman, R.M. of Daly.

MORDEN, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. David Arnott, Private Citizen,
Reeve Henry D. Hildebrand, R.M. of Rhineland,
Mr. Bill Muirhead, Private Citizen,
Reeve Donald J. Alexander, R.M. of Thompson,
Reeve Dave Harms, R.M. of Pembina,
Mr. Gérald Grenier, Société franco-manitobaine.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Bill Spencer, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ernie Sloane, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ted Dodd, United Church of Canada,
Mr. Albert St. Hilaire, R.M. of Montcalm,
Reeve Julius Petkau, R.M. of Grey,
Mr. Henri Bouvier, Village of St. Léon,
Mr. Eric Lansky, Private Citizen,
Reeve R. Ivan Stocks, R.M. of Roland.

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Anne Mc Eachern, Private Citizen,
Ms. Marie-Blanche Oliviero, Private Citizen,
Mr. Travis McCullough, Private Citizen,
Ms. Adéline Fillion, Community of St. Joseph,
Mr. George Henderson, Private Citizen,
Mr. Peter Francis, Private Citizen,
Ms. Jacqueline Fortier, Private Citizen,
Ms. Yvonne Pantel, Comité de parents,
Mr. Paul A. Cenerini, Personnel de l'Institut collégial Notre-Dame,
Ms. Thérèse Bilodeau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Olier Labossière, Private Citizen,
Reeve Roy McLaren, R.M. of Louise,
Mayor George Kozak, Village of Manitou,
Mr. Raymond Labossière, Private Citizen.

ARBORG, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Reeve Edward Peltz, R.M. of Woodlands,
Reeve Harold Jones, R.M. of Woodlands,
Councillor Vernon Sund, R.M. of Woodlands,
Mr. Rens Renooy, South Interlake Planning District.

2:00 P.M.

Mayor Ken Reid, Willage of Arborg,
Ms. Lesley Osland, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ray Sigurdson, on behalf of the R.M. of Gimli and as a Private Citizen,
Mr. T. Hoffman presented a brief on behalf of Mr. Karl Lange, Private Citizen,
Mr. Mike Taczynski, Private Citizen,
Mr. John Cochrane, Private Citizen,
Mr. Robert Dubois, Société franco-manitobaine.

7:30 P.M.

Mrs. Blanche Tully, on behalf of the people of Marquette & District,
Mr. Jim Day, Private Citizen,
Mr. Rob Sarginson, Private Citizen,
Ms. Alvira Altman presented a brief on behalf of Mr. Bill Pendree,
Reeve William Halabura, LGD of Armstrong,
Ms. Margaret Smith, Private Citizen.

STE. ANNE, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. F.P. Doyle, Private Citizen,
Mr. René Vermette, Division scolaire de la Rivière Rouge No. 17,
Mr. Guy Lévesque, Private Citizen,
Ms. Irène Lemoine, Comité de parents de l'école Pointe des Chênes,
Mr. Roger Legal, Private Citizen,
Mr. Louis Bernardin, Private Citizen,
Mr. Paul Ruest, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jean Detillieux, Private Citizen,
Dr. G. Lemoine, Comité de parents des Scouts et Guides de Ste. Anne,
Mr. Tobie Perrin, Private Citizen,
Reeve John Giesbrecht and Councillor Gilbert Tétrault, R.M. of La Broquerie,
Ms. Margaret Smith, Centre cultural corporatif de Ste. Anne,

Reeve Carl F. Pitura, R.M. of Macdonald.

2:00 P.M.

Mr. Norbert Ritchot, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Joan Chaput, Private Citizen,
Ms. Cécile Mulaire, Private Citizen,
Mr. Robert Freynet, Private Citizen,
Mr. Maurice Prince, Association des pro-
canadiens,
Mr. George Léger, Private Citizen,
Mr. Eugène Kirouac, Bureau d'administration de
la Caisse Populaire de la Broquerie,
Mr. Raymond Boily, Private Citizen,
Mr. Alfred Laurencelle, Comité de centenaire de
La Broquerie,
Mr. Lionel Joyal, Private Citizen,
Ms. Béatrice Freynet-Boily, Private Citizen,
Mr. Armand Desharnais, Comité culturel de St.
Pierre,
Reeve John Loewen, R.M. of Hanover,
Dr. Archambault, Private Citizen,
Mr. Rino Ouellet, Comité de parents des écoles
françaises de La Broquerie,
Ms. Michelle Freynet-Arbez, Private Citizen.

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Agnes Dubois, Comité de parents de l'école
Noel-Ritchot de St. Norbert,
Ms. Laurette Théberge, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Marie-Joseph Fiset, Fédération des aînés
franco-manitobains Inc.,
Ms. Dolores Legal, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérard Desrosiers, Private Citizen,
Ms. Gabrielle St. Hilaire-Mulaire, Educateurs
franco-manitobains de la division scolaire Rivière
Seine,
Mr. Gilles Hébert, Private Citizen,
Mrs. Lucienne Boucher, Private Citizen,
Mayor Roger Smith, Town of Ste. Anne,
Mr. Léo Robert, Société franco-manitobaine,
Mr. Richard Loeb, Private Citizen,
Mr. Frank Baker, Private Citizen,
Mr. Roger Lafrenière, Private Citizen,
Ms. Elaine Tougas, Etudiants de l'école Pointe
des Chênes,
Mr. Normand Roy, Private Citizen,
Father Laval Cloutier, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérald Fontaine, Village of St. Pierre-Jolys
and Conseil économique de la Rivière Rouge,
Mr. Daniel Tougas, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gérard Gauthier, La classe des finissants de
l'école secondaire de La Broquerie,
Ms. Valérie Vielfaure, La classe grade 11 de
l'école secondaire de la Broquerie,
Mr. Donald Boulet, Private Citizen,
Ms. Nicole Fontaine, Private Citizen,
Mr. Norbert Piché, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jean-Paul Lemoine, Private Citizen,
Ms. Carole Therrien, Conseil Etudiant, Ecole
secondaire La Broquerie,
Mr. Denis A. Fontaine, Association des
professeurs de la division scolaire Rivière Rouge,
Mr. Roland Gauthier, Club sportif de La
Broquerie,
Mr. Michel Lavergne, Collège régional français,

Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin, Comité des parents.

WINNIPEG, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Messrs. Stan Carbone & Mario Audino, Italian-
Canadian League of Manitoba,
Mr. Merle Hartlin, Private Citizen,
Mr. Clarence Morris, Private Citizen,
Mr. Fred Cameron, Private Citizen,
Mr. A. Bedbrook, Private Citizen.

2:00 P.M.

Ms. Alice Richmond, Private Citizen,
Mayor Elmer Greenslade, Manitoba Association
of Urban Municipalities,
Mr. Fred Debrecen, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ian MacPherson, Private Citizen,
Dr. A.E. DeLeysac, Président-général de la
Société canadienne du français à l'université.

7:30 P.M.

Ms. Margaret Harding, Private Citizen,
Mr. Tom Fuddy, Private Citizen,
Mr. Reginald Dubbin, Private Citizen,
Mr. H.C. Lim, Chinese Community Council of
Manitoba,
Mr. David Osborne, Canadian Parents for French,
Mr. Robert Clague, Private Citizen,
Mr. E.T. Annandale, Private Citizen,
Mr. Dave Harms, President of the Union of
Manitoba Municipalities.

WINNIPEG, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Herb Schulz, Private Citizen,
Mr. Alan Beachell, Private Citizen,
Mr. Michel Simard, Association des Etudiants du
Collège universitaire de St. Boniface,
Mr. H.S. Dulat, Sikh Society of Manitoba Inc.,
Singh Sabha of Winnipeg Inc., Nanaksar Satsang
Sabha of Manitoba Inc.

2:00 P.M.

Ms. Paula Fletcher, Communist Party of
Manitoba,
Mr. Jack Oatway, R.M. of Rosser,
Mr. Renald Guay, Associations des avocats
francophones,
Mr. Marc Monnin, Collège de St. Boniface,
Mr. K.B. Jakubowicz, Canadian Polish Congress
(Manitoba Division),
Ms. Florence Bourgouin, Private Citizen,
Ms. Maralyne Donovan, Private Citizen,
Ms. Rita Lecuyer, Pluri-elles,
Mr. Helmut Albrecht, Private Citizen,
Ms. Janick Belleau, Réseau,
Messrs. B.T. Quennelle and Paul Moist, CUPE,
Local 998.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by CUPE, Local 998 was continued.
Mr. Charles Gagné, Private Citizen,

Ms. Emile Clune, President, Local 5 of the Communications Workers of Canada,
Mrs. B. MacKenzie, Private Citizen,
Dr. E. Sabbadini & Mr. Dino Longhi, Dante, Alighieri Italian Cultural Society.

WINNIPEG, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. William F. Shaw, on behalf of some interested groups in the Province of Québec.

2:00 P.M.

Presentation by Dr. W.F. Shaw was continued.
Mr. Bruce Odium, Past President of the Welsh Society,
Mr. Jerry Dorfman, Private Citizen,
Mr. Martin Samoiloff, Private Citizen,
Mr. A.J. Moreau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Christian Schubert, Private Citizen,
Mr. Edouard Vêroneau, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ernest A. Wehrle, St. Boniface General Hospital,
Messrs. Baruch Rand & Myron J. Spolsky, Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages.

7:30 P.M.

Presentation by Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages was continued.
Reeve Clarence Kiesman, LGD of Grahamdale,
Ms. Lillian Stevens, Private Citizen,
Ms. Mary-Ann Adams, Private Citizen,
Ms. Claire Toews, Private Citizen,
Mr. Kenneth Emberley, Private Citizen.

WINNIPEG, MONDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Dr. W. Potter, Private Citizen.

2:00 P.M.

Professor A.R. Kear, Private Citizen,
Mr. Gordon W. Pollon, Private Citizen,
Mr. Michael Kibzey, Private Citizen,
Dr. Neil G. McDonald, Manitoba 23.

7:30 P.M.

Mrs. Friesen, Private Citizen,
Mrs. B. Holst, Private Citizen
Ms. Beryl Kirk, Private Citizen,
Ms. Sandra Oleson, Private Citizen,
Ms. Judy Flynn, Private Citizen,
Ms. Ruth Rannie, Private Citizen,
Mr. André Fréchette, Association des professeurs du Collège universitaire de St. Boniface,
Ms. Linda Archer, Private Citizen,
Ms. Juliette Blais, Private Citizen,
Dr. Rey Pagtakhan, National Chairman, United Council of Filipino Association in Canada;
Advisor, Phillipine Association of Manitoba.

WINNIPEG, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1983

10:00 A.M.

Mr. Vic Savino, Private Citizen,
Mr. Lucien Loiselle, Le Centre culturel franco-manitobain,
Mr. Rhéal Teffaine, La Fédération des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Inc.

2:00 P.M.

Rev. Bill Hutton, Private Citizen,
Mr. Ferdinand Guiboche, Private Citizen,
Mr. J.G. Russel, Private Citizen,
Mr. Guy Savoie, Fort Gibraltar et la Brigade de la Rivière Rouge,
Mr. Ivan Merritt, Private Citizen,
Dr. Joe Slogan, Tri Club of Winnipeg.

7:30 P.M.

Mr. Taib Soufi, Private Citizen,
Dr. Vedanand, National Association of Canadians of Origins in India,
Ms. S. Stephansson, Private Citizen,
Mr. Chandra, National Association for Canadians of Indian Origins,
Mr. Georges Forest, Union Nationale Métisse St. Joseph du Manitoba,
Mr. Barry Turnbull, Private Citizen,
Mr. Jim Robertson,
Town of Souris,
Mr. John M. Brooks,
Mayor A.R. Friesen, Town of Morden,
Reeve J.R. Guthrie, R.M. of Pipestone,
Mr. Ben Pemky,
Town of The Pas,
Submission received and signed from Swan River,
Mr. Jim Chegwin,
R.M. of Sifton,
Mme. Irène Lecomte (Ste. Rose, Manitoba),
Ms. Hélène Montsion, Comité culturel de Ste. Rose,
Mrs. Elvier Brunel,
R.M. of Shoal Lake,
Mr. Jim Reid, R.M. of Albert,
Reeve Arnold M. Birch, R.M. of Rosedale,
Mayor Ken Burgess, City of Brandon,
R.M. of Arthur,
Ms. Mariette Bosc Saquet (Laurier, Manitoba),
Mr. Jean-Louis Saquet,
Mr. René Saquet (Laurier, Manitoba),
Mr. Jacques Saquet (Wasagaming, Manitoba),
Reeve Norton E. Cassils, R.M. of Winchester,
Mr. Harry F. Robinson (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mayor M.J. Stefaniuk, Rapid City Town Council,
Ms. Marie-Joséphe Fisete, Fédération des aînés franco-manitobains,
Mr. Fablo Jajalla (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Manitoba Municipal Administrators Association,
Mr. Arno H. Jansen, United German School of North Kildonan,
Mr. Clarence Kiesman,
Irish Canadian National Committee,
Ms. Elsie Jawolik (Gimli, Manitoba),
LGD of Fisher,
Mr. Willie Dumont, Manitoba Metis Federation, Interlake Region,
Fred & Phyllis Ronge, (Matlock, Manitoba),
S.M. Taylor (Winnipeg, Manitoba),

Theresa & Alex Novak (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Brian Lange (Moosehorn, Manitoba),
Presentation signed by a number of Teachers
from Ecole St. Malo,
Ms. Doris Hogue (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
Mr. Gilbert Fournier, Chambre de Commerce,
Ms. Gisèle Loyer (Lorette, Manitoba),
Le Club de Bicolo,
Yvonne Lagassé (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Mr. Léo Nadeau,
Mr. Louis Fiola (Ste. Geneviève, Manitoba),
Ms. Carmen Catellier, Educateurs franco-
manitobains de la division de la Rivière Rouge,
Ms. Yvette Fluet-Gagnon (Ile-des-Chênes,
Manitoba),
Mr. Gilbert Legal, Ecole secondaire La Broquerie,
Mr. Hubert Balcaen,
Le Club de Curling de La Broquerie,
Ms. Jeannine Kirouac (La Broquerie, Manitoba),
Ms. Rachelle Ouellet,
Comité Culturel de La Broquerie,
Father Gérard Clavet, Clercs de Saint-Viateur
résidant à La Broquerie,
Mr. Pierre Palud, Professeurs du secondaire de
l'Ecole Pointe des Chênes,
Ms. Claudette Lavack,
Mr. Hubert Bouchard, Comité protecteur Scouts-
Guides Animatrices et animateurs de La
Broquerie,
Mr. Gilles Normandeau, Ecole Pointe des Chênes,
Mr. Armand Fréchette,
Mr. Léonard Deshamais, Chambre de Commerce
de St. Pierre,
Ms. Carmelle Gagnon, Ecole St. Joachim de La
Broquerie,
Mr. Normand Bamabé,
Mr. Aimé Gauthier, Comité de direction du centre
récréatif de St. Pierre,
Ms. Lyse Deshamais, Comité de parents de
l'Ecole élémentaire de St. Pierre,
Mr. Aimé Tétrault,
Comité de patinage artistique de La Broquerie,
Mme. Irma Gauthier,
Mr. Jacques Trudeau (Ile-des-Chênes, Manitoba),
Ms. Marjorie Beauchemin (Ile-des-Chênes,
Manitoba),
La ligue St. Gérard de La Broquerie,
Ms. Georgette Gérardy, Comité culturel de St.
Labre,
Ms. Raymonde Graham,
Soeur Thérèse Cloutier, (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Ms. Thérèse Bouchard,
Mr. André Flamondon,
Soeur Zélie Ruest,
Ms. Lucie Dupuis,
Denise & George Perron,
Lise & Roberte Boily,
Ms. Cécile Bérard,
Mrs. Sylvia McInnes (Ste. Anne, Manitoba),
Mrs. J.L. Asta Asselstine, World's Woman's
Christian Temperance Union,
LGD of Reynolds,
LGD of Stuartburn,
D. Nelson (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Ross Meggison (Goodlands, Manitoba),
R.M. of Morris,
Winnipeg Jewish Community Council/Canadian
Jewish Congress,

Supplementary Statement on Constitutional
Amendments by Manitoba Association for Rights
and Liberties,
Supplementary Submission by the Manitoba
Association for the Promotion of Ancestral
Languages,
Mr. Omer Fontaine (St. Pierre, Manitoba),
Mrs. Margaret B. Ladders (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Henry Elias (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. Ray Brunka (Winnipeg, Manitoba),
Mr. J.A. Knight (MacDonald, Manitoba),
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers,
Local Union 2034,
Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of
Winnipeg.

Your Committee met for further deliberation on
Monday, November 21 and Thursday, December 22,
1983. Your Committee has agreed to report as follows:

The Committee heard submissions from 305
delegations and received an additional 99 written
submissions.

The Committee has now completed its task and has
consulted with those Manitobans who expressed a
desire to be heard.

Your Committee was impressed with the interest
shown and analysis of the subject matter demonstrated
in many of the submissions. While there were a great
many more briefs which supported the government
proposal in principle than opposed it, a large number
of briefs noted specific areas of concern. While it may
not be easy for the government to find a middle ground
between conflicting views, it should seek to do so while
protecting the broader public interest. In your
Committee's view, a political resolution of Manitoba's
present constitutional difficulties (which difficulties flow,
in part, from the Supreme Court decisions in 1979 in
the Forest case and the Blaikie case) is preferable to
a court imposed solution.

Your Committee recommends that the Legislative
Assembly proceed with a Resolution to amend The
Manitoba Act. Your Committee also recommends that
consideration be given to an amendment to Section
23.1. It is recommended that the Assembly give
consideration to an amendment to Section 23.5 to make
it uniform with Section 23.4 so as to address concerns
expressed with the delay period for the re-enactment
of certain private and public municipal acts. Your
Committee further recommends that Section 23.7 of
the proposed resolution be reviewed so as to more
explicitly delineate the responsibilities of the Provincial
Government with respect to the provision of
communications and available services in English or
French and that a specific exclusion be provided with
respect to this section for all municipalities and school
boards.

Your Committee also recommends that consideration
be given to the addition of a further subsection similar
to Section 22 of The Constitution Act, 1982, which would
provide protection for customary rights or privileges
with respect to other languages.

MOTION presented and carried for Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House, moved by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, that the report of the committee be received.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Blake, Brown, Carroll, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 29, Nays, 24.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement I would like to now read to the Chamber.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the presence of the new Leader of the Official Opposition, the Member for Tuxedo sitting in his seat. I would like to, of course, welcome the honourable member and wish him, of course, many years of success as the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes this afternoon before we move onto other matters to make a statement about the top priority of this government, the top priority being that of the economy of Manitoba and jobs in Manitoba.

Two years ago when this government was elected, the economy was floundering. Manitoba jobs and population, where indeed the population was declining, thousands of people, Mr. Speaker, were being laid off with little or no warning, and generally the quality of life here was seriously undermined by acute protracted restraint.

Today, despite the lingering recession, this government, Mr. Speaker, by taking bold and innovative steps has worked with Manitobans to turn much of this around. The current indicators speak for themselves.

During the past two years the Manitoba economy has performed as well or better than most other provinces. Despite an international downturn, Manitobans are able to point to their unemployment rate - the second lowest in the country.

Manitoba's retail sales increase has led Western Canada.

Manitoba has suffered fewer bankruptcies than other provinces.

And Manitobans are able to say proudly that we have led Canada by way of increase in housing starts.

I can categorically state, Mr. Speaker, that this province's economic record is strong, is a successful one - one that has and will continue to build confidence in our province whether it be in agriculture, whether it be in the field of small business, whether it be in transportation, or whether it be the service industry.

I can also state, Mr. Speaker, that it has been hard work and a commitment to working together by Manitobans that has provided the basis for this success story.

A nowhere is that more evident than in the brief nine-month history of the Jobs Fund.

Manitoba has never been short of hard workers. But hard work alone is not enough. It has taken a government that is creative and imaginative in its approach to the economy. It has taken a government that is willing to take bold and new steps in order to put Manitobans back to work and to put pay cheques back into the pockets of Manitobans.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to say that we have been able to achieve much during the past few months.

The Jobs Fund has managed to achieve much of that which it sought to undertake. Designed to alleviate unemployment, to bolster our communities, the Jobs Fund has achieved its goals.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to tell the House that by mid-December, 1983, 15,600 Manitobans had worked in construction projects, in small businesses, on farms, in our industries, and that by the end of March, 1984, through other Jobs Fund efforts, such as the Manitoba Employment Action Program, such as grants to municipalities, such as the initiation of several large capital projects, more than 17,000 job opportunities will have been created for Manitobans.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was more than willing to allow for a reasonable amount of latitude, but our rule clearly states about Ministerial Statements that announcements of policies, new policies, are acceptable under our rules to be made. A simple description of success or failure or ongoing programs under an existing policy that has been announced on numerable occasions in this House hardly fits into the category for Ministerial Statements under our rules applying under these circumstances.

A MEMBER: Which number?

MR. H. ENNS: Rule No. 19(4): "A Minister of the Crown may make an announcement or statement of government policy . . ." This is not a new government policy. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if this is new government policy that he is now announcing, then we would all begin to listen. This Jobs Fund, this "fraud" fund policy has been with us for nine months. Mr. Speaker, I ask you to look at Rule No. 19(4).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point of order raised by the Opposition House Leader, certainly — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'll have difficulty dealing with the points raised by the Member for Sturgeon Creek, but if he's recognized I will.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the mechanism provided in our rules for Ministerial Statements has never been interpreted in this House to preclude progress reports on specific programs that the government is providing for the people of Manitoba. To suggest that would be a repudiation of the whole concept of Ministerial Statements.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, until we hear the full content of the Ministerial Statement we don't know whether or not it does contain new announcements as to the policies which flow from the report that the Premier is making to the people of Manitoba.

I submit on that ground, Mr. Speaker, that the objection by the Member for Lakeside be rejected, and that you await the completion of the Ministerial Statement to determine whether or not it is, as he suggests, only a progress report, which I submit is in order anyway, or contains additional policy statements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, to continue with the statement, in other words by mid-December . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It may have escaped my attention but was a ruling made on that particular point of order that was raised?

MR. SPEAKER: Though the House has not yet heard the balance of the Ministerial Statement it does seem to me that the Honourable First Minister is making a progress report. Perhaps honourable members would wish to hear that.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in other words by mid-December 215,795 work weeks have been created through the Jobs Fund. This means, Mr. Speaker, that 4,150 person years of employment have been generated and that 16,000 Manitobans have shared in that employment.

Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly an impressive record for any government today. I want to say unconditionally, Mr. Speaker, that I am proud of that record.

I'm also proud and gratified to know that this government was willing to try a dynamic new program in order to help alleviate the loss of self worth and the human indignity that is a by-product of unemployment in our society.

It's a tribute to all Manitobans that we worked together to make this program a success.

Through our concerted efforts more than \$138 million was contributed by other levels of government, the private sector and community organizations for the Jobs Fund projects. This money was in addition to the announced government commitment of \$210 million

for 1983-84. By working together we have not only put paycheques into the pockets of some 16,000 Manitobans but our communities have also been enhanced by creating important assets with long-term benefits in housing, community facilities, roads, and other permanent investments.

Together, Manitobans working together, building together, neighbour to neighbour have been able to insure that their youth are given jobs, and others are given the opportunity to share in the dignity that comes with work within Manitoba.

We've built new houses, new sewers, firehalls, community centres, started new educational facilities, new industrial facilities.

Manitobans can see where their money has been spent, where their investment has been undertaken. They can see their assets for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so vitally important in respect of so many projects undertaken by the Jobs Fund that this government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister is engaging in an election speech then we welcome it. If he wants an election we welcome it, but this is hardly a Ministerial Statement to be read at this time of the proceedings of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I regret that honourable members across the way are not anxious to hear a progress report, are not interested in hearing good news insofar as Manitobans are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, not all the funds - Mr. Speaker, I hear the Leader of the Opposition, I mean the former Leader of the Opposition shouting from the back row.

A MEMBER: I think you had it right the first time.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, nor did all money come from the Provincial Treasury.

Indeed, many of the projects were initiated by local people, by local councillors, by local community groups and organizations.

For example, in the South Central region, a region which is represented by the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Member for Gladstone, the Member for Pembina, each is familiar.

The Boissevain Village Council has contributed \$11,000, matched by another \$11,000 from the Jobs Fund to repair the arena roof in that community.

The same has happened in the Altamont area, the arena there, where the village council came up with \$7,000 to be matched by the Jobs Fund.

The Morden and District Community Organization thought enough of their community and the Jobs Fund to find \$37,500 to take advantage of the matching grant.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of other examples in the Municipal and Community Assets Program, in NEED, MEAP, Career Start, small business people, big business, service organizations and municipalities.

They've all responded and they've all responded enthusiastically to make the Jobs Fund work.

I'm proud to table this progress report.

Its numbers tell a story of people and those people are Manitobans.

The numbers tell a story of working Manitobans building a better Manitoba.

Those who want to quibble about numbers, about figures, can continue to do so. For my part, and for the part of my government it is our intention to continue to work, and to strive to make the Jobs Fund, to make the economy of Manitoba even better.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud, with this statement that I have just read, to table today a Jobs Fund Progress Report for the benefit of all members of this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. May I begin by lamenting the fact that the First Minister had to engage in this obvious exercise in public relations, which was not in any way an appropriate ministerial statement. Given the fact that we are entering into a new mini-Session and the First Minister obviously didn't have an opportunity for a Throne Speech full of smoke and mirrors and with an opportunity to try and make something that is not there, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this has been nothing more than a clear abuse of the rules and a clear abuse of what was intended in the form of ministerial statements in this House.

Having listened to the entire statement, it's clear that there were no new policy announcements contained within that statement. There was no attempt to inform the House about government policy, but rather just simply to try and indulge in an exercise of public relations to prop up the face and the fortunes of a sagging government. I say, Mr. Speaker, that although it has been permitted to happen as a result of the flaunting of the rules which this government seems to be happy to engage in all the time, members, I think, in the Chamber can understand why we arrive at the acrimonious debate that we do in the House when the government insists on being so careless and so casual about dealing with the matters of the House business as they should be. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this exercise that we've just gone through is one that is totally inappropriate for the situation today. This mini-Throne Speech that the First Minister has engaged in need not have occurred.

The First Minister has indicated to us that he thinks that the economy is of prime importance today in Manitoba and should be highlighted at the beginning of this Session that we are entering into or the continuation of this Session. It's odd that he didn't think the same thing when on the 12th of December he invited me to an urgent meeting with him in his office. The only matter that he wanted to discuss, that he felt was of urgent importance, was the French Language Services issue. That's all he wanted to discuss at that time.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I note from the Order Paper that there is no intention to discuss the economy or to engage into any debate or discussion or

consideration of the economy in this Session, that there is only one item of business that he wants to deal with. That is my understanding from the First Minister and the Government House Leader. Where is the economy in this material that's before us? Where is the concern for the jobs and for the people who are unemployed? Where is the No. 1 priority? Where has it been? It hasn't been anywhere, Mr. Speaker, because I suggest that this is a sham, a total sham. Like everything that this government is doing, it's a fraud, Mr. Speaker, and they won't be allowed to get away with it.

The First Minister talks blithely about how well-off everyone is, how people should be grateful to his government for the job that's being done by the "fraud" fund, for the wonderful policies that they put forward, and we have headlines before us on the 4th of January: "Record jobless number face Welfare. Big increase seen in Manitobans who have exhausted UIC benefits." That's the real testimony to the effect of this government. That is the real testimony, not this public relations statement that has just been released today by the First Minister.

The fact of the matter is that there are over 20,000 more unemployed in Manitoba today than were there when we left office in 1981. That's the fact that should be included in this report, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that this province is facing the largest deficit in its history. That's the fact that should be in this report, not what he has stated, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that we are facing the highest per capita debt in Canada in this province. That should be in this report, not what the First Minister has stated. All of these things don't appear anywhere in the report, because they're the truth, Mr. Speaker. They are the truth. That's why they are not in this report.

Mr. Speaker, we have no reference in the report to the fact that all of this money that is being diverted from line departments where it should have been put to use in needed infrastructure and needed projects on behalf of our province, all of this money that has been diverted into the Jobs Fund has resulted in various things happening. We now have in Manitoba a payroll tax, which was not there before this government was elected, the most damaging disincentive tax, the most damaging disincentive move towards job creation that has ever been seen in this province as a result of this government's action. That's what should be in this report, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that there hasn't been any particular job creation to speak of in this province other than on tax dollars, other than what came out of the hard earned tax dollars of all Manitobans to be spent on - what? - short-term, make-work projects that this government is so fond of, the grass cutting, the brush clearing and all of those things. Where is that in the report, Mr. Speaker? How about the advertising, over half-a-million dollars in advertising on the "fraud" fund already? How about that? Where is that shown in this report? Is that something this government is proud of?

How about the fraudulent diversion from one pocket to another to try and make it appear as though they are creating jobs when actually those jobs would have been created in the normal process of government spending, instead of this way where the departments who need the work to be done have to come cap in hand on bended knee and beg to have money added

to their budgets and beg to have that done, Mr. Speaker? Where is that in the report? I want to know.

How about the downgrading of our credit rating in Manitoba? Where is that in the report? That's very important and of great concern to Manitobans. That is part of the progress report that should have been in this report. I want to know where it is.

Mr. Speaker, where is the information about our health care system in a shambles? Why isn't it in the report? That's part of the responsibility of this government. They have to take the blame as well as the credit for all of the wrongful things that they've done in this province. Where is that in the report, I ask?

Mr. Speaker, the government takes great credit in saying that Manitoba has never been short of hard workers. That's true, but what credit is that to this government? This government has done nothing but discourage people, discourage initiative, discourage investment, discourage real job creation. That's all this government has done.

Mr. Speaker, where is the information in here about all the jobs that have been given, the political support positions to all of the people who have come here from Saskatchewan, all of the transients who have come here because they haven't been able to find employment in Saskatchewan and other provinces, who have come here to the haven of socialism so that they could be employed on the tax dollars, on the government payroll? Where is that information? I think that's what Manitobans are concerned about. I think that's what they would be interested to hear in this news report, in this progress report of this government. Those are the kinds of things - the hiring of all their political supporters - all that should be in this report, not about the fraudulent Jobs Fund and the make-work short-term projects that it's created and all of the things that Manitobans don't need.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if the First Minister is so proud of all of the accomplishments of his government in the past two years, that he needn't come to the Legislature with a fraudulent report to try and take false credit for it, all he needs to do is turn to the people and call an election.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a Ministerial Statement. The Clerk has copies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am both pleased and honoured to make a statement to the House today respecting the government's intention with regard to the Resolution to amend The Manitoba Act and to provide for French Language Services.

The Government will be introducing an amendment to the Resolution moved last summer by my colleague the Attorney-General. This amendment is part of a substantially different proposal to address this subject matter and I will be moving it at the earliest opportunity after the calling of Orders of the Day.

Members have already received notice of this amendment on Tuesday last of this week and in addition also received copies of a proposed bill respecting French Language Services. That bill is consequential to and flows directly from the amendment that I will be proposing. Members will note that it appears on Notice of Motion on the Order Paper for Monday next. For the benefit of all members the Clerk has further copies of both documents in both languages for distribution to members. Parenthetically I would ask honourable members on both sides and members of the gallery to note that the format of the proposed amendment now includes headings on the sections and a year change on the Proclamation citation.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, we thank the Minister for his statement on his intentions with respect to the French Language Services proposal. I question why this couldn't have been put in the Report of the Committee or couldn't have been considered beforehand. It's obvious from the process of events that the government has had great difficulty in arriving at a solution to the matter and through their own inept floundering have finally brought this to a position where it can be dealt with in the House, but it would have been much more preferable to have it dealt with by the committee prior to its reporting back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, as members of the House are aware of the unfortunate electrical flash mishap in the Norquay Building that claimed the life of Government Services' electrical technician, George Sedun, I would like to inform the House that since the time of the accident in the Norquay Building, trades and operating personnel in the Department of Government Services have been instructed verbally of mandatory safety practices and procedures. The safety precaution that will be strictly adhered to will ensure that personnel will not be allowed to work on energized equipment where the voltage limit exceeds 300 volts A.C. In such instances where the voltage limit exceeds 300 volts A.C. the power will be turned off, unless circumstances require otherwise.

The Department of Government Services has begun the development of an Accident Avoidance Program for all the trades and operating personnel in the department. A consultant will be retained to develop the program which will clearly set out in writing safe work procedures that will be mandatory for departmental personnel. The Accident Avoidance Program will include such points:

That the power supply be disconnected and locked out prior to any work being performed on or in proximity to any electrical equipment or installations;

That a standardized lockout and release procedure be established;

That allowable voltage limits not exceed 300 volts A.C. where it is necessary to perform work on energized equipment;

That all necessary safety precautions and procedures be followed and that all necessary protective equipment be supplied and used;

That training in safe work practices and procedures be conducted on a regular basis;

And the department will undertake all steps and actions within its control to prevent similar accidents from occurring in the future.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I want to thank the Minister for his report of that tragic accident and, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly do hope and pray that such similar accidents will not happen in the future. Our sympathy goes to the man's family and friends.

Thank you.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my left. We have a former member of this House, Mr. Len Shuttleworth. On behalf of all the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Also, prior to question period, I have a short statement for the House.

On Thursday, August 18th, the then Minister of Community Services rose in his place to object to words spoken in debate by the then Leader of the Opposition on the grounds that they were false. I took the matter under advisement in order to review Hansard and the words used. In reviewing the words used in Hansard, I found the dispute involved alleged prior knowledge by the Minister of the actions of certain officials of McKenzie Seeds. No question of order was invoked by the Minister. A careful reading of Hansard failed to reveal one. A question of order is defined in Beauchesne's Citation 80.(1) as "the interpretation to be put upon the rules of procedure . . ." In order to fully review the matter, I consulted various references to the matter in Hansard Numbers 81, 96A and 102A where, although some questions remain unanswered, it is clear that the Minister had some knowledge, however limited. Any dispute between the members therefore concerns the extent of the Minister's knowledge and is a matter for debate.

In summary, since no point of order was raised and none is evident, there is no matter on which the Chair is to decide.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health care system - hospitals

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of concerns that have been expressed recently by health care professionals in the province with respect to what has been called a crisis in our hospitals, will the hospitals in Manitoba be held to a 3 percent budgetary increase limit in 1984-85?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: First, in response to the question from the honourable member and Leader of the Opposition, we recognize that insofar as Canada as a whole the financing of health care, health care in general, is proceeding through a difficult time. In fact, just a few weeks ago I had the opportunity to be in the Province of Alberta and noted the imposition of user fees in the Province of Alberta. The same is happening in other parts of this country. We are indeed sensitive to the problems that do exist within the health care field in Manitoba, and in fact we, as a party, have consistently and persistently over the years stood in favour of a comprehensive universal system of Medicare in Manitoba as elsewhere in the province.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as financing is concerned, the health care institutions in the Province of Manitoba, that is a matter by which it is our view that health care institutions can work within a range of 3 percent and the Minister of Health will be quite pleased, I'm sure, to provide further particulars to the Leader of the Opposition pertaining to government intentions pertaining to health care financing in Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about government policy, not specific policy of the Department of Health.

In view of the fact that the inflation rate in the health care sector this coming year is likely to run at a minimum of about 6 percent, how does the First Minister and his government expect the hospitals to cope with this situation and to respond to his 3 percent limitation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: To the first, when the honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, makes reference to inflation probably he ought to be aware that grants to hospitals during the past three years in Manitoba have exceeded the rate of inflation by over 20 percent up to this point. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition ought also to be aware that inflation insofar as Manitoba is concerned has decreased from December, 1982, some 9.6 percent to an inflation rate November, 1983, of some 4.8 percent in the Province of Manitoba. It's a matter of projection at this point as to what the inflation rate will be during the 1984 period.

Mr. Speaker, this is a government that is sensitive to health care and, as I indicated before, unlike other parts of Canada where there are provincial Conservative administrations, we do not intend to impose per diem fees, user fees, other forms of fees that are deterrents to the assurance of proper health care within the provincial community. We do not intend to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Health is working very closely in examining the health care situation insofar as Manitoba is concerned, and we will be reviewing the needs of

the health care institutions very carefully in the period leading up to the preparation of Estimates and the tabling of Estimates in this Chamber for the upcoming fiscal year with sensitivity and with concern, at the same time recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that we have - and let there be no mistake about this - led the country by way of increased grants to health care institutions in the Province of Manitoba during the past three years, keeping that in mind by way of . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the First Minister about his intentions for the 1984-85 budget year. I'm not asking him for a review and a justification of the last three years. I appreciate his sensitivity and his concern, but we're not talking about the adequacy of the past. The question is: Is his government intent on limiting the increases in hospital expenditures to 3 percent when they will be facing in all likelihood an inflationary increase of about twice that amount? Is that his intention?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the new Leader of the Opposition is saying that there is a crisis in the funding of health care in Manitoba. He's absolutely wrong. There is a crisis only if there was - and always will be a crisis. I heard him distinctly say that in his opening remarks on the first question that there was a crisis. I will say that when the inflation was very high, the Government of the Day and the health critic now for the Conservative Party announced in the House a policy of a 2 percent increase for hospitals - 2 percent was announced. It was changed after; it was 2 percent.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just for the record, Mr. Speaker - and we'll get to this - but just for record, just to keep the Minister of Health honest, the announcement was not 2 percent, the announcement was 2.9. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Is the honourable member wishing to ask a question or is he rising on a point of order?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is a point of order, because I don't think it is accurate, I don't think it is fair, and I don't think it is ethical for the Minister of Health to rise in his place and put untruths and inaccuracies on the record in this debate. Let him answer correctly, truthfully and accurately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . glad that the honourable member is so adamant to say that it was 2.9. There was a correction that was made; 2.9 is still a little lower than 3 percent and you're making a big thing of 3 percent right now. I wonder when we're talking about

inflation of the 20 percent and we talk about the inflation now.

Mr. Speaker, furthermore under the new change of policy in the funding formula, this present government with this change in formula is going to lose \$700 million in the next five years. Now let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in the year when my friends were in government, looking at the amount of money received from government, there was actually a net reduction - and I'm not talking about inflation - in money, in sums of over \$16 million of their share of the Manitoba Government, not the total cost, in 1978-79.

Now we are talking about grants but prior to '77, the four western provinces, we started with third and end up No. 1 in the grants. Then in the four years they were there, they went down to third, and finally the last year they were fourth or last. Now we pull that to third and now to second.

I am not evading the question of 3 percent. The 3 percent was a guideline issued by the Commission. It is a serious guideline. We will have to look at the wages also that are being paid around here. The message is certainly, in answer to the question by the hospitals, you are there to be tough in your dealings, but it is not a government policy as yet. It is a guideline, and when we meet in the next Session to go over my Estimates, we will announce what it is. Right now, it's a guideline, the same guidelines that Cabinet and government is adopting all across the board.

We are asking, as the custom has been, for the hospitals to come back and tell us if they can't live with that. Many of them are making a real effort. They are doing well, and we'll look at it. I haven't even gone in front of Treasury Board yet for my Estimates, so it is not a policy. The policy is saying to the hospitals, the same as any other groups, it's time that you tighten the belt. We have been going up and up. We're losing money from the Federal Government. Our partners in the federal field are not paying their shot.

I might say also, Mr. Speaker, that we are the only province that are saying, go back to cost funding, 50 cents on a dollar. We are ready to pay our share, but we want the Federal Government to pay their share, and I will be discussing that with Mrs. Begin on Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to have asked a question of the First Minister that he wasn't able to answer, as to how he expects hospitals to live with a 3 percent increase when the inflation rate is double that.

So I'll ask him a question that I hope he can answer, because it comes directly from information that he published during the 1981 election campaign. You will recall the document entitled, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," the section on it, that document was signed by the present Premier. It is signed by Howard Pawley, so I assume that is a question that will be within the capability of the First Minister to answer.

Under the section entitled, "Health care, not cutbacks," the statement is made, "Health care is too important to be short-changed." Now how does that square with his intention to give increases at half the rate of inflation in this coming budget year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, regrettably the new Leader of the Opposition has not been listening to the responses by either the Minister of Health or myself, or he would not have gone to the effort of asking that question. He obviously did not hear the remarks and the response to the effect that the estimate process pertaining to health care is about to be proceeded with.

Let me assure the honourable member - in fact, I would like to assure all Manitobans - that this government, unlike many other Conservative Governments in other parts of this country, is committed to the importance and priority of health care within the Province of Manitoba. Let there be no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we are talking again about statements that the First Minister made. He has indicated - and I believe it's on the record. There have been letters sent out to all the hospitals, suggesting that their budgetary increases will have to be held to 3 percent when the health care sector inflation rate is anticipated to be 6 percent. How does that square with his statement that Manitoba New Democrats would, "restore the health care system"?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Tuxedo, Leader of the Opposition, has not apparently heard the comments that were made that, in fact, grants to hospitals during the past three years have exceeded the rate of inflation by over 20 percent. He has not heard that this government is not pursuing the kind of policy that is being pursued by some other Conservative administrations, indeed administrations much wealthier than the Province of Manitoba.

Here is a column from the Edmonton Journal, "Hospitals vote against user fees." Mr. Speaker, the answer has been clearly presented to the Leader of the Opposition . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that we are committed to health being maintained as a priority. There will be certainly the type of commitment that would be expected of a New Democratic Party Government in regard to the review of Estimates preparation for the next fiscal year. The inflation rate has decreased which means, Mr. Speaker, that we can certainly proceed with less grant increase than in previous years in order to ensure that the proper priorities and concerns of health care are looked after.

Let me assure honourable members and Manitobans that we would not introduce a user fee, as implied by the Honourable Member for Morris during a recent leadership convention that we viewed in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, let me also point out, and honourable members will not like to hear this, but this government did not hesitate to demonstrate commitment by the imposition of a levy insofar as health and post-secondary education is concerned in Manitoba in order to avoid the utilization of fees such as this in the province.

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, as the new House Leader, I just seek some guidance from you. Are we to carry on the tradition of long speeches in place of questions and answers, or how is this Session going to be called from your point of view, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the Opposition House Leader about the length of questions and answers. I would only caution that when a question is repetitive and asked to the same Minister, the Minister or Premier can only assume that the previous lengthy answer was inadequate, and the honourable member opposite wants more information.

MR. SPEAKER: To the same point of order, the Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition asked a direct question. I answered his question, told him that I had not even been in front of the Treasury Board, and that there was no government policy at this time, there's only a guideline from the Commission. He chose to ignore that, Mr. Speaker, he chose to ignore that and he's talking about the - he brought in this red herring talking about a commitment that was made, or a statement that was made during the election. Well all right, but let me say - if that's cutting down, that during that time in '77 there were \$253 spent and this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The discussion has varied somewhat from the point of order and I remind all members that questions should be short and concise and to the point, and the answers to them should also be short and concise and to the point.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will just confirm for the Government House Leader's benefit that indeed the answers that were given by the First Minister were inadequate and that was the reason for my continued questioning. I'm not optimistic that might change in the near future, Mr. Speaker.

I must say, by way of introduction to the question, that the fact that the Minister of Health insists on making statements that aren't quite true about the MHSC having given the order when the order came from the Minister of Finance to all public institutions and agencies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . was in a news release from Government Services. That's one of our problems, that

we can't get any straight information out of these Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I would hope that the new Leader of the Opposition would not like to set the example to his colleagues that the question period should be for other than asking questions. Perhaps he, and all other members, would confine their questions to questions and not to speeches.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question then for the Minister of Health is - have any of the hospitals indicated that they will have difficulty in meeting these guidelines and expressed concern to the Minister, or to MHSC, with respect to these guidelines?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Officially, as of this morning, the Commission had not heard from any hospital. I'm sure that they will have difficulty. I expressed that concern to my colleagues. But I am saying, and I'll repeat again, that there have been general guidelines all across Manitoba for all departments by the Minister of Finance. I stated that. I said that the hospitals were told by the Commission that the guidelines were 3 percent. If they can't live with it they'll have to show us, if they can't live to it, then we'll see.

In the meantime it's not going to be a futile exercise. We're not going to say don't worry about it. Maybe that's the way you'd like to see it but that's not the way we're going to do it. It's got to be an exercise; we've got to look at it; we've got to start to plateau the cost of health or we're going to lose the whole ball game.

You're talking about crisis, I'm willing to match Manitoba with any provinces in Canada, any country in the world. Then if there's a crisis there's a hell of a crisis all over the universe then.

Licensed Practical Nurses

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, another question for the Minister of Health.

The members on our side have been receiving letters from concerned licensed practical nurses and the question seems to be posed as to whether or not the government is intending to do away with LPNs in their restructuring of the health care system in Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd be very surprised if the letters would indicate that. Either that or somebody can't write or can't read. I think it was quite clear that I announced in this House that we were concerned about that and that we had a committee, that a Chair that would be nominated, chaired by Justice O'Sullivan who will look at the role of the LPNs, the role, at all the nurses and there'll be representation on this committee from different groups.

I think that we'll go even further to see if nurses in general, could play a more important part and maybe lower the overall cost of health care here in Manitoba. This is the kind of study that has to be done.

By the way I might say that in the restraint which my leader was talking, during the election, that we were not to cut down, that the first thing was that all the civil servants that went first when were all the research and planning. We didn't have any research, when we took over this department there was no research and planning at all. That is unbelievable when we talk about the difficulty and the problems that we are now facing that there would be no . . .

So those things will be addressed and there'll be some very tough decisions, I mentioned that. I would hope that our friends and the leader, well not only the leader but the health critic, will not try to be on every side of every issue. We won't let them. We'll challenge them to that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

Nursing Manpower - Standing Committee

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I might just ask the question. As the Minister of Health in righteous indignation beats his breast about what he's done in research and planning, what has he done about the Standing Committee on nursing Manpower. For example, just as one example of an initiative that was aborted by that Minister and that government. He can deal with that question when I . . .

Also to keep the record straight and honest, Mr. Speaker, don't let him get away with his figure of 2 percent corrected to 2.9 percent. It was 2.9 percent corrected to 4.5 percent and he knows it. Even that was low. It ultimately went to about 7.

Mr. Speaker, my question, Sir. Can the Minister of Health, Sir, who suddenly after months of inactivity, and insensitivity, and disinterest, or apparent disinterest seems to have been stung into action by virtue of the fact that the House was going back in today, and who held a press conference this morning to announce some things rather than announcing them in the House - but I'm not going to make an issue of that, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister, Mr. Speaker, tell this House how many of Manitoba's '84 or '85 budget hospitals came in over budget, or came in with a deficit in 1982-83? That is the last fiscal year, not the current one, but in '82-83. He'll know that because all those figures will have been compiled.

I asked the question during the Estimates and at that time got some projections, and some thoughts, and some speculation. Now he'll have the answer. How many of those hospitals came in with deficits at the end of '82-'83?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll try to go by order about the statements and the questions, and so on.

First of all beating by breast. I might say that for two years he didn't do any criticism at all. All of sudden he blew the leadership thing and now he's going to find out and fight with Epp to see who's going to be the national Minister of Health. He's not going to get

away with it on my back. If I'm indignant, it is because of the untrue and uncalled-for remarks that he made, Mr. Speaker, after reading something in the paper that he thought there's my chance, I'm going to bugger up this Epp. I might say that he has the nerve to come here and say these kind of things.

Now, as far as the nurses, that committee that he's talking about, there's no shortage of nurses. There is a shortage of different kinds of nurses. — (Interjection) — You asked me the question because you didn't know. Let me answer the damn question. There's no shortage of nurses as such, there's a shortage of specialized nurses. That's where the problem is. And there is a shortage of specialized nurses not because of underfunding, because it is difficult to get these type of people. It is a very hard demanding job to be in intensive care, for instance. This is being addressed right now, so it's not a question of cancelling any program.

Now, as far as - I'll get this information, I don't happen to have it at this time, I didn't know we were going into my Estimates today, Mr. Speaker. Now, my older friend, if he thinks I'm indignant, as I've said, he's been mostly unfair. For somebody, not too long ago, criticizing us because we were going ahead and allowing the Health Sciences Centre to perform open heart surgery. A couple of days ago he was damning us and saying that people were dying because of us. That takes a hell of a lot of nerve, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't been in this House as long as the Minister of Health, but I've been in for a few years and I've seen him in action for a long time in this House. I know precisely the way he operates when he's cornered. I know that precisely, so I'm not concerned . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Let's say, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member's question.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . that I know exactly how he operates when he is surrounded; let's put it that way. He's going to evade the questions. He's going to try to turn them around.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But, Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with his Estimates; we are dealing with conditions in the health care system today and with what was debated in this House last year relative to his Estimates last year in terms of the funding and the budgetary provisions made available to hospitals in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister whether he can advise this House - and I would ask him to consider carefully his answers because I intend to follow this theme up on subsequent questions on subsequent days - whether his officials from his office, from his department, or from the Manitoba Health Services Commission are intervening in any way in the budgetary

and programming decisions of hospitals in this province, and in particular in the budgetary and programming decisions, the global budgetary and programming decisions, of the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface Hospital?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I get so nervous when I'm cornered. At least I don't go in circles, I'm on every side of every issue.

One minute he's in favour of closing obstetrical beds when the college is for it and then the next day being against it - every day. You know, I can't corner him, he's got every issue covered. He's on every side of every issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if he's talking about interference, no. There's no such thing as interference from any of my staff that I know of. If there are discussions, that's the role of the Commission; that, he should know. The Commission is continually speaking and is asked questions by the members of the hospitals and they have to go along with the money that they have because all the funding comes from the Commission; therefore, no hospitals have any authority to go over their budget or to go along when they haven't got the funds. I want to make sure that my honourable friend understands. So far as I know, there has not been any interference.

We've had a lot of lobbying in the past by the deliverer of health care that the government, any government, that don't have enough information or enough knowledge and the experts have decided, so we went to block funding. We went to block funding when I was chairman of the Commission. Now, all of a sudden, we don't hear about some of the boards and we're looking very seriously to see if we need all those boards. Because if we're going to catch all hell whenever there is something wrong, and if the boards do not want to take their responsibility we'll have to think that over again. Now, block funding is just that. The same as I go to Cabinet, and I'll argue to get as much as possible, and once I'm told that's it, get the heck out, I have to live with that. The Commission has to do the same thing, then the different boards and hospitals have to do the same thing. Managing a hospital properly is their responsibility.

Brandon University - firing of President

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pose my question to the First Minister. But first of all, Mr. Speaker, if you allow me, I find it intriguing when the government has spent so much time on the economy problem that they had so much time to view the P.C. leadership race. I thought they were so hard at work through the fall period.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the First Minister if I could, in view of the petitions signed by 1,500 Brandon residents . . . — (Interjection) —

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

MR. C. MANNES: . . . in December and now the decision made by Brandon City Council, will the

government consent to the wishes of the Brandon community and launch a judicial inquiry into the firing of Brandon University President, Dr. Harold Perkins?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I must say that in respect to the preamble of the honourable member's comments that I do enjoy watching circuses, particularly when there are lots of tricks being played in circuses.

Mr. Speaker, this government operates on the basis that I believe every other previous provincial administration in Manitoba has operated upon, and I would think every other provincial government in the country, that the affairs of universities, the management affairs of universities, can be best handled by the boards of directors of the universities.

Mr. Speaker, the concern that honourable members in this Chamber, and I believe the vast majority of Manitobans would have in respect to this issue is strictly the question of whether or not the standard and quality of education has been affected insofar as the students are concerned at Brandon University. It is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of boards of directors and individuals consisting of the boards of directors. It is not a matter pertaining to the involvement of local government. It's a matter of the welfare of students, Mr. Speaker, and the challenge is for any honourable members to demonstrate any decline by way of faculty or by way of students of declining universities. My understanding, for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Morris who may not have received this information, that the Faculties of Education, Arts and Science have all overwhelmingly supported the decision that was made by the Board of Directors of Brandon University.

MR. C. MANNES: A supplementary question to the First Minister. Can the government give the taxpayers of Manitoba and Brandon assurance that if Dr. Perkins is successful in his legal suit claiming \$500,000, as he is, for wrongful dismissal that collectively the taxpayers of Manitoba will be saved from this settlement and that instead the Brandon University Board of Governors will be held personally liable for the unwarranted firing and therefore responsible for the payment of this claim?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The remarks of the honourable member were, in fact, a hypothesis and not a question. Would he be prepared to reword his question so that it is a question?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I then ask the First Minister if he would save harmless the people of Manitoba from the payment of this claim?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any claim having been filed within the court system of the Province of Manitoba, so I know not what the honourable member is referring to. — (Interjection) —

Bilingualism - proposed resolution

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood. Order please, order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Given that the Provincial Government has no mandate to proceed with its provincial bilingual resolution and given that 78 percent of Manitobans who voted in the municipal plebiscites, some 175,000 citizens voted against the government's proposals, and given that the New Democratic Party has always prided itself in being democratic and listening to the people and representing the people, will the First Minister allow members of his caucus to cast a free vote on this legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the particular resolution will be delighted to deal with that, except I want to comment that I'm somewhat surprised at the honourable member talking about the province becoming officially bilingual because in 1980, April 16, when the then government, the Conservative Government of Manitoba, introduced legislation to this Chamber the honourable member got up in his place and said from this point on we will become officially bilingual. So it appears the honourable member has had a change of heart or mind since 1980 as to whether Manitoba is officially bilingual. With that background I would ask the honourable member to comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In further reply to the Member for Elmwood, I think perhaps the shortest reply would be the most appropriate one in the circumstances, and that is to say that in view of the strong commitment of the government and every single member of the caucus on this side of the House, the question is irrelevant. All of the members on this side stand strongly behind the government resolution.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: A supplementary question to the First Minister. In lieu of a free vote, will the First Minister allow his MLAs to leave the country?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The honourable member will have to repeat his question because his question was drowned out by honourable members across the way, so I did not hear the question. The honourable member will have to repeat it.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister was in lieu of a free vote will the First Minister allow his MLAs to leave the country?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me — (Interjection) — Yes, we will grant leave for one of our honourable members, Mr. Speaker, if a request is made.

MR. R. DOERN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister confirm that the Honourable Member for St. Johns has fled the province and the country for a number of weeks?

HON. R. PENNER: That question is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Elmwood will realize that his question is not in order as it has to do with the presence of a member who is not within the administrative competence of this government.

French Language Services

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Government House Leader. On the 3rd of January, Tuesday of this week, I wrote to the Honourable Government House Leader requesting copies of the government's legal opinions on the proposal that is before us with respect to French Language Services. Will the Minister be providing me with copies of those legal opinions and, if so, when?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did appreciate the Opposition House Leader having given me notice of his request two days ago and I do have copies of a legal opinion from the government's Counsel of Record with regard to the Bilodeau case. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important because of the significance of both the legal opinion, both in terms of the significance that the Leader of the Opposition has attached to it in recent days and to its significance in terms of the issue before the House, that I would like, upon distribution of it, to read it into the record.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The time for ministerial statements has passed and since we are rapidly approaching the end of question period I would think that the matter should be raised and leave requested, if necessary, after the end of question period.

Industrial Building permits

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister after his glowing report on the economy of the province. Can the First Minister confirm the report of December 28th of Statistics Canada that the industrial building permits in this province are down \$9 million? They were 26.7 million at the end of October 1982, and this year industrial building permits are 17.3

million which is a 35 percent decrease over last year - a \$9 million difference - a 35 percent decrease in industrial building permits. Can the First Minister explain that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice but quite related - and the honourable member will be pleased I'm sure to hear this information - real capital spending projection, as projected by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion insofar as industrial capital expansion, indicates that Manitoba be the one of two provinces only that will increase capital spending by way of projection in 1984. Eight provinces will suffer decline by way of capital spending increases in Canada. Manitoba is one of two provinces that will, according to these projections, demonstrate an expansion insofar as the 250 largest industrial firms in Canada are concerned. I think we can all take some satisfaction that Manitoba will be leading the way according to that projection.

Manitoba Products decline

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The First Minister gives statistics of total capital investment. Total private investment is down in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder if the First Minister could explain the December 21st Statistics Canada figures on shipments of manufactured products by origin of province. The Province of Manitoba is down 1.7 percent, ninth in Canada. The only one that the Province of Manitoba is ahead of is Newfoundland. Can the Minister explain, with all of this great economy, why the manufacturing of Manitoba shipments are down, ninth in Canada?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would be glad to take that question as notice, and would be delighted to acquaint the honourable member with a full comprehensive report as to statistical analysis, as to increases by way of various economic indicators.

I am pleased, because this is a government, Mr. Speaker, of doers and not knockers - we prefer to be the doers - that we have improved our economic performance by way of economic indicators to first, second, third or fourth or fifth in Canada, unlike No. 10, No. 9, No. 8, No. 7, when the honourable member who just asked the question was the Minister of Economic Development in the Province of Manitoba. That has been the shift that has taken place.

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

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, that under Rule 27, the ordinary business of the House be set aside to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the deterioration in recent months of the health care system of this province as alleged by media, many private citizens, and many health care professionals.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I take it the member is not moving the last four or five lines of this printed motion that I have received?

Order please. In accordance with our Rule 27, the honourable member has five minutes to make the case that the matter is indeed of urgent public importance. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that my obligation is to speak to the urgency of debate of this matter, and it's certainly my intention to do so. I think there is no argument about the urgency of the issue, the importance of the topic, but I appreciate the constraints of the rules of the House. I intend to utilize my time to try to impress upon the House, Sir, and on you and on all present the fact that it is of utmost urgency and importance that we deal at the present time with the subject of the health care system of this province and the kinds of things that have been said about it recently - not by me, Sir, I hasten to point out to the Minister of Health, not in partisan debate I hasten to point out to him. I make reference to a specific comment in his statement of this morning in which he referred to partisan debate - but by media in this province, by many private citizens in this province, and by many distinguished and knowledgeable health care professionals in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister delivered himself of a long apologia at a press conference this morning which fails to deal with the urgency of the issue, which is at the point of my remarks, and the substance and subject of my few moments of address this afternoon.

The urgency of this matter rests in the fact, Sir, that this House will prorogue as soon as the French language resolution is disposed of. We are, as all members know - I certainly don't need to re-acquaint the Chair - in the resumption of a Session, in what in effect is the dying or concluding phase of a Session, not the initiation of a Session. We will be proroguing, according to an agreement made between the two parties five months ago, as soon as the French language resolution issue is resolved. Therefore, Sir, we will not have an opportunity, except under rules of this kind, rules permitting emergency debate, to deal with this particular issue. The House is not likely - I understand from the Government House Leader and others - to reassemble much before March. It may be two or two-and-a-half months from now.

Further, Sir, I ask the question: If this matter is not urgent, why did the Honourable Minister of Health call a press conference on it this morning? Why did he deem it necessary and desirable to assemble the press, the media gallery members this morning, and to deliver a statement to them something in the length of 14 or 15 pages in response to the kinds of accusations that have been levelled against him and the health care system recently. He must think it is an urgent matter.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with a view to the clock and the time constraints, I submit, Sir, that a final and perhaps the most compelling aspect of urgency where this issue is concerned rests in the degree to which public confidence has been shaken in some of our finest and most prestigious health care facilities in this province, not through any fault on their part, not through any mismanagement or fault on their own, but simply because of the neglect of that government opposite, the failure of that government opposite to recognize two years ago and longer what was happening in terms

of the encroaching problems, the encroaching showdown, the approaching crisis, if you like, for the Canadian universally-insured health care system.

Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely urgent, Sir, that this breach in public confidence be repaired as quickly as possible. It must be repaired as quickly as possible in the interests of the well-being, the safety, the security and the peace of mind of our citizens. It can only be repaired by leadership from the government and from the Minister of Health today which demonstrates to the public and those institutions that he is moving to address the problems that are assailing the system. Short of that, Sir, that public confidence cannot be restored. If it isn't restored, it will be tragic for the peace of mind of the citizens and the health of the citizens of our province. That, Sir, is the urgency of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader also has five minutes to speak to the matter.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not choose to address the matter itself since that is forbidden by the rules as suggested by the Member for Fort Garry, but more appropriately the question first of all of whether or not it is urgent that the debate take place because, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Beauschesne's Citation 285, 5th Edition, provides that there must be urgency - sorry, 287, Mr. Speaker - 'Urgency' within this rule does not apply to the matter itself . . . "which I appreciate the Member for Fort Garry feels is urgent. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that he has not made the case that there is urgency for debate first of all.

Mr. Speaker, as well the member suggests that there is no specific time appointed for the debate, and made reference to an agreement amongst members and the two House Leaders this past summer. Mr. Speaker, certainly the agreement between members makes no reference to prorogation after dealing with one specific issue. I would certainly agree with the honourable member opposite that there is no specific time appointed in the balance of this Session for the debate he proposes, but certainly there is no obligation on the House or on you, Mr. Speaker, or on the Attorney-General to call for prorogation after dealing with one specific item.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the other requirements that must be met, certainly it is clear that the whole question of the health care system in this province in terms of the current fiscal year was addressed comprehensively, as members demonstrated during question period, during the Estimates process earlier in this Session.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Similarly, as the Minister pointed out during question period today, there will be full opportunity to discuss funding for the future with regard to the Estimates for next year, which appeared to be part of the concern. But, Mr. Speaker, more importantly I think, the motion purports to raise in the House something which members opposite are obliged to factually determine before they bring it to the attention of the House. Beauschesne provides, Mr. Speaker, that

members are required to ascertain the truth of statements they bring to the House. Mr. Speaker, the motion — (Interjection) — I'm hearing something from the cheap seats, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by the Member for Fort Garry clearly suggests that the purpose of this debate, he proposes, is to deal with allegations in the media. Mr. Speaker, that's hypothetical. The member has offered no evidence in his motion or in his remarks as to the accuracy or truthfulness of these statements. Under our rules, Mr. Speaker, in debate at any time, he is required to ascertain the accuracy of statements he brings to the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, No. 1, the member has offered absolutely no evidence of the need for urgent debate, even though he may consider and I'm sure members on this side would agree the matter is of urgent importance. There's no question the matter is a very important matter, but certainly there has been no evidence provided by the Member for Fort Garry that the need for debate is urgent.

Secondly, the member's motion fails because it tries to bring to the attention of the House allegations that the member has chosen not to substantiate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Our Rule 27(3) requires that the motion be ". . . in order and of urgent public importance." There is also under 23(5) the requirements to be met. Under 27(1), there are from (a) to (f). I cannot see that the motion is contrary to any of those.

One particular point that's always kept in mind when judging on matters of urgent public importance is the reasonable opportunity for further debate. That matter has not been put clearly to the House, that there is in fact a clear opportunity for members to have that debate. Therefore, I will ask the House to make that decision.

The question then before the House is: shall the debate proceed? Those in favour, please say aye. Those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it. I declare the motion carried.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is, shall the debate proceed.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Blake, Brown, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak,

Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23; Nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Attorney-General at the top of Page 2, currently adjourned in the name of the Member for Minnedosa?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the constitutional resolution regarding languages, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After such a lengthy recess, it's difficult to get back into the reason that we have been called back to finish what is one of the longest Sessions in Manitoba's history.

So I suppose, Mr. Speaker, in addition to welcoming back all of the members to this Session, I take the opportunity to wish you health and happiness in the new year, Mr. Speaker and to colleagues on this side of the House. To the members on the opposite benches, I can wish health, but I'm sure they are not going to experience too much happiness in the year ahead with the way their leader is taking them headlong from crisis to crisis and one problem to another with the people of Manitoba.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear the Minister of Government Services announce that they had a new Accident Avoidance Program in place, because I'm sure his leader will be happy with that. It may avoid some of the rather headlong blunders that they have made in the past Session.

Mr. Speaker, I would too welcome my new leader to the front bench on this side of the House. Also to the new Cabinet Ministers that have been appointed since we last met, I will extend to them my deepest sympathies.

Mr. Speaker, we are back in Session now supposedly to receive a report of a committee that was a standing committee, but it was instructed to report back to the people of Manitoba after hearings around the province to ostensibly hear what the people of Manitoba thought about the government's proposed amending resolution in connection with The Manitoba Act and the French language problem.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't able to attend all of the hearings, but I sat in on several of the committee meetings, and was officially on the committee for the representations that were heard in the western part of the province,

and was impressed by the quality and calibre of people and the concern that people expressed when they appeared before that committee. After hearing some - well we heard the figures today - 300-and-some-odd presentations, Mr. Speaker, and 99 written submissions of people that waited for sometimes one and two days and longer in the City of Winnipeg and were unable to get on and be heard at the hearings, we felt that the government had gotten a pretty good insight into the feelings of the people of Manitoba in connection with their proposed legislation.

But when the committee was finally called back to sit, Mr. Speaker, they were presented with a report. There was about one page and a quarter, saying that they had observed with some appreciation and respect for the submissions that they heard, but in effect they weren't going to be pay any attention to them. It was nice of the people to take the time to appear before the committee and express their views very strongly in opposition to what the government was doing, but they weren't going to pay any attention to that at all.

That is very difficult to understand, Mr. Speaker, in view of the election promises that were made about, this is a government that cares and this is a government that listens, and we want to have the concerns and the input of the people before we forge ahead with any new thrust or any new legislation. So it was absolutely with disbelief that we realized they had a report of about a page and a quarter.

So, Mr. Speaker, those members of this side of the House that were on the committee were naturally concerned, and felt that the report should contain a little more than a page of next to nothing that was what the Chairman of the committee proposed. So there was a minority report submitted to that committee, Mr. Speaker, and it was consequently voted down when the members of this side of the House tried to have it attached as a minority report. So I want to just read that into the record, Mr. Speaker, so that we do have it on file.

It's moved that the Report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "submissions" in the sixth line thereof and substituting thereafter the following.

That's the normal motion to put an appendix on a committee report. Your committee has taken into consideration the many briefs that were presented at the hearings after . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to interrupt the remarks of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, but I think it should be brought to the House's attention first of all that in this Assembly there is no such thing as minority reports and the suggestion that there was a minority report, he might not want to leave that impression on the record; and secondly, since minority reports have not been considered in order in this House, in fact are specifically forbidden in our rules, although I have no objection to the member reading into the record the proposed amendment moved by his new leader, I think it would not be appropriate then

to describe it as something which our rules forbid it to be.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that. They can call it an amendment or whatever they wish, but it was just about as long as the report that was written. Your committee has taken into consideration the many briefs that were presented at the hearings. After listening to the delegations which appeared and considering all briefs submitted, your committee has come to the conclusion that in the best interests of all of the people of Manitoba the constitutional amendment to Section 23 should not proceed. Your committee cannot make its report without reference to the plebiscites held on this question by the City of Winnipeg in various municipalities on October 26th, 1983.

The results of the Winnipeg plebiscite indicated that 76 percent of those voting were opposed to the government proceeding with an entrenchment amendment. The combined results of the plebiscite indicate that well over three-quarters of the people of Manitoba who voted want the amendments to Section 23 withdrawn.

Your committee is therefore unable to recommend proceeding with the entrenched amendment. The people of Manitoba simply do not want this amendment. To force it on them would undoubtedly result in further acrimony and divisiveness.

Since your committee last met, the government has announced on December 15, 1983 further substantive amendments to the original proposal submitted to this committee and which set of amendments are attached hereto as Schedule A.

With respect to this new proposal your committee has come to the further conclusion that this is not in the public interest to adopt it.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's the end of the committee report that I wanted to read into the record that was voted down in committee. But after hearing all of those briefs, this report, short and concise as it is, expresses the views of those people who appeared and took time to appear before the committee, in far, far broader terms than anything that the original report submitted.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely astounded. I don't know where the members opposite are. If they take time to walk through their constituencies, and the Member for Dauphin has got to be a prime example, if he walks through his constituency and talks to his constituents and checks with the voters and checks their reaction, he has got to be astounded by what his government is doing. Either that or he's completely out of touch with reality.

This government has got this cancerous sore that they would love to see go away, and it's not going to go away, Mr. Speaker. They're stuck with it. They were bundled into it by the Attorney-General, and God-knows-what arrangement he made in Ottawa with Trudeau and his friends and the SFM. There has been an arrangement there, and we don't know where the carrot is, Mr. Speaker. We think there's a carrot somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, if these people opposite want to continually blunder on in the face of the opposition

that is out there to what they are trying to do, it's just unbelievable. The open-line shows, Mr. Speaker, their own members - and I can go on if I have to use up my 40 minutes - I can quote from Rev. Hutton, who was a former president in the NDP Party; Herb Schulz, who was almost a founding member, who they have just thrown out of the party; from the Honourable Member for Elmwood, who is sitting over here now, they've tossed him out because he has views that are contrary to theirs; these people know where it's at, Mr. Speaker. They are out there where they get a feel for what the people think and what the people want, and they don't want entrenchment.

Mr. Speaker, last May, when we first heard of this so-called arrangement or this deal that had been made after a year in consultation with the feds and the SFM and Mr. Bilodeau, apparently they hammered together this proposition that was presented to us sometime later. The Attorney-General, the Member for Fort Rouge, presented this to us, and after some question he said no, that's it; we're not going to change it; that's the deal. It took us a long time to make it; it's a fair deal; we're not going to change one comma. "I don't care a jot or tittle", he says, "we're not going to change it".

Well, it was funny to observe, Mr. Speaker, sometime later, in July, there were some more amendments, in September there were more and today we get another whole raft of amendments and the explanations of what this is going to mean and what that's going to mean brought to our desk. December 12th, December 15th we got more. It's very difficult to keep up with all this paperwork, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how the members opposite are doing it.

The First Minister, of course, has got such a grasp for this and understands it so thoroughly that he is pushing this thing through. In fact, he's appointed one of his senior Ministers now to pilot this through the House, because apparently his other senior Minister bollixed it so badly that now we have a new freshman that's going to take this knotty, thorny problem and lay it to rest because he has just waved his magic wand, Mr. Speaker, and said a few magic words and everything is going to smoothly flow through the Chamber and within 48 hours we'll have this all wrapped up and we'll be out of here.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid he's going to have a bit of shock in store for him, because our opposition has always been to the entrenchment. English and French are not the official languages of Manitoba. After 113 years I don't think there have really been any problems created. They've been able to put out driver's licences in both languages and various other things. There hasn't been a problem. There has been no need for entrenchment for that. No one, Mr. Speaker, has promoted the expansion of French Language Services better than our government when we were on the government benches from 1977-81.

So just why the government have handled this so badly, Mr. Speaker, leaves us, on this side of the House, wondering just where they're getting their information from or where they've been seeking advice. They certainly haven't been listening to the people of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the grassroots. — (Interjection) — The House Leader says they certainly have been listening to the Union of Manitoba

Municipalities, Mr. Speaker. Now he is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and supposedly represents their views, and how he can sit there and say he's listening to them. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether he's going to get it or the Premier's going to get it, but another petition signed by many thousands of Manitobans, if he hasn't already got it - there are more and more and more. The feeling out there, Mr. Speaker, is extremely strong.

This resolution has created divisiveness such as we haven't seen in this country for years and years and years. All those old wounds have healed and have been put to rest. This has done nothing but bring them forward, Mr. Speaker.

It was mentioned earlier that we've been adjourned now for about four months. We're back in here for goodness knows how long on this particular resolution when there are extremely important things to be discussed, Mr. Speaker. The economy is not well. As has been mentioned today, the health care system from all reports is falling apart as people are having difficulty getting beds. Brandon University, my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell mentions, goodness knows that needs some attention. Maybe the Member for Brandon East will address that when he gets up to speak. The farm bankruptcies, our agricultural community is having tremendous problems, Mr. Speaker.

But for the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, they ran forth a great flourishing list today of how wonderful it is. That is to just take the attention away from the problem that's at hand, Mr. Speaker, that things are in a mess in Manitoba. They ferret out \$20 million from Highways and \$7 million out of Natural Resources, and fund it all together. All the members are going to get up and object that I'm straying from the subject, Mr. Speaker, but I'll get back on it very shortly.

The health care costs, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could be probably helped in some way if we looked at some of the government waste, some of the cost of this resolution that we're discussing now, not only the cost of what has been imposed on the Treasury to date, but what it's going to cost down the road. That's a concern of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, Mr. Speaker. There is nobody who can come up with an estimate of what this is going to cost. It's going to be astronomical. That would assist the health care system. It would assist some of our farmers, instead of the little band-aid program. Interest rate relief certainly was a bit of a help. It's paid out a couple of thousand dollars to the odd farmer, but a farmer that's in trouble, Mr. Speaker, that's just been a band-aid help to him. It's not really going to help him that much. So there are a lot more pressing issues that this government could tie right into, instead of fiddling around and wasting all of the members time and creating the divisiveness — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Speaker, the Member from Government Services says, we're wasting time.

They are the ones that brought this resolution in. It was never mentioned during the election campaign. They have no mandate to do it. I would like to see them table this, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see them table this legislation and then call an election, and go to the people and campaign on this resolution. I would just like to see that happen. Then they would get the message loud and clear. I'm convinced that they are

going to get it whenever they do have the courage to call an election anyway, Mr. Speaker, because then they're going to realize that what we have been telling them isn't just conjured up. It's facts. You get out there and talk to the people. It is a feeling that I haven't seen in my years in politics.

The Member for Thompson wouldn't understand because he hasn't quite got his apprenticeship in yet in politics, but he'll find out when he goes campaigning next election, let me tell you. He's a one-termer, the same as a few more of them. I had mentioned earlier, the Member for Dauphin has got to be worried about the feeling in his constituency. It's great to have party solidarity, but when they're leading you to the slaughter, Mr. Speaker, I think it's time for members opposite to stand up and really object to the direction that their so-called leader has been taking them.

Mr. Speaker, the article in the Brandon Sun, "Would NDP foresee smooth French sailing." Well, I don't know where the headline came from, but it's quoting the new House Leader, that Minister that's going to pilot this legislation through the House in a smooth manner. Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

Part of the reason for the whole exercise that we're going through, of course, is to forestall Mr. Bilodeau from proceeding to the Supreme Court with his case. The Attorney-General said that his case had been postponed indefinitely in May when he introduced the legislation. Mr. Bilodeau says now, if you guys don't pass it by the 15th of January, I'm going to the Supreme Court anyway — (Interjection) — well, it was December 31st originally, but he gave them two weeks' grace. I can assure members opposite that we're going to be here on January 15th. Mr. Bilodeau will probably proceed to the Supreme Court, and let the ruling that would have been far more favourable had he proceeded in the first case than it's going to be now after this government has fiddled around and screwed up this problem so badly that now they've probably got the Supreme Court even mixed up. And we don't have a Manitoban on the bench down there.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes we do. What do you think Justice Dickson is?

MR. D. BLAKE: Well he's from Manitoba. I stand corrected. The Attorney-General is far more learned in the law, Sir, than I am. I had never heard of Mr. Dickson, so I congratulate him on being appointed from Manitoba — (Interjection) — he hadn't heard of me either, so we're even. I hope that he has Manitoba's interest at heart when Mr. Bilodeau gets his case before him, because he's going to have his hands full trying to settle this thorny problem.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and quote many of the fine people that appeared before the committee, giving this government some direction, telling them how ridiculous they were, how preposterous the amendment was. But that is not going to serve any purpose, Mr. Speaker, because the Minister who is piloting this thing through wants to get this resolution onto the floor so that it can be debated. So I would just be belabouring the fact if I read him back many of the quotes that I'm sure he's aware of from members of his own party and from strong supporters who have told the government

the ridiculous path that they're on, the shock that it's going to be to Manitobans if they continue and force this thing through. So if they're going to force it through, we can't do too much about it.

Mr. Speaker, they tell me, the cameras have gone. That's one thing that really doesn't bother us on this side of the House too much, because we don't rely on that. We go out and talk to the people. We don't rely on the electric media to get our message across. We don't rely on the electric media or the print. We go out and talk to the people and say to them, now how really should I handle this French problem? How do you want me to vote?

I don't want to get onto seat belts, because these two issues, Mr. Speaker, over the holidays is what I really got more than - I've been in politics for 12 years, and I have never been bombarded by so many people with two items such as this. I just warn the members opposite to tread lightly. If they want to withdraw this, we can probably wrap this Session up very quickly, then in another year or so when they're ready for an election, if they get ready, put this on the table and say, this is what we're campaigning on. We are going to entrench the French language. We're going to settle the problem in Brandon University, and let's go. I will tell you, there are two seats in Brandon West gone and Brandon East is gone plus half the seats in Winnipeg that aren't held now by us will be gone.

So make up their mind, Mr. Speaker. They can make up their mind. They can withdraw it and we'll wrap the Session up or they can introduce their new bill and we'll take it from there.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to participate for the first time in this debate on this particular question. Before I begin my remarks though, I would like to join with other members in offering my congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition on his recent election as leader of members opposite. I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate him for the courage that he has demonstrated in taking away from the Member for Charleswood the responsibility for being official opposition critic on this issue. I think that has taken a lot of courage, and I think assuming that responsibility himself demonstrates a willingness to grasp the mettle, so to speak.

I would also like to congratulate the Member for Minnedosa, not only on his contribution to this Throne Speech debate — (Interjection) — well sorry, to this resolution debate, but also, Mr. Speaker, on his re-election as caucus chairman of members opposite. I make no comment, Mr. Speaker, of course, on why he might have chosen to resign as caucus chairman, but I certainly welcome his leadership of the caucus and the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, during the last half-a-year or so, there has been a political debate both in this Legislature and throughout the Province of Manitoba dealing with the question of French language rights and services in this province. Mr. Speaker, this question arose from a court case and the possible consequences of a Supreme Court decision arising therefrom. The Government of Manitoba, as always, wanted and still wants a made-in-Manitoba solution with respect to the interpretation

of The Manitoba Act. It should be noted somewhat paradoxically, Mr. Speaker, that the leave granted to Mr. Roger Bilodeau to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada was granted on November 16, 1981, the day before the last provincial election. It probably serves no purpose, Mr. Speaker, to even mention that except in passing, because of the paradox represented by the positions demonstrated by members on each side of this Chamber.

The government, Mr. Speaker, has during the last few months addressed the concerns that have been heard loudly and clearly from Manitobans with respect to the proposal to amend The Manitoba Act. I have no quarrel with the remarks of the Member for Minnedosa when he suggests that Manitobans have spoken out on the issue. Mr. Speaker, what I find rather amazing is that the position of the members opposite has not changed, even though they claim to have been listening and to have heard. It is the position of members on this side that has changed in response to those messages. I believe the government has listened well and is prepared to respond in a fashion that provides a consensus for the 1980's and for the future. I believe that it is a credit to all Manitobans, and that this consensus is not only possible but real.

As I said earlier prior to question period, Mr. Speaker, it will be my intention at the conclusion of my remarks this afternoon to move an amendment to the resolution introduced last summer by my colleague, the Attorney-General.

I would like therefore, Mr. Speaker, to comment both on the need for a reasonable and principled solution and also on the character of that compromise.

Mr. Speaker, part of human nature is the fear of the unknown. Certainly all members, certainly members of the public as well, try to quantify that fear in terms of things we actually do know in real terms. In that context, Mr. Speaker, the experience of Manitobans, including members on both sides of this House, with The Federal Official Languages Act and the resulting implementation programs for federal bilingualism, has certainly not had a salutary impact on the views of Manitobans on this proposal. I regret that, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand, I understand it and appreciate the rationale for that fear.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that some individuals in responsible positions have gone to great lengths to be irresponsible, and misrepresent and play on that fear. Mr. Speaker, not only have they played on that fear, but they have played on the emotion which springs from it. Those people, Mr. Speaker, have become part of the problem rather than part of the solution. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the most simple manifestation of that irresponsibility has been their unwillingness to seriously consider and review the compromise that the government first put forward in mid-December, and has since fleshed out in definitive terms.

Mr. Speaker, what could be more irresponsible than those individuals who were exposed, as the Member for Minnedosa agreed, to all the public discussions and standing committee hearings, and have come out of that process with their position totally unchanged?

Mr. Speaker, I impute no motives for that action. Rather, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to appeal to all members and to all Manitobans to give the proposal which has been recently outlined, and which will take

shape in the form of motions in this Chamber over the next several days, to give that proposal a fair hearing, to evaluate it on its merits. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba expect members of this Assembly to set aside the tactics of irresponsible misinformation, the playing to the gallery of emotion and give a fair, reasonable evaluation of the proposals put forward in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, that is the high road and in politics, as in life, it is the only road.

Mr. Speaker, the government set out — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, we're hearing from the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I would think that he would be hanging his head in shame since December 10th, when members found out what the "J" in his name stood for.

Mr. Speaker, the government set out with essentially three simple objectives last May when it first proposed the resolution we're debating today. Mr. Speaker, the first objective was to provide for a made-in-Manitoba solution, rather than a solution imposed by nine Supreme Court judges in Ottawa. That objective, Mr. Speaker, was confirmed by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections which recommended that a political resolution of Manitoba's present constitutional difficulties was preferable to a court-imposed solution. Mr. Speaker, those unbelievers who think that the Supreme Court will answer all of their prayers need only look to the recent decision made in Ottawa in the Supreme Court regarding the assessment freeze first imposed by members opposite in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the second objective of the government in making this proposal was to reflect by means of a legislative and political solution the political consensus and reality of Manitoba in the 1980's, rather than a consensus reflected in Section 23 which was over 100 years old.

The third objective of the government was to provide for the translation and validation of the Statutes of Manitoba, and to provide for French Language Services at a reduced cost to Manitobans. In these days when astute financial and fiscal management of our economy and of government programs and services is required to assist Manitobans to recover from the acute protracted restraint of 1977 to '81, every dollar is required, Mr. Speaker, to prime the economic pump and provide jobs for Manitobans. That's why, Mr. Speaker, we consider that a "laudable" objective. In fact, that's why we agree with Brian Mulroney, who said the objectives of this proposal were "laudable." Mr. Speaker, I don't know where we could find a finer source to commend himself to members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I consider these objectives to be shared by the vast majority of Manitobans, and the proposals I will be presenting shortly before this Legislature, I believe, will implement these objectives in the best possible fashion.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment that I will be proposing to Section 23.1 of the resolution will provide a guarantee that the freedom to use either English or French enjoyed under the law of Manitoba at the present time will not be restricted by this or future Legislatures. Mr. Speaker, as you and members of this House will observe, the drafting of this particular section is both designed to provide that guarantee of which I speak, but also to ensure that the recognition of English and French as the official languages of Manitoba will be construed in the future as a declaratory

and symbolic statement of the intent of the original Section 23 which it follows. I should point out as well, Mr. Speaker, that intent was also recognized by the Supreme Court of this nation in the Forest decision of 1979, and more recently by legislation introduced by members opposite in 1980.

The second change I will be proposing, Mr. Speaker, relates to Section 23.5, and deals with a technical requirement for the translation and authorization of those translations for the acts referred to in the schedule to the resolution. As members who served on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will recall, some concerns were raised concerning the status of organizations in Manitoba which were incorporated or otherwise came into existence under the authority of the acts in the schedule. It is the government's intention to ensure that the requirements for the translation and authorization of these acts are essentially no different than that provided for the public statutes referenced in Section 23.4 in the original resolution. It would be our proposal as well, as members will see in 23.5(2), to provide the same for regulations.

The third part of the amendment I will be moving, Mr. Speaker, has three components. The first provides that Section 23 will be in no way affected by the changes being proposed in Section 23.1 and 23.2. It has always clearly, Mr. Speaker, been the government's intention to leave Section 23 in its original form and ensure that none of the amendments proposed in The Manitoba Act, the original resolution, in any way impact on the wording or interpretation of Section 23. This is important both from an historical and a legal perspective, since legal precedents with regard to this section and its equivalent in The British North America Act, Section 133, have some importance and value to the citizens and Government of Manitoba.

The second component, Mr. Speaker, deals with local government and provides that this amendment to The Manitoba Act will place no responsibilities upon municipalities, school divisions or other forms of local government to provide for their by-laws etc., to be in both the English and French languages. Once again, Mr. Speaker, an exception has been provided with regard to Section 23 and any possible requirements that may be interpreted to exist under that section. For those with specific interpretive interests, I would commend their attention to the recent decision of the Supreme Court in *Blaikie No. 2*. The intent, however, is clear. The government wishes to ensure that the resolution amending The Manitoba Act in absolutely no way places an obligation on municipalities or other forms of local government.

The third component, Mr. Speaker, deals with legal or customary rights and privileges of languages other than English or French. The intent of this section is clearly to provide that none of the amendments proposed in the original resolution will in any way affect the legal or customary rights which have been enjoyed with respect to other languages. The second clause in this particular section has a similar intent with respect to the enhancement and protection of the multicultural heritage of Manitobans.

The fourth part that members will note as Section (D) in the amendment deals specifically with the citation of this resolution and the proclamation which results therefrom. The last part of the amendment deals with

an act which was inadvertently included in the schedule, and has since been repealed.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this amendment represents a clear and definitive statement of the government's intention. But, Mr. Speaker, for some members who have some difficulty believing what they read and would like some support and some additional advice, the government has acquired in addition to ongoing legal advice throughout the discussions, various legal opinions on various possible wordings has acquired a definitive statement with respect to the definitive final wording. I tabled that earlier in the House during question period, Mr. Speaker, but I would ask your indulgence to allow me to read a portion or all of that into the record for members and for those who are desirous to read our Hansard and have this type of information. It's a legal opinion from Mr. A. Kerr Twaddle, Q.C., who was Counsel of Record in the *Bilodeau* case, engaged initially I believe by The Honourable Member for St. Norbert when he was Attorney-General.

He writes with regard to the revision of the proposed constitutional amendment: "You have asked me to confirm in writing the opinions I have expressed to you in conference regarding the construction likely to be given to proposed Sections 23.1 and 23.8 of The Manitoba Act in their revised form. The original form of Section 23.1 was the bold statement that English and French are the official languages of Manitoba. In my opinion of August 17, 1983, to Mr. Penner, I expressed the view that such declaratory statement would not likely be construed so as to widen the compulsory use of French in the province.

"At that time, however, it was proposed to include in the constitutional amendment an entrenched but limited right to communicate with the government and be served by the government in French. Once it was decided that such a right should not be entrenched, but enacted by ordinary act of the Legislature, the danger of Section 23.1 being construed as guaranteeing language rights beyond those contained in Section 23 increased.

"The revised form of Section 23.1 does not declare English and French as official languages. Instead it provides that because they already are the official languages, which can only refer back to Section 23, the freedom to use either such language as enjoyed presently under the law shall not be restricted. The operative part of the section is the restraint on restricting existing freedoms. The section does not create official languages. It gives as the reason for the enactment of the restraint the existing fact that the two languages are official, official to the extent their use is permitted or required under Section 23.

"It is, in my opinion, clear that the section is not intended as adding any further right to the use of either official language than exists at the present time."

I'll read only one more paragraph, Mr. Speaker, because I believe many members opposite have copies and are following along.

"Notwithstanding my strongly expressed opinion, it is possible for a court to reason that if the two languages are official, there must be an implied right to use either in official business. That is with government or to use this same reasoning to give a broader interpretation to Section 23 than it has been given to date. Whether

a court would likely recognize rights as being created by the first part of Section 23.1 would depend on the circumstances in which the issue was raised.”

Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say: “I regard it as a remote possibility.” Mr. Speaker, how strong a statement do members want? Mr. Speaker, what is very interesting is that members opposite wanted a legal opinion, and all the members opposite and the members on this side know as well that when obtaining legal opinions - I guess for the same reasons that lawyers can make a living before the courts - we can never get a 100 percent guaranteed answer, but certainly you can't get much closer than to describe something as being a remote possibility. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I make no comment on the remarks of the Member for Lakeside or his comments on either - I'm not clear what it was, the gentleman who provided the legal opinion or the justices of the Supreme Court. He was making some references to absurdity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, as obviously does our Counsel of Record on this case, Mr. Kerr Twaddle, the chances of misinterpretation have been reduced so dramatically as to render the fears of many of the instant constitutional experts completely without foundation. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, because I honestly don't view this as a battle of legal opinions, this compromise symbolized by the amendment I will shortly move and by the bill we'll be presenting in the House during the next several days, represents a consensus of what is best for Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, Manitobans deserve credit for that achievement. Mr. Speaker, that's probably the most important message.

The Member for Minnedosa only went halfway. He gave them credit for speaking out, for raising their concerns. But, Mr. Speaker, he failed to give them credit for helping develop a consensus and a compromise that would address those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, before I actually move the amendment, I would like to add somewhat parenthetically that members will observe that there is a slight variation in form between the amendment distributed today and that distributed on Tuesday. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Arthur, who obviously has not yet compared the two even though he has them, that the only difference is that the headings used for each of the sections did not appear in the original document on Tuesday and they now appear and are appropriately included in the document distributed today.

I would also point out that in Part (D) of the amendment a minor technical change has been made to provide that the Citation of the Proclamation will bear date 1984 rather than the original which called for date 1983. Mr. Speaker, although we consider the technical drafting of this proposed amendment to be excellent and definitive, the government is nonetheless willing to review any reasonable suggestions to enhance the interpretation of our very clearly stated intent, as I have outlined it this afternoon.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of the

Environment, that the Proclamation amending the Constitution of Canada set out in the motion be amended:

(a) by striking out Section 23.1 of The Manitoba Act, 1870, as set out in Section 1 of the proclamation, and substituting therefor the following section:

Freedom to use English and French

23.1 As English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, the freedom to use either official language enjoyed under the law of Manitoba in force at the time this section comes into force shall not be extinguished or restricted by or pursuant to any Act of the Legislature of Manitoba.

(b) by striking out the proposed section 23.5 of The Manitoba Act, 1870, as set out in section 1 of the proclamation, and substituting therefor the following section:

Delay period for Acts in Schedule

23.5(1) Any Act referred to in the Schedule, or any amendment to or Act substituted for any such Act, is of no force of effect after December 31, 1993 if it is not printed and published in both official languages on or before December 31, 1993.

Delay period for certain regulations

(2) Any regulation enacted before January 1, 1986 that would, if enacted on or after that date, be of no force or effect under subsection 23.3(1) if it were not printed and published in both official languages is of no force of effect after December 31, 1993 if it is not printed and published in both official languages on or before December 31, 1993.

(c) by striking out the proposed sections 23.7 and 23.8 of The Manitoba Act, 1870, as set out in section 1 of the proclamation, and substituting therefor the following sections:

Rights preserved

23.7 Nothing in sections 23.1 and 23.2 abrogates or derogates from any rights guaranteed by section 23.

Local authorities

23.8 Except as may be required by section 23, no municipality, school division, school district or institution established by or under an Act of the Legislature of Manitoba with local legislative or local administrative authority is required to enact, pass, print or publish its by-laws, regulations, rules or resolutions in both the English and the French languages.

Other languages

23.9(1) Nothing in sections 23.1 to 23.8 abrogates or derogates from any legal or customary right or privilege acquired or enjoyed in Manitoba either before or after the coming into force of this section with respect to any language that is not English or French.

Multicultural heritage

(2) This section shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Manitobans.

(d) by striking out sections 2 and 3 of the proclamation and substituting therefor the following section:

Citation

2. This Proclamation may be cited as the Constitution Amendment Proclamation, 1984 (Manitoba Act).

(e) by striking out the words and figures “an Act to incorporate Club de Golf St. Malo,” S.M. 1970, ch. 126 in the list of Private Acts set out in the Schedule to the proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, that is the amendment and I move that amendment, seconded by the Minister of Environment. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: That's right, Mr. Speaker. Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, during the course of his remarks, in introducing these amendments referred to them at one time as motions, at another time as a motion. The point of order that I'm raising, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not it's appropriate to deal with them as an omnibus amendment, and whether or not the amendments should not, in fact, be dealt with separately, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that there are perhaps precedents in our usage in Manitoba and other places that could lead you to a conclusion to accept either position. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in view of the history and in view of the labour that has gone into working out and arriving at what the Minister now calls excellent, although not necessarily definitive, you know, amendments, should he not allow this House and the opposition to deal with the amendments individually? We're not dealing with a large raft of amendments; we're talking about six amendments. We are not dealing with a minor matter; we are talking about the first amendment to the Constitution of Canada. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there is ample precedent for asking the government to introduce and deal with these first amendments to Canada and Manitoba's Constitution individually.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point of order raised by the Opposition House Leader I would like to make several observations.

I think the first point that I should make, however, for the benefit of the member, is that I was very careful during my remarks because I did anticipate his concern to refer to the amendment I moved at all times in the singular fashion. When I referred to motions being moved, the amendment I will be moving, or have moved, is one motion. The first second reading of the bill, which is on the Order Paper, is another motion. I made reference to several motions.

When I referred collectively to amendments in the plural sense, which the member expresses some concern about, at all times I was referring, you may check the text of my speech, to ensure that to The Manitoba Act and amendments to that act of which, you will observe from the resolution, there are approximately eight or nine in the original resolution and that was the reference that I made.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the concept of presenting amendments individually is one that is well established in this Legislature and elsewhere with respect to bills. The purpose of doing that, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for clause-by-clause consideration at committee stage; and also because those precedents, which I've recently examined as far back in terms of our authority as Erskine May, relate to the fact that once a section is

amended the question on that section under consideration in committee is then put, and the section is passed as amended, or if the amendment was defeated in its original form, that then precludes any further amendment and you go on to the next section. You can only go back further in the bill by leave if you want to go back and re-examine other sections.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the case for resolutions and in moving this amendment in omnibus fashion it was not my intention, and I would certainly say for the record it is not the government's intention, to preclude an amendment to Section 23.2 which is not touched upon in the amendment I move today in which a member may wish to move an amendment upon after this amendment has been dealt with.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the rule is clearly to ensure that amendments are dealt with on bills individually during a committee stage. Why don't we do it for resolutions? Well, Mr. Speaker, because we don't have the committee stage on resolutions. Members, I thought, should have picked up on that. I appreciate that the Opposition House Leader may not have been at all of the committee hearings, but I do know that he was at the one at which we discussed the very question of committee responsibility with respect to a resolution as opposed to a bill. That meeting was held a couple days before Christmas, I believe, and I believe the member was at that meeting and participated in the discussion of a similar point of order at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the reason we do not interpret the requirement for clause-by-clause consideration on resolutions to be appropriate under our rules is simply because resolutions, No. 1, are not referred to a committee; and No. 2, receive consideration only once in the Assembly. They do not receive three readings.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I think it's appropriate for me to point out by means of four examples from recent Manitoba legislative history situations where amendments roughly equivalent and omnibus in character have been presented to the House and considered by the House, and examined in the context and clearly considered admissible in the context of being omnibus, Mr. Speaker. Amendments are ruled out of order that are omnibus in character, but usually for other reasons. In fact, I know of no example where they have been ruled out of order because they were omnibus, because they related to more than one part of a resolution. I would certainly agree though, if that had been the case with a bill, the member would have a good case.

I draw the members' attention, Mr. Speaker, and your attention to the Journals of the Legislature of 1958, where I believe the Minister of Finance of the day, the Honourable Mr. Greenlay, having moved an amendment which runs some three pages and amends in detailed form - sorry, Mr. Greenlay had moved a motion to provide for some changes in a federal-provincial, I believe it was a tax-sharing agreement, federal-provincial arrangements for tax sharing, an amendment was proposed - I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to Pages 323-324 of the Journals of 1958, which proposes to amend through a series of half-a-dozen different sections, striking out one paragraph, substituting therefor, etc., Mr. Speaker, clearly a situation where

running two-and-a-half pages a series of amendments to different paragraphs and then different clauses of the proposed resolution to approve the tax-sharing agreement.

I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, in 1964, for the benefit of the members opposite, on motion of the Honourable, I believe, Member for Logan at the time, Mr. Gray, Mr. Lissaman, a member from Brandon, moved the deletion collectively of Reasons No. 2 to 6 in the resolution and certain words and some additional items on Page 78 of the Journals for 1964.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965 to an amendment moved by Mr. Johnson, then the Member for Portage la Prairie, not the current Member for Sturgeon Creek, moved a motion that - this is on Page 177 of the Journals for 1965 - that the resolution be further amended by: 1, placing the letter (a) before the words; 2, changing the numbering of present paragraphs, etc.; 3, by deleting the present paragraph; 4, by deleting another paragraph; 5, by deleting another paragraph, and going on in detail.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is very interesting, but as recently as 1981, for those whose memories don't go back as far as the Member for Lakeside, an amendment proposed by my predecessor, Mr. Anderson - it says here, "as corrected." I don't know if that means it wasn't in proper form when it was first tabled, but it was accepted. It goes on in lengthy detail, Page 262 of the Journals of that year, to add - would you like the full text read? It goes on to make a series of seven or eight specific amendments to a resolution originally proposed by Ms. Westbury, the member at that time for Fort Rouge.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate the Member for Lakeside having given me notice of his concern about the character of the amendment so that I could provide him with the information as to why it was being moved this way. Clearly the question of bills being considered clause by clause, I agree with him wholeheartedly. With regard to resolutions, Mr. Speaker, to do as he proposes would violate parliamentary practice in general and, very specifically, all past practice in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Opposition House Leader to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: I marvel at the diligence of the Government House Leader in doing all that homework, but I want to assure him, and surely it hasn't escaped anybody's attention in this Chamber, that whether or not we are dealing in omnibus fashion with eight amendments to the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission or the Manitoba Crop Insurance or any other number of statutes that we have dealt with from time to time in this Chamber in that fashion cannot in any way be compared to what we're doing here. This is unique. This is the first time.

Mr. Speaker, what it really does, and I'm attempting to very seriously bring this point to honourable members opposite - it is this what is offensive to us in the opposition - that we have the feeling that we are being presented as legislators with a package that cannot be interfered with, because it has been arrived at with parties outside of this Legislature. That is not the

purpose of legislators getting together and putting our collective wisdom to bring about the best amendments; therefore, it is quite possible that some of us in our caucus will want to take a positive approach to some of the amendments being offered, amend other amendments. Surely that is the purpose of dealing with this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, if this plea falls on deaf ears, it merely confirms, and that really has been the problem on this whole issue, that this government has no flexibility in this matter; that the decision is made not in this Chamber, but in ongoing discussions outside of this Chamber and then being brought in this Chamber simply for rubber-stamping. Mr. Speaker, that wasn't the impression that the new House Leader was giving us, the new Minister was giving us, that he would follow on this course. We are asking him right now, I am asking him right now, let's turn over a new leaf.

We are only dealing with six short amendments. We have agreed that this is the only matter of business before us over the next few days or the next few weeks. Let's deal with the amendments individually; let's deal with them in a manner in which they can be treated with the respect and the time they deserve.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister to the same point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that there clearly is some misunderstanding on the part of the Opposition House Leader, and it may very well be that he did not follow closely the comments by the Government House Leader or he would not have made two basic statements that he just completed. One, he made reference to this, that in a statute, and by a specific reference to the Hog Marketing Statute. We are not talking about statutes, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Government House Leader made that very clear. What we are dealing with is a resolution of this House which is quite separate and apart from the method and the approach by which statutes or bills are dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, we listened intently, and I'm sure honourable members across the way listened intently to the series of precedents by which similar situations have been dealt with by way of omnibus amendment insofar as resolutions dating right back to 1958, leading to 1981 insofar as resolutions in this Chamber. So we're not dealing with statutes, we are dealing with resolutions. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition House Leader would like to dig and do some further homework, as obviously the Government House Leader has done, he would find many other such precedents that could be presented to this Chamber that would sustain the position that has been presented to this House by the Government House Leader.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I heard the honourable member correctly, or whether the honourable member was indeed being serious in this Chamber because he said, look, this removes our opportunity for flexibility. This flies in the face of comments that have been made by the Government House Leader about this government being flexible. He suggested, Mr. Speaker, that we were being asked to be rubber-stamped. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to

talk about a lack of flexibility because we've seen the opposition for the last six, seven months, they have been the most inflexible group that one could imagine in respect to this matter.

What, Mr. Speaker, this is indeed doing is provide for the opposition, if they so wish - it's my understanding and I'm subject to be corrected - this does not prevent the opposition from introducing their own amendments to the resolution. They are not precluded from attempting to amend and, in fact, succeeding possibly, if they can win the support of this Chamber, to amendments to the resolution that is before this Chamber. There is not a rule that I'm aware of, and I stand to be corrected, preventing the opposition from being precluded from amending this resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, I must comment that we have heard - well I want to put it politely - just a gem of a lack of wisdom or understanding on the part of the Opposition House Leader, a flaw. I assume that he has not listened as intently as he might have to the Government House Leader in making the presentation.

Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with is a resolution before this Chamber. We are dealing with amendments to this resolution. Amendments by way of precedent in this Chamber can be moved in an omnibus fashion, as opposed, Mr. Speaker, to the situation pertaining to statutes, hog marketing acts, etc., as referred to by the Member for Lakeside. Precedent establishes, precedent sustains the amendment that has been proposed by the Government House Leader.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to the submission of the House Leader. The First Minister, Mr. Speaker, refers to the fact that there are no precedents in favour of the argument of the Opposition House Leader; that probably is true, Mr. Speaker. We are dealing here, as he said - if the Government House Leader would listen for a minute - we are dealing here with something that is very unique. We are dealing here with a resolution to amend the Constitution which has amendments to The Manitoba Act attached; it is a resolution with amendments to the act attached. The Government House Leader says the reason this has to be dealt with in an omnibus fashion is because it's not going to go out of the House, it's going to ealt with in the House, it won't go to committee. Mr. Speaker, that to my mind is the very reason why they should be dealt with separately in the House, so that they can receive the careful attention of this House, and so that there should be a separate debate on each motion and a separate vote on each motion.

There are, Mr. Speaker, certainly theoretically in any event, if not practically, some amendments that can be supported by some members and some that can't be. The Government House Leader is going to put the opposition in the position where if you're opposed to everything you have to vote against everything. That's not, Mr. Speaker, an appropriate way to be dealing with amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is in your prerogative to decide how this matter should be dealt with, and I submit to you,

Sir, that because we are dealing with an amendment to the Constitution in the form of a resolution, with amendments to The Manitoba Act attached, because we are dealing with an Act, therefore, the amendments to the various sections of the Act should be considered to be separate matters and should be debated separately and should be voted on separately.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the members of the opposition are now in agreement that there are no precedents for their argument. They are saying that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Sorry, this is a resolution. We have had many resolutions in this House. — (Interjection) — Now we get to the nub of their argument. They're saying that because this resolution changes our Constitution somehow this resolution should be treated different from other resolutions. Now, what they don't seem to realize is that the Constitution of Canada, The British North America Act, which preceded the present Constitution, was changed more than 20 times in this country by request to the British Parliament, and it was done by resolution of Parliament, or it was done by resolution of Parliament and Provincial Legislatures, etc. You cannot say that this kind of resolution has never been passed before in a Provincial Legislature or the Federal Parliament of this country, and yet they say, they admit they have no precedence for the argument that they are making. I think that speaks for itself, I think that very clearly speaks for itself.

We have here the House Leader presenting very specific precedence for the method in which we are preceding; it is a logical method. The members of the opposition will have the opportunity to debate this issue; they will have the opportunity to make amendments; they will have the opportunity, they know and we know, to talk about this for a number of days. For them to suggest that we should now provide a forum for the kind of grandstanding that we've heard from that group day after day, let's do it on each word rather than each paragraph. It makes just as much sense. You have no precedent whatsoever for your argument. The precedent is on the side of what the government is doing. Let's get on with it, so we can get on to the economy of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the same point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well you know, it seems almost superfluous to have to make the argument that has already been made by the Minister of Finance. He is saying that there is no precedent for taking this interpretation of the manner in which to proceed with these amendments — (Interjection) — that's what he has said.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on a . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I resent the Leader of the Opposition putting words in my mouth. I said very clearly that the precedents are on our side. He has none. His Member for St. Norbert stood up and said they had none. The only precedents that have been offered to this House are in support of the resolution that we are presenting here. Don't lie about it!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the Honourable Minister of Finance felt quite deeply about what he had to say. However, his last remark suggested that another member on the other side had, in fact, lied. He knows I believe, as every other member does, that is an unparliamentary expression in this House. I would suggest that the Minister of Finance withdraw that.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I recall my statement was, don't lie about it. I believe, however, that it is very clear that the Leader of the Opposition is a stranger to the truth.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that the Minister of Finance has so little concern for the courtesies of the House that he has to indulge in such intemperate remarks and then declines to withdraw those remarks when requested to do so. I accept that, because I think it's a measure of the individual involved, and certainly not a reflection on the office of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the point that has to be made is the fact that there is no precedent for a resolution dealing with an amendment to the Constitution. That was not enunciated by the Government House Leader. He did not give any example of a precedent that had to deal with a resolution dealing with an amendment to the Constitution, and there is no precedent that he has provided us with. We are dealing with other resolutions that he has put forward, and none of those resolutions — (Interjection) — in Manitoba, Manitoba legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: We are dealing with the Manitoba Legislature, and we do not have a precedent dealing with a proposed amendment to a resolution proposing

an amendment to the Constitution of Canada. That's the point that we are making, and that is the point that has failed to sink in on members opposite.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the fact that he has not presented us with a precedent that deals with a resolution amending the Constitution of Canada in the Manitoba Legislature, that it is they indeed who are being inflexible on this matter. The First Minister referred to inflexibility, but you know it is they who have been desperately lurching backwards and forwards under the guise of flexibility, but rather trying to seek some sort of answer as to how they can extricate themselves from the problem they have placed themselves in today. They're the ones who have put themselves in this very unfortunate situation. It is they are who are attempting to save face by lurching backwards and forwards from one area to another.

The point that has to be made, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the various proposed amendments are entirely different in their concept and in their view. There are various of these amendments that I think are probably acceptable to some members of the House, maybe even to all members of the House. I don't know.

There are ones, for instance, that seek to satisfy the concerns that were expressed before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am referring to the ones that seek to remove municipalities and local government authorities from the effects of this proposed resolution. There is the one, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that seeks to correct an error that has been caused by the government. There is the one that seeks to correct the error that the government inadvertently put into this resolution.

There are other ones that deal, such as Section 23.1, with an entirely different proposition that will expand - I am saying that the various aspects to the amendment are entirely different, some of them . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank all honourable members for their contribution and for the numerous documents that have been presented by the Government House Leader in support of his remarks, which I have not yet read. I'm also told that there are three pages in the Journals of the House of Commons dealing with this very matter which I have not yet read. I will take the matter under advisement and advise the House as soon as possible.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.