



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. 135 - 2:00 p.m., FRIDAY, 5, AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 5 August, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement. I would like to report on the status of the aerial spraying operation to combat a potential outbreak of western equine encephalitis. Monitoring in western Manitoba and the Red River Valley indicates that in certain areas the numbers of *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes are increasing at a significant rate.

I would like to emphasize that the mosquito kill in each of the sprayed areas was effective averaging 85 to 90 percent. However, in these areas a new generation of *Culex tarsalis* is now emerging and its numbers have already surpassed the peak levels in 1981.

Although the mosquito numbers are high this is only one indication of health risk. Additional information is also required on viral activity in sentinel chicken flocks.

Additional data is also being compiled through the co-operation of several rural poultry producers, and the Department of Environment which is currently collecting wild nestling birds for study.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that extensive monitoring is continuing and that every effort possible is being undertaken to accurately measure viral activity. However, I am informed that, should the present unseasonably hot and humid weather conditions continue, mosquito activity and numbers will increase at an accelerated rate which may again set the stage for a potential epidemic situation.

In light of today's announcement I have asked the Department of Health to continue its public awareness campaign urging personal precautions to guard against the possibility of contracting western equine encephalitis. The information centre will remain in operation and has handled over 8,500 calls since becoming operational July 20th.

Although there are not confirmed human cases, I can report that 206 people are currently being tested for possible symptoms of the disease. The reported horse case of western equine encephalitis in western Manitoba has been confirmed and another 14 cases are currently under investigation.

In conclusion, I offer the reassurance that every possible effort will be undertaken to protect Manitobans during this health emergency.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

the Honourable Minister for his update on the situation and for his alert in his call for a continuing alert on the part of Manitobans with respect to this condition. If combined conditions indicate that a public health threat is there then it is absolutely necessary that the government undertake the very careful watch that is contained and proposed in this statement, and that has been maintained in recent weeks, and certainly they will get no argument from us in that course of action.

I note that the Minister's statement does not specify that a new aerial spraying program will necessarily be launched but, I repeat, that if combined conditions indicate that a public health threat is there the government may well have no other course but to do that. They will not get an argument from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, as long as they are acting on the best advice that they can assemble from their experts in the health field.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to table 11 additional highway construction projects arising out of the recently announced \$4 million allocation from the Jobs Fund.

These projects are intended to assist the heavy construction industry to cope with the difficult economic times it is facing. The projects are small in nature, thus allowing more projects to be undertaken with the additional Jobs Fund allocation. This will result in a greater number of contractors participating in the additional program.

These jobs will be tendered shortly in order that the work may commence as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, this is a remarkable piece of work by the government in the establishment of their Jobs Fund in the most cynical manner that one could imagine. The government took funds directly out of the capital program of the Department of Highways; they had a fund put together, Mr. Speaker, for which they had the advertising campaign ready before they ever thought about how they were going to spend the money; before they ever put their advisory committee together; now they have the consummate gall to come back before the people of Manitoba and announce additional highways projects and expect the public to somehow give them accolades for restoring the money that they took away from the Department of Highways in the original situation, Mr. Speaker; this is the absolute height of cynicism.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Premier's Conference - agenda

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. We understand that he's going to pry himself away from his legislative duties in the Chamber and attend the Annual Premiers' Conference which is being held in Ontario under the chairmanship of Premier Davis. Could the First Minister advise the House as to the major points on the agenda to which Manitoba will be speaking and seeking support from the other provinces of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition it's not going to require much prying to get me down to the Premiers' Conference this coming week.

The two major items that Manitoba will be addressing at the Premiers' Conference will be: (a) the question of jobs, unemployment and the need for a co-ordinated effort on the part of all levels of government, federal, provincial, municipal, plus the private sector to ensure that the co-ordinated campaign is undertaken to reduce unemployment.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we intend to address the subject of pension reform from a provincial perspective and will be presenting some of the proposals that we are proposing by way of our pension legislation that is presently before this Chamber.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the First Minister if the Province of Manitoba will be taking a position, as it apparently has from time-to-time in this House, in support of the rather hysterical statements that have been made from time-to-time by Madame Begin with respect to extra billing and other health related costs, what will the position of the Government of Manitoba be particularly with respect to extra billing, which has been part of our Medicare setup since 1968, but never a significant deterrent to access to medical services by any citizen of Manitoba.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for inviting a response to that question because that will be a matter that will probably top the list of discussions at the First Ministers' Conference next week.

Mr. Speaker, the position that Manitoba will be taking in respect to the crisis that is presently confronting Medicare is that both the federal level and the provincial levels of government are contributing to that crisis. First, I think that it has been duplicity on the part of the Federal Minister of Health and Social Services to attempt to suggest that it is the provinces that are responsible for the undermining and the undercutting of comprehensive universal Medicare throughout Canada for, Mr. Speaker, it was the Federal Government that cut back sharply on its funding of post-secondary education and of health to all the provinces of Canada, placing the provinces in a difficult and untenable position.

The result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that different provinces have pursued different paths and different routes. Judgment calls had to be made by different provinces as to what was the best route for each individual province to undertake, but the requiring of the following down of that particular route was brought about, in the first instance, by the cutback in respect to federal funding.

Mr. Speaker, having said that though, and I do want to say this, that I decry the route that is being taken by some other provincial jurisdictions in this country. They, of course, will be accountable to their own constituencies pertaining to the routes, as indeed this government will be for the routes that they have undertaken in response to the federal cutbacks. They are not the kind of routes that this government would intend to take by way of the charging of user fees, per diems, etc., and so far as extra billing, that has not been a significant problem insofar as Manitoba is concerned, but it is a much more significant problem insofar as some other provincial jurisdictions are concerned. So it is not extra billing itself, is not a matter of priority concern, insofar as our provincial jurisdiction is concerned at this time.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we're happy to have that assurance from the First Minister that he does not associate himself or his government with the hysterical comments of the Federal Minister of Health about extra billing vis-a-vis Manitoba - and Manitoba is the jurisdiction with which we are concerned - so we're pleased to have that assurance.

Can the First Minister tell us, Mr. Speaker, whether the press report was accurate when it indicated that the First Minister would attempt to have the Premiers of Canada, in conference assembled, take some collective action with respect to the testing of the Cruise missile in Alberta?

HON. H. PAWLEY: First I want to, just so there not be any misunderstanding, the Leader of the Opposition commended me for not endorsing what he described as hysterical comments by the Federal Minister of Health. I'm not prepared to denounce her comments as being necessarily hysterical. I think it, indeed, has been her government that has contributed to the crisis that presently exists throughout Canada in regard to Medicare. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, what is important is that we associate with the general concern that has been expressed, not only by Madame Begin, but by others, to the effect that our Medicare system is being eroded and is in a serious crisis at this time; that the equal accessibility of comprehensive, universal Medicare to all Canadians is now in danger of being seriously undercut and undermined; and, Mr. Speaker, though I decry the cutbacks on the part of the federal level of government, I decry somewhat, as I mentioned earlier, some of the measures that have been taken by other provincial governments in Canada in response to those cutbacks at the federal level.

Insofar as the Cruise issue, it is not on the agenda and I indicated that because, when asked a question whether I would be dealing with it at the First Ministers' Conference, the answer is, it's not part of the formal agenda. At all these meetings there is sometimes

occasion to have informal chats. I have not hesitated, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, to formally or informally on any given occasion, to express my opposition to the testing of the Cruise.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong for Canada to be so involved; it is wrong for the world community; it is wrong for humanity and it's not — (Interjection) — Yes, I agree, it is a stupid move, the movement towards continued proliferation in respect to nuclear weaponry. It is not part of the formal discussion but as I have indicated - and I have not hesitated when given the opportunity - to express my views.

HON. S. LYON: A final question on this conference, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. I don't think it would be unfair to characterize his position and the position of the Government of Manitoba on economic matters and fiscal matters at the last two Premier's Conferences, to describe the First Minister as being really the odd man out in terms of the consensus of the other Premiers of Canada as to what should be done vis-a-vis control of expenditures and other matters of that sort, matters which I realize are largely alien to the thinking processes of my honourable friends opposite, although they are coming, albeit belatedly, to their senses somewhat in the partial restraint program that the Minister of Finance has announced.

Can the First Minister give us any indication as to whether or not his thinking has matured with respect to economic and fiscal matters, and whether or not Manitoba may find, now, more common ground with the other Provinces of Canada with respect to a concentrated attack on government spending as part of the problem, rather than part of the answer, and hitting the employment and the unemployment problem by ensuring that government taxation is kept at a level which will ensure that the private individuals in Canada are able to make investments, and see a return on them, and create the jobs that are necessary to get the 48,000 people off the unemployment roles in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm never particularly defensive of being an odd person out, but I must advise the Leader of the Opposition of some facts that he may not be aware of. I find of interest that Conservative Premiers have varied views, some are much more liberal than others; such as, Premier Bill Davis of the Province of Ontario, in contrast, for instance, to Bill Bennett of the Province of B.C. As the Leader of the Opposition is asking, will I be an odd man out? I will be an odd man out, certainly, if it comes to the kind of atrocious policies that are being developed and being implemented in the Province of British Columbia, yes, Manitoba will be odd man out if the other provinces go along with that kind of approach, because, Mr. Speaker, it's not only destructive to social programs, it is destructive, I think, in the long run to the economy of the Province of British Columbia.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hope this is the final question, but I'm stimulated by what the First Minister has said. Does he really think it is conducive to good provincial relations and relationships among the provinces of Canada for him to make that kind of an

overt partisan statement about activities over which he has no control in another province as, indeed, he is reported in the press as having said about the Government of Quebec being anti-labour, when he went yesterday, ostensibly on government business, to speak to some of his union pals in Montreal; does he really think that that helps the public interest of Manitobans, or does that just help the socialist party?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I've attended meetings of the Chamber of Commerce and other groups and I don't consider that to be chatting with business pals. At the same time, when I speak to groups of trade unionists, I don't consider that to be such that we should attempt to suggest union pals, union people, business people, farmers, others, all citizens of Canada. I hope that the Leader of the Opposition was not reflecting upon the working men and women of this country in his opening remarks.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as . . .

HON. S. LYON: Well reflecting upon your ruining our chances to negotiate at all, and making decent relations with the other provinces.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . other provinces are concerned one area that I've appreciated, in respect to my fellow Premiers, whether they be Conservative, whether they be Parti Quebecois, no Liberals, fortunately at the present time, is that they are candid in respect to their views. Bill Bennett is candid and has been quite candid in respect to his views of the New Democratic Party Government of the Province of Manitoba, the New Democratic Party Government when it was in office in the Province of Saskatchewan. That is his right, that is his duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is our obligation to be frank and candid and not to skirt around or try to avoid our candid views insofar as economic and social issues. I intend to continue to be candid, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister not agree if his candid remarks, with respect to other governments, tend to then sour relations with other governments, such as, his candid remarks did with respect to the negotiations with the Province of Alberta on the Western Power Grid, might he allow the people of Manitoba to be spared some of his candid comments about the other governments of Canada, in order that this province can, once again, enjoy good relations with the other provinces, instead of being considered, as I know we are now, a sort of provincial Typhoid Mary by the other provinces?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Leader of the Opposition that my fellow colleagues and I have the best of relations, because it may seem rather strange to the Leader of the Opposition, but people can meet, they can discuss, they can frankly deal with their differences; and even though they be of different partisan backgrounds, different philosophic views, we can respect each other without, Mr. Speaker, ending up considering each other to be enemies in the same room.

HON. S. LYON: Well, you ought to try it then.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in fact, I have found this to be rather interesting, insofar as First Ministers Conferences, that I have frequently found myself to be agreeing with some Conservative Premiers, as against other Conservative Premiers. There's no such thing as odd person out, there's no such thing as a monolithic block, fortunately, of Conservative Premiers in this country, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: There are some that are more liberal than others; there are some that are more right wing than others. That is the political process, Mr. Speaker, that is the political process under which we live, and generally people respect each other for their varied views within a democratic society.

HON. S. LYON: Quite seriously, Mr. Speaker, and having perhaps a bit more familiarity with that scene than the present First Minister, will the First Minister, and I ask the question seriously, restrain himself with respect to his left wing ideological and philosophical views so as not to do further harm to the public interest of Manitoba, whether on negotiations with respect to the Western Power Grid, economic or fiscal matters, or whatever, will he do, in his last two years, if he has that left in office, will he do Manitobans that favour and cease serving his ideological masters long enough to serve the public interests of the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have emphasized throughout the first 21 months of our government the importance of federal-provincial co-operative federalism, the importance of learning to work, for example, with the Federal Government, even if there be political differences; that we understand; that we respect each other; and when there are issues of disagreement, we speak candidly about those areas of disagreement, but we not take petty jurisdictional or partisan advantage of each other; that is the process, Mr. Speaker.

Will I refrain from further speaking in respect to my views? I cannot, Mr. Speaker, because it is my sincere belief, and I respect the views of the Leader of the Opposition, it is my sincere view that it has been tight money, high interest rate policy of Conservative monetarists throughout the Western World, headed by many of the Western Conservative leaders, that have done the damage to the Western economies; that have created the human and economic waste of unemployment in our society; that have caused a total young generation to despair of hope because of unemployment within society, Mr. Speaker. I will not cease, nor do I believe Manitobans would for one moment want me to duck issues, to avoid taking stands, to not reflect the views that I believe are shared by the majority of Manitobans in regard to economic and fiscal policies.

Cruise missile

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister concerning taking stands

on issues of importance to Manitobans. He went to Montreal to campaign against the Cruise missile, and I would like to ask him whether he will be carrying his campaign against the Cruise throughout Manitoba in regard to the municipal referendums on October 26th?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time, unfortunately, I don't have the time to do so, but an issue that is as important as the Cruise missile I can assure the Honourable Member for Elmwood that I have not hesitated — (Interjection) — when there has been an opportunity to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that has come its way to speak out in respect to the Cruise issue. I would not be becoming involved in municipal campaigns in respect to whether or not the Federal Government's Cruise policy ought to be supported or not. I have, and I will continue, to make statements that will be clear, and I believe I can say for each and every member on this side of the House our total - maybe one exception, I'm not sure - our total rejection of the philosophy that the testing of the Cruise missile will bring us closer to world peace.

Bilingualism referendums

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also ask the Premier whether he will be campaigning on behalf of his proposals on bilingualism throughout Manitoba in relation to the municipal referendums which will be held this fall in dozens of municipalities across the province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the Member for Elmwood may, or may not, be exaggerating. I heard Mr. Harms this morning mention that a referendum is going to take place in Turtle Mountain and Hamiota and Brandon, maybe they will in some other centres. I'm not going to get involved in the campaign in respect to this issue, Mr. Speaker, that will be up to the people in each given municipality to make their own determination, and where they wish they will have that question on the ballot, and they will make their own determination; in the same way that I will not be out in Carman, or in Morden, where I understand there are questions pertaining to nuclear disarmament, I will not be in those communities campaigning. I will be leaving that to the people of Morden and to Carman to decide whether or not they want to support worldwide movements toward disarmament.

Commissionaires in New Brunswick

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a final question to the Attorney-General, following up on something that he was asked this morning by the Leader of the Opposition, in relation to the relationship between federal and provincial bilingualism in relation, again, to the four commissionaires in New Brunswick who were laid off because they were not bilingual.

I wonder if the Attorney-General could explain what he would understand as the point being made on this

issue by Max Yalden, the Federal Commissioner of Official Languages, when he said this, quoted in the St. Catharines' Standard on May 4, 1983, he said: "There are two key points I would like to mention. First, the airport is under federal jurisdiction; and secondly, Fredericton, as a provincial capital, has been officially declared bilingual." Is there not some relationship between official bilingualism at the provincial level and at the federal level?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been asked to comment on a statement allegedly made by the Official Languages Commissioner for Canada quoted in a St. Catharines paper about something that happened in New Brunswick, which seems to me we're straying rather far from the administrative competence of the government in this Legislature. But it's clear, insofar as anything can be clear from that convoluted way of posing a question, that under The Official Languages Act, for purposes of the Federal Civil Service, pursuant to the provisions of the act and regulations, certain areas where there is significant demand are designated for Federal Civil Service provisions; it's nothing to do with any New Brunswick statute or New Brunswick constitutional provision.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Well, it's clear, it's absolutely clear, and one would hope that when members of this Legislature get up and ask questions scooped out of some newspaper they would do a little more research to at least understand the context about which they are talking, legally speaking.

So to the references which were made inaccurate in the extreme to the Constitutions of Alberta and Saskatchewan, which were completely wrong in terms of the parallelism allegedly drawn between their Constitution and the Constitution of Manitoba, I mean, these are will-o'-the-wisp questions which ought not to be asked and really do not permit of an appropriate discussion in this Legislature.

User fees - Health Care System

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago in this House I asked the Acting Minister of Health, and he took the question as notice; three days have passed on an important question without any information forthcoming from the Acting Minister of Health. I now direct a question to the First Minister, since he's headed for the Inter-Provincial Premiers' Conference apparently next week, has the government been advised by Ottawa that the Federal Government intends to impose so-called dollar-for-dollar penalties in its new Canada Health Act as a means of attempting to outlaw user fees and extra billing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Acting Minister of Health advises me he has that information.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: I rise to say that the Minister of Health, who has been dealing with this issue and has had, I think, some personal discussions on this matter over the past few months, will be in on Monday and will be making a report to the Legislature on that. When I raised that with the staff I was informed that the Minister would be coming back on Monday and I thought it would be appropriate that he, who's been right on top of the issue, be here to give the answers and he will do that on Monday morning.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask whether the First Minister will be awaiting a briefing from the Minister of Health on that subject before heading into the Premiers' Conference?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I certainly will be having an opportunity, upon the Health Minister's return on Monday, to further discuss the current health prices issue because it is going to be a dominant issue discussed at the Premiers' Conference.

Baby virus

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a different question to the Acting Minister of Health and, again, it emanates from questions I asked earlier in the week, does the Acting Minister have anything to report with respect to the viral epidemic that is affecting newborns at the St. Boniface Hospital?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I had information yesterday but I didn't want to give it in the House because the member who asked the question wasn't in the House yesterday, and I wasn't in this morning, but I certainly have the information available to me.

I'm advised by the department that there is no evidence to show that there was overcrowding at St. Boniface General at the time that the virus was discovered. It is still suspected that the virus originated with a normal admission to the obstetrics unit but they are still working on this, they don't know for sure and that is being investigated.

No emergency cases were transferred from Seven Oaks and Concordia, only the usual high-risk cases were brought in and these were handled by the new isolation unit at St. Boniface.

A complete investigation will be carried out by a team composed of the St. Boniface Hospital staff, the Cadham Provincial Laboratory, representatives from the Centre for Disease Control in Ottawa, representatives from the Centre for Disease Control from Atlanta. They will provide the first investigation. They will determine then whether a further investigation is required.

There have been some concerns that the high-risk unit at the St. Boniface has not been operating; that is false I'm advised. The high-risk unit at St. Boniface has remained open throughout the week and is operating normally. I am advised by the department, who have been in contact with the hospital, that absolutely no crisis situation existed yesterday which might have caused St. Boniface to make any changes.

I'm advised, again by the department, after consultation with the hospital, that the situation is fully under control. The babies are recovering; identification of the virus continues; they don't know the exact identification yet and that work continues.

Of the 19 cases, two remain under intensive care but I've been told that the babies are improving; and of the babies recalled, I believe two showed symptoms, but apparently the virus seems to have been contained to the hospital and those people who were in the hospital. It has not spread to other hospitals.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask him one final question and that is, will the College of Physicians and Surgeons or the Obstetrical Section of the Manitoba Medical Association be asked for an opinion as to the advisability and desirability of consolidating obstetrical units as a result of this situation at St. Boniface? Will they be asked for an opinion as to whether the consolidation of obstetrical units can create situations in the area of crowding and overcrowding that can contribute to the spread of infection and it, therefore, should be avoided? Will those two bodies be asked by the government to offer a professional opinion on that point?

HON. W. PARASIUK: It certainly will determine whether, in fact, those two bodies have been consulted to date with respect to consolidation. I would also see that they are consulted now and I would also determine whether, in fact, there is the other side of the coin that needs to be looked at and that is whether, in fact, you can have overcrowding in hospitals that might not have sufficient facilities in their own right. I believe that the intention was to create a situation where there were sufficient facilities to meet the demand and this was the way which the professional staff advised would be the best way, but I'll certainly do another check to ensure that advice was sought from all parties and certainly as the impact of this particular virus epidemic is looked at in a larger context, after the emergency is dealt with. I certainly would hope that the matter would be reviewed, taking into account that which has occurred, which I have been told is a very unusual circumstance, but one that does occur from time to time and has occurred from time to time in North American hospitals.

Vehicle inspections

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

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Transportation. In view of the fact that the Minister announced during his Estimates that his department reduced the number of vehicle safety inspection units from four to three units, has the Minister reduced the quality and standard of vehicle inspections on cars called in for the inspection?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that the level of activity has been reduced by 50 percent

since we had two such units and we now have one - I believe I'm right on those numbers - but we are currently reviewing, Mr. Speaker, the present policy in any event. It is our hope that we come up with a computerized program which will be more selective than the present one, with respect to call backs, and that has to do with the sale of used vehicles, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have an additional question to the same Minister. Is the Minister aware of the allegations made by a Portage la Prairie mechanic, who says that the vehicle and safety inspections are a laugh and that inspections performed are inadequate?

HON. S. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the first premise is correct then I wouldn't want them to be more adequate than they are. I have to reject the premise that they're not properly done or carried out and no doubt that one could use more of these kinds of inspection services. However, one has to recognize the limitations within which we must work. I think the crucial area has been missed, however, and that is the question of how to trace down used vehicles that had been sold privately, where there are problems that we are unable to pick up in that way. It's my hope that we change the program to dwell very much on the calling in of older vehicles that have new registrations issued.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a further question to the Minister. Will the Minister investigate these allegations and ensure that inspections are being performed in a complete and comprehensive manner to ensure public safety?

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that if the member has some information he would want to forward it to me. I have really no basis on which to investigate anything, other than a comment. If there's something substantive I would appreciate the member provide me with the information.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to forward this information and I have to assure the Minister that the people in our area are very concerned about what has transpired.

Highway Construction assistance

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being in the House when the Minister of Transportation indicated this belated further assistance of some \$4 million to the construction of highways in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, just a simple question to the Minister. Could he confirm that of the 11 projects listed, 10 of them are in NDP-held constituencies and one in a PC constituency? It's rather amazing when you consider how many PC constituencies there are in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is not quite correct, although it's probably close to being correct. I noted, Mr. Speaker, that there is some work going

to be done in District 2, and that is, of course, represented by the Member for La Verendrye - at least a portion of one project is in that district - and there is one in the constituency of Minnedosa.

A MEMBER: It's what you call fine tuning - real fine tuning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. S. USKIW: There's one for the Member for Virden. With respect to the balance of them, Mr. Speaker, if you look at Steep Rock, I think members opposite and the former Minister of Highways would recognize that that is a problem road and needs that kind of upgrading. It is ready; it is in a state of readiness and that is one of the reasons why it's being proceeded with.

Advisor appointment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Economic Development. We are aware of the appointment or the hiring of Mr. Gerry Fullerton as an advisor to the Minister. Could the Minister of Economic Development tell us the wage rate in which Mr. Fullerton has been hired?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: \$85,000 per year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. H. ENNS: \$85,000.00? That's twice as much as the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: He's worth twice as much as the Premier.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, does Mr. Fullerton get all his expenses while on the job included, or does that have to come out of \$85,000.00?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I gather from the comments that people are aware of many different ways of paying salaries. Those of us on this side are, as you know, committed in the long run to bringing the wages, the salaries of people in the country or in the province closer together.

Mr. Speaker, we nonetheless recognize that we live in a society where groupings in the community, doctors, managers, people of particular occupational background and expertise have been commanding a particular level of salary. Mr. Speaker, we are realistic in terms of recruiting a variety of management and advisory expertise and we acknowledge that, in this case, we have recruited a person who has come from the private sector where his salary was 60 percent higher. We feel we have negotiated a fair deal with this

gentleman and we, not only expect, we know that the work he will be doing for us will prove that he is worth that figure.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the question to the Minister was, does he get his expenses over and above that for his daily activities while involved in the job? Mr. Speaker, how much more than the Deputy Minister of Economic Development is Mr. Fullerton making?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that one as notice for the detail. This is a consultancy contract and it has some different components to it.

Bilingualism poll

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

MR. G. MERCIER: I have a question for the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Could the Attorney-General advise when the government poll on bilingualism was commissioned, when was it completed and when will it be available for tabling in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the first two parts of those questions, I'll have to take them as notice. My recollection is that the poll was commissioned about the middle of June and taken between the middle and the end of June, certainly I think, before the end of June. As I said, with respect to the third question, I'm waiting for an analysis of the poll to table in the House as soon as I have that it will be tabled in the House at that time.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the poll was completed before the end of June, it is now some 35-36 days later, how much longer will we have to wait for that information to be available in the House? We're prepared to accept the results of the poll and we'll do our own analysis of the poll.

HON. R. PENNER: That's a fair offer. I may, in fact, end up doing that because I don't want any suggestion that an analysis that is tabled is merely my version or somebody else's version of the raw data. I may, in order to avoid that kind of comment, at the time when I'm able to determine whether the analysis that is being prepared is one that gives sufficient information to members of the House, instead of doing that, simply table the raw results and let them make their own analysis.

Working conditions in Chamber

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to direct one question to the Attorney-General in terms of the working conditions in this Chamber. Given that it's a long, hot summer, that there's a lack of air conditioning in this Chamber, that the Premier made a statement a few

weeks ago in answer to a question that I asked him that he wouldn't object to this, could the two House Leaders meet and work out an agreement whereby MLAs would be allowed to work without their jackets in this Chamber, either all the time or outside of the question period, as we do in Committee of the Whole?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm restraining myself, but really, I heard you rule on previous occasions, and I believe that's right, that the question of decorum in the House is not a matter of discussion between the respective House Leaders, but is for the Speaker to maintain and that your ruling has been that proper dress in this House requires jackets and ties. I don't think it's the responsibility of the House Leaders to take that up on a private basis with the Speaker.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Government House Leader could indicate to the House what his intention is for the ordering of business tomorrow, whether there'll be two sittings or three sittings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I think, to a very considerable extent, Mr. Speaker, that depends on what progress we make with the urgent business which is before the House but, nevertheless, in all fairness, if there is any variation of the announcement that was made yesterday, or the day before, that the House would be sitting on the Speed-up timetable today and tomorrow, I will certainly advise the Opposition House Leader as soon as I can.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Government House Leader indicate the next item of business?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the - can we refer to it in shorthand as the "referral motion?"

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

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has 16 minutes remaining.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we recessed for lunch, I was in the midst of reading from an article which says, "Clark says province is too hasty on French."

Mr. Speaker, this article reads, "Mr. Clark says, 'If I was Premier of the Province of Manitoba and faced with this threat of a Supreme Court judgment, I would have waited for it to indicate to worried citizens that unhappily they didn't have a choice. That could have been accepted more easily than what they're doing right now.' Clark said the imposition of official bilingualism in Manitoba and in New Brunswick, the only province where it now exists, couldn't be compared. New Brunswick has a Francophone population of 40 percent." In Manitoba, it's 5 percent, Mr. Speaker. "In New Brunswick, Premier Richard Hatfield made the Anglophone population aware of the French fact for years and then acted. Clark noted that Pawley's predecessor, Conservative Sterling Lyon had begun the slow and expensive task of translating the province's laws into French after the Supreme Court ruled that the 1980 law, making only English official in the Legislature and courts, was unconstitutional."

It goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "In a multicultural Manitoba, where there is much poverty, a problem with Native people, a combination of poverty and prejudice, it's not the best time to declare official bilingualism. He added that in Western Canada there was a movement toward bilingualism that stalled when Prime Minister Trudeau brought The Official Languages Act and westerners began thinking French was being pushed down their throats." He concludes by saying, "That's why I think it's sometimes wiser to wait."

Mr. Speaker, we've been saying that for the last week to 10 days, maybe two weeks, on this debate of the enforcement of bilingualism on the people of Manitoba. I can't help but think that the opposition is now realizing the fact that maybe they have moved a little hastily and are not ready to give the people of Manitoba that time that is required to absorb all the facts, all the issues that our people will be faced with should this resolution become law in our province.

We, on this side of the House, are grateful, if you can say that. I hesitate to even give the opposition that bit of credit, but they have agreed to our suggestion that intersessional meetings be held throughout the province to allow our people to realize the extent of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of New Brunswick certainly have had their problems and so are the people of this province and that province. This article that I have in my hand at this time, from the Atlantic Insight, tells it a lot better possibly than what I can and this is an issue of the Atlantic Insight, July of this year, 1983 and the heading of this article reads, "The Anglo Backlash."

"It's getting tougher to get a job in New Brunswick if you're not bilingual. For some Anglophones that's causing resentment and fear. The difference strikes travellers the moment they cross the New Brunswick border. Roadside signs tell drivers, circulation - and now my French is not good and I'm not going to attempt to read some of the French, Mr. Speaker, because it just wouldn't come out the way it is supposed to; but however I'm sure what the intent of that message is, that signs are going to keep saying in French, "keep right, keep left." It's so confusing to those who enter

that province and cannot understand the French language.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in one of my speeches, that I'm afraid that will be one of the next steps taken in our province; that the road signs will be erected throughout our major cities and throughout the country and I feel sure that if this here resolution is adopted and made part of our laws that it will just be like a cancer, it will be growing on us. There'll be no end to it, Sir.

Going on: "For most Anglophone visitors, that's about as far as bilingualism ever goes, not for the people who live in New Brunswick. More and more often many believe the ability to speak both of the province's official languages is the only test that seems to matter when you go looking for a job or try to keep the one you have. Judy Martinson's staff, at an Avis car rental booth at Fredericton Airport, she's been told to learn French or lose her job."

Mr. Speaker, that's one more thing that we can look forward to, those people who presently have jobs in such places as the airports and that, they'll very likely be asked to move on and make room for someone who is bilingual. Do we need that? Do we want that? I say, no, Mr. Speaker. The people of our province do not want that to happen.

"I don't think it is fair," says Judy Martinson, "to replace a girl who's been with us for 15 years, to say to them, that because you don't speak French you have to go; but Tobias (phonetic) has received an ultimatum from Transport Canada, car rental outlets at St. John and Fredericton airports, they must be able to provide services in both French and English starting in September."

A federal civil servant in Moncton, says: "Sometimes I feel like a token English person in middle management. We know French-speaking people are given jobs, not on merit, but how can you say it without being called a bigot?" This particular person says: "I've been looking for a job now for two years, says an unemployed teacher with 11 years experience. Had I been bilingual, I could have stood a chance. If you have a French background you are much better off."

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

It goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say: "The Federal Government also is enthusiastic about applying its bilingualism policies in a province where nearly 34 percent of the population is French speaking, but with the unemployment topping 15 percent and no offshore oil and gas to light a fire under the economy, the tolerance of New Brunswick's Anglophone majority is showing signs of strain as bilingual ability increasingly becomes a criterion, sometimes the deciding one of hiring, especially for competent civil jobs."

"When Transport Canada cracked down on inadequate bilingual service in New Brunswick airports several unilingual Commissionaires with relocations. Three thousand people in Fredericton signed a petition demanding the policy be revoked."

"You're going to find a lot of backlash," warned Lieutenant-Colonel Stan Rodensieder (phonetic),

Commander of the Canadian Corps of Commissionaires, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Division. "It's just beginning to surface."

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that is what will happen in the Province of Manitoba should this become law. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

"There is a resurgence of a backlash in New Brunswick," admits Robert Pichet (phonetic), the Moncton-based Atlantic representative of the Federal Commission of Official Languages. "It's becoming evident around St. John, around Fredericton. I've been receiving threats, nasty phone calls, all very vague," this man says.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on and read more on this here particular issue but the story is there. They have experienced what I believe this province will be running into in the not too distant future. As I said earlier, it grow if this is made law, as a cancer grows in a human body and, Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, it is the duty in each and every one of us sitting in opposition to this government today, to speak on behalf of the people of our constituencies and ask them, the present government, to take heed to what the people of Manitoba are telling them, the message that we are endeavouring to put to the government today. They apparently are determined to put that deaf ear on the message that we are endeavouring to put across. If this is the case, Mr. Speaker, we, as Manitobans, will be the ones who will have to pay for the mistakes that they are making.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that we, in opposition, will continue to debate this issue as long as we have breath to do so. We will continue, Mr. Speaker, because we believe this cause is worthy of every effort we can muster.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the sub-amendment to the amendment to the main resolution of referral, I would like to take the opportunity to explain to the members opposite, to the public and for the record what is happening in the Legislature these days and why it is happening.

We are being accused, Mr. Speaker, of filibustering and of delaying the Business of the House and even the part of some members opposite insinuating that we are somehow destroying the parliamentary process. Sir, what is actually happening here is not the destruction of the parliamentary process by any means, but the functioning of the parliamentary process, because what we have here is the opportunity and the demonstration of how an opposition party, with a minority of elected members, can prevent the government from proceeding with an action that the majority of Manitobans do not want that government to proceed with.

But that cannot be done indefinitely by the opposition. There is a mechanism for the government, there is a mechanism that the government can use if they believe that what they are proposing is right and proper and has the support of the public, then they need not fear to use the mechanism which is available, Sir, and that is the mechanism of closure.

If the Attorney-General wished, the Government House Leader wished, he could stand in the House this afternoon at 5:30 and he could say that he was going to invoke Rule 37; and this evening, Sir, it's my understanding he could move that debate no longer be adjourned under Rule 37 and that by 2:00 a.m. the following morning, the question would have to be put, Sir, and the vote would be taken and the government would prevail and they could send their resolution to the committee.

Now they can do that, Sir, they can do that if they feel that what they are doing is correct, and if they believe that what we are doing is wrong, then, Sir, the public will pass judgment on that.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Would you permit a question?

MR. B. RANSOM: In a moment. If the Member for Springfield is concerned that we will ring the bells indefinitely and not let the motion pass, then surely he knows if the position that he is taking is right, and the public is with the government, the public will also be against what the opposition is doing and they will make their views known immediately through the mechanisms that are available to them to contact us, and they would eventually make their position known through the ballot box; but the government must know, the government must feel strongly then that what they're doing is correct.

If the honourable member wishes to ask a question, Sir, I'd be happy to entertain it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question was exactly as the member supposed, but slightly different wording. I would ask the member if he would give members on this side an assurance that on either the closure motion or on the substantive questions which would be put at 2:00 a.m. the bells would not ring longer than the 24-hour record which they approached earlier this week? If he would give us that assurance then we would be much more interested in listening to the suggestions that he has to make.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to give the honourable member any undertaking beyond that we will act in what we believe is a responsible fashion. We will act in a way that we sincerely believe is in the interests of the public and in a way that reflects what the majority of the public thinks.

If the honourable member thinks for a minute that if we were to allow the bells to ring for 10 days, for instance, that the public would not respond to that in a way that was saying the opposition was preventing the government from proceeding with their business, then I think he would misread the situation. If it's a question of a day, the member says 24 hours earlier, Sir, that was simply a legitimate tactic on the part of the government to draw public attention to what the government is attempting to do, and to draw the government's attention to the seriousness of this situation and to the way in which the opposition views this, the seriousness with which we view this proposed action of the government.

So, Sir, we have brought in an amendment to the referral - and perhaps I should back up a moment, Sir, and review the history of this - that initially the government had no intention of going to a Standing Committee of the Legislature at all, at all; they were not going to go to a committee. In fact, Sir, all they were going to do then, at that time, was perhaps they had a media program in mind because we know that they do plan these media programs well in advance, such as they did for the Jobs Fund. But, nevertheless, they were not going to have a standing committee of the Legislature to consider this resolution.

Then they agreed to have a committee, but even then the Attorney-General said - and I'll quote from Page 3771 of Hansard, Friday, June 17, 1983 - "The government has said that it will not call for a vote on the resolution until those hearings are finished because it is not, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination a PR exercise or a sham, because it is open for us to do one thing, but one thing only, that is, to reject the agreement completely. It is not possible at this stage because the case in the Supreme Court merely stands adjourned. It is not possible for us to take an agreement that involves four, five parties and unilaterally start playing around textually with the agreement."

Well, Mr. Speaker, even at the time that they finally budged off the initial position that they wouldn't go to a committee at all, they said, all right, we'll go to a committee but bear in mind that the only thing that's open to us is to reject completely this agreement. We can't play around with it textually at all; that's what the Attorney-General said.

Mr. Speaker, then they've started to move a bit off that and they are now, the First Minister is now acknowledging that there might be some amendments possible. We don't know the extent of the amendments possible, but evidently there might be some amendments. They initially were only prepared then to have the committee meet here in Winnipeg. They wanted it meeting here this week when the temperature outside happens to be 105 and, I think, sometimes in this building, outside of this Chamber, it's even higher than that. They wanted to have the hearings here to get them through and to get the resolution back in the House and pass it; they wanted it passed.

Now, as debate has continued on this issue and as we have tried to make known our views and the views of the vast majority of the public, the government has come to realize that they have created something of a monster in the action that they're undertaking. They're getting reaction from the public, and they've now decided that perhaps they could consider going and taking the committee out into the country for three or four days, visit perhaps three centres, I think they've mentioned, but still get back here and push it through before this Session ends. Sir, we say that's not good enough.

The government cannot and must not proceed in that way. They must give the public an opportunity to make presentations to the committee in an unhurried way, in a relatively informal atmosphere as they travel around the country because it is known, Mr. Speaker, that the public, by and large, tend to be a bit overwhelmed by making presentations to committees of the legislature. They know that this is a very sensitive issue, that there is a danger of them being branded

as racists and bigots when they put their position forward and say they don't like what the government is doing. So there must be an opportunity for the committee to go around the province and hear people in a number of centres in the province. It's not good enough just to have the committee here. We can't have people travelling in from outside. There are apt to be literally hundreds of submissions. You cannot expect people to come from Thompson and Flin Flon and Melita and Emerson and all over the province, to come in here and sit day after day - as it's going to be necessary to do if the government plans to hear all the submissions - and perhaps not have their opportunity to make the submission before it's necessary for them to return home. They can't be expected to incur the kind of expense that they would have to incur to do that.

So what we have been attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, is basically not to debate the content of the resolution which the government is putting before us, but basically to talk about the process. I know that members on both sides of the House have strayed from that, Mr. Speaker, but the essence of the argument at this point has to do with the process. I think we have made some progress, those in opposition to this resolution have made some progress, in beginning to convince the government that what they are doing is not acceptable to the people.

We will continue, Mr. Speaker, to extend debate and if the government wants to call it a filibuster, they want to call it obstructionism, that's their prerogative, but what we are going to do is extend debate on this issue until the government recognizes that it is essential to go to an intersessional committee, and to give the public the opportunity to be heard or the government will have to use the mechanism that's available to them to force it through. As I've said before, Mr. Speaker, if they think they're right, then that is the only course of action that they can take. If they think that they're right, they think the public supports them, they can do it.

Now they're trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition is preventing this resolution from going before a standing committee of the Legislature so that the public can be heard. They say we are preventing the public from being heard on this issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, that has a element of truth, of course, because if we passed the resolution, if we agreed to what the government wants, presumably they could have it into committee, maybe not tomorrow now, but next week. They could have it into the committee easily on Monday. They would hold hearings for as short a period of time as they possibly could and then they would get it back in here and pass it.

But we have seen, Mr. Speaker, how they dealt with the cattle producers, for instance, when the cattle producers came before the committee on Bill 90. We have seen how they dealt with those who were opposed and even some who were in favour of the seat belt legislation on Bill 60. We saw, Sir, how that committee cut off hearings when there was still 17 people on the list. They can argue that that's the way it's always worked. But, Mr. Speaker, when you have large numbers of people wanting to be heard and they have to sit hour after hour, day after day, waiting for their opportunity to be heard, it is not unexpected that when you come to a certain point there will be no one left in the room that day partly because of the short notice

involved, but mainly because these are people who are taking their own time to try and come and make their presentation before a committee, and because of the long wait involved they had to leave at that point. So you end up with, in that case, I believe 17 people left on the list. That is not good enough if we're going to deal, as we are, with a constitutional amendment. So, Mr. Speaker, they must see the wisdom of going to an intersessional committee and allowing the people to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield wishes to ask a question. I'll entertain a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the sincere approach the member is taking to addressing this problem and also his willingness to respond to questions. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate his concern about the nature in which a committee might be run. If he, and our House Leader, were able to reach an accommodation that would provide a guarantee, publicly given, of unlimited time for that committee to hear the - I think the member said 170, I think he means roughly 55 or so - public representations plus a block of about 110 municipalities, I think that's roughly the present statistics. But if an accommodation could be reached that they would all be heard; that the committee wouldn't sit past a certain reasonable hour, and that the committee would not sit on certain days that were going to be problems, either Saturday or Saturday evenings or Sundays; that the committee would try and expedite its work, but not do it in such a way that did not prevent everybody from being heard, and did not provide reasonable time, in terms of advertisements, perhaps at least a week or two weeks, if necessary, in advance for the rural hearings where travel was involved; if that kind of proposal were made, is the House Leader of the Official Opposition suggesting in his comments that he would then be amenable to proceeding with some immediacy to committee hearings as long as he had that guarantee that there would be a full hearing under very firm rules?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the government is moving toward what will be necessary for them to do; they are moving towards it. Their next relatively small step is to go to an intersessional committee. I'll explain to the member why it is not acceptable, in my view, to say that we would go out immediately, we'd recess, or we'd go on with other business and the committee would go out and would sit for seven or eight or 10 days consecutively, and then come back and deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, the reason is that we are dealing here with a constitutional amendment. We are dealing with an amendment to the Constitution of our province and part of the Federal Constitution in the sense that the Federal Government has to be part of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, a consensus should be achieved on a constitutional amendment, in our view. It simply is not within the realm of reasonableness to think that the original Fathers of Confederation, for example, would have sat down and drawn up a Constitution which

perhaps only 30 percent of the people agreed with. It's unreasonable to think that they would have done that, Sir. That is essentially what this government is doing, is wanting to proceed with a constitutional amendment that I would guess, at the outside, only 30 percent of the people would agree with.

Mr. Speaker, in The Constitution Act of Canada, provision is, of course, made for amending the Constitution of our country. How is that done, Sir? It is done by requiring that the proposed amendment go through Parliament; that the proposed amendment go through the Senate; that the proposed amendment be approved by seven provinces which have at least 50 percent of the people in those provinces. Now, what is that, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a recognition that there must be consensus, there must be a majority view in order to make an amendment to the Constitution? What we are talking about here is an amendment which, once made, is essentially not going to be changed. It is just not going to be changed, Mr. Speaker. So the government must achieve consensus on it.

Now, to come back to the question that the honourable member is asking. In our view, the only possibility of achieving consensus is for the government to go to an intersessional committee in an unhurried way, explain the position that the government has, explain it to the people. Perhaps when you explain it to them you will get consensus for what you want to do, but bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment it hasn't been explained. The public has not even seen the wording. The information that the Attorney-General has sent out has not contained the wording. Neither of the pamphlets which have been sent out has contained the wording, but if the government is right, if they're right that this must be done, that they have no choice and, on top of that, that it is the proper thing to do, then let them go and explain that to the people. What have they got to fear from going to the people and explaining that? And if consensus can be achieved on that basis, Mr. Speaker, then they will have achieved a great victory. If they can't achieve a consensus, then they must begin to modify their proposal until they get consensus.

In our view, this kind of constitutional amendment should not be made until there is consensus. We know from the actions taken by the Member for Elmwood that he clearly is at odds with the government on what they're proposing. I know from some of the comments made by the Member for Ellice who spoke on an open-line radio show one morning speaking about the desirability of achieving consensus for a constitutional change. Now, there must be other members on the government side who also have deep down some recognition that this must be done. There must be consensus.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is something of a record, but I'll accept a third question from the Member for Springfield if he's prepared to keep it brief.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Once again, Mr. Speaker, a thank you to the member for accepting my question.

Following on the suggestions he's making which I believe have merit, could he explain to the House why he sees a difference between a completely open-ended series of standing committee meetings during a recess period sine die, without a date set, so that the committee is not under any pressure, and it can fully hear the public versus intersessional. If he sees no difference subject to those conditions on the recess, I'm wondering if there is much difference and if maybe we are reaching an understanding here.

MR. B. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should think that the government would see some advantage to concluding some of the business which is before the House. There is other business still before the House which really should be concluded and remove the pressure for the House to get back and complete that business and perhaps the Member for Springfield would see some advantage in doing that. I'm sure that some of his Ministers would see some advantage to doing that.

Mr. Speaker, the public doesn't understand. They don't either understand what the government is attempting to do, or they don't accept what the government is telling them, and that's one of the reasons why they must take some time and go out and explain what's happening, because, Sir, I mentioned previously they haven't seen the wording.

Now I know that a great many people in the province would like to have an explanation that satisfies them as to what is meant by what we're being asked to accept. You need go no further than look at 23.1, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba. Now, what does that mean? Is there any person on the government side who can stand up and categorically tell us, what does that mean? Even more, Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to go to the five parties that are involved - the Attorney-General mentioned four or five parties that are involved - would it be possible to go to them and say with respect to Section 23.1, write down what Section 23.1 means to you? Do you think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that we could then look at what those four or five parties wrote and that they would all agree on what English and French are the official languages of Manitoba really means? Nonsense, they wouldn't. It hasn't been explained that way. It isn't known what it means.

This morning my Leader asked a very legitimate question based on some factual information about how this would affect the application of The Federal Government Official Languages Act, the Attorney-General simply assures us, it doesn't have any effect. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that he can make that assurance.

Do you know what this is going to lead to? As an example, I'll refer to the other constitutional amendment which is before the House, and that is the one that deals with aboriginal rights; and when the First Minister introduced that he stood in the House, he gave us approximately two printed pages of speech with respect to that constitutional amendment which contained exactly seven lines actually telling us what the constitutional amendment was. There was no explanation of it. I raised some questions with the members opposite. Of course, we haven't yet had any answers as to what that means.

What does it mean, Mr. Speaker? For instance, "That notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Aboriginal and Treaty rights referred to in Subsection 1 are guaranteed equally to male and female persons." It seems simple on the surface, but nobody can tell us what it means. Now if that is entrenched in the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, we will have the same sort of situation that we now have with respect to the Treaties where over 100 years later one reads the Treaty, one sees that the Treaty says certain things, the Indian people say, well that may be what the Treaty says, but at the time we understood something else, we believed that it meant something else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know with respect to this situation, because I happened to be at the meeting in Ottawa when the provinces and the representatives of the Native people sat around the table and arrived at this wording, I can give you an absolute ironclad guarantee, Sir, that the people who agreed to this wording don't all agree on what it means, but if that becomes entrenched in the Constitution I can see 10 years from now, 20 years from now, 100 years from now, that when people go to court on that, they're going to say, well that may be what the words say, but that isn't what we thought it meant at the time, that isn't what we understood what it meant.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the same thing, in my view, applies to the wording of this amendment which the government is proposing. What does it mean, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba? Does that mean that French, it's official but it's not as official as English? It doesn't have the same standing as English? Or does it mean it has the same standing? You can go on through the various sections - which I don't intend to do because we're not actually supposed to be debating the resolution at the moment - but I raise these questions, Mr. Speaker, because it's this kind of understanding or misunderstanding which must be cleared up if the public is going to have some basis to make a judgment on, of whether they're behind the government on this issue or whether they're not behind the government on this issue.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that in my view the government has done nothing to really explain to the public what these amendments truly mean. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the information which the government is sending out is misleading the people. The people are being misled by what the government is sending out. I'm not charging that the government is attempting to mislead them, Mr. Speaker, but I am saying they are being misled.

Let's look, for instance, at the pamphlet that was sent out which the Premier, first of all, placed the big ad in all the papers and said, watch for this pamphlet that I'm going to send you, I want you to look at it. Then when the pamphlet came it has some nice subtle little features to it, such as, the young girl in the Ukrainian costume, on what would probably be the back of the folder I guess, Mr. Speaker. Now, what does something as simple as that indicate to the public? What does a young girl in Ukrainian costume have to do with an amendment that deals with French language services and the official place of the French language in Manitoba? — (Interjection) — It has nothing to do with it, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I have enough time to deal with the honourable member's argument but I think I'm going to run out of time.

What this attempts to do and what some of the other material that the government has put out attempts to do, Mr. Speaker, is to appeal to the other ethnic minorities in the province saying, what we are doing with respect to the French language is somehow related to the rights of other minority groups in the province? Mr. Speaker, that is not true. If anyone in the Ukrainian community should think that two years from now, or a year from now, this government is going to bring in an amendment that says English and French and Ukrainian are the official languages of Manitoba, forget it; it's not going to happen. The two things are not related, Mr. Speaker. So why is the government sending out this kind of information because this information is serving to confuse people? It's serving to confuse people more than it is to provide a real explanation to the people of what is happening out there.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, one can look at the series of questions and answers that the Minister of Cultural Affairs has evidently been sending to the various cultural groups, the various ethnic minorities in Manitoba, and he's saying in that material, "Manitoba is not going bilingual." But, Mr. Speaker, the public looks at that and they say, the government assures us the province is not going bilingual but yet if they ever have a look at the actual amendments that are being proposed they see that the amendment says, English and French are the official languages of Manitoba.

Now, how are the public to reconcile those two positions, Mr. Speaker? The one that is going to be entrenched in the Constitution forever if this government has its way, and the other which is a bit of propaganda that the government puts together and sends out and if it happens to be wrong, well you know, it's going to be forgotten about before too long, that's the government's hope.

Mr. Speaker, there are other answers in here which simply aren't accurate. It says, "This constitutional amendment will ensure that all Manitoba laws remain valid, even if in English." I presume that it means, even if printed in English only. But since that time, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and others have acknowledged, that there's nothing in this amendment which will prevent someone else from raising a challenge under Section 23.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to debate these specific issues in the resolution at the moment. What I'm trying to impress on the members opposite is that if you are really going to clear up the misunderstanding, if you believe it's a misunderstanding, then you must get out and go to the public and explain some of these contradictions. You must get this amendment before the people and explain to them what it means, it must be, Mr. Speaker.

This is a constitutional amendment which is going to stand forever. Let's not fool ourselves. We're dealing with an issue that is extremely volatile. There is perhaps no issue more volatile than language and if these changes are made they're not going to be changed in any way after that. Explain to the public what is the implication of what you're doing. Explain to the public what is the implication of placing this into the hands of the courts so that the courts will be determining the extent of French language services and not the government; not the Minister of Education; not the Minister of Natural Resources; not the Minister of

Agriculture. They may be elected by the people of Manitoba; they may be appointed to the Cabinet, but once this goes through, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to have control over it anymore and that is wrong.

But that tends to get into a debate of the resolution, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to do that as I've said before, but I want to point out to the members opposite that those are the kinds of questions that have to be dealt with in the committee when it goes to the public and if consensus can't be achieved, Mr. Speaker, then the government is going to have to consider some other avenue. They're going to have to consider changes. They're going to have to consider withdrawing this and proceeding to the court, as we had said they should, as we believe they should. — (Interjection) —

My colleague from Roblin Russell says, call an election. That would be a good idea too, Mr. Speaker, if they really believe that this is an issue that is important to them, that's important to all Manitobans, that they have the public behind them, call an election. I don't really expect them to do that, Mr. Speaker, but there are other things that they can do. There are other things which they must give consideration to doing. Don't let the government simply put their heads down and bull ahead with this, Mr. Speaker. Just because they have been forced to delay their process, to set it back because they don't like what the opposition is doing by way of the Legislative tactics, don't let that cloud their judgment on what is really important here. They must reflect the public will.

The public would not be expected to sit down and draft a Constitution with which they didn't agree and it makes no more sense to assume that they would sit down and draft an amendment to the Constitution with which they didn't agree and the public does not agree with what the government is doing. Surely, surely all of the public reaction must be convincing the government of that. Surely they are getting phone calls. Surely they are getting letters.

The Member for Elmwood is getting thousands of coupons back from his ads, thousands of dollars back from his ads, Mr. Speaker. There are dozens of organizations expressing genuine concern over what the government is doing. Why won't the government listen to them, Mr. Speaker? This is the same government that said, we care, we listen. They are not listening now, Mr. Speaker. They've got their heads down and they're trying to bull straight ahead. They realize that this issue is politically very dangerous to them and that the quicker they get it behind them, the better. They know that the quicker they get this behind them the more chance there is of the electorate forgetting it.

They know that there's that provision in the amendment that doesn't bring the services into effect, as far as the amendment is concerned until I believe, it's 1987. Yes, certain sections, 23.8 and 23.9 shall come into force January 1, 1987. Mr. Speaker, those have to do with the delivery of services and this has been rather cleverly put together, or at least a cynic might say it's been rather cleverly put together. The public might say that. They've put it together so that it doesn't become effective until after the next election; so that if one proceeds with this at the moment, as quickly as possible, pushes it through, gets it on the books, then forget about it, we'll have a couple of years before this

actually comes into effect, before the first court challenges will be able to come forward, Mr. Speaker.

But what will happen as sure as we're assembled here if they pass these amendments, is that at some point in the future people are going to go to court on the basis of these amendments, they are going to get decisions which the vast majority of the public are not going to accept; they are going to create frustration among the public, just as people are frustrated with the federal bilingualism program, just as people are frustrated with the metric program. People look around, the other people they talk to agree with them that some provision of metric or some provision of federal bilingualism doesn't make sense. They say why is it that this must be? We don't agree with it. Whatever happened to democracy when the majority of the public don't agree with something, but their government imposes it on them? That's what's happening here, and that's what going to happen as people take provisions of these changes to court and there will be frustration. Mr. Speaker, if the public is not behind what is done, then it simply is going to serve to undermine the confidence that people have in their governments, the confidence that people have in the system.

That's why we're here. Those are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we are here now preventing the government from pushing ahead with this resolution. If the government wants it to go the public and if they genuinely are prepared to go the public, take some period of time, some extended period of time, then let them say we will support the amendment, we will support the proposed sub amendment and we will get it into committee. It can begin next week, the week after, perhaps. The House would probably wrap up within a week or so and could go to the committee. They could have it there. The public could be heard. — (Interjection) — My colleague for Roblin-Russell raises a good point at the moment. We happen to be into a year that is rather advanced; we're into harvest now. Those of you who sit around this Chamber perhaps haven't been out, don't realize what's going on, but we're into harvest.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the point is that if you're going to go out and try and have committee hearings over the next 10 days, two weeks, three weeks, it's not going to work very well, because there are a great many people out there in the rural areas, the municipal councillors, for example, a great many of them are farmers, they're not available now to express themselves. I would hope the government would not make the mistake, Mr. Speaker, of misinterpreting what would happen if they went at that time and didn't get people coming expressing their views. If they happen to hold those committees at a time and place that's not convenient, and people who are out there struggling to make a living are unable to make the time and the effort to come and be heard, that should not be misinterpreted as a lack of concern or as support for what the government does. That's why it must take time; they must take time to genuinely seek the public input.

Mr. Speaker, I implore the government to support the sub-amendment; support the amendment; give us their commitment they'll do that. We could have this into committee hearings within a very short period of time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of more questions for the member that flow from his later remarks, because I think he is searching for a way of assisting the House out of the impasse in which it finds itself. Mr. Speaker, if the member is willing . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Since the member's time is over, we need unanimous consent if there is to be any questions. (Agreed)

The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the member suggested that the House could wrap up in a week or so in terms of the other business that's before the House. He also expressed some concern about the harvest which we might be able to accommodate by doing the Winnipeg hearings first, because they might take a month alone, so we could be well into September.

If that were the case then, if we could wrap up the House in a week or so, and I think the "or so" might well be two or three weeks because there's some contentious business before the House, and if we could handle the Winnipeg hearings first which would probably take a month in terms of the amount of people who are stacked up to appear on that list, would the member not agree then that if we agreed to adjourn the House upon the completion of all that business, leaving the only item on the Order Paper, the French language services constitutional amendment, and then sit sine die with no date set for reconvening, that in effect that kind of recess would accommodate all of his goals and all of the government's goals, and allow the public to be heard?

Is there problem if that scenario were followed in accommodating the wishes of both sides?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Member for Springfield is the person who is authorized to be a spokesperson on behalf of the government or not, but I made a comment that I thought that the other business of the House could be dealt with in a relatively short period of time. That doesn't mean that it's going to be passed, Mr. Speaker. That means that the government may have to bend to some reason with respect to other provisions as well. I wouldn't want the member to misunderstand what was said. I'm talking about things that might be within the realm of possibility.

Mr. Speaker, if the government has some proposal to put forward that involves the intersessional committees that would give full and adequate opportunity for public input, then we would like to hear from some official spokesman on the side of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House . . .
The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again this sub-amendment to the resolution provides me with an opportunity to voice some of my concerns, not only the concerns that I have, Mr. Speaker, of a personal nature, but also those concerns of the people which I have the privilege of representing in this Legislature.

One thing that has been increasingly clear over the last little while is that there is a definite public concern and public reaction building with regard to this particular resolution and the manner in which this government is proceeding.

Mr. Speaker, we will all recall when the government introduced this resolution the news media, especially the print media, lauded the government for taking such a bold initiative and such a bold step in providing this type of assurance to the Francophone community in this province. What we have seen, however, now over the last little while, and I must say to a large part of that the credit has to go to members of the opposition who are really doing their job in this Chamber in the last while. Some of the credit for that change in attitude really has to go to the opposition because what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is the press - and all we have to do is read the editorial comments today - both of the major newspapers in Manitoba have indicated now, and are starting to show concern for the type of haste that is being exhibited by this government's handling of this particular issue. We are now seeing people asking, why the hurry? That, Mr. Speaker, has to be the question that is at the bottom of this whole issue. Why the hurry? It's the first constitutional amendment this province will deal with, and this government in their haste to get it through, has really made themselves suspect in the eyes of the majority of people of Manitoba.

I mentioned the other day that the greatest difficulty this government has is trying to convince the people of Manitoba that their position as put forward in their pamphlets and in their constitutional letters as well as that pamphlet which they put out, one of their major problems is that people just do not believe them. One asks, well, why is that?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw a classic case of the type of thing this government will stoop to to try and conjure up a little PR. We saw a classic case of that exhibited this afternoon. Members of the opposition have been telling the government that the Minister of Highways, during the Estimate process, was robbed of some \$20 million. And the government, the Minister of Finance, by his own admission, has said that some of that capital which was to go to highways was put into the Jobs Fund. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we saw happen today was what we as the opposition have been saying all along, that the government reduced the expenditure in the Department of Transportation. The Minister of Natural Resources had some money pulled out of his department which was supposed to go for capital for drainage. There was money pulled from different departments, put in the Jobs Fund. And why in the Jobs Fund, Mr. Deputy Speaker? For only one reason - that they could use that as a propaganda tool to try and convince the people they were going to give them something more than was really going to be spent in the first place. In other words, this was up and beyond what was going to be spent under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, today we saw an announcement by the Minister of Transportation which indicated an additional \$4 million would be spent out of the Jobs Fund. Mr. Speaker, that Minister is still some 15 million to 16 million shy of what he had going into the budgetary process, and we find out today that the government

had the PR machinery set up for the Jobs Fund before they even knew where the money was going to come from. So the government on the other side asks, why isn't the public believing the things we are saying on this issue? Mr. Speaker, that's only one of the reasons the public isn't believing them on this issue and the public really believes there's more to this than the government is letting on.

The other reason is the one I mentioned the other day and I want to talk about that briefly too. We have seen in this country, governments bring in certain measures, which at the time of introduction and at the time that they were passed, were said to be of such an inconsequential nature that it would only affect the lives of a few individuals, and that things would be moving along only at a very slow rate, and that really nobody should be worried about it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we saw, and we have felt the effects of the Federal bilingual program. As I said the other day, one of the greatest difficulties that we've had, there was reference made to the bilingual commissioner, Mr. Yalden - one of the greatest difficulties we've had is that there has been an overzealous approach by the Bilingual Commission to bring about what they perceive as being the mandate from Parliament. I happen to believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the things that they have done, and the length they have gone, and the lack of common sense that has been exhibited by many bureaucrats in Ottawa is an example, is one of the reasons why the public is nervous about this resolution which we are being asked to pass.

Mr. Speaker, let's take another issue. Let's take an issue which has effected the lives of all Canadians. It won't affect my children that much because they're learning metric in school now, but it affects everybody that has gone through the school system, learned the other system and now has to convert. But you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we've got bilingualism in this country through a very innocuous bill that was passed by the House of Commons and we were told, you know, as our major trading partner, the States, moves along. — (Interjection) — We're talking metric, I'm sorry Mr. Speaker. As the U.S. changes into the metric system, Canada's slowly going to move along with it; let's not too excited about it; it's a thing of the future and we're slowly going to move into it. Mr. Speaker, you go talk to anybody in rural Manitoba today or anybody in the city, and you ask the members of Parliament who passed that innocuous little bill, Mr. Speaker, we're having airplanes landing at the Gimli airport that shouldn't be landing there. We've got problems with metric, and this government is going to tell the people of Manitoba, don't worry about it, there won't be any changes, we've got everything under control.

Section 23, subsection 1, I believe, of the proposed amendment says one thing and that says that English and French shall be the official languages in Manitoba. If there is any question in anybody's mind that that doesn't mean exactly what it says, let me tell you, that question is only in the minds of members opposite because the majority of people in Manitoba know what that means - that means bilingualism - that means full-fledged bilingualism. That means that the authority of the Legislature will no longer have control of the rate in which we will move towards that end. What we're going to see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is a move that will

take the authority away from myself, from the members opposite and if we say that, really from the people, because let's face it, the judges, the courts of this country don't have to report back to the people every four years, they're appointed. I know they do their job, they do it to the best of their ability, but as the Member for Turtle Mountain pointed out in 10 or 15 years from now some judge can say, I don't really think that's what the Legislature wanted and I don't really think that's what the Legislature meant and therefore I'm saying, it's going to be like this. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that authority to move is taken away from this Legislature, I believe it is wrong.

Right now if we have a law, if some person in the judiciary interprets a law on the statutes of Manitoba in a way that we as the legislators, the majority of legislators had not intended it to be, or had not intended it to be interpreted, we come back here and we change that law, that is within our power to do that. But once this amendment is passed that authority is taken out of hands and, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we in the opposition are voicing our concern with the process, with the lack of consultation, with the lack of the attempt of this government to seek a consensus of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am one of the individuals on this side who comes from a so-called ethnic minority in this province and I want to say that I believe that we in Canada are embarked on a program of bilingualism in a manner in which most of the people of Manitoba could live with.

The other night I pointed out my personal experience with regard to all I had to deal with on that particular issue when my children are now faced with taking either German or French in the schools. I advised the House at that time that because I believed that French will in the future be a language that will have to be learned by the majority of people if they want to get a Civil Service job, I was moving in that direction. I gave up a certain part of my heritage, Mr. Speaker, when I decided to have my children take French and not German.

The education system in this province is one, Mr. Speaker, which has been moving under the previous administration, and I hope it continues under this administration, to provide funds to school divisions who wish to provide Francophone courses, whether it be immersion or core programs, because I believe that is the only way that we can bridge this so-called gap which we have within the fabric of Canada but, Mr. Speaker, that was happening, as in my case, on a voluntary nature.

I remember the former Member for Inkster sitting in this Chamber and saying that was really the essence and would really be the final test for bilingualism in this country, when people realize that for economic reasons they would have to learn French, or English, the converse, when people realize that, that is when they would adopt this bilingual approach in a manner which would cause very little public outcry and very little controversy.

But, Mr. Speaker, need we have any larger example of what I have just said, and maybe this is one of the few things that helped cement my belief, that if you want the best for your children you're going to have to teach them that second language of French, as we

Conservatives just went through at a national convention. One of the basic reasons of what I believe was one of the best candidates - one of the top three candidates it turned out to be at the Leadership Convention - one of the reasons that individual did not get elected is that he did not speak French. A fact of life is, Mr. Speaker, that if one aspires to be Prime Minister of this country you're going to have to be bilingual.

There are many of us in this Manitoba of ours who have realized that to arm your children with the best possible tools for advancement in the future, they will have to know French. The Minister of Education the other night when she was sitting here, hopefully took note of the suggestion I made with regard to reinstating the criteria or the entrance requirements for university and reintroduce the two-language criteria for university entrance because that becomes another further incentive to do what we're talking about doing here. Mr. Speaker, what people don't want, what they don't want is the type of approach this government has taken.

The Attorney-General the other day took a lot of time in a speech on July 4th, to try and point out to the members of this side of the House that really our position on this was not founded on a very strong base because we had - and he's got almost a whole page-and-a-half in Hansard - because we had really started to do a lot of these things. He quoted from Cabinet memos, he quoted from documents, he quoted from letters sent by the then Premier, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, and he said, look at all the things you were doing. We're not really doing that much more, we're just taking that logical step further and we're now entrenching it.

Mr. Speaker, as I said the other night, I was part of a government that moved on providing more services to the Francophone community in Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of that. I really believe that we were moving in a prudent common-sense way in dealing with this issue.

As many people know I have a fairly large population of Francophone people in my constituency. I have had a number of letters from people who feel that the government should move in the direction they are. I've also had a lot of people write me and say they aren't happy with what's happening. I have indicated to my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter which I have sent out to many people and I'm not about to say to anybody that I want to not have a firm position on it. I've indicated to him that I do have a firm position.

Mr. Speaker, to just quote from that letter: "My position has been, and continues to be, one which supports the establishment and expansion of French language services as initiated in 1979 by the Lyon Government of which I was a member. I am proud of having been involved in a government which moved on and expanded services to the Francophone community of Manitoba."

"I am, however, opposed to the entrenching of these services as I believe the responsibility for this should rest with the elected people and not with our courts."

That is my position, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I will be speaking on this amendment, and on as many amendments as are required to point out to this government the error of its ways in dealing with this resolution.

The Member for Turtle Mountain held up the pamphlet which the members opposite have sent out. As you

know, I guess history has a habit of repeating itself, and I think the members opposite are going through very much the same thing we went through in about 1979, 1980 when we were in government. You see, we had to do a few things that were unpopular and, of course, the opposition was really hammering us on that restraint program which we had introduced. Now all of a sudden after two years we see them talking about zero and five and they've suddenly, I guess, maybe come to some of their senses or realized that money doesn't grow on trees and they're going to have to be a little more responsible because the deficit's getting out of hand.

But what really happened to this government is they introduced this resolution and suddenly their executive assistants, and their high-priced PR people, and the people on the street started calling their members and said - what are you guys doing? What's happening here? The PR people said - you know you're not getting your message out. You're not getting your message out so what we have to do is we have to get this campaign going, PR campaign, and what we're going to do is we're going to tell the people because they're really misinterpreting what we're saying, so we're going to spend a whole bunch of taxpayers' money and we're going to really tell the people what it's really all about.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they have indicated now that they're going to spend about \$100,000.00. Well, the material that's gone through the ads we've seen, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, when the Order for Return comes in we're going to find out they've spent a lot more. You know, it's ironic though because the Attorney-General says, one of the reasons they're bringing in this resolution is to save the taxpayers money, and here they're spending it trying to go ahead and tell the people what they're really doing. But at the basis of this, this has not really been put forward, it was never planned to be put forward, this type of public information. The reason they're doing it is because their people, their New Democrats, their political advisers, and their PR people have been telling them that they are in trouble on this issue and that's why we've got the stuff coming.

So having been there, Mr. Speaker, and knowing how the system works, I want to tell members opposite that every time a new ad comes out, or every time a new piece of propaganda comes out, we know there's more and more heat building. It's a sure sign of the problems of the government.

The other thing that I want to talk about a little bit that I found very interesting in this brochure, is the attempt by the government, and I guess really by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, to say this is really a package for the other minority groups in this province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I said earlier in my speech that the two-language system, and as I said before, which we are headed for, and I think is an eventuality which nobody will be able to really stop, is one which will really put a strain on the different ethnic communities in this province.

I say to someone that has got his or her child enrolled in German immersion, or Ukrainian immersion, that they should really sit down and assess what the impact of this type of resolution will really mean. The fact of the matter is that if you apply to the RCMP and want to go to the school in Saskatchewan you get put on a list.

Talking to an individual this morning who had a son on the list for, I believe, over a year he's been waiting. He is No. 2 on a list which says, Mr. Speaker, unilingual male. That's the list he's waiting on. Mr. Speaker, a fact of life is that if you want to get into the RCMP, and you speak both languages, your chances of getting in there are going to be a lot better, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) —

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Springfield will listen, his government is trying to say that this particular thing is going to be really good for the other ethnics. I want to say, as I have come to the realization as an ethnic, that we will all have to decide and all have to teach our children eventually, French and English. The different pilot projects that we have going, which our government was involved in - my goodness, we set up the Ukrainian bilingual program, we set up the German immersion program - but I want to say to members opposite that if they really want to go out and really represent the fact that this is going to help them; it's not going to help them because the fact of the matter is, with or without this, we are moving in that direction. What we have seen happen here is that this government in their overzealous approach to dealing with this matter has caused the divisions in the country which need not have been there.

Some of my colleagues have indicated that the committee which we are asking for is one in which, of course, the public will have a chance to make public representation. I say to members opposite, however - I believe I said this a while ago - that the public in my area, I'm talking about the people other than the Francophone community - the public there will not be very vocal on his issue publicly. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that we in the southeast have Francophone communities; we have Ukrainian communities; we have German communities. Those people work together every day; they do business together; they play hockey together; they play baseball together, Mr. Speaker. And if the government really feels, really believes, that these people are going to come before a committee of this Legislature and indicate to them that they are either violently opposed or violently for this issue, I don't believe they will, I really don't believe they will because they will not want to jeopardize the relationship that has built up over the years.

Mr. Speaker, this government, in its haste to move on this issue has done, as I said before, the Francophone community and the other ethnic communities in this province a big disservice. No matter how they try and sell this issue to the public, the public is not for this approach. The public will buy a slow-moving approach towards the bilingual institutionalizing of this province, but it will not buy this type of legislation. It has seen too often, what has happened when legislators say one thing and then after a few years, the bureaucrats and the courts move in another.

I say to members opposite that this side of the House will not allow the government to move on this in the type of rapid approach that they have undertaken. That is why we have brought in the type of amendments which we have, and we will continue to use the Legislature for what it was intended for, Mr. Speaker, to express the concerns of the public. If the members opposite talk about frustrating the Legislature, that's

their business. They're the people who indicated the other day, the Member for Springfield indicated the other day that they had a mandate. You didn't have a mandate to do this; you did not have a mandate to deal with this issue. You had never even mentioned it during the election. If you think by virtue of having been elected you can do anything you want, you've got another guess coming. You have not had a mandate to deal with this major constitutional amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please, order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the opposition to this is building, not only from our side but members opposite, I'm sure, are starting to receive calls and are starting to have second thoughts about what is happening too. Let them not talk about the problems within our caucus dealing with our Federal Leader, Mr. Mulroney. All they have to do is turn their chairs around and look at that seat right behind the Minister of Education and the Minister of Natural Resources. My goodness, you've got more trouble in your group than we have over here.

Mr. Speaker, we're all going to vote for this sub-amendment. Can the New Democrats say the same thing? Were they sure of their position on this bill, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they would have kicked that member out so quickly. Look what happened to the Member for Brandon East. He got booted out - for what? Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a privilege to continue to speak on the matter that's before the House, the matter of the amendment to the referral motion that suggests that we ought to be taking this matter to intersessional committee hearings, hearings that will report back to this House no later than December 30, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, we will debate the substance of the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act at a later time. Some of us have already had the opportunity to speak and debate on the substance. Our leader, I believe, has stated very well the case that is to be presented by this side of the House.

This, as I say, is another opportunity to speak about the process. I intend, Mr. Speaker, as much as possible to stay on that track of speaking about the process. Why else are we here on the 5th of August when the temperature is running in the 90-degree range outside, when all of us like other typical Manitobans should be outside enjoying the good weather and participating in the good life in Manitoba, because this is what Manitoba is all about. These are the things that all of us should enjoy. We are here, Mr. Speaker, because we are committed to the people of Manitoba to demonstrate that this government is not doing what it should in trying to ram through a piece of legislation, a proposal to amend the Constitution of Canada, at a time when most Manitobans cannot participate in that democratic process.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, knowing that members opposite have made recently some very very interesting speeches suggesting that they are now committed to hear the people of Manitoba. "Hah," is what others have said. That's what I say, hah. That is not true at all, Mr. Speaker, and you know I have to talk about it to some extent in the terms that it was presented to us by the Minister of Energy and Mines yesterday because he spoke about, when he said how committed they are now to hearing the people of Manitoba, and I emphasize "now" - he spoke about it in terms of "the big lie" because he said, Mr. Speaker, that what the opposition is attempting to do is to subvert the right of the people of Manitoba to come before a legislative committee. Well, I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when he says that he is indicating to us that he may be intelligent - the jury is out on that - but he is intellectually dishonest when he presents that argument because, Mr. Speaker, when he says that they are now willing to listen to the people I say, when and how, under what circumstances? It's not good enough just to simply say you're willing to listen to the people of Manitoba. They have been saying it for some time. They said it starting a number of weeks ago. They didn't say it initially but they started to say it a few weeks ago.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when I wanted to talk about the position that's been put forward by the Member for Transcona, the Minister of Energy and Mines, I also want to include in that discussion a similar position that was put forth the other evening by the Premier. At that time we were talking about the big lie, because the Premier was starting to talk for the first time about their commitment to hear the people. At that time great exception was taken by members opposite to the fact that some members on this side, principally our leader, indicated that what was being put forward by the Premier when he suggested that they have always been willing to listen to the people and give an opportunity for participation by the people of Manitoba was indeed the big lie. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that our leader was not wrong, in fact, I don't think that one could disagree with the position . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I remind the Honourable Member for Tuxedo he should not use phrases in this House that are listed in Beauchesne as being unparliamentary.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please clarify for me because I'm not aware which of the phrases I've just used was unparliamentary. If it is "the big lie," Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest to you that you ought to instruct Hansard to exorcize from Hansard. I'm sorry I can't suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, so I would just suggest that it would be wise to have Hansard exorcize from its transcription of the speech made yesterday by the Minister of Energy and Mines, his use of the term "the big lie," because he used it repeatedly, and indeed if it is unparliamentary to use it then, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is unparliamentary for any of us here to use it. If that is the phrase you're referring to I'd like to have that clarified.

Mr. Speaker, I'll carry on assuming that "the big lie" is not the phrase to which you were referring because

the Member for Transcona used it a number of times during his speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would refer the honourable member to Page 108, where there is a long list of unparliamentary words. Although I don't have the citation immediately in front of me, members are expected to behave as honourable members in this House and to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I intend to behave honourably in all that I say and do in this House, and I would expect at all times that I will only present that which is in keeping with the order of debate and the level of debate that it pertains. I am only referring to the speech that was made by the Minister of Energy and Mines, I believe it was last evening, in which he repeatedly used the phrase "the big lie."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: I don't have Hansard before me. I think I said "the big lie technique," and then I talked in terms of the technique. I will look at Hansard. I don't have it available now but I was trying to be careful not to just say "the big lie."

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, then in that case I too will speak about the big lie technique, because if that is the matter that's open for discussion and debate then certainly I'd like to carry on on the same topic and be able to discuss it on similar terms to that which was used by the Minister of Energy and Mines.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Energy and Mines was waxing eloquent last evening as he gave all sorts of presumptuous and gratuitous advice to this side of the House. He told us that we ought to be careful and cautious of moving to far to the right in the policies and platforms that we were espousing as an opposition. Well, I find that absolutely fascinating, Mr. Speaker, that he would be so presumptuous as to give advice to this side of the House when, in fact, he doesn't appear to be capable of, or indeed his Caucus does not appear to be receptive to, the advice that he is giving or is capable of giving, because they don't appear to know where they're going at all whether it be left, right, down the middle. There appears to be no line of thought that has any logic to it whatsoever.

The Member for Transcona obviously is capable of giving them advice, and obviously nobody is listening there because they have totally confused approach to government in this province. They don't know whether they're going right, left or down the middle, as far as I can see. Mr. Speaker, they're lurching from pillar to post, reeling from one set back to another, from one confrontation with a group of society to another, and they are totally out of touch with Manitobans in general. I speak in terms of the economic policies I think he was referring to when he said "going to the right."

For instance, a little while ago, Mr. Speaker, perhaps a year to a year and a half ago when this government was first elected, they talked about the fact that other

governments, principally the Federal Government and other Provincial Governments, were putting constraints and advocating constraints on expenditure in the public sector. They said that there was no place for that sort of thing, that we were in a situation that called for massive government intervention, massive increases in spending. They became very offended that the suggestion that the Federal Government was imposing the so-called six-and-five wage restraint program on people across the country, very offended. The First Minister stood up on a number of different platforms, on a number of different occasions, and suggested that six and five was not appropriate to Manitoba. In the very first year they were in office, they came forward with 18 percent increase in expenditures. The next year, their second year in office, the budget was closer to a 19 percent increase in expenditures. At the same time, they were telling McKenzie Seeds in its settlement with its employees that 13 percent increase in salaries was okay. At the same time, they were telling universities and health care institutions that they ought to keep their increases in salaries to 9 percent, Mr. Speaker. At the same time, they were telling the public school system that they would give them a 10 percent increase in expenditures. Then all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden, a year later, they have come forward with their 0 and 5 percent wage restraint, or expenditure restraint policy, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that they have no idea where they are going; that for him to give advice to us about where we ought to be going in terms of our political perspectives and our philosophical beliefs, is totally gratuitous and is absolutely ludicrous when they have no idea where they're going, to come over and suggest that they know where we ought to be going in our future and politics in this province.

We know where we ought to be going, Mr. Speaker. We are going and headed towards government in this province after the next election. We know that our policies and our positions are those that are in keeping with what Manitobans want and need and we have no need for advice from the Minister of Energy and Mines, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want though to take the opportunity just to give the Minister of Energy and Mines a good deal of information which he is obviously lacking with respect to this particular issue; because when he is presumptuous enough to say that they are the ones who want public hearings, that they are the ones who want public input into this decision making, and that they have always been in that position, Mr. Speaker, I want to take him to task and correct his understanding of the issue. I think it's necessary because the Minister of Energy and Mines, as we understand it, was away on vacation for almost three weeks, was over in England and was touring and enjoying himself while the others in this House were paying attention to the business of the Legislature, to the business of this government and were attempting to arrive at an understanding and some agreement on the legislation that was before us - while we were doing those things, the Minister of Energy and Mines was absent from the whole piece and, therefore, I suppose it's not unreasonable that he should be totally lacking in an understanding of what went on.

Just so that he understands, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell him why we take the position that what was said by the government before as compared to what

is being said by the Premier, the Minister of Energy and Mines, and other members of the government today are two entirely different things. That is why, Mr. Speaker, when we discussed the position that was put forward by the Premier the night before last, or a couple of nights ago, and that of the Minister of Energy and Mines with respect to where they have stood regarding public input, public hearings before committees, then I want to tell him why we believe that the technique of the big lie is at play here, and why there is some understanding on our part, or some position on our part, that they have been less than truthful with the people of Manitoba and our side of the House when they spoke about what their position was.

Mr. Speaker, the offending parts of the speech that were made by the Premier, for instance, on Tuesday evening, were when he said and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, honourable members ought not to be pretenders in this Chamber because we have said, and we have said very clearly, that we are anxious to listen to the public in the Province of Manitoba and that we are prepared to look at the wording pertaining to the resolution that we have in this Chamber."

Further he said, "We've been saying this in the Chamber, that we are prepared to examine the wording within this resolution; we are prepared to tighten up that wording and we are prepared to present that resolution, then for the Federal Government and the Société Franco-Manitobaine to concur or not to concur, hopefully to concur with the wording of that resolution." That's what the Premier said on Tuesday evening, the 2nd of August.

This is what the Attorney-General said on the 17th of June, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: "So what I'm saying is this, that yes, the hearings will invite comments obviously." Now, these are the first set of hearings, those so-called informational hearings, that were held in Dauphin, in Brandon, in Thompson, and in Winnipeg; informational hearings. He said, "They would be held to invite comments obviously, that's what they are there for. They are also there to answer questions because we have found out in the tour of southern Manitoba that when questions are answered with factual information, it helps considerably. The government has said that it will not call for a vote on the resolution until those hearings are finished because it is not, Mr. Speaker, by any stretch of the imagination a PR exercise or a sham."

Here we get to the important part, "because it is open for us to do one thing, but one thing only, that is to reject the agreement completely. It is not possible at this stage, it is not possible for us to take an agreement that involves four, five parties and unilaterally start playing around textually with the agreement. What we can do, and I hope we won't because of the importance to Canadian unity of what we're doing, is pull back from the agreement entirely."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a very different position from that which is being presented today by speakers opposite, because what the Attorney-General said without question on the 17th of June, was that we had two options, either to accept the agreement as it had been drafted and accepted and agreed upon by four or five parties as he said, or to reject it completely. No room for maneuvering, no room for tightening up, no room for amendment, no room for changing of wording,

none at all, Mr. Speaker. So anything that has occurred in the past six weeks since that statement was made was as a result of the tremendous debate and pressure that has been put on by this side of the House, to tell the government that what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

It's unacceptable to the people of this province. It doesn't allow for the input and the ideas and the advice of the people of Manitoba on this matter and, therefore, it is the wrong process and the wrong way to go. That's what we have been saying for six solid weeks here and finally, Mr. Speaker, within the last short while - and it's only been a very short while - since the Attorney-General introduced his referral motion which was then intended to give an opportunity for members of the public to appear before a legislative committee and have their say and give them advice, but under what circumstances, Mr. Speaker?

Well, it's very interesting what the circumstances being proposed were. My colleague, the Member for St. Norbert said it very well yesterday when he had pointed out that the circumstances that were being proposed earlier this week were that the Standing Committee of the Legislature ought to sit on Wednesday and Thursday of this week, that is the 3rd and 4th of August.

Now, one only needs to think back a day or two to know that on those two days, Mr. Speaker, we had temperatures ranging in the 90-100 degree range, that we have a vast majority of Manitobans and most of the special-interest groups who are interested in this whole process and this future plan for Manitoba's history, most of those people are not in a position, necessarily, to mobilize their forces, to have meetings at which they can gain a consensus and draw up a brief and present their ideas and feelings, that they have no opportunity for that because, as I said before and I'll repeat it again, 80 percent of Manitobans one way or another take their holidays in the months of July and August. All you have to do is talk to major employers and you'll find that when they set up their blocks of time for people to call for their holidays, everybody, or at least 80 percent of them, come within those two months of July and August.

So this group opposite wants to force through one of the most fundamental changes in the rights and responsibilities and privileges of Manitobans in that period of time when most Manitobans are on holidays or unable to meet with their own special interest groups, are unable to gather together to discuss ideas in committee or in conference with others of like mind, are unable to do anything but maybe come in from their holidays, interrupt their holidays and come back here on the spur of the moment to try and make a concerted brief.

Members opposite may think that because those of us who are in the House have no difficulty in getting up and speaking on an issue such as this, have no difficulty in sitting down and gathering a consensus and presenting a brief or a position or a statement as to where we stand, that all of Manitobans are similarly blessed and able to do that sort of thing. But I tell them that there are many countless groups who are interested in this matter; that there are many countless individuals who cannot do that; who have to have an opportunity to weigh out the consequences; to marshal

up their arguments and their thoughts; who need the time to present their views, their views that ought to be listened to before a committee of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an easy manner for the average Manitoban to participate in this sort of process. Consequently, we are only asking that on an issue as important as this, the government make it as easy as possible for Manitobans to be heard. It would be one thing, Mr. Speaker, if the government had campaigned on this issue, had said this is a cornerstone of the platform that we are offering you as the New Democratic Party running for election in 1981 - this will be the future of Manitoba if we are elected - but they did not. Indeed, it wasn't even whispered. The Member for Transcona talked about the whisper campaign. Well, it wasn't even whispered in the 1981 election campaign. Indeed, it wasn't even presented in their first or their second Throne Speech. People of Manitoba had no idea that the government was going to move toward this kind of amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is only right and just that the people of Manitoba be given an opportunity to react to this totally new idea. What does the government intend to do about it, Mr. Speaker?

Well, its idea was initially just simply to put it forth as a resolution, to have it debated and to go to Ottawa. That was the first idea. The second idea was that it would have public informational hearings, four of them, throughout the province in which they could present their position on the whole matter and have a little bit of opportunity for public representation - not a great deal because of time constraints were very limited. In fact, the day that they sat in Dauphin and in Brandon, they started the meeting at 11 in the morning in Dauphin and they intended to be through by 1 o'clock. I think they stretched it until 2, but then it had to be done and finished with because they had to move on to Brandon, and so on and so forth, the sad tale went. There was no opportunity for public debate or input on the matter. There was very very limited opportunity for those who were present to even gain an understanding of the issue, Mr. Speaker, so they took it a step further. As I say, after six weeks of debate, after great pressure from our side of the House and great pressure from the public, I'm sure, because we have no idea how many people have been calling in to the New Democratic Party offices, to the government offices on this matter. We only know that in the past decade, no issue has invoked more public response - even though we are in July and August - for us in the Legislature, than this particular proposal.

So, if we are getting that kind of reaction, if all of the media are getting that kind of response - and we know that the open-line shows daily are being phoned into by people who are so concerned about it - if this kind of public response is being achieved in midsummer when many many Manitobans are totally and yet completely unaware of this matter, if that kind of public response is out there, then we know that they're getting it as much as we are. So, in response to the debate, the discussion, the pressure that's been put on by our side of the House in response to the public reaction, finally they said, well, we'll refer it to a committee of this Session of the Legislature.

Well, what does that do, Mr. Speaker? That puts a very very narrow time frame on the whole matter. That

puts on the matter a time frame that says this Legislature is likely to be through its business by sometime in August or maybe in September, but it certainly puts a very narrow time frame on the matter. Now, they have said, we've done our bit, we've given into the demand for public presentation, public representation on the matter, and our conscience is clear. Just like Judas, they are going to wash their hands clean of the whole issue of not having given proper public response. — (Interjection) — It has been suggested to me that the government does not have a conscience, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not in a position to argue with that matter.

Here they are suggesting that because they are willing to send it to a committee of this Session of the Legislature for public representations to be heard, that they have then done their bit for public input on the matter. They have listened to the people, or they will have after the end of that. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not good enough and members on this side have said that if you really, truly believe in this matter, if you really, truly believe that there is a role to be played by public representation, then take it that simple, little step further and let it be in a situation in which there isn't a time constraint on the matter, there isn't a pressure to report back to this Session of the Legislature whenever it concludes. As I say, it may not be long. In fact, it can be foreshortened, depending on the government attitude to it.

We have seen demonstrated recently just how committed members of this Treasury Bench are to public input on matters of importance in their area. The Minister of Highways decided that he wanted to have his seat belt legislation through and he wanted to have it through in some reasonable time frame because he wanted it to be wrapped up and over with, and they just simply called the committee to sit day after day after day, into the long hours of the night - I believe they sat until after 3 a.m. one morning - they exhausted the opposition as well as the public on the matter. Having drawn out everyone on the matter, Mr. Speaker, having left them totally exhausted and unprepared to fight the battle on it, they closed off the hearings the Friday afternoon that was sat concurrently with the regular Session of the Legislature. People were not in a position to complete the public hearings. That was it . . .

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

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would submit to a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to respond to a question at the end of my speech. I'm currently in the midst of a line of thought that I'd like to pursue and — (Interjection) — I would certainly not want to misrepresent the situation, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I trust that the honourable member is not referring to the proceedings of the committee which has not yet reported, which as the member knows is prohibited under our rules.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your wise counsel on the matter and I will simply carry on suggesting that there is a technique that can be used and has been demonstrated in various committee hearings in this Session, to ensure that matters are proceeded with very very quickly, in fact, perhaps more speedily than some would choose it to be in order to wrap up public presentations, and get them over with.

— (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite say that they are so interested in public representation and in hearing back the views of important segments of Manitoba society, and the Minister of Education yesterday was invited to a public meeting with over 100 representatives of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, who are vitally concerned with Bill 77, a proposal to amend The Public Schools Act. They are vitally concerned that it will have long reaching ramifications, that it will forever in future be to the detriment of the quality of education in this province.

They believe that the Minister of Education has sold out her commitment to the increasing of the quality of education, to the improving of the quality of education in this province, in return for her commitment to the Teacher's Union. That's what they believe, and they have said so in a variety of different ways.

Yesterday over 100 of them gathered, took time out of their summer holidays and their other commitments, to come to Winnipeg for a public meeting with the Minister and other interested representatives. Four people from our side went to that meeting. The Minister did not go to that meeting, Mr. Speaker. That's how committed they are to hear the people.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the government is only interested in hearing the people when the people agree with them but when the people disagree with them, they will not be there to listen. If they are there to listen, Mr. Speaker, it will be to listen without hearing. They want to do it in as expedient a fashion as possible, in as short a time frame as possible and in a manner, that I suggest to you, does not really allow for true public representation and true public participation, and that's what we're faced with by the manner and the form in which this government is proceeding at the present time.

Further, Mr. Speaker, members opposite said to us, a number of different times, that they believe that they were heading on the right course, that they believed that former Conservative governments would have proceeded in the same way that will recognize experts, such as former Premier Roblin, would have taken a similar course. Well, Mr. Speaker, former Premier Roblin was interviewed on this matter not too long ago. I read from some of the quotations that he made in response to his view of how this government should have proceeded with this matter, and I quote: "In the Manitoba context it would have been wiser to allow the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with the case of Monsieur Bilodeau in order to set that issue at rest. The fear that the Supreme Court might invalidate all the laws of Manitoba since 1870 is an academic legalism that should have been put to one side. It is not likely that the Supreme Court would lend itself to such a questionable decision."

He went on to say: "Once the judicial process has begun it should be left to follow its natural course. It

was a mistake for the government to short circuit the administration of justice. In the Manitoba context the language question carries the burden of 100 years of history."

He goes on further and with respect to the very matter that we are currently discussing, that of public opinion on it, and how to best establish and allow for the expression of public opinion. He says: "Public opinion is particularly important in this case for two reasons. One, it is the first effort to amend our Constitution, and two, it deals with a problem so difficult for Manitobans to agree upon. This means that the debate shouldn't be limited to discussion between MLAs particularly when a constitutional change is not supported by a political mandate."

Mr. Speaker, we have made that point and it bears repeating: "This constitutional change is not supported by a political mandate."

He went on to conclude: "The people of Manitoba deserve the opportunity to have some means of bringing the issue to an acceptable conclusion." He went on to compare it to the decision that was taken by his government with respect to the unification of school divisions in the province a couple of decades ago; and how they followed the procedure of, in essence, a White Paper proposal that was then taken out and explained by groups of representatives of the government. They allowed for all the public debate and input, and then before implementing it they sought another political mandate by going to the people, after they had arrived at a consensus.

This government has done none of that, Mr. Speaker. This government has shied away from gaining any consensus from the people of Manitoba or from attempting to garner a political mandate. In fact, I think they're terrified of going to the people on this issue. And indeed the other telling factor is, that as the process has continued, an interesting thing has happened. As we spoke about the issue itself, and I said that I would stay away from speaking of the issue, but as we spoke early on in the case about the issue itself it appeared as though the major media in this province, that is the two daily newspapers in Winnipeg, editorially were supporting the government's position on it and they were supporting the position they were taking with respect to the agreement they had arrived at.

However, as the time has proceeded on this, as debate has occurred on the referral motion and on the process, both of the major media in Winnipeg, that is the print media, the two newspapers editorially have now come about to saying the process is wrong, the process ought to be changed. If indeed the principal is correct it will stand the scrutiny of public debate, of public review, of public criticism, of public input; but if it is wrong it won't stand that test, and therefore it is wrong to proceed. That is the conclusion, and indeed it is being suggested and supported by the two newspapers.

Editorially the Winnipeg Sun has said: "It suffers noisy opposition from within its own caucus, and the Manitoba Government Employees Association is less than enthralled with the idea." It says: "By now the government has to walk us through gently, trying to push the legislation through by the end of this Session is, while tempting, not a great idea." It concludes: "At the moment by its own actions" - it meaning the

government - "is affirming the Tory point of view." The Tory point of view is that there has not been an opportunity for adequate discussion and debate; that there has not been an opportunity for adequate public input; and that is why the process we are following is wrong. The course upon which we are headed is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Here's a quote from the Winnipeg Free Press editorial: "But the new constitutional provision will be empty, sterile, if they are not felt to reflect the beliefs of most Manitobans." I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government doesn't know what are the beliefs of most Manitobans at the present time. It has not taken the opportunity to listen to them. It has not taken the opportunity to provide a good mechanism by which they can be heard and putting it through in this Session of the Legislature, at a committee of this Session, will not give that opportunity. That will be force-feeding the process to arrive at the agreement and the decision that they've already made, and that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

I realize that my time is running short and I hope that I have another opportunity speak upon this matter as the process goes on. I leave with the members of the government just a few short thoughts. Firstly, let the democratic process take its course. You have not been provided with a mandate, so take it to the people. If it is right and it is good for the majority of Manitobans, you'll get your mandate through the intersessional committee hearings. You'll have an opportunity to listen to the people, because as my colleague from Fort Garry said, in quoting Winston Churchill, "Trust the people." After you have listened to them, you'll know then that what you're doing is right, or if it is not, you'll know then that you have to amend it and you have to change the course upon which you are presently headed in order to make it right. If so, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that it will be for the good of all Manitobans, but not by what you're doing today.

Thank you, very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the member agreed to answer at the end of his speech. I would like to ask him to reflect on his statement earlier in his remarks where he indicated that we had kept people till 3:00 in the morning presenting briefs on Bill 60. I don't believe that he would want to leave that on the record, because that did not occur.

The day that we completed our hearings on the helmet and seat belt legislation, we completed them about 4:30, an hour ahead of schedule when there were no more people ready to present briefs, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the Honourable Minister is also not referring to the proceedings of a committee which has not yet reported to the House. If he was, his remarks are really out of order, and if the honourable member is to reply to them they would really be also out of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure you and the House that I will not debate the issue with the Minister. In fact, I will willingly concede that it was

the hearings on Bill 90 that went till after 3 in the morning and that, in fact, the process with respect to seat belts was completed by having a number of hearings in one week that jammed the process into a short time frame and, therefore, exhausted the opposition.

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

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm indeed most reluctant to speak at this moment, but I don't think it will be any debate at all if only one side of the issue had the opportunity to express their views. I have been observing the ways of this House and trying to learn its conventions and its customs and I do intend to observe as much of the rules, formal and informal, obtaining in the House. In so doing, I've been wondering in the past, why is it that the opposition party in this Assembly were the ones who were asking for Speed-up? Normally, the logical thing for me to believe is that it would be the government party who would normally ask for Speed-up in order to facilitate the work of this House.

So it keeps me thinking for a little while and it seems to me there must be some kind of an objective or purpose to it. On the surface, any kind of Speed-up is being asked allegedly to facilitate the legislative work of the House, but being a matter of procedure, it can also be used as a tool. So it seems to me that there must be some hidden motivations why the opposition party is asking for Speed-up. It would appear to me then - and I might be wrong, I admit - the basic objective is to lay the atmosphere, by which they can say later on that the majority party had rammed the legislation down their throats, through this Speed-up. This only confirms my theoretical observation about political communications, that in any kind of political discourse, it seem to me there are two wave lengths of communication taking place, whether the communicators are talking to the people in general or talking among themselves.

It seems to me that in political communication there is the language that is intended to be heard, a language intended to be read, the behaviour that's intended to be seen by the public, but that is not the real message. Behind and always, there will be another unintended, subtle medium by which we want to communicate our message. What we often say publicly, we do not mean, but what we say from our hearts, that is what we mean and we cannot always say it's so in the open. In political discourse to be effective, sometimes you cannot say the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Neither can you say the whole falsehood, falsity and nothing but falsehood. It is often the case that there is no truth of the pure kind. It is also the case there is no falsity of the pure kind. The useful kind we meet in political communication and political discourse is the half-truth and in dealing with half-truths, we better be careful which half of it we are talking about. It is much more easy to deny and to demolish a total falsity than it is to deal with a half-truth. Beware of the half-truth, because they are very difficult to decipher.

So what is actually happening here? Instead of a Speed-up, we have a slow down; instead of facilitating the work of this Assembly, we are delaying the work

of this Assembly. I said "we," because I am part of the whole process. Instead of debating the issues on the merits, we are debating the issues again and again and again. There is a flow of words, very little of arguments and thoughts. Fluency in words is not necessarily the same thing as fluency in thought and reasoning. Without reference to anyone, we sometimes - and myself included - fall into the trap of they call "verbal diarrhoea." We say a lot of words, thousands of them, mounting, and saying nothing which is of substance.

The next thing they asked me to think about is, why is it now that because the Speed-up strategy failed to work, why is the opposition party now trying to insinuate and to suggest that the government party use the closure? What could possibly be the purpose why they want the government party to use the ultimate weapon so that the work of the Assembly can be done? I muse and I think and I say, maybe, maybe, they would want the government to appear to be undemocratic. Maybe, maybe, the opposition party wants to make the government party appear to be stifling debate and discussions. We have no intention to do that. Indeed, our intention is to go on with this referral motion, to get done with it, and to go as fast to the committee so that the committee can hear and start hearing the people of this province.

Some opposition members have said, some honourable members from the other side have said that people out there are being misled. This may or may not be true. Why? Because it's like any other advocacy in any kind of public debate. The positive side will be obligated to put forth the best of its side. Of course, the negative side will have to put forth the best of its side. In the marshalling of the facts, in the arrangement and organization of data, each side will try to put forth its best.

So there is no intention to mislead. What happens is that there is, in operational fact, a confusion taking place on the part of the public. They are hearing different sets of data. They are hearing different sets of statistics. They are hearing different sets of facts. They are hearing different sets of arguments, but that is precisely part of our political process. The truth is difficult to find. There is no clear indicia of what the truth is.

In the search for the truth, all we need to do is to say what we sincerely believe in. In this process of advocacy of both sides, there might empirically and in actual fact be some confusion, but there is no malevolent or malicious intention, either on the part of the government party or on the part of the opposition, to mislead the people. Any intention on the part of any party to mislead the people will, in the long run, rebound to the demise and death of that political party, because the people are the source of all political authority in our political system.

We have been talking about minorities and majorities. Things have been changing so fast in our society. Maybe in 1867, there was a majority of French settlers and a minority of English settlers, but since the new wave of immigrants from Eastern Europe, from all the other European countries, there are so many, many different groups now in this province. Indeed, what we have now in this Province of Manitoba is what they call a pluralistic system, a pluralistic political system. It is a mosaic. They call it the vertical mosaic of culture. It is, in actual

fact, a conglomeration of many different minorities. They are all minorities in the sense that no single one group has the voice to control the direction of public policy, but there are powerful groups.

There are some bitter groups within that political system. By the accident of history, one of them happens to be the Franco-Manitobans or the Anglophones. They happen to be powerful politically, because of the nature of the setup of this country. The number of MPs, Members of Parliament, from Quebec at any time cannot be disregarded by any federal politician. That explains the nature of the thinking of Prime Minister Pearson and also of the great Prime Minister Diefenbaker. That explains why all the three parties are in favour of bilingualism, because it is a tool for political power for the entire nation of Canada . . .

A MEMBER: What did Krushchev say?

MR. C. SANTOS: Pardon? I don't know what Krushchev said, but he said when he banged his shoes in the United Nations, "We will bury you."

A MEMBER: What does the Member for Springfield say?

MR. C. SANTOS: The Member for Springfield said, let us be reasonable. Let us find a way by which we can shorten our Session in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to voice a segment of this pluralistic province which is not often heard from before, because if we accept this historical myth of the two founding nations, the French and the English, and if the basis of the special status of these two languages is the fact that they are earliest in this North American continent, let us enquire and look into the logic of that theory. If it is on the basis of their historical presence here at the earliest opportunity and if that is the basis of the special privileges of these two languages, I ask and I only ask, how come the logic does not apply to those groups in this North American continent who preceded the English and the French? I am talking about the aboriginal people of this province.

If there is anyone who is earliest in this continent, they are the aboriginal people of this province. The myth of the special status of the languages of the two founding nations is based on the premise that they were the first people in point of historical time to be in the Dominion of Canada in this part of the great North American continent. If the fact of being first in a geographical territory gives rise to special status and privileges, then our Native people in this North American continent should, with greater reason, under this same logic, be accorded an extra, extra-special status and extra, extra-special privileges, because they were the original people in this continent.

The next question is - and this is rhetorical - was there any entrenchment of any of the languages of these Native people? Was there any entrenchment of the language of the Cree and the Ojibway language? The obvious answer is, there is none. The only provision that I see that inures to the benefit of the Native people in the new Charter is the one, Section 25, which states, "The guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or

derogate from any aboriginal Treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal people of Canada, including the rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of October 17, 1963, and any rights or freedoms that may be acquired by the aboriginal people." It only talks about the prospect of rights and freedoms that may be acquired by the aboriginal people.

Why was there no entrenchment for special privilege and a special status of the original people of this North American continent? The answer is simple. The Native people do not have the votes in Parliament as many as the other segments of this society. The Native people have very little political power in the Canadian House of Commons when we repatriated the Canadian Constitution and brought it home.

What about the point of view of the new groups of Canadians, those that are neither French nor English? All I want to do now is ask some questions. I do not expect some answers.

One question I want to ask is, given that the Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau apparently accomplished his political goal of entrenching within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, the language rights in English and in French for Canada and New Brunswick as contained in Section 16 to 22 of the Charter, what I want to know, and we have indication here, is whether we want to follow the footsteps of the Federal Government to the same extent, or do we want a limited time, a limited scope, for the protection of French minority rights in the Province of Manitoba.

Given that the other ethnic groups, who are neither Francophone or Anglophone, in actual fact, would be placed in a somewhat disadvantageous category in the sense that they do not enjoy the special privilege of those languages, how could the proposed amendment, if we follow the federal model, how could that be reconciled with the very provision of the Charter itself, Section 15.1 which says, "Every individual is equal before and under the law, and has a right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination, and in particular without discrimination based on race, nationality, or ethnic origin," when by the very entrenchment of English and French we have already given them a special status that is a constitutionalized institutionalized discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak too much. I have expressed what I want to express. All I can say is, truth is mighty and always will prevail. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this motion is next before the Chamber the honourable member will have 22 minutes remaining.

The time of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Just one brief announcement, Mr. Speaker, if I may with respect to House business. The House will not sit tomorrow evening, 8 o'clock Session.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned, and will stand adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.