



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. 127 - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 2 AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert Island	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
USKI, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 2 August, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, with the Speed-up resolution in place and the House sitting three times a day the opposition is of course entitled to have three question periods a day, but in keeping with the undertaking which the opposition made to the government on entering upon Speed-up it is our intention to forgo the third question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the resolution standing in my name on Pages 12 and 13 of the Order Paper, now adjourned in the name of the Member for Fort Garry.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the sub-amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has 18 minutes remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really surprised me when the architect of this program, the Government House Leader, the Honourable Attorney-General, spoke in this debate on the amendment moved by our side and that speech occurred on Tuesday, the 26th of July, was the flip manner - and that's the only term I can use to describe it - the flip and flippant manner in which he addressed himself to certain remarks, commentaries on the issue that had been offered up to that point in time in the amendment debate.

The first person to speak in response to the proposal of the Attorney-General, to refer this resolution to committee study, for report back to this Session of the Legislature was, I, myself, Sir. And I, of course, moved the amendment calling for the reference to

intersessional committee study and public hearings and report at the next Session of the Legislature, and the second speaker in that debate on that point was the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The third speaker in that debate on that point was my colleague, the Deputy House Leader, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, and the fourth speaker appearing in the rotation on July 26th, last Tuesday afternoon was the Attorney-General, the architect of this attempt to change the nature of Manitoba arbitrarily and unilaterally.

I was very surprised by the glib and, as I say, flippant manner in which he responded to the kinds of things that the Honourable Member for Elmwood had to say, that the Honourable Member for St. Norbert had to say, and if I may say so, Sir, the things that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry had to say. I believe if one wants to review those three speeches, and particularly the speech of my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, one would find that a very sensible, reasonable and equitable approach was put forward to the government. It commanded, at least, if not acceptance, if not support - because we've gone beyond the point of expecting reasonable acceptance and support for reasonable ideas from those members opposite - but one would have expected at least the common courtesy, I think, of some recognition of the fairness and the reasonableness of the position put.

Such was not the case. What we got from the Attorney-General was a rather theatrical put down, or attempted put down, of the points raised by the three speakers I have mentioned. They were points, I think, that command and enjoy the support of the majority of Manitobans, and certainly in a serious legislative arena and a responsible legislative arena, at least deserve and command the serious attention of the Government House Leader.

So I was very surprised at his response to the kinds of things that I tried to say, in which I asked for a reasoned and reasonable approach, in response to what I felt was a reasoned and reasonable amendment put by our side in my name, and my supporting remarks thereto. There were comments from the Honourable Member for Elmwood, having to do with the desire and indeed, the requirement, the need for a consensus, which was a point to which I also spoke and to the very fair and reasoned approach taken by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

What did we get in response to those attempts to deal seriously with one of the most important and one of the most potentially profound issues to come before Manitobans and to come before their Legislature in the time that it has been my privilege to be a member here. Well, Sir, we got a contrived, attempted putdown and a theatrical response that talked about the Wizard of Oz, and that talked about smoke and mirrors, and that talked about the absolute impracticality of attempting to seek a consensus when those of us on this side of the House, following the lead of my leader, have said that we do not believe in entrenchment where

extension of French language service is concerned and where members on that side of the House, following the lead of the Government House Leader, claim to be hard and fast proponents of entrenchment.

The Government House Leader said that because members on his side of the House believe that entrenchment is a sensible and a practical way to go in politics in Manitoba and in Canada in the 1980s, and because we don't, because we believe in the basic, fundamental parliamentary system where Parliament is supreme, where the elected representatives of the people are supreme, where those of us who run for elected office have the final say and the representational say in determining how our fellow citizens shall attend to the administration of their affairs, that there was no possibility of reaching consensus because he is for entrenchment, because my leader has pointed out the pitfalls of entrenchment and we, at least on this issue and on most issues having to do with the well-being of Manitobans and Canadians, in fact, I would say on all issues having to do with the well-being of our society, are opposed to the concept of entrenchment.

We find that to be hostile to the basic principle of parliamentary democracy in representational government. Because of those two diametrically opposed positions at this point in the debate in this formal, clinical arena, in this atmosphere, in this Legislature, the Government House Leader tossed off the suggestions that there should be some attempt to strive for consensus, to seek and hopefully achieve consensus, with the declamatory dismissal that that was not possible; that such a thing was impossible because they were on one side of the question and we were on another side of the question. He said, Mr. Speaker, and I quote from Page 4531 of Hansard: ". . . as long as that is the view of the opposition, no entrenchment, and we believe," meaning his party, the government, "that minority rights deserving of the protection should be entrenched, there is no possibility of consensus on that issue."

So that became the nub of his argument, Mr. Speaker, and with that he was able to then reach into his bag of rhetorical tricks and dismiss the comments and positions taken by our side, advanced by our side as so much "smoke and mirrors." Well, Mr. Speaker, I reject that argument of the Government House Leader's without equivocation. I reject that unconditionally. I believe that he dead wrong rhetorically, let alone politically, dead wrong rhetorically, when he says that because they are on one side of a question and we're on another side there is no possibility of consensus on the issue. That is what this arena is all about. If they're wrong, we're here under responsibility as representatives of the people and as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to demonstrate that they are wrong and vice versa, and out of that will emerge, hopefully, a sensible, reasoned consensus on the issues of the day.

Further to that, Sir, this debate should not be confined to this arena. That's the whole point of the position that we've taken from Day One. To say that there's no possibility of consensus between the Government House Leader and my leader possibly has some scintilla of truth to it, Mr. Speaker, because I can't believe that my leader would ever be so obtuse and so confused in his thinking as to settle on consensus with the

Government House Leader, but that is not the point that is at issue here, Sir.

What we're striving for is a consensus of the people of Manitoba. We're asking for the opportunity to permit the people of Manitoba to pursue that consensus. If they don't reach a consensus, fine; not fine, but at least acceptable; not fine, but understandable. Certainly there are quests that all of us engage on in this world, and particularly in the political and legislative arena which do not produce consensus. From time to time they fail to reach consensus. If that happens, that happens; and then we'll have to seek for some other course of agreement, some other plane of discussion on which to proceed, but we haven't even sought the consensus yet, Mr. Speaker.

HON. S. LYON: A general election would do it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A general election, as my leader says, would be one way of doing it. But for the Government House Leader, Sir, to say that, because he's on one side of a question and my Leader is on another side of a question, which is likely to be gospel in this province for as long as both of them live, unless the Government House Leader comes around to see the light on some of the more sane and sensible positions articulated from this side is to draw a red herring over the question, over the debate. So what, if the Government House Leader can't reach consensus with my leader?

HON. S. LYON: He doesn't reach consensus with 95 percent of the people. He's a former communist.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That doesn't say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Manitoba cannot reach a consensus. That does not say, Sir, that the members in general of this Chamber cannot reach consensus. That doesn't say that the Honourable Minister of Highways and I cannot reach consensus.

A MEMBER: Not any more.

MR. L. SHERMAN: It's difficult, as I look over the field, to find persons on that side, Sir, who are so reasonable in their approach that I can even talk about consensus.

HON. S. LYON: A collection of reds over there.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Let me go back to the Honourable Minister of Highways. I don't find it impossible to conceive of a consensus on certain issues between the Honourable Minister of Highways and the Honourable Member, for example, for Arthur, or my House Leader, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. So what is this contrived cavalier, casual, flippant dismissal of the arguments raised by myself, by my Deputy House Leader and by the Member for Elmwood having to do with consensus simply on the grounds that there happens to be a sincere and, thank God, a very legitimate and very sensible difference of opinion on most things between my Leader and the Government House Leader. Thank God, there is; God grant there always will be. But that doesn't say that we, in this Chamber, can't generally come to a consensus, or that the people of Manitoba can come to a consensus.

HON. S. LYON: Marxist totalitarians we don't agree with, that's all.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A consensus, Sir, by definition of every dictionary that I've investigated means an agreement. It doesn't mean unanimity, doesn't necessarily imply or dictate unanimity, it means an agreement.

HON. S. LYON: It's hard to agree with reds.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The people of Manitoba have a right to search for and seek an agreement on a course as profoundly revolutionary - and I use that term in its best sense - as profoundly revolutionary as this proposed by this government, Sir. So, I reject that posture of the Government House Leader as out of hand.

Further to that, I think that it certainly bordered on the insulting to dismiss as cavalierly and as casually as he did the arguments advanced by those members to whom I've already referred. I felt that he did not pay proper attention and reflect proper sensitivity to the kinds of things we were saying in our roles as responsible members of the opposition speaking for 23 constituencies in this province who represent a substantial component of our population and speaking perhaps for many many residents, many many constituents and citizens in other constituencies in this province that we do not hold, but who nonetheless deserve the honour of the recognition of their views and respect for their rights too.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, where the course proposed by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Gladstone, and my colleagues generally, will ultimately lead us. It may well be that the outcome of properly constituted, properly held, and properly disseminated public hearings providing for real meaningful public input would produce a conclusion that surprised many of us in this Chamber. It might produce a conclusion of the kind that we predict would occur. It might produce a conclusion of the kind that the First Minister and the Government House Leader have predicted would occur. But the point is, Sir, nobody knows it, nobody knows at this point in time which conclusion would be produced, and I suggest to you, Sir, that those members opposite fear that the course of action that we have proposed providing the public with an opportunity to speak out on this issue would defeat their purpose, would defeat their initiative. That is why they don't want the kind of public hearings over the period of time that we have proposed. Others speaking in this debate have from time to time raised the question, Mr. Speaker, what is the rush, what is the rush? That is a very valid question, what is the rush?

But I want to ask the First Minister another question and the Government another question. Leaving the question of what is the rush aside, I want to ask the First Minister and the Government House Leader, what are you afraid of, what are you afraid of? Never mind the question of a rush, but what are you afraid of? We have proposed a democratic course of action giving the people of Manitoba a chance to express an opinion on this question. If they express an opinion supporting a position taken by the government, we'll abide by it,

that's democracy, we'll abide it and we're not afraid to put that issue to the test. We're not afraid to face that challenge. What are they afraid of? They don't want that question to go to the public in any meaningful way. They don't want public hearings. They don't want a few informational meetings.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Why does the First Minister and why does the Government House Leader refuse to permit the people to have meaningful input and a meaningful opportunity to address the issue. We've given them a way out; we've given them a sub-amendment which takes them off the hook in terms of the corner they've backed themselves into; we've given them a sub-amendment which gives them the opportunity to come back within their deadline with the kind of report that they said they wanted to have at this Session of the Legislature.

Well, we've said you can have it within your deadline, within the parameters of the deal that you made behind closed doors unbeknownst to Manitoba people, unbeknownst to members on this side of the House and unbeknownst to the Manitoba voter a deal was made behind closed doors and the Government House Leader has to meet that deal by December 31st. Okay, he's in a bind, he's in a very difficult spot, Mr. Speaker, and we have said to him that we'll take him off the hook on that, we'll give him till December 31st but we want that report achieved, we want that report pursued, we want that report accomplished in a reasonable and democratic and meaningful way.

That is why we have moved the sub-amendment that we have, Mr. Speaker, that is why we moved the amendment that we have and that is why we are here fighting on this issue and will continue to do so.

HON. S. LYON: Hear! Hear! We've been here a long time on this issue.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, perhaps with a repetitious question, but it bears repeating, to the Government House Leader and the First Minister, what are you afraid of? Are you afraid of the people?

A MEMBER: You think you're better than the people.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are you afraid of their opinion? Are you afraid of meeting the challenge of giving them the opportunity to speak out? Have some courage, take some courage in your hands and put the question to the people; that's all we're asking.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable First Minister.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

A MEMBER: You flushed him out.

HON. S. LYON: I thought he'd put up Doern as a designated speaker. It's the first time he's been brave enough to speak on the issue.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words following the remarks by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry repeatedly said, what are you afraid of, in reference to members on this side of the House. I would like to deal with that and, as well, deal with the general nature of the issue that confronts us. I concur with comments that have been made by honourable members in this House and elsewhere that this is a matter of considerable importance. It doesn't weigh in importance however to the matters pertaining to the constitutional changes that were made, the establishment of a new Constitution for Canada in 1981, so we must keep that in balance with the proposals in respect to a new Constitution in 1981 that we were dealing with.

The question of the Constitution, 1981, dealt with the entire issue of the creation of a Charter of Rights and, Mr. Speaker, I recall the previous government in the Province of Manitoba making clear, loud and clear, its opposition to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights at First Ministers' Conferences that were held in various parts of this country. They carved their position in stone, Mr. Speaker, that they were opposed, unalterably opposed, to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights. You recall, I recall, my colleagues recall that that decision was made without reference to the people of Manitoba, without reference to this Chamber, without reference by way of a request to the municipalities of this province. A clear, unequivocal position was taken by the then First Minister of this province that he was opposed to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the question, here we are dealing with an amendment to the Constitution that by comparison is not nearly as significant, in fact, is minor compared to the questions pertaining to the entrenchment of a Constitution, and yet by way of comparison, by what you are afraid of . . .

HON. S. LYON: A pity you never understood it, Howard.

HON. S. PAWLEY: . . . they did not in fact form a committee; they did not in fact take a committee of this Legislature to the public in Manitoba until already they'd carved their position in stone, until such point indeed that it was a complete and absolute sham, the hearings that took place in this province, because they'd already carved their position in stone.

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.

HON. S. LYON: Oh, now that we've shamed you into it, yes.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The honourable member says "now," Mr. Speaker. We've been saying this for one week, two weeks, three weeks. We have been indicating

it repeatedly for four weeks, we've been saying this in this 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.

HON. S. LYON: Put that to the people, put that to the people.

HON. S. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, why did not the former First Minister have the nerve to put to the people of this province his opposition to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights? Why did the former First Minister indeed hide? One of the reasons probably for his defeat in November, 1981 that he doesn't want to acknowledge in this Chamber, is because most Manitobans disagreed emphatically with his chicken-like approach to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights for Canadians and for minorities in this country.

The honourable member wants to know one of the reasons . . .

HON. S. LYON: You've lied in the campaign - you've lied throughout the campaign.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is disgraceful.

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

HON. R. PENNER: On a point of order, the First Minister is addressing . . .

HON. S. LYON: Sit down, you communist.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is addressing this House on a matter of some considerable importance . . .

HON. S. LYON: Yeah, like a little wet hen.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . and, Mr. Speaker, are we going to have to tolerate the disgraceful behaviour from the Leader of the Opposition throughout the length of this evening or are you going to have to call him to order? It seems to me that his remarks about being a liar, about being a little wet hen and all of those other unparliamentary, disgraceful, zoo-like things must be put an end to.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the right honourable gentleman to conduct himself in a right honourable manner.

The Honourable First Minister.

Does the honourable member have a point of order?

HON. S. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I were the First Minister of a government that had lied so openly to

the people as this Minister did in 1981, I would never have a point of order, I would hide my head in shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did not have a point of order. He is also well aware that he is not allowed to use the word "lies" or "lied" in this House. I would ask him would he please withdraw that word.

HON. S. LYON: Anytime, Mr. Speaker, to say that my honourable friend, the First Minister, his statements and the truth seldom coincide; seldom have, seldom will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to waste any time in respect to the position of the Leader of the Conservative Party, because his position has been unmasked, his position in respect to the Constitution and his opposition to the Charter of Human Rights was unmasked in 1981, and I repeat, it probably was a significant reason for the defeat of the then Premier of this province and those that supported him in the election of November 17, 1981. It probably was a significant reason.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, better to be defeated telling the truth than to be defeated lying, as you did. Lying.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition can yell lying, lying, lying, three times from his seat, but he's only trying to conceal the fact that he recognizes that that which I speak on this side of the Chamber is true and that which he is saying on his side of the Chamber is untrue.

I want to now revert to the discussion . . .

HON. S. LYON: Call an election if you're so bloody brave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will revert now to the comments I made earlier that seemed to cause a sudden consternation on the part of some of the honourable members across the way in the Conservative Party.

We've indicated for some four weeks our expressed intent that services would be provided in a very limited manner insofar as French services were concerned in the Province of Manitoba. We indicated that those services would be consistent with a policy that was enunciated by the former Conservative Government in the Province of Manitoba, and would be consistent, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: It was never entrenched.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . with the announcement that was made in March of 1982 by this government in the Province of Manitoba, that those services would not be inconsistent, but would be consistent with those services, — (Interjection) — that the provision of those services in this Province of Manitoba would involve approximately 400 public servants in the Province of Manitoba.

HON. S. LYON: Entrench that figure then . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to ensure that expressed intent on our part is reflected by way of wording.

HON. S. LYON: Good.

HON. H. PAWLEY: We're prepared, Mr. Speaker, something which the honourable members across the way did not do in 1980 and 1981 . . .

HON. S. LYON: Entrench the figure; entrench 400.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . because they were intransigent. Mr. Speaker, this government is prepared to listen to groups, listen to individuals that bring forth constructive proposals in respect to the wording of this resolution. We will then, as a Legislative Chamber, make our own decision as to the final form of the resolution that would be passed in this Chamber, and then will be forwarded to Ottawa. Let there be no mistake about that.

HON. S. LYON: Now that you've finally capitulated, will you make the referral after you've completed the resolution? No, you haven't got the guts to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Leader of the Opposition kindly permit the honourable member to make his remarks?

HON. S. LYON: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I'm helping him along, telling him to tell the truth, if he can.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could, with your help, proceed with further remarks.

HON. S. LYON: You need all the help you can get.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are anxious to speak to Manitobans. We are anxious to meet with Manitobans in respect to this issue.

HON. S. LYON: Yeah, I bet you are.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, who was it, indeed, that held four informational meetings in Brandon, in Dauphin, in Thompson, and in the City of Winnipeg pertaining to this resolution? It was the Attorney-General of this province.

HON. S. LYON: The old communist, yes; get him out.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Did the former Attorney-General, the Member for St. Norbert, hold informational meetings

as to the stance that he was taking at the constitutional conference? No. Did the former First Minister of this province hold informational meetings in various parts of this province to explain the intransigent stand that he was taking on the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights in the Constitution?

HON. S. LYON: Did you?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, the answer is no. — (Interjection)

—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: But the Attorney-General of this province has already held four informational meetings.

HON. S. LYON: Oh, big deal.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Four informational meetings and it was during those meetings, Mr. Speaker, he had the opportunity to speak to some 1,300, 1,400 Manitobans that attended those meetings. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, as can be expected the reaction was varied at those meetings.

HON. S. LYON: We had all the NDPers trying to work on it, but they didn't do much of a job, did they?

HON. H. PAWLEY: We are asking, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to, again, hear from Manitobans.

HON. S. LYON: After the Session, after prorogation.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I had opportunity to examine the number of groups and individuals that have already indicated a desire to speak to the members of this Chamber and there are some 47 individuals or groups that have already indicated . . .

HON. S. LYON: How many did you stipulate?

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . a desire to submit resolutions.

A MEMBER: 46.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from those that represent the Ukrainian Community Development Centre, the Manitoba Parents for Ukrainian Education, the Manitoba Association for Bilingual Education, the Ukrainian leadership of this province. I would like to hear from the Ukrainian leadership of this province. The Leader of the Opposition might not wish to hear from the Ukrainian leadership of this province, I would like to.

Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties . . .

HON. S. LYON: Oh, great bunch, funded by the Attorney-General, a communist, yeah, great bunch!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will, for a second time, ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to permit the honourable member to make his remarks.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. S. LYON: Oh, I think we help him along with a little bit of spice.

A MEMBER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Order, indeed.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the Association for Rights and Liberties. There has been some reference that group is funded by this government, Mr. Speaker. There's been some . . .

HON. S. LYON: No, the taxpayers.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . implication that this group is in the pockets of this government. If that, indeed, be the case, I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, the stance that they took in relationship to Bill 3, introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, in which they had some very critical remarks to say in connection with Bill 3.

HON. S. LYON: Did you solve that too?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are other groups that are anxious to make representations; the East Indian Group, the Manitoba Metis Federation, representatives of the Chinese community, representatives of the Chilean community, representatives of the Irish community, and, Mr. Speaker, — (Interjection) — yes, on the list we have Mr. Sidney Green waiting to make his presentation to the Chamber. I'm sure that . . .

HON. S. LYON: You can't control him, I know that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are many many representations by private individuals. Many of these representations, I anticipate, will be quite critical of the government's resolution. I expect them to be critical.

A MEMBER: They should be.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I suggest though, Mr. Speaker, they will offer constructive proposals, that their constructive proposals will be on target in respect to their criticism of the resolution, as such, and they will not wander into areas that are totally unrelated to what we are dealing with here, but will deal with the resolution that's before this Chamber, and I look forward with anticipation to the briefs and submissions from individuals and groups.

Let it not be said, Mr. Speaker, that this government is afraid to meet the people of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the . . .

HON. S. LYON: You've got five little dreamers over there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addition, I note in referring to the Journals of Manitoba 1980-81 that a

Legislative Committee met in Thompson, in Swan River, in Brandon, as well as in the City of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, that would not to me be an unreasonable expectation of this committee to decide to hold public hearings in three other centres outside of the City of Winnipeg, as did their committee in 1981.

HON. S. LYON: That will be up to the committee, not to you.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I agree it's up to the committee, Mr. Speaker, but why, if it be up to the committee, then why are honourable members saying, why are you afraid? The question would be better put, why are they afraid to not have this issue dealt with by the committee?

HON. S. LYON: We agreed to a committee . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Let us get this matter to the committee. I would like to speak to the reasonable members across the way, because there are some reasonable members across the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Why not allow this matter to reach the committee so that the committee indeed can visit communities not inconsistent with the decision that was made in 1981. Remember that in 1981 we were dealing with the entire Constitution. Remember that in 1981 we were dealing with the very principles of the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights, Mr. Speaker, and the then government went to four communities including the City of Winnipeg. Did the then government go to 12, or 15, or 20, or 27, or 57 communities in the Province of Manitoba, someone suggested this afternoon. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is clearly no way, no way.

HON. S. LYON: If we had gone when you said, we wouldn't have had anything to talk about.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know, I'm going to check, but I do not believe that there was criticism from this side of the House for those hearings being held in four regional centres in the Province of Manitoba, in Brandon, Thompson, Swan River and the City of Winnipeg.

HON. S. LYON: I read you what you said.

HON. S. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition wants to know that there was a decision to hold meetings . . .

HON. S. LYON: Your comment was mediocre.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that that decision was made some six months after it was requested by members on the then opposition side after a position was firmly carved in stone, after they had already made an inflexible position that was nationally televised from one end of this country to the other that those hearings took place in altogether different circumstances than what these hearings will take place in.

HON. S. LYON: Your persuasive powers are not nearly as great as those of your predecessor. We know you for what you are.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I and my colleagues want to have an opportunity to hear from Manitobans.

HON. S. LYON: After the Session you will.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's important that we reach out to hear the views of Manitobans. We have been receiving communication from different organizations in the Province of Manitoba. Some of those organizations favourable, some of those organizations unfavourable to the proposals that have been made and that is understandable, Mr. Speaker. The municipal people have told me of their concerns, for instance, on whether a Court of Revision would be included in respect to the wording under the resolution. It's important that we define and ensure that Courts of Revision are not included within the wording.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to be reasonable on this side.

HON. S. LYON: Good. You're agreeing to the sub-amendment then.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Let us not be under any meaningless interpretation in that respect. Mr. Speaker, it is not this side that is inflexible, it is the Conservative Opposition that is being inflexible. It is not this side of the Chamber that has carved their position in stone, it is the Conservative Opposition that's carved their position in stone. It is not this side of the Chamber that is cowardly, it is that side of the Chamber that is cowardly on this issue, because it is that side of the Chamber that is not prepared to take this matter to the public and to hear from representatives of the public in the appropriate forum.

HON. S. LYON: Have an election tomorrow if you're so brave. Have one tomorrow. Would you have an election on it? Show us your bravery. You're a puffy. Have an election tomorrow, you puff of wind. You're a mere puff of wind.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I do not expect to have to tell the Honourable Leader of the Opposition again to allow the Honourable First Minister to complete his remarks.

HON. S. LYON: If he has any guts, he will - if he can answer - and he can't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to then summarize three basic points that I've made this evening.

HON. S. LYON: None of which hold truth.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, that will be up to Manitobans to decide.

HON. S. LYON: Have an election and find out what the Manitobans think, if you're so bloody brave.

HON. H. PAWLEY: One, Mr. Speaker, we've indicated that we are prepared to be flexible in respect to the wording . . .

HON. S. LYON: All right, have it after the Session.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . to the extent that we're prepared to ensure that the wording reflects our expressed intent. I would not, Mr. Speaker, want for a moment the expressed intent of this government to be inconsistent with the wording within this resolution and, Mr. Speaker, I pledge that insofar as the government is concerned . . .

HON. S. LYON: You can't pledge anything.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . we will ensure . . .

HON. S. LYON: You can't even tell the truth.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . that we'll make changes upon the appropriate representations from legal and from other groups within the Province of Manitoba, will make representations that will deal constructively with the wording of this resolution and, Mr. Speaker, if there be concerns about the wording of this resolution, we want to make those changes in the wording.

HON. S. LYON: Well, that's not what you said three weeks ago. You weren't even going to have public hearings three weeks ago, until we shamed you into it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't when I first started to say this whether it was three weeks ago or four weeks ago, but . . .

HON. S. LYON: You don't even know the truth when you hear it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . I've been saying this, the Attorney-General has been saying this for at least three or four weeks, and I only regret, what I regret at this point is that although we have been saying it, it's now clear this evening that the Leader of the Conservative Party and the Conservatives across the way have not been listening . . .

HON. S. LYON: We shamed you into it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . because maybe all this could have been cut short, if now the Leader of the Conservative Party is suggesting that I made this announcement for the first time tonight, when we've been making the same statement for the last three or four weeks. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what the Leader of the Conservative Party states, either he has not been listening . . .

HON. S. LYON: We'll read the record back and show you to be a liar in your mouth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I have told the Honourable Leader of the Opposition three times this evening and I have told him the last time that I would not tell him again. I am unfortunately compelled to name Sterling Lyon for defying the authority of the Chair.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the Rules, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines that the Leader of the Opposition be suspended from the services of this House until the end of the Thursday evening Session of this week.

HON. S. LYON: Well, now we know the communists are really in charge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be suspended from the service of this Chamber until the end of the Thursday evening Session.

Those in favour please say, aye. Those opposed please say, nay.

In my opinion the ayes have it, I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

HON. S. LYON: You'll hear bells for quite a long time, you bloody reds.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, it is moved by the Honourable Attorney-General, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be suspended from the service of the House until the end of the Thursday evening sitting.

Those in favour of the motion please rise.

HON. S. LYON: They're reds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Bucklaschuk, Cowan; Mrs. Dodick; Ms. Dolin; Messrs. Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak; Ms. Hemphill; Messrs. Kostyra, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner; Ms. Phillips; Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott; Mrs. Smith; Messrs. Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham; Mrs. Hammond; Messrs. Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman; Mrs. Oleson; Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Sherman.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 24; Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

HON. S. LYON: When I return you'll still be speaking untruths.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what is important, as I was indicating prior to the recent situation, there are three major points that ought to again be emphasized.

First, as we have been indicating for the last number of weeks, we are prepared to examine the wording of this resolution and to ensure that wording reflects the stated-in-public intentions of this government. We are prepared to listen to individuals and to groups that make representations and if, indeed, it is demonstrated to us that the wording be too loose or too broad or, as was suggested by the Manitoba Government Employees Association one month ago, then we are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to tighten that wording, in order to reflect our stated intentions.

Mr. Speaker, that has been made very very clear by the Attorney-General; it's been made clear by myself; it's been made clear by other members. Mr. Speaker, if indeed, this be the reason for the difficulties that we have been encountering, then I'm pleased we have now discovered that honourable members apparently had not been listening to those assertions over the past number of weeks. I'm pleased to know that at least now we may have cleared up one area of misconception, because it is in Hansard and honourable members can refresh, but I don't want to even deal with that. If that was not fully understood by honourable members, then I understand some of the misconception and some of the reason for some of the reaction from honourable members across the way.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, when the previous government took the resolution for public hearings, those public hearings were in Winnipeg, they were in Thompson, they were in Swan River and they were in Brandon. Mr. Speaker, the resolution pertaining to referral of this resolution to a committee or committees at place or places, certainly does not preclude this government, the committee in performing in the same manner, as was the case in 1981. — (Interjection) — The Attorney-General points out to me, it is such times and places that is in the hands of the committee, but I would think it would not be an unreasonable expectation that the same kind of process, the same sort of format, would be held in respect to this particular referral resolution as was done in respect to the referral of the resolution pertaining to the entire new Canadian Constitution that was being dealt with in the years 1980 and 1981.

Mr. Speaker, one third point I would like to make, and if I misunderstand the position of the opposition then certainly I will anticipate that members of the opposition will so say. I sense that there is no disagreement with the extension of French language services, as per the policy statement of the former Lyon administration in the Province of Manitoba, and the Pawley administration, so-called, of March 1982, that there is no disagreement by honourable members across the way insofar as the French language services being provided, in the ways that were outlined by the

Lyon administration, by the Pawley administration in March of 1982.

If there be any disagreement, Mr. Speaker, then I think that should be dealt with by honourable members across the way. If honourable members would like to pinpoint areas where they feel there has been too much announcement pertaining to French language services and that we should pull back, or if they feel we should extend French language services beyond that, which was announced by the Lyon administration or the Pawley administration, then I would appreciate those views coming forward from honourable members. But I've not heard that from honourable members opposite. I interpret the main flow of statements by honourable members across the way as being in support, as a Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba, as to the extension of French language services, as per the pronounced policy statements of this administration, the previous administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have bipartisan agreement in respect to French language services in this Chamber and I express in respect to that appreciation, so that we can take that out of the political arena. Because honourable members ought to be aware that many of those that have been speaking against this resolution, have certainly not been speaking against this resolution pertaining to whether it should be entrenched or not, but they've been speaking against French language services in the Province of Manitoba. That has been the basic issue of many of those that I've heard speaking in opposition.

There was reference made to the phone-in programs earlier this afternoon. I have heard some of those phone-in programs, as I travel between here and Selkirk, I get the opportunity to sometimes turn those programs on and what I have been hearing have not been callers that have been saying I don't want the resolution to be entrenched. I've been hearing in the main, callers that have been opposed to what they refer to as bilingualism, federal style. They have indicated their opposition to French language services in the Province of Manitoba, they have not been arguing the legal niceties of whether or not the resolution should be entrenched or not entrenched. That appears to be the basic opposition.

I must say that the Western Concept Party - I had the opportunity to listen to Mr. Christie on the air, I don't know whether honourable members had - two weeks ago when he was in the Province of Manitoba, attempting unfortunately to exploit this issue. And Mr. Christie, because there was some reference made of petitions, indicated on the public radio forum that he was holding a meeting in the Assiniboine Motor Inn two weeks ago this past Sunday in order to organize opposition to the Manitoba Government's French language service programs, he referred to as bilingualism and that he would be handing out forms for petitions to be taken.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do anticipate that we will be receiving petitions and I do know, because I heard Mr. Christie, that separatists will be behind much of that activity. Mr. Speaker, but I want to make it clear so that we're all clear so that honourable members across the way have no truck or trade with the arguments of the separatists and they don't agree with the separatist arguments that have been advanced in this province

against French language services. I give credit to the opposition that they do not have truck or trade with the Western Concept Party nor do they have truck or trade with the proposals of the Western Concept Party and, Mr. Speaker, I think we can be unanimous in this Chamber, that we stand 57 full strong in this Chamber against the sort of propaganda that has been enunciated by Western Concept Party.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, I have heard honourable members, and again I bear to be corrected, indicate they are not opposed to the translating of statutes. I want to be very frank, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the translation of statutes. I had some trouble, much more trouble with the translation of statutes going back to 1890, than I have about the extension of French language services because I would prefer that we didn't have to translate statutes going back; I would like to translate statutes going ahead. But, Mr. Speaker, what we have done is reduce the number of statutes to be translated from 4,000 to 4,500 to 400. I'd like to hear from honourable members because the honourable members have indicated they're not opposed to the translation of statutes, whether they agree that we were right to reduce the number of statutes that we would be compelled to translate from 4,000 to 4,500 down to 400, because honourable members have said they agree with the translation of the statutes. They recognize that is required because of the Supreme Court case, the George Forest case. So, Mr. Speaker, we have agreed, and I would be interested if I hear variance from honourable members, the French Language Service Program, we have agreed in respect to the translation of statutes, and all that really this now is about, this disagreement is about, is whether or not the provision of French language service and the translation of statutes should be entrenched in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has dealt with the basic reasons as to why it was felt necessary, on the part of the government, to make an entrenchment in regard to these particular provisions in the resolution for entrenchment in the Constitution.

The Attorney-General has indicated, I understand, that there would be a continuation of court cases; there would be continuation respecting the challenging of statutes; there could be the imposition of a court decision that would say, rather than having 10 years to translate 400 statutes, you have five years to translate 500 or 600 or 1,000 statutes, or even 300 statutes, or 4,000 statutes, or we might not have even been given five years; we might have been given two years and, although very unlikely, as the Attorney-General has said it could, although very unlikely, had been that all the statutes in the province would have been declared illegal. We have said that we would not expect that to be the conclusion, but certainly the recent Quebec case does not provide any reassurance; and that Quebec case has been determined since the introduction of this resolution in this Chamber, and that Quebec decision does not cause anyone to feel any more restful about what the court decision might have been, and what the consequences of such a court case might have been imposed insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I do think that there is an honest disagreement, in principle, between the New Democratic

Party and the Conservative Party on this issue and I think it traces back to - and this is where the discussion started - the opposition that the Conservative members in this Chamber, not their counterparts federally - this was not the case of their counterparts federally; it was not the case of the Conservative Premier of Ontario, the Conservative Premier of the Province of New Brunswick. I think it really does relate back to the entrenchment of basic rights and a philosophical disagreement as to whether or not minority rights ought to be entrenched in the Constitution, for what otherwise would the argument be about? It's not about French language services, we all agree on the statements pertaining to French language services; it's not about the translation of statutes, honourable members have said they agree with the translation of statutes. What we're arguing about is some legal nicety insofar as whether or not there should be the entrenchment take place in the Constitution; we're back to the arguments pertaining to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights, the same sort of arguments that were dealt with in respect to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights.

We are of the view that we have obtained a non-court-imposed solution, a court-imposed solution would not have been the Manitoba way. A Federal Government solution would not have been the Manitoba way because the Manitoba method of approaching this issue has been one that has been expensive; it has been poorly administered in many respects and, if we have any difficulty in respect to the selling of this particular program, it's because unfortunately we have been proceeded by years and years of poorly administered federal programming in respect to bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba, and honourable members know that. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the opposition I find to this amendment, it's rather interesting. In fact, I got a call, I acknowledge it, on Sunday afternoon from someone in the constituency belonging to the Member for Lakeside, and do you know what he was concerned about, Mr. Speaker? He raised the French language issue with me. His concern wasn't on the resolution or the particulars of the resolution; he said, I think you're crawling up too close to Mr. Trudeau. That was the opposition and I've heard that again, and again, that there's concern about crawling up too close to Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker, for that to be suggested in respect to this government, this government that stood unequivocally against the Trudeau proposals in respect to the Crow rate; this government that stood unequivocally against the Trudeau proposals in respect to tight money, high interest rate policies; this government that has stood firmly against the Trudeau policies pertaining to economic policy in Canada, Mr. Speaker; let me assure you that no Manitoban need have any concern about this government being too close to the Trudeau Liberals.

I am more anxious probably than any other member in this Chamber to see the Trudeau Liberals removed from office after the next federal election. I acknowledge I don't want the Trudeau Liberals to be removed and to be replaced by the Mulroney Conservatives; I want the Trudeau Liberals to be replaced by the New Democratic Party of Canada under the leadership of Ed Broadbent. So, Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation, as legislators, to deal with this issue in, I'll say this,

Mr. Speaker, to attempt to deal with this in as cool and as logical a fashion as we can; we have an obligation to look at the pros and cons; we have an obligation to look at the cost factors and the alternatives that might be thrust upon us in respect to cost factors if we proceed one way or the other way; we have an obligation to look at this problem insofar as the historic, the constitutional obligations, yes; we have an obligation to look at this question from every perspective.

Mr. Speaker, it's for that reason that we would like to hear from the people of the Province of Manitoba during the committee hearings. I must admit, I don't mind listening to honourable members across the way, we have some excellent speakers across the way. The Honourable Member for Russell gave a very fiery and, I must say, rather effective speech this afternoon, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry raised some very pertinent points in his address earlier today. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside - I must tell, and I'll breach some caucus confidence in this respect, there was some comment made in our caucus about the fact that the Honourable Member for Lakeside had stood shoulder high in his speech that he presented to this Chamber, that it was a well-constructed, a well-presented, thoughtful address to this Chamber.

Just for a moment, I do want to apologize to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Russell. I'm certainly not intending to kiss them with the kiss of death this evening insofar as any leadership aspirations, because, Mr. Speaker, quite honestly we want the Member for Pembina to lead the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that is easy to exploit, I make no issue with that. I mentioned there are already separatists in this province that are trying to exploit this issue in the Province of Manitoba. Why are the separatists in the Province of Manitoba - they want to exploit this issue so they can gain adherence, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Ah, baloney.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . so let us be aware of the fact that it's an issue that deep emotions can be exploited. But I want to warn anyone that attempts to exploit deep emotional issues in respect to a matter such as this, that in the short run, in the short few months, those that attempt to do so may very well be the political winners, but let me warn those that attempt to exploit an issue like this for narrow, partisan reasons that they will be the severe losers in the long term.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond briefly to some of the arguments made by the First Minister of this province. I will try to attempt to deal with them in the order in which he made them.

He talked about our government's position with respect to entrenchment of the Charter of Rights. He referred to an intransigent position, Mr. Speaker. I wish

that he would have taken the time to examine Hansard with respect to discussions which have gone on between the Attorney-General and myself during the past two sets of Estimates, and to examine some of the public statements that have been made by the Attorney-General lately. It is becoming more and more aware each day that even this Attorney-General has a growing concern about the manner in which the Charter of Rights exists and the court's authority to interpret the Charter of Rights in a way in which it may very well be contrary to the wishes of their political party, and the people that they represent, or any other political party and the people that they represent, Mr. Speaker. So there are growing concerns now on that side which indicate a position that is becoming very equivalent to the position we took.

That was also a position, Mr. Speaker, that was not only taken by our government, that was taken by seven other governments in this country and was agreed to by the Liberal Government when they included the override position in the present Charter of Rights in our Constitution. We are not ashamed of the position we took, Mr. Speaker. We did indeed hold public hearings with respect to that matter throughout the province. We took a position for which we became politically responsible and we believe that position was right and every day it will be shown that position was right.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister indicates now that the government is prepared to examine the wording of the constitutional proposal which is before us. We can go back to Hansard a few weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, when the Attorney-General rose in this House and said either the proposal has to be accepted in the form in which it is now, or it has to be rejected. He said those words in this House, Mr. Speaker, he said them. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, from those statements that was the position at that time.

A MEMBER: He said it today. It's in Hansard, he said it today.

MR. G. MERCIER: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister and the Attorney-General are indicating to us that they're prepared to examine the wording of the constitutional proposal based upon the representations that are made by the public of Manitoba to the committee, then we think that is certainly a step forward.

Mr. Speaker, it is all the more reason why we urge the government to take one further step and to appoint an intersessional committee. These are the dying days of this Session, Mr. Speaker. The government is proposing a committee which is going to go out and meet for a few days - and now he indicates outside of the City of Winnipeg - is going to meet to hear the people, we're going to meet in Winnipeg to hear the people. Then, in a hurried fashion the government is going to examine the wording and possibly suggest some amendments to that wording. Mr. Speaker, that is not the manner in which constitutional amendments should take place. That is much too hurried a manner in which to amend the Constitution.

Amendments to their proposal cannot be adequately brought up within a matter of a few minutes or a few hours of hearing the public representations. It is evident,

Mr. Speaker, this government wants to get this resolution through whatever limited public hearings they hold, and through this Legislature as quickly as possible. That is not the way the Constitution should be amended, Mr. Speaker. That is a further reason why the government should take this one further step and agree with the proposal to hold intersessional hearings, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this important matter. They're now prepared to examine the wording. There are a substantial number of people who are prepared to and wish to make representations to the committee, but any amendments to the proposal cannot be done in a hurried manner.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister indicates that he is now prepared to allow the committee to meet in three places outside of the City of Winnipeg; Thompson, Swan River, Brandon or similar locations. He says let the committee decide. Mr. Speaker, the government has a majority on the committee. We have no assurance that our views as to where those meetings are going to be held, are going to be respected. There's no assurances whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that our views, we have communicated our views that these hearings should be as broad as possible with respect to this constitutional resolution. We have no assurance as to how many meetings will be held; we have no assurances that the public will not be cut off, they were cut off by this government last Friday afternoon, Mr. Speaker; we have no assurances that is not going to happen again. The government holding a majority on the committee, Mr. Speaker, it will be the government, whatever representations we make, it will be the government that will decide where and when those meetings will be held, and if they will cut off the public. They've already done that last week, Mr. Speaker, and we are concerned that may very well happen again.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister indicated why add French-speaking services to this constitutional proposal? He spoke about the translation of statutes first, Mr. Speaker. I think we have indicated that we have no great argument with that part of the constitutional proposal. I think, Mr. Speaker, perhaps quite like the First Minister, if I had my choice, and I've expressed this to the Attorney-General, I would think we should have examined more closely the statutes that we have to translate, because even the French-speaking community recognizes that they don't need all of the statutes translated. If we could only come with a way, Mr. Speaker, a form of wording that would somehow guarantee to them, under Section 23, that they would be entitled to receive the statutes that they wanted without having to translate all of the statutes, then we would be doing the public and the taxpayer a great service.

The trick, of course, Mr. Speaker, is to come up with an appropriate wording. I don't have that wording at hand. I don't believe the government has, but perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that's one more reason why there should be intersessional committee meetings and this matter should be considered in depth and with a great deal of concern for this particular problem which, I think, I and the First Minister, and many others share, including those people in the French-speaking community.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister went on to say, why include French-speaking services in this constitutional proposal, and he referred to the comments of the

Attorney-General who he says has told us we might lose this case, and we might have to do a great deal more translation than we will have to do under this proposal. Mr. Speaker, that is a - I don't intend this as a pun - red herring. The Manitoba Court of Appeal found against Mr. Bilodeau in a majority judgment by Chief Justice Freedman, a jurist who is respected throughout Canada as one of the outstanding judges of our time. Mr. Speaker, he would not make that kind of judgment that he made in that case, when he wrote for the majority of the Manitoba Court of Appeal, lightly; he would not make that lightly at all. He is a great Canadian, I believe, Mr. Speaker, very much concerned with the rights of French-speaking people throughout Manitoba and all of Canada. They made that decision, Mr. Speaker, and counsel for the Manitoba Government have told them that they have an excellent chance of success. It is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, to expect the Supreme Court of Canada to throw the Province of Manitoba into what has been called legal chaos; that simply would not happen, Mr. Speaker. So that cannot be the reason why we're dealing with the balance of this constitutional proposal.

The Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, spoke the other evening, Mr. Speaker, on this issue, as I understand he's spoken for many many years in this Legislature, and referred, speaking to us particularly, to the former Premier Duff Roblin, and asked us the question, as if it was somehow prodding our conscience; what would former Premier Roblin have done if he were on this side of the House at this particular time? He suggested to us, Mr. Speaker, that former Premier Roblin would have followed the lead of the government on this issue.

It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the very next morning in the Winnipeg Sun was an interview with former Premier Roblin who took great pains to point out to the government that they were proceeding in the wrong way, that they should not have interfered with the judicial process, that they should have allowed the case to go to the Supreme Court, that constitutional amendment particular dealing with this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier, I think, suggested in his remarks that the Charter of Rights was a greater issue than this. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that is the case in Manitoba. When you look back on the history of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the history of this particular problem, this has been a very emotional, a very divisive issue for years and years, since the very beginning almost of this problem.

The Charter of Rights was more of an intellectual argument almost, Mr. Speaker. The practical effects of the decision will be seen in the future, but the public certainly was not anywhere near concerned about the Charter of Rights issue than they are today about this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, former Premier Roblin indicated clearly I think in that interview, a man who was acknowledged by the Minister of Health, rightly, as a man who led the way in this province in this particular area, who took gigantic steps forward on this issue, but a man who is saying to the government, with all of that experience, with the experience of now serving in the Senate of Canada for some years, he is saying to the government, you're handling this the wrong way, the whole process is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister went on to raise this implication that perhaps we, on this side of the House, were exploiting this issue. Mr. Speaker, I say with all sincerity that I can muster that the objective of any government in Manitoba must be to unite the people of Manitoba, not to divide the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, if the Ministers in the government, in any government, their time is scarce, their time is limited, they deal with the heads of organizations, the heads of ethnic organizations, the heads of cultural organizations. They don't have the time, in many situations, Mr. Speaker, to speak to the people. On this particular issue, Mr. Speaker, this is a very divisive issue. The Attorney-General tabled documents in this House when he spoke to it that indicated that we, as a government, were providing French language services to French-speaking communities, French-speaking persons, and he somehow thought that would embarrass us, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we're not embarrassed, we did that. It caused no problem in the community; there were no outrages of concern expressed in the community, as he indicated. Nobody even knew we were doing it, but we were doing it, Mr. Speaker, and we were doing it in the proper manner.

The manner in which this government has dealt with this, the process they have used, has caused such divisiveness in this province, Mr. Speaker, that we will probably never see such similar divisiveness in our lifetime. I am hearing, talking to people, stories about French-speaking people that go a long way back, stories that really deserve not to be repeated, but are being repeated because this constitutional proposal, and the manner in which this government has raised it is causing this divisiveness among the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it's going to last now, unfortunately, for a long period of time.

We on this side don't have to say anything about it, it's out there in the community, and it's the process by which this government is bringing this forward that is causing it, and they should take a moment to sit back and to think very seriously about what they are doing and about how they are dividing the people of Manitoba, because they are.

There are bitter feelings in the community, feelings which were not expressed in Manitoba before they raised this issue, but they're being repeated now, Mr. Speaker, old stories that don't bear repeating in this Chamber, but they're being said out there and they're going to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I have a substantial number of French-speaking people in my constituency and I have French-speaking people coming to me and saying, we don't need this, because what this is doing is causing a very anti-French feeling in the community and I don't like it. The French-speaking people say to me, I have been accepted in the community just as any other member of other cultural groups and ethnic origins have been accepted in our society these days, people have become very tolerant of other groups but, because of this issue, because of the antagonisms they've raised in people, French-speaking people are saying, we don't need this. It's making, and it's going to make life much more difficult for us than it has been and things were okay before this.

I say that, I repeat, with all the sincerity that I can muster, because that is a strong emotion that exists

in our province at this particular time and, as former Premier Roblin said, on this kind of issue you have to go very slowly with people; people have to understand it. The Attorney-General says, I wrote to the former Attorney-General, the Member for St. Norbert, sent a copy to the Leader of the Opposition, on December 17th and there have been some stories in the newspapers since then, and people should have known this was coming forward. That's not enough, Mr. Speaker; that was not enough at all.

The government should realize this is a very sensitive matter and has to be handled very tactfully, and to raise it in the way in which they have, they brought it in and they said, it's going through. We asked for public hearings; then they said there would be public hearings. They said they would examine the wording which we asked them to do, but it's been much too hurried, this has got to be slowed down, this whole process. Emotions have to cool off, Mr. Speaker, and it has to be considered very carefully and very thoughtfully, keeping in mind the public interest and the objective that should be achieved by a government in Manitoba, to attempt to achieve unity of all our people in Manitoba, not to divide them according to ethnic origins or cultural groups, because the way in which the government is dealing with this, Mr. Speaker, is tending to do that. So I would urge them to consider seriously the recommendations which we have made to the government, in terms of an intersessional committee, so that this matter can be dealt with in a much more thoughtful way, in a way which will unite the people of Manitoba and not divide them.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak at this time on the Resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

I regret that I missed some of the earlier debate, especially the contributions of the members opposite, when I understand last Saturday they filibustered their own bill to put in the full day; but I want to reiterate the words of many of my colleagues that have spoken tonight, and previously, on what is the rush in bringing in this amendment.

The Member for St. Norbert has just indicated to the First Minister this is probably one of the most serious pieces of legislation we have had brought before this Chamber for a considerable length of time, and I don't see the need to have it rushed through with the haste that the members opposite seem to feel it has to be proceeded with.

The Supreme Court ruling that required the Conservative Government, when our party formed the government, was brought in without the fanfare and the great hurrah that this particular government is dealing with this issue, and provided all that was necessary under that Supreme Court ruling. It has been mentioned time and time again that the Supreme Court ruling on the particular case that has supposedly brought this resolution to the fore, were it allowed to proceed to the Supreme Court, would be thrown out and that would be all there was to it. I just want to mention, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the First Minister's

remarks tonight that brought some remarks from my leader and resulted in him being ejected from the Chamber until Thursday.

It's just one more indication of the high-handed or the iron-handed methods used by members opposite that when they are faced with a great deal of truth, the heavy hand comes down and the members on this side of the House get ejected. There's no question, if you take a very very close look at all of the incidents that resulted in members on this side of the House being asked to leave, you will find that there was a great deal of meat in the statements that they made and I, particularly, don't think it's going to solve any particular good of this Chamber to have people continually ejected.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of regret that I rise on a point of order because I don't believe the honourable member means to reflect on the ruling of the Speaker, but, in effect, that is what he has been doing and I urge that he not continue that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on the same point.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is not reflecting on the ruling of the Speaker the honourable member is simply referring to a number of events which have taken place in this House from time to time based upon motions passed, proposed by the Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: I listened carefully to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa and certainly his remarks were coming close to reflecting on the Chair. I would urge him to review his words carefully.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of reflecting on the Chair because the motion was made in every case by the House Leader, the Attorney-General of the province, and you merely called for the vote on the question so I wasn't reflecting in any way on your rulings.

I'm just saying that if members opposite reflect on the reasons for that motion being brought, that they may have some second thoughts because the First Minister in his remarks got fairly fired up this evening, Mr. Speaker, and it's rather entertaining to see him in that frame of mind because it's about the only thing that we've seen him defend in the last couple of Sessions that his government has done. He has left his Deputy Premier hanging out to dry on the flag-burning incident and the demonstration at the United States Consulate, and other Ministers have gotten themselves embroiled in rather controversial issues and there hasn't been a moo from the First Minister to defend his Cabinet colleagues. He obviously feels a little stronger on this particular issue and is prepared to put some remarks on the record that we heard with some skepticism, Mr. Speaker, because it appears that they're mellowing somewhat over there. We heard some

pretty strong language when the resolution was first proposed about it being carved in stone and unbending and there wouldn't be public hearings held so that they could hear from the people of Manitoba and now we hear, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some public hearings held.

I also want to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on the remarks of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose earlier on this afternoon. He seemed to indicate also that there had to be somewhat of a rush decision to have this dealt with before the end of this Session, and he went on to read at great length, Mr. Speaker, from a letter he'd received from one Peter Elzinga, the President of the Progressive Conservative Party, requesting funds. — (Interjection) — He read one section.

Well, I might read a little more, Mr. Speaker, on a letter I have from one Charles Bigelow, President, Manitoba New Democratic Party. He goes on, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not going to say they are not truthful statements in here because I know what that leads to . . .

A MEMBER: You get expelled from the House.

MR. D. BLAKE: . . . but he goes on to say: Dear Friend, During the worst recession in 50 years Manitoba economy has out-performed the national to such an extent that our population is growing, business bankruptcies are declining and essential services are freely available. One reason is the Government of Howard Pawley and his NDP colleagues."

Mr. Speaker, if that is just not tipping the scales of truth just a shade, I really don't know what is. "The establishment of Manitoba's Jobs Fund to save and create jobs today by investing in a stronger Manitoba tomorrow." Well, we don't have to say much more about the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, it's been labeled a "fraud" fund by, not only us, but it's been labeled a fraud fund by the press. The fund is now out of funds; it's exhausted its funds and is bankrupt. "They have saved 800 farms, more than 400 small businesses and additional hundreds of homes from high interest rates when no other government was offering such relief." Very, very close to playing dangerously with the truth, as they would say, Mr. Speaker. "Worked with livestock producers to establish a widely accepted Beef Stabilization Plan; doubled health care construction to help ensure that every Manitoban has access to reliable medical hospitals." The former Minister of Health has put that untruth to rest sometime ago. "This province again and again has sensible, sensitive, good government, thanks to the NDP in power."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this government is so sensible and so sensitive to the needs of the people of Manitoba, why are they not listening to what is going on out there in relation to the resolution to amend The Manitoba Act and whether they say it's not going to make Manitoba bilingual that is an argument that, Mr. Speaker, you're going to have when the government goes to the rural areas for hearings and to the City of Winnipeg. You're going to have great difficulty convincing the people of this province.

I want to read in case the members opposite haven't had a chance to read the press release that was put

out a couple of three weeks ago by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities by the President, Dave Harms. Mr. Speaker, we all know how close the rural municipalities are to the people of Manitoba. They're much closer than government or this particular Legislative Assembly and they have held a number of hearings with their executive, with their other municipal people, Mr. Speaker, and they have met with the Premier and with other members of his Cabinet.

This press release goes on and I'm going to read it into the record, Mr. Speaker: "A very significant majority of the Members of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and also a very large percentage of the citizens of this province oppose the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as presented by the Government of Manitoba.

"It is not that we oppose French language services when it is needed or requested, but we feel that the application of such a service would be entirely up to the Provincial Government to administer and should not be entrenched in the Constitution and left to the decisions of the Courts of Law in Canada to enforce.

"We agree that the minority groups in our province should be protected from injustices by the majority, but not to the point where it could and will give the minority the power to rule the majority through the courts thus destroying the democratic rule.

"The program as suggested leaves itself wide open to challenge by any person or group as to the limited service given or significant demand made for such services. We would be forever faced with court rulings by any individual or groups of people. The program as proposed affects all of the citizens of Manitoba directly and indirectly as already the government departments are instructed to hire bilingual speaking people whenever replacement on staff occur.

"We know for a fact that it will affect the Civil Service people, agricultural representatives, nurses, labour, teachers and many more in the hundreds of government agencies and Crown Corporations.

"It will also affect all of the citizens of Manitoba with the costs of Autopac brochures, drivers' licences, crop insurance procedures, hospital billings, etc., etc. These items have to be paid for by the citizens of Manitoba from now until all time to come.

"The French language program as it exists today costs the taxpayers \$1.7 million annually. If it should be expanded, as indicated, to all departments of government agencies, Crown Corporations, electoral offices, and the Office of the Ombudsman, it is conceivable to see the costs double and triple from year to year. It would be much more practical to leave Section 23 of The Manitoba Act intact and pay for the translation on a one-time basis and continue the French language services as required or needed in Manitoba because we can and do understand each other as it is. The translation cost effect outlined in the paper, "Constitutionally Speaking," cannot be considered a saving since the taxpayer of Manitoba will have to contribute his share of the so-called \$4 million benefit paid by the Federal Government.

"Even if it would cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$5 million more to not accept the federal agreement, that would be a very small price to pay for the freedom to make our own decisions on required language services in Manitoba. For \$4 per person, we are not prepared

to give concessions that could plague us for all time to come in cost and legal wranglings.

"As already pointed out previously, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act should be left intact and, if amended at all, it should be amended to include the 1890 Manitoba Provincial Languages Act that has formed and shaped our province into what it is today over the last 93 years. The proposed amendment will not limit any future court action against the province and, on the contrary, it will open up possible court action against the government departments. It is one of the most dangerous steps any government has contemplated under existing conditions, and could leave a never healing scar on the citizens of Manitoba regardless of their ethnic background and nationality.

"The claim that the proposed program is not like the federal bilingualism program and is not creating a bilingual province is unfounded with evidence of action already taken by the Provincial Government, as stated in the press by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture that the agricultural representatives hired now will have to be bilingual, as well as the issuance of this year's drivers' licences and other documents already going to municipalities in both languages.

"The first amendment, namely Section 23(1), which states, "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba," overwhelmingly proves the intent of the amendments and leaves the door wide open for a complete and comprehensive federally-controlled bilingual program. We say this program is too costly. It is not practical. As a dual-language program, it is cumbersome and unworkable and, most importantly, it is not needed in Manitoba.

"The most important reason for not implementing such a program is that it is going to and already has created hurt feelings and our legislators should have realized this. Not a single community in our province is made up entirely of one ethnic group, but most communities have representatives of three or four ethnic groups. It has also created the same hurt feelings within the ethnic roots, even on the family level. So instead of uniting, it is dividing the entire fabric of the community spirit that already existed in our province."

Mr. Speaker, that is a fairly hard-hitting press release, coming from an organization that is respected, I think, throughout the length and breadth of this province, whom the First Minister professes to rely heavily on. The present Minister of Municipal Affairs claims to have close contact with that organization. I wonder if he is not listening to them, Mr. Speaker. Can he not get the message across to his colleagues that the people out there have to have a say in this important step that's being taken?

This document is familiar to all members opposite, that we've shown them many, many times with the message from Howard Pawley, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans, the policies of the New Democratic Party," that we have referred to many times. While we haven't maybe hit the exact wording that might adequately describe the slanting of some of the statements in there, Mr. Speaker, if we can believe statements or documents like this put out by this government, then surely, if they're going to listen to the people as they say they are, surely they're going to go out into the rural areas where I have been for the last couple of weeks and they're going to listen to people.

This is a damaging piece of legislation they're bringing in and when they get out there and do some listening, they're going to get that message. That's why it is so important that these hearings be held because the people out there are just starting to realize what can happen, how far-reaching this particular piece of legislation is, and they're not very happy about it. They're not very happy about it, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that. They are not very happy about it.

We can see, while the members opposite can protest and say, Manitoba is not going to become bilingual, it's a very, very serious step down that road. The Province of New Brunswick is designated bilingual. You only have to pick up the papers from day to day to read headlines, "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." They go on to describe a person that had worked for 15 years at her job, and has been told now that if she's not bilingual she will have to be replaced.

Those are the things that the people of Manitoba are concerned with, Mr. Speaker. These are the things that we want this committee to go out into the Province of Manitoba and hear, because it's out there whether these people realize it or not.

This piece of legislation, I feel personally, was dreamed up by the present Attorney-General, probably in consultation with some federal members and members of the Société Franco-Manitobaine, and he sold that bill of goods to the Cabinet and to the First Minister. I don't think they realized what they were getting into when they bought that argument and brought in that resolution, because if this particular amendment and the arguments and the problems and the feelings that it's going to create in this province, if that doesn't blow them out of the water next election, I miss my guess. I miss my guess, Mr. Speaker, from what I have been hearing on my tours around the province this summer, which incidentally all of the members should be doing. They should be back in the constituencies while the people have a little time between seeding and harvest. We are not able to do that now with this amendment that's before us.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we have to do to convince members opposite that there have to be some changes.

Another headline out of the Winnipeg Sun, "Penner changes act to please the cops. Sometimes political principle and even political power isn't enough, Roland Penner admitted last week. He accepted major changes in his cherished Law Enforcement Review Act not because he couldn't get it through the House, but because he couldn't get it past the police."

Mr. Speaker, if he's prepared to make changes such as that, maybe he's prepared to sit down and listen to the people of Manitoba, and have some meaningful public hearings in not one or two major centres in Manitoba, have hearings in several centres across this province. It would be nice to have them in all 57. That may not be completely practical, but numbers up in that figure where you can hear a broad cross section of Manitobans and not just a chosen few sites where audiences can be brought in and be caused to present their case, whether it's pro or con, Mr. Speaker.

So there is no question that those of us on this side of the House will oppose the resolution. We will support

the amendment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, which gives some sensibility to the hearings that we have requested from time to time, Mr. Speaker. Goodness knows, that's not too much to ask, because there is a strong feeling out there that I don't think the government is aware of. My colleague, the Member for Virden, touched on some of the costs today that are going to be borne by the taxpayers of this province, not only costs to the government and to the taxpayer, but the cost to industry and to the businesses of this province. We all know, Mr. Speaker, what happens to those costs, they're passed on to the consumer and the taxpayer eventually picks up the bill.

We have had some advertising on the Constitution. There's a coloured brochure has gone out, and I'm sure the Attorney-General has had a great number of them mailed back to him. We know the cost of printing was 20-some thousand, and another \$20,000 probably to mail it out. I don't know how many he's received back in the mail with not favourable comments on it. — (Interjection) — They were not very favourable comments on the one that he got back. I don't want to get into the other advertising bill, Mr. Speaker, because goodness knows what the cost of the whole advertising program might be. We have Howard "A." Pawley, and we're not just too sure whether that's the first initial of his wife or whether it's just another typographical error such as we found in "both" languages and "official" languages in one other release that he put out.

Mr. Speaker, the cost to the taxpayer eventually is going to be horrendous if this proposal as put forward by this government is allowed to proceed along the lines that they would like it to proceed.

I mentioned the problems being experienced in New Brunswick now, Mr. Speaker. There's no one can tell me that's not going to occur in Manitoba. You can't tell me when you extend these services - and there's a list of them here somewhere here, Mr. Speaker, that was put out by the government, and government boards and agencies that will have the French language. Just to run through them briefly, Mr. Speaker - the government departments as well as the following agencies and that includes Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Telephone System, and Autopac. Now there's very few of our citizens that aren't touched by one of those government agencies, Mr. Speaker. In addition, there's the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, the Human Rights Commission, the Legal Aid Board, Licence Suspensions Appeal Board, Manitoba Labour Board, Municipal Board, and the Public Library Advisory Board.

They mention the urban offices of St. Boniface, St. Vital, and Red River, St. Lazare, Ste. Rose, and we know those towns have a large Francophone population, Mr. Speaker. But this is just the thin edge of the wedge. You can list those boards and commissions, and as I say, they touch every municipality and rural hamlet in this province where there may be not one Francophone or French-speaking person. If those services are provided in the other communities, they can be demanded in the communities such as Minnedosa and elsewhere where there is virtually no one in the community that speaks French.

That's the danger, Mr. Speaker, and when that happens it runs down the line into the people that work

for those agencies and commissions. You see a glaring example right now in the RCMP. You talk to any Anglophone RCMP constable and he'll tell you what they're being faced with. It's even been mentioned here, Mr. Speaker, that once that is entrenched - that's what we're opposing, the entrenchment of because it's irreversible - once that's entrenched, then the government becomes the master and they can move it on to those people supplying government with goods and services and say, well, we're giving you a pretty nice contract. You're going to supply the meals downstairs or the meals in the Norquay building or wherever, in the hospitals or mental institutions and jails, and you will have to have a certain percentage of your staff bilingual or we won't be able to deal with you. There's where the danger comes, Mr. Speaker, and for those of us that had hoped to have a future in this province for our families, you start narrowing down job opportunities. Once you do that, you know, you can understand what that leads to.

This might not have all been necessary, Mr. Speaker, when The Official Languages Act was brought in in 1968, if it had been brought in at kindergarten level, instead of trying to have it opposed from above such as the Federal Government did, we might have had a fairly large section of our population now that would be bilingual. Through all this, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there's no one on this side that's opposed to the French language or those having their culture the same as the other ethnic groups have their culture. There's nobody ever has ever objected to that. The services were being provided in the Legislature, which I might say I feel is not necessary or not needed, and we've spent a bunch of money on the translation services here and you know how much use it gets, Mr. Speaker. I think that was a waste of money, but nevertheless it was a requirement under the last Supreme Court ruling, so that has been gone ahead with. The services are being provided in the courts, and in the Legislature, and that was as far as was necessary other than the translation of some of the statutes that was required under the last Supreme Court ruling. That was going ahead and everything was fine.

This particular government comes along and right out of the blue takes a real quantum step forward, a step far beyond what's required. That is what we're objecting to, Mr. Speaker; that is the danger; that's where the cost to the Manitoba taxpayer is going to become cumbersome. I don't know how we're going to get the message to the people across the way, Mr. Speaker. They've heard numerous deliveries from this side of the House but it's falling on deaf ears apparently, they're not listening to it at all. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure if the First Minister were truthful and indicated to us just how much mail he has had and how many phone calls he's had - he must be having some uneasy feelings on just what he has embarked upon.

There's a letter, dated July 24th, Mr. Speaker, addressed to the Premier, and I'm sure it is not the only one that he has received. In case the other members of the government benches haven't been privy to the contents, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from it and maybe it will give them some idea of some of the feeling that's out there.

"Dear Sir: When your government came to power, you indicated yours would be an open government.

Manitobans construed this as a meaning that you would listen to them and govern accordingly. If you are listening, you will not proceed with the resolution to entrench French language services in the Canadian Constitution, to forge ahead with this amendment, which is so divisive, so foolhardy. The feeling abounds that you, Mr. Pawley, Attorney-General Penner, Prime Minister Trudeau, and the Société Franco-Manitobaine have attempted to resolve this issue in a devious manner, behind the backs and upon the backs of the majority of this province.

"The cost of bilingualism, as we have seen in the federal exercise, is excessive and wasteful. To say, as Mr. Penner has, that it really won't cost Manitobans that much is ludicrous. Mr. Penner's explanation that the Federal Government will provide monies is, I'm sure, very true. Of course they will, because the Liberal Government of Mr. Trudeau is determined to promote French at any cost.

"Does Mr. Penner believe that all Manitobans are so naive that they don't realize that both federal and provincial monies, needed to carry out this proposal, come from the taxpayers' pocket? Does Mr. Penner think that the Federal Government has a money tree? Many people who expect government to subsidize everything don't realize the money must come from their pockets, but I wouldn't have expected Mr. Penner to be one of those.

"The George Forest and Roger Bilodeau perpetration of the alleged injustice perpetrated upon the French Canadians is enraging to many people. Could neither of these men read or speak English; was there really a need there? These costly battles, abetted by Mr. Trudeau and company, and funded by taxpayers, were not needs; they were demands, for revenge by vindictive individuals.

"These fanatics, of course, consider all English-speaking people to be bigots and racists - using this terminology to describe everyone who disagrees with them, and the tolerance of many towards the Forest and Bilodeau types is wearing thin. If these types are attempting to create chaos in this country of ours they are doing just fine; they are causing people to hate French Canadians, and this could end up being another Ireland - Canadian fighting Canadian."

The former Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, alluded to that feeling that's developing out there and I can attest to that because I've worked in French-speaking communities, I have a great many friends who are bilingual and of Francophone extraction. So, Mr. Speaker, I can attest to some of the statements and the feelings that are contained in this letter.

"Forest-Bilodeau and their ilk," to quote again from the letter, Mr. Speaker, "are concerned about the injustices committed against French Canadians. If we are going to be concerned about injustices I'd like you to consider some changes in my country that I feel are unjust. My father fought in the Canadian Army in World War I, and my husband and my brothers fought for Canada in the Canadian Navy in World War II, they fought under the Canadian Red Ensign and all of us loved our flag and were proud of it.

"Now, of course, we have a replica of the Canada Packers flag because the Union Jack in the corner of the Canadian Red Ensign upset the French Canadians. The capital of our country, Ottawa, is now most often

referred to as Ottawa-Hull to give it a French flavour. The Hudson's Bay Company became The Bay because the French didn't like the British connotation. The metric system is being forced on us because it is the French system and the Imperial system is English. The words of our beloved "O Canada" were altered by a French Canadian. A French Canadian M.P. managed to have the name of Canada's birthday changed from Dominion Day to Canada Day in a questionable manner. Dominion Day somehow seemed English to the French Canadians. If they know their history they'd know it was not. Maybe they'd like to change the date next. How much do we have to give to mollify these vengeful Canadians that will never be satisfied?

"It appears that all that English Canadians hold dear must be swept away. Our traditions don't count, even those through British Canadians who preceded us were instrumental in the opening up and developing this country of ours."

We don't agree with all of the statements in this letter, Mr. Speaker, but it goes on at some length and I want to quote one more paragraph from it because there's something, I think, that the members opposite should hear.

"You claim, Mr. Pawley, that your government has to honour the agreement of 1870 to make Manitoba bilingual. You appear to feel obligated to do the right thing, however, I noticed an item in the local newspaper indicating that the CPR was given permanent exemption by the city taxes in 1883 in return for providing employment. I believe the CPR is still providing employment, but your government has no qualms about negating that pact.

"I'd say, because times have changed in 100 years, the same thing holds true in the bilingualism issue. Times have changed. The French Canadians no longer form 50 percent of the population, probably less than 6 percent would be the figure today."

They go on to say how much they admire Russell Doern, Sterling Lyon and Mr. Mercier and others in the party, Mr. Speaker. As I said, we don't agree with all of the sentiments expressed there, but those are very strong sentiments, Mr. Speaker, and I know when the members opposite get out and listen to the people in the country, not only the rural areas, the people in the City of Winnipeg, they will find what the former Attorney-General, the Member for St. Norbert, mentioned earlier tonight; that there is bad feelings developing in the communities.

There are Francophone people that have come to me and have come to other members of my party and my colleagues and said, we're getting along just fine; we're teaching our children the language in our home, we keep our customs and we're getting along just fine. We don't require a government to come along and foist something on us that's going to create a backlash, unrest, and bad feelings in our communities. It is just not necessary. We were getting along just fine. The government was providing more and more services and, as the Member for St. Boniface well knows, he's been around a long time, Mr. Speaker, and he said the other day that if this is pushed too hard there's a danger of the Francophones losing what they have gained so far, and that is so very very true. If this issue gets pushed too hard it'll create bad feelings and a backlash that would create a situation where they're in danger of

losing some of the benefits that they have obtained to date.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know, by the actions of members across and way, and statements from his seat made by the Member for Ste. Rose, that I will probably have another opportunity to speak on this amendment, or a similar amendment later on, so with that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the opportunity of speaking on this today. I will be supporting the supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to have a chance to make a contribution on this sub-amendment that was proposed by the Member for Gladstone, indicating that intersessional hearings should be held and that the report be made back to the Legislature by not later than December 31, 1983.

I would like to spend some time in discussing the situation with respect to the constituency that I represent. The constituency is made up of a number of different ethnic groups from Eastern Europe, from Central Europe, from Western Europe including Great Britain, as well as people from other parts of the world, but we have a cosmopolitan area that is certainly not anti-French in their makeup. I think they recognize the interests of all minority groups, but there has been a few situations in recent years that has caused much concern for the people of my constituency.

I go back to the Forest case and when that went before the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court made their decision with respect to the Forest situation, and reverted back to the laws that were established some 90 years ago. I think that the Lyon administration, at the time in 1979 when the Supreme Court made the decision, the Lyon Government acted very responsibly in providing certain services that had been neglected back since 1890, and going back to a news release of March 20, 1981, "Premier Sterling Lyon has announced the establishment of a small section in the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources to improve the capacity of the Provincial Government to respond to requests from the public in the French language. Reporting to the Deputy Minister, this section will assist him in the following functions:" - I'd like to list those functions - "Liaison between the Franco-Manitoban community and government departments; liaison with government departments and channeling requests for specific services or information required by individuals or organizations; studying and recommending policies and priorities of services provided in the official minority language, French; responsibility for matters relating to French language and culture at the provincial, federal and international levels; advising provincial government departments in the planning and operation of programs and services in French."

Certainly this was left to the discretion of the Legislature, and certainly there was a real interest in providing extended French services when and where they were required. I can recall many instances in my constituency where people were a little bit concerned with the implementation of those functions that I have just read from the news release, but when explaining

this to the constituents they understood that this had been lacking and they certainly were prepared to go along with it.

Then, just another year and a half ago, we had another incident in the constituency that created some further concern in that a few people that had moved into the Swan River constituency. In one particular case, an individual that lived in the Town of Swan River wanted to pursue the French Immersion course in the local school division. Information was sent home with many of the children from the elementary schools - a note sent home by the children to the parents - with respect to the implementation of a French Immersion course in the Swan River School system. Of course, this was worked on for about a year and it was indicated that in kindergarten and Grade 1 there would be somewhere around 30 or 32 students, as I recall, who were interested in taking this French Immersion course. This matter was referred to the school division and they studied it and reviewed it for some time, and they wanted to implement the French Immersion Program if they could possibly do so, but they were concerned that it wasn't fair to couple-up kindergarten and Grade 1 in order to provide the French Immersion course.

And, of course, at that time, the restraint program was being promoted by letters from Howard Pawley to all the municipalities and to the school divisions to make every effort to cut back in cost where possible. So the school division felt that there was no way they could provide the service of French Immersion to the particular situation they had in the Swan River School Division. They turned down the proposal by - I think it was a six to four vote, as I recall.

However, the parents of the proposal to have French Immersion were not satisfied with this and they pursued this for some time and it was brought back to the school division again and there was consultation back and forth with the Department of Education. The school division upheld their decision not to proceed with it because they didn't feel that they could conceivably offer the type of French immersion course that would be beneficial to the students that would be taking that course.

Furthermore, if the course was to be held in Swan River, they would have to build facilities in Swan River that they did not have at the present time. However, there were classrooms available in other parts of the school division, but it would mean busing the majority of the students from Swan River to Birch River or from Swan River to Benito. Benito and Birch River were the two areas where classrooms were available.

Well, there was a lot of consultation and decisions to be made but the school division stuck with their decision that they couldn't proceed with this. The parents then took the school division to court and the school division won their case, but subsequently went to Court of Appeal.

In the process, I was called to a meeting that was held by the school division at which time the Minister of Education was asked to come out and meet with the school division to pursue this question further before it went to the appeal. The meeting was called on a specific date. I went to the meeting and the Minister of Education, although asked to come out and participate with the school division, saw fit not to attend for other reasons, I suppose, that she couldn't be there.

She did send a representative from the Department of Education as well as her executive assistant.

All of the issues were talked about by the members of the school division and the official from the Department of Education, and I can vividly recall the school division saying that in order for them to even proceed with the French Immersion course, they would have to have the course held at Birch River. If they were to do that, it would appear on the surface at least, that it was just a further attempt by the school division to quash the French Immersion course because it would be unlikely that some of the parents would allow their children to be bused to Birch River.

But, I can vividly recall the representative from the Department of Education saying, well, if cost is a concern to you, you shouldn't worry about it because there is money available for developing classrooms here in Swan River. But this was defeating the purpose of the Swan River School Board because they felt that they didn't want to spend taxpayers' dollars for creating classrooms when they had available classrooms in the area.

However, the story is well-known to many people in the province in that the Appeal Court was held and ruled in favour of the parents, that the school division must supply French instruction to the parents of those 30 or 32 children that were in Grade 1 and kindergarten. So, the school division was then forced to proceed with the details and the physical components in order to facilitate this course.

But to get on with the story, by the time the course was to be held, there was some difficulty in getting the qualified instructor in French and in English to handle this particular course, but eventually a successful candidate came on the scene. By this time, there were only something like 17 students that were interested in the course, which was below the 23 students that were required. I know that the school division had then written to the Minister of Education to determine whether it was still a requirement of the school division to proceed with this French Immersion course when they didn't have the required number of students, but the Minister of Education wrote back and said, yes, that it was necessary for them to proceed with the course because, prior to the court cases, there were a sufficient number of students.

The reason for discussing and putting this on the record, I think is important because this whole exercise built up a great animosity towards this whole French language proposal. I think it just shows the divisiveness that can be created when something is being forced on the people after an elected body makes a decision one way and then they're told that, no, their decision is not right, you have to do it another way.

So this had further complicated the question of extended French services when the present government now announces the amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to go well beyond what was intended in the Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as of 1870. So to extend French language services to the government departments has flared up the situation in my constituency. I know that a very large percentage of the constituents there are adamantly opposed to the encroachment of the extended French language services at this time.

I know that the Premier and also the Attorney-General have received resolutions from some of the

municipalities in the area. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that only recently, I had tabled a letter from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Town of Swan River that was sent by the Premier, in where he quoted Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and where he had changed the - and I'll just read the last sentence of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. "The acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both official languages." Yet, the statute says that, "The acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages." You will recall that the Premier said, well, you know, that's a very petty thing to bring up and obviously it's a typographical error. So that well may be, but it's very difficult to appreciate that that could be a typographical error.

My question of raising it is that it changes the whole context of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. If what the Premier had sent out was factual, then there would be no argument with respect to what the present government is trying to do with respect to the amendments that are being proposed. So to me and to many of the municipalities, it is very suspicious that this "official" was maybe more than a typographical error. I haven't heard from the Premier, although he indicated, I believe, that he would take it as notice as to how many municipalities and individuals had received this kind of letter with this typographical error.

I know that there are somewhere in excess of 100 resolutions that have been passed by municipalities. These have been sent to the Attorney-General and also to the Premier, I would expect. Hopefully, they have received replies back. I would be interested in knowing whether all of those letters have had the same typographical error. Certainly if that is the case, then there is really no explanation for that other than that certainly, whether the Premier likes it or not, this has definitely misled a lot of the people into a false understanding of what is being proposed.

Certainly I was pleased to listen to the Premier tonight, indicating that he has had some change of heart with respect to allowing the committee to go to other areas of the province, outside of the City of Winnipeg. My understanding earlier was that the committee would only hear briefs in the City of Winnipeg and that they would not be prepared to go outside of the city. Certainly to expect constituents to come in from the distant constituencies, one that I represent and there are certainly others in the North that are much further, but to expect constituents to come in some 300 miles and not know when they would be called before the committee; maybe have to spend many dollars in hotel accommodation and meals, and waiting for the fact that they may have a chance to be called before the committee. We all know that last week, the committee dealing with the seat belt legislation was cut off and no more representations to be made to that committee. So people coming in from a distance would have some reluctance, I'm sure, because of the expense and the fact that they would not know whether they would be heard or not.

However, the Premier has indicated that they would be prepared to hold meetings in Thompson and Swan River and Brandon and possibly other locations with respect to the proposed amendments to the Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. It's encouraging indeed. I know that the people of the Swan River constituency will

want to have representation at those committee hearings and with the fact that one can be held in Swan River, will certainly simplify matters for that particular part of the province.

Now just recently the Attorney-General in speaking to the amendment, had indicated what would be included in the proposed resolution. Section 23.7(1) of The Manitoba Act would read, "Any member of the public in Manitoba has the right to communicate in English or French with and to receive available services in English or in French from the head or central office of any department of the Government of Manitoba." In other words, he's entrenching the fact that French and English will be official languages of the province.

Then to follow up on this, a pamphlet was sent out, "The Facts About French Language Services. Manitoba is not becoming bilingual. This proposed French Language Services Program is not federal bilingualism. Today, Manitoba is able to fulfill its constitutional obligations in a practical, just and economical way. Those Manitobans whose first language is French will be offered government services in that language if they so desire. The services outlined in this folder are being introduced in an orderly and considered manner.

"A number of approaches were carefully considered. Manitoba rejected the federal bilingualism model, because it has been a costly failure. The province has no intention of using the federal approach. What is proposed here is a practical, made-in-Manitoba solution."

Well, when you read this pamphlet over, it would seem that it's a fait accompli. The thing is done and over with, so people reading this feel that this is already something that's happened and they have no recourse on it with respect to making any changes. It says here, "French language services are to be offered by the Provincial Government in limited ways in specified areas only." How can the province guarantee that this can happen once it becomes entrenched? They have no further control over it.

"By 1986 new Manitoba laws are to be enacted in both languages." Without the amendment this would be required now. "By 1987 people requesting service in French will be served in French by certain specified provincial departments and agencies." Well, as my Leader, when he was speaking to the original resolution some time ago, pointed out this fact that nothing really is going to happen until January 1, 1987, and then the whole roof caves in with respect to the French services that will be entrenched, and that certain requests will have to be supplied in French to the different provincial departments and agencies.

"Businesses, municipalities, non-government bodies, school boards and institutions are not affected in any way." Again, how can the Provincial Government of Manitoba make this claim when the French language services will be entrenched and the floodgates will be open and there will be all kinds of court cases?

"The facts: Manitoba is not becoming bilingual nor introducing the Trudeau Government's Bilingual Program." Well, I don't know just how it is going to differ. I don't see where there's going to be any difference at all.

"Provision of French language services will be limited to communities which have significant numbers of French-speaking Manitobans." Again, this was being

considered and being dealt with under the previous administration. It wasn't being entrenched; it was being dealt with by the Legislature and certainly people in this province have no objections to French language services being supplied in communities where there is a real need for it, but once it's entrenched, I suppose, if there's two or three people in the community, then they can force the courts to provide services in the province, in the various communities of Manitoba.

The pamphlet goes on in some detail. There's a personal message from the Attorney-General in it. "This folder has been prepared for you to explain the fact that Manitoba is not going bilingual." They seem to make a special effort to try and convince the people that the province is not becoming bilingual; and yet, they've entrenching extended French language services in the constitution, which then turns it over to the courts to make the decision, and out of the hands of the Legislature.

"Our government has a constitutional commitment to Manitobans and to Canadians. With your support and understanding we look forward to fulfilling that commitment in a practical, just and economical way." So nothing has been forced on the people, it says here, "Limited services simply means most people will not be affected."

What is this French language business all about? Well, that's very interesting. It says here simply, "It's a proposed solution to a possible legal challenge in the Supreme Court of Canada, which could have struck down all of Manitoba laws. To avoid the possibility of legal chaos, which might have resulted from a Supreme Court imposed ruling on language rights, your Manitoba Government worked out a proposal which will bring the legal challenge to an end." Well, this is absolutely rubbish.

"At the same time, it will provide limited French language services in the province through a constitutional amendment." Well certainly I think another area that concerns people in my constituency, and I'm sure most of the constituencies in Manitoba, is the fact that this government could make a deal with an organization called the SFM, an individual by the name of Bilodeau, and an individual heading up a country called Trudeau and then, all of a sudden, just force this on the people of Manitoba.

As the Attorney-General had said in this House some time ago, that there was very little room to manoeuvre on the agreement; that the Société Franco-Manitoban were not prepared to budge on this agreement, except for maybe some slight changes, but the Attorney-General didn't think that they would be prepared to go very far with respect to changes. I think this is distasteful to Manitobans, generally, that this kind of a deal could be struck and really behind closed doors. The NDP, during the 1981 election campaign, made no reference to the fact that they would be entrenching extended French language services to the people of Manitoba. Nowhere can you find this in the propaganda that was sent out, and certainly there was really scads of propaganda that was sent out. I've looked through this "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," which is signed by Howard Pawley, Leader, Manitoba NDP, and you can go through, there's pages of stuff. It was the propaganda that - well I think the first, "Great people, great future. We can build a dynamic future in Manitoba. We can

turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years." They go on with a whole bunch of promises that they could not make.

They were going to have resource development, energy development, a whole bunch of stuff here. They were going to develop ManOil so that this would help pay the bills of the province; they were going to develop the hydro resource that would help pay some of the bills of the province, and these things haven't happened. As a matter of fact, it's been a disaster with respect to this government in the last couple of years. But nowhere in this document does it say that they're going to provide extended French language services to the people of Manitoba. What we are saying is that, if they're going to do this, then I think it's important that this government go back to the people and let the people have a chance to make their case known before a committee, and this committee could certainly conveniently go to the people between this Session and the next Session and, as the sub-amendment indicates, that the report could come back to the House here not later than December 31, 1983.

The Premier has indicated tonight that he has prepared to at least go to three other locations outside of Winnipeg, which was the same locations as the general constitutional hearings that were held back when we were government, which would include Swan River and Brandon, I believe, and Thompson, as well as the City of Winnipeg. So at least if the Premier is prepared to do that it's a step in the right direction and I'm sure that he would get a pretty good indication as to what the feeling of the people really is out there.

I know that I've dealt, to some extent, on the situation in the Swan River area. The municipalities have indicated that they are opposed to what the government is doing. A number of individuals have indicated that they are not happy with this, and I am concerned, as other members have mentioned here when they have been speaking, the fact that the French element in our province are bound to suffer from this amendment because of the opposition that people generally are going to give to it. I really believe this because I know that I don't have a large French population in my area, but I know they are very quiet on the issue because they know that they have to live in the community with other ethnic groups. The fact is that they are going to be criticized for forcing this kind of issue on the people of Manitoba, and yet they have had really no say in it, they haven't asked for it.

I know that in my own family I have a son-in-law who was born in Montreal and could not speak very good English until he came west in 1976. He has become quite fluent in English and still retained his French. He has not indicated to me his true feelings on this situation, but I also have relatives that are translators, in Ottawa, for the Federal Government and they have indicated that, you know, there's some concern with what is happening here in Manitoba by forcing this on the people, and certainly that it will have repercussions for the Franco-Manitoba element.

Well, I'm just wondering what kind of deal that this government has made with Trudeau and the Société Franco-Manitobaine, because that's what the people are asking me, that's what constituents are asking me; what in the world is the Province of Manitoba progressing on this constitutional amendment when the

people have not requested it? They feel that there has to be some kind of a deal because the Bilodeau case, at best, would appear to be a frivolous court case, and that the Attorney-General has said that they've been afraid to proceed on it because there is a good chance that the Supreme Court could rule against the province and create a - what is it? - chaos situation for the province. Yet the Attorney-General has the advice of top legal services and they indicate, in their opinion, that this is not very likely to happen.

So I appeal to the government that the least they can do is provide the opportunity for people to make their case known to an intersessional committee of the Legislature which could be held, quite conveniently, between now and the end of December, 1983, to really get the true feelings of what the people of Manitoba are saying about this constitutional amendment, and the fact that it's going to be entrenched, and not likely it could be ever reversed. Certainly I believe that the government would have to change their story from what they are telling us today.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the comments that I wanted to make at this time. I'm sure I'll have further opportunities to make further contribution on this resolution at another time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make both a motion, and an announcement with respect to House business tomorrow, but I would move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines, that this House do now adjourn until the Session beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I would like to announce that I will be calling this resolution, again, tomorrow morning, and afternoon, and evening but we will discuss House business continually during the course of the day.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.