



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. 128 - 10:00 a.m., WEDNESDAY, 3 AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 3 August, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.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

Baby virus

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Acting Minister of Health, and I would ask him whether the viral infection which has caused the death of one infant, and illness of 19 others, in St. Boniface General Hospital is, to the best of the Ministry's knowledge, at this point in time, now contained and under control?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: The advice that I have received from the department is that to the best of their knowledge the virus is, indeed, contained in St. Boniface Hospital, in the nursery there.

The advice also is that, at this time, the exact type of virus has not been identified, but that it is contained to St. Boniface Hospital. Some 20 babies have been affected, one baby has died, three are critically ill.

In this situation the infected babies are in isolation; maternity cases are being shifted to Misericordia Hospital, unless these are emergency cases or high-risk cases, and there is co-operation between Misericordia and St. Boniface Hospital at present.

They've called in experts from the United States to try and determine the exact nature of the virus, but there is no situation where it's spread beyond St. Boniface. They are doing a check with those mothers and babies who have been in the hospital within the last 10 days. That check is proceeding to see if there are any cases but, to the best of the knowledge of the department, the situation is under control.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would thank the Minister for that information. I would ask him a supplementary. Does the high-risk obstetrical capability at the Health Sciences Centre have the capacity to accommodate the volume in this field, the two high-risk obstetrical centres for Manitoba essentially, but certainly particularly for Winnipeg, being the Health Sciences Centre and St. Boniface Hospital?

HON. W. PARASIUK: I have received the information that the Health Sciences Centre does have the capacity

to accept the high-risk cases. I will have to take that question as notice.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable First Minister, does this situation cause the government to rethink its decision to consolidate obstetrical units, and to phase out the obstetrical units at Seven Oaks and Concordia?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have received no information to indicate that decision should be rethought, reconsidered on the basis of what has happened in St. Boniface, but if, indeed, the Acting Minister, upon obtaining further information brings anything anew that we ought to examine, then certainly we would examine it in light of any additional information.

Fitness, Recreation and Sport

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that the government has disbanded and dissolved the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, no, there is no intention to dissolve. There has been a restructuring and reorganization insofar as the Department of Fitness. I think the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs is probably best to deal with that particular question.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, then a question to the Minister, I guess, responsible for recreation in the province. In light of the fact that the department has now been split up and there will not be any cohesive department in government which deals with sport, fitness and recreation, could the Minister of Recreation now, who is also responsible for Culture, advise the House as to what type of duplications will now exist between the two departments? In other words, how will the sporting public, as well as the recreation public, which are activities which go hand in hand, how will they be instructed to deal with this particular situation now that this department has been dissolved and the priority of fitness and sport downgraded by this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The newly reorganized departments will continue to work hand in hand with respect to the activities of recreation and

fitness and sport. The reorganized Department of Cultural Affairs, including recreation, will be responsible for the regional delivery of recreation, fitness and sport activities outside of the City of Winnipeg, and we will work in concert and in consultation with the reorganized Department of Health, Fitness and Sport to ensure that there is a cohesive delivery of those services to people in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that this is clearly a downgrading of priority by this government, with regard to fitness and sport and recreation in this province, and that really will be a blow to the recreation and sporting community of this particular province, I wonder if the Minister now in charge of recreation could inform the people of Manitoba why this action was taken, why this downgrading was undertaken.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reject the allegation that this was a downgrading of the commitment of this government to recreation, fitness and sport. The facts of the matter are the decision was made to reorganize the departments and to make one less department within government as a means of streamlining government operations. It's certainly not the intention to downgrade the activities of recreation, and I'm sure if the Minister of Health, who is responsible for Fitness and Sport, were here he would echo my words and indicate that, in fact, it's an upgrading of responsibility by including and working closely together with the Department of Health and Fitness and Sport, and that the ongoing consultation and co-operation between our two departments will continue to ensure that there is an effective, but an efficient, delivery system for those services to people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, to the same Minister. In light of the fact that there was a cohesive organized and concentrated unit within government, namely, the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, which was put in place because of the kind of chaos that was happening before when people were dealing with recreation in the Department of Cultural Affairs, and sport with the Department of Health; in light of the problems that were being caused at that time, how can this Minister now say we're going back to the old system and say this particular department isn't downgraded? We've had experience with the type of approach that the government now is reverting to. We had a better system to serve the people of Manitoba, the sporting community. What kind of rationale does the Minister use now, going back to the old system, which will be less effective and less responsive to the needs of sport and recreation in this province?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of the chaos that the member opposite refers to. I can guarantee those — (Interjection) — I hear some chaos over there, Mr. Speaker, but I'll try to ignore it. I'm not aware of the chaos that the member alludes to or alleges existed in the past. I can assure honourable members, and the people of the Province of Manitoba, particularly those that are interested and involved in recreation, sport and fitness activities throughout

Manitoba, that we will continue to provide the service, in co-operation with the local municipalities, the local recreation districts and the new revitalized Department of Fitness, Health and Sport. I believe, from what I've been told by others, that the reorganization of the departments that took place some time ago were not done for reasons of government efficiency, rather for political reasons to shuffle Ministers, at the time, around.

McKenzie Seeds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds. It was recently reported that the manager of McKenzie Seeds retail outlet moonlights as manager for the Carillon Card Shoppe in Brandon. The Carillon Card Shoppe, of course, is owned by Mr. Moore, and the other two senior officers recently fired from McKenzie Seeds in Brandon. There's also a fourth shareholder involved in that corporation, Mr. Speaker, who also works for McKenzie Seeds. My question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds is, does he see any potential problem with this kind of business arrangement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I read the newspaper this morning, as obviously the honourable member did and I gather that the Provincial Auditor is looking into the matter.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister who is responsible for McKenzie Seeds, who must answer in this House for McKenzie Seeds. I'm asking the Minister whether he has any problem with that kind of business arrangement? Does he personally find that sort of business arrangement acceptable?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone should try to presume to prejudge anything. We should get the facts, have an analysis by proper qualified people such as the Provincial Auditor and his staff.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Board of McKenzie Seeds, Mr. McDowell, has reportedly said that he sees no problem with this kind of business arrangement, having a person employed full-time with McKenzie Seeds, and also working part-time with another business owned entirely by people who are the present or former employees of McKenzie Seeds. Since the chairman of the board has expressed an opinion about that, would the Minister not care to venture his opinion on this sort of situation?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, this sounds very repetitive. I would like to get the facts and the analysis of the Provincial Auditor's Office.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the fourth shareholder involved in the Carillon Card Shoppe, a Mrs. Greeniaus,

is a person who has served as official agent for NDP candidates on at least three occasions. Given that she . . .

HON. R. PENNER: That's dipping into the mud.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . well, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General says that's dipping into the mud. If being an official agent for an NDP candidate is dipping into the mud, then that's up to them.

This has to do with the responsibility of the Minister. He is dealing with a situation where one shareholder who has been an official agent of NDP candidates on at least three occasions; a situation where his long-time friend and political associate was a major shareholder. Is that why the Minister is so reluctant to accept his responsibility to take charge of this situation?

HON. L. EVAN: I think the attitude of the honourable member is very regrettable. I think we have to look at the situation; we have to look at all the facts. The political allegiances of any individual or individuals involved is beside the point. As the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain full well knows, some of the people who have been named by the Provincial Auditor and who have been in the news recently have been prominent Conservatives in the Brandon area. But, Mr. Speaker, that is irrelevant. The irrelevancy is the actions of individuals, the incidents, the events - not their political allegiance.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds seems unable to answer questions in the House concerning his responsibilities. He has evidently expressed his concern publicly to newspaper reporters to the effect that he feels betrayed by his long-standing friends and political associates. Given that set of circumstances, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister not come to the conclusion that this Minister now responsible for McKenzie Seeds is incapable of dealing with the situation in an objective fashion, and will he remove him from that responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to review some of the circumstances pertaining to the allegations that flow from the honourable member's question. It was the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds that caused an internal investigation to be undertaken four days before the matter was raised in the Chamber by the Member for Turtle Mountain. It was immediately insofar as the additional information that was brought to light - and I have credited the Member for Turtle Mountain in respect to this - brought that information to light in this Chamber, that the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds caused an inquiry by the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know in what way it can be suggested that the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds has been negligent in respect to his responsibilities. He caused the Auditor to investigate the charges that were levelled by honourable members across the way. He has been prepared to await the

Auditor's report, rather than that it come to hasty, premature decisions; to act on the basis of factual information provided to him by the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has no foundation for any suggestion that the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds ought to resign.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. He has an interim report from the Auditor; it apparently dealt in sufficient detail with the situation to result in the firing of the three senior executives. Perhaps the First Minister would be prepared to make that report public.

A further question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Does he find it acceptable as a method of doing business that a person employed by McKenzie Seeds should also be employed by persons who are now shareholders and formerly were employees of McKenzie Seeds and some who still remain as employees of McKenzie Seeds, does he not see some potential avenue for abuse in that kind of business arrangement?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is for that very reason that I would await the report of the Provincial Auditor. There are a number of public servants who do have second jobs and have had second jobs for a number of years. Mr. Speaker, it is a question whether or not that second job is inconsistent or in conflict with their first job. That has to be determined, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have the facts and information from an independent source that reports to the Chamber as a whole and it is the Provincial Auditor that is non-political and reports to the Chamber as a whole that can best bring forth to members of this Chamber the facts so that we can evaluate those facts and then conclude whether or not there is an actual conflict of interest. Mr. Speaker, that is the honourable way to undertake this. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we will be resorting to trial by innuendo, trial by way of allegations in this Chamber without having the facts and the particulars checked out by the Provincial Auditor, that again, I wish to emphasize, is non-political, is reportable to the Chamber as a whole and whose information I would best accept as to any member in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, as to the facts in this particular case.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, this is a question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds. This situation has been reported in the press. It is public information. My question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds is, has he specifically approached the Provincial Auditor to ask whether or not he has the details involving this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor is on record as saying he is looking into this matter.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a public allegation has been made. There is potentially tremendous opportunity for abuse, not necessary that that abuse has actually taken place, but the opportunity is there. Has the Minister not even gone to the Auditor to ask specifically about this situation?

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

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as members of the House are well aware, the letter requesting the Auditor to act on the matter came from me because it is under The Financial Administration Act — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Mr. Evans that very afternoon before the letter went to the Auditor. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, members opposite know full well that the Auditor and I have been in discussion on a fairly continual basis on this issue.

On this particular item, the card shop, I had many weeks ago requested the Provincial Auditor to provide us with a full report. I point out that right now the conflict-of-interest potential that the Member for Turtle Mountain is concerned with is fairly insignificant, in that the actors who could have assisted in some kind of conflict-of-interest are not there, that is, they have no access to any power or influence in McKenzie Seeds. They are not there anymore. There will be a report provided and it will include this particular item.

I point out as well that I had contacted the Member for Turtle Mountain within several days of the first allegations being made in the House and I requested that all information that he had should be forwarded on to the Auditor so that all of these items could be dealt with at once. Well, the member says that that's where we learned about the card shop. In fact, the card shop item came to my office from another source, because once this thing was opened up, there were a number of other individuals who had some concerns, who came forward and people who were employed at McKenzie Seeds were interviewed, etc., and so the investigation should surely be allowed to conclude.

The Member for Turtle Mountain has requested the interim report of the Auditor. I will assure the members that I will attempt to talk with the Auditor today and ask him whether in view of what has happened between the time he provided that report and now, it would be all right, that there would be no conflict with other investigations that are going on, for me to release it. I would love to be able to release it in order that we can stop this speculation and have people see exactly what the Auditor did say with respect to the entire situation. He, of course, will be reporting again in a more full way. He was predicting the last time I talked with him somewhere around the end of September.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister.

Who presently within his government is responsible for McKenzie Seeds?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is responsible for The Financial Administration Act and thus is responsible pertaining to all matters referenced to the Provincial Auditor. The Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds directly is the Minister of Community Services, but there is a responsibility on the part of the Minister of Finance in respect to involvement in discussions and initiating actions by the Provincial

Auditor and that has been done by the Minister of Finance.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question then to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds. It's reported that Mr. McDowell, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of McKenzie Seeds, may have know as long as a year ago about a possible conflict-of-interest situation. Has the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds been in touch with Mr. McDowell within the last few hours or days to determine whether or not that, in fact, was the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated previously, the matter - and it's on public record that the Auditor has stated that he is looking into the matter and what discussions the chairman of the board has with the Auditor is between the chairman of the board and the Auditor.

Ukrainian Festival

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

Last week, on Thursday or Friday, I asked him a question concerning an impending announcement that the Dauphin Ukrainian Festival concerning some \$10 million worth of construction and the Minister laughed uproariously because, of course, the announcement was for \$15 million and he wasn't making it. I want to ask him a question. In view of that announcement, did he himself make any announcement of any goodies in Dauphin or did he just go there to sample the food?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was asked a number of questions last week regarding Canada's National Ukrainian Festival. One was regarding whether or not I was announcing any new - and I quote the term used by the Member for Elmwood - "new goodies" for Canada's world-famous National Ukrainian Festival. My response to that was, no, I was not announcing any new goodies for Canada's National Ukrainian Festival. What I did announce and present to the President of Canada's National Ukrainian Festival was a cheque in the amount of \$15,000 from the Multicultural Grants Program of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources, which is the same level of funding that was given to that festival last year.

In regard to the announcement that was made with respect to a Destination Manitoba grant, that grant comes under the responsibility of the Minister of Economic Development and I would ask her to respond on the specifics of that grant.

I would, however add, Mr. Speaker, I, and I think all Ukrainian people of this province, resent the allegations that are made with respect to the small amount of

assistance that is given by the people of Manitoba, through their government, to the world famous, Canada's National Ukrainian Festival. I believe that most people regret and do not agree with the kind of position that's being advanced through questions by the Member for Elmwood. I think most Manitobans, and I'm sure members opposite, recognize the value of Canada's National Ukrainian Festival, recognize it both in terms of its tourist impact and in the proud way that the Ukrainian people are portraying their culture and heritage in the community of Dauphin, and I think we should all congratulate them.

MR. R. DOERN: On a matter of privilege. I have never said, and I have never complained, and I have never begrudged grants going to the Ukrainian community, and I think the Minister is making a slanderous attack. I have never suggested, Mr. Speaker, in this House, or outside of this House; I have never made that suggestion before and will not make that suggestion. I have said that the Minister is attempting to influence the ethnic groups and organizations to support the government legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood, a second question.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I will make my statement later. I have a question, then, for the Minister of Economic Development who attended the National Festival in Dauphin and announced a \$500,000 grant - or at least I believe she was present - announced a \$500,000 grant along with Senator Gil Molgat, which apparently is assistance for the construction of a \$3.2 million multipurpose complex. I just wonder if she could explain what, in fact, is involved there; and secondly, whether there are any private funds going into that project.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to rise to give more details about the Destination Manitoba grant that was made to the Ukrainian Folk Arts Council of Dauphin. Unfortunately I was not able to be present at the festival but the announcement was made, and quite appropriately so, by the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Speaker, the grant was one of the grants being given under Program 3 of Destination Manitoba. That is a Capital Assistance Program for non-profit rural organizations, municipal organizations or non-profit groups. It is one in a series that we have been announcing. This particular one, as the Member for Elmwood has already said, was for a \$500,000 contribution, cost-shared with the Federal Government, and it is our contribution, along with some federal monies for employment, and monies raised by the local community, to develop Phase I of a site, a park, or at least an area on the north slope of Riding Mountain Park.

This is a project that has been under study and in a planning phase for many years by the Ukrainian

community in Dauphin. I can't tell you the hours of volunteer work, of vision, of careful thought and planning that has gone into this project. It is in a phased state in a sense that this will mark the first stage, and the project will continue to expand as resources become available and we, I think, as Manitobans, can all be justly proud, not only of what will eventually be a major destination attraction for tourists, but of the vision and the hard work that has gone into such a project.

MR. R. DOERN: I still didn't hear whether or not there was private funding, but perhaps the Minister could indicate that.

My final question is this, what is the length of the project, because according to a press release, Mr. Speaker, it was a \$500,000 grant on a \$3.2 million building, which is the first phase of a four-phase development which will involve a total capital outlay of \$15 million? How many years or decades to the completion of this project?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the project is such that it can proceed from phase to phase, or it can stop at the initial phase, and that will depend on the resources available. The projected time scale is at least 10 years for the completion of the entire project, but it is possible that Phase I will be as far as it goes. It would stand alone on the completion of Phase I. As the tourism builds in the area, and as local resources are accumulated, possibly with public support from the government, but with no advanced commitment, later stages such as a museum may well be done, but the local group have been extremely responsible in developing their project in this way so that it could be responsibly handled, step by step.

The member has also asked whether or not there is local money being put in. I think if he knows the contribution by us, and by the Federal Government, the difference between that and \$3.2 million will represent local contribution.

Pelly Trail School Division

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education and it follows on a question that I asked about a month ago about a special grant to the Pelly Trail School Division. I have a copy of a letter in which the Minister is explaining it to the reeve of the rural municipality. If I could just read one sentence from it. It says, "I am pleased to report that a special grant will be implemented in 1983 to assist small school divisions with enrolments of fewer than 1,350 pupils which have experienced a decline in enrolment in 1983 of 5 percent or more. As a result, Pelly Trail School Division will receive an additional \$99,675 from the province." My question to the Minister is, how many other school divisions fall within those parameters of having fewer than 1,350 pupils and a decline in enrolment of greater than 5 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Very few, Mr. Speaker. I will take it as notice, and provide the Member for Tuxedo with the information about the other school divisions.

My recollection is that there might be three school divisions in the province, out of the 57 divisions, who were particularly hard-hit by declining enrolment this year, Pelly Trail was one; but I will get that information for the member.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, how did she arrive at those criteria. They are very specific, so I'm just wondering how she arrived at them.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we arrived at the criteria by looking at the deficiencies of the Education Support Program that put a large number of school divisions in a particularly disadvantaged position because they were not adequately protected through the Education Support Program for a number of items, particularly, declining enrolment. We knew that the combination of very small numbers, and low assessment and declining enrolment, were the big factors that were hitting some divisions very hard.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it could possibly be that, rather than look at the deficiencies of the Educational Support Program, the Minister decided that this division should get a grant, and then sought out some criteria that would allow them to justify it for the division, is that possible.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker, it isn't possible. It is possible that we have done what we've done from the day that we took office, and that is, that we have been prepared to get information and to receive information that told us there were serious problems and deficiencies and to move.

You know, you have two choices, Mr. Speaker. That is, that you leave things alone and say, too bad, they didn't cover it, then you're in a very difficult, awkward position, and we're just going to leave you there; or you decide that where there are serious problems you're going to something about it, and we opted for trying to do something about it.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this school division has an \$800,000 surplus that it wasn't willing to spend on its needs, I find that to be a very fascinating response.

My final question then, in view of all this ad hoc dealing with divisions on a very political basis, when can we expect the Minister to bring in the Education Finance Report of Dr. Nicholls?

A MEMBER: Where is Pelly Trail?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, where is Pelly Trail is a very good question, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: It's in Russell, isn't it?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: More help for our friends, Mr. Speaker. We do have friends everywhere, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to say that.

Mr. Speaker, I think I suggested the other day that we are reviewing Dr. Nicholls report and, I must say, that if there is real concern on the other side for getting

it tabled and getting on with very very important business of the province, which is making decisions and having discussions about the recommendations in the Nicholls Report, I suggest the members opposite get on with the business of the House so we can get to other things.

Fitness, Recreation and Sport and Co-operative Development services

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Co-operative Development. In light of the fact that the Department of Fitness, Recreation and Sport, and the Department of Co-operative Development shared administration services as well as personnel services, could the Minister tell us who will be providing that particular function within his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That matter is currently under review between myself and the Deputy Minister. We're discussing that at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the referral resolution with respect to the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act on the Order Paper, Pages 12 and 13, standing open for debate.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTIONS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been listening with some interest to the various Conservative positions being put forward in this debate over the last few weeks and I wanted to try and examine the logic of their position. Now the resolution that we are talking about clearly states that:

"WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba deems it advisable to hear the views of Manitobans on the subject matter of this resolution;

“THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections hold such public meetings at such times and places as it may deem advisable to receive briefs and hear representations.”

That is the heart of the resolution that is being debated, not the substance of the resolution, but this is a referral motion. It's a very open referral motion, and I have heard Conservative after Conservative get up and say that the government doesn't want to hear from the people. It's completely and totally illogical. The government is stating very clearly here that it wants to hear from the people. The government has stated very clearly for over two weeks that it wants to hear from the people, for the last month-and-a-half that it wants to hear from the people, and it has been the opposition who have frustrated the government from enabling the people to be heard. It has been the opposition who have not allowed this resolution to pass; it's been the opposition who wanted to have it both ways. On the one hand, they would say that the NDP doesn't want to hear from the people, and then at the same time, they have been filibustering this resolution, this referral motion, they have been filibustering it, and anyone who observes what they have been doing would conclude that it is a filibuster.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, they have gone beyond what I would call parliamentary methods of trying to frustrate the passage of this referral which would allow the people to come forward and be heard by a duly constituted committee of this Legislature. They have used what I would call extra-parliamentary means. They have done so, supposedly, in the name of protecting parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that position is totally illogical. If they want to hear from the people let this resolution pass. Why stall it for three weeks? Why stall it, also, and then say that somehow, if this resolution passes, it will be too rushed, the people won't have a chance to be heard? Imagine if this resolution had been passed three weeks ago, or four weeks ago; we would have been hearing from the people of Manitoba for the last three or four weeks on the substance of the resolution.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, what we have heard has been a filibuster from the opposition on what they perceive to be the substance of the resolution; but we've heard about five or six different messages from the Conservatives as to what they think the substance of the resolution is. I'll get into that later, but let me be clear that the position of the government is that we want to hear the people of Manitoba, and we want to do so at such times and places as the committee may deem advisable. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition said it's the committee that should decide when it should hear the people and at what places. I heard him distinctly say that when my leader was speaking, when the Premier of Manitoba was speaking.

We're saying, let the committee get on with its business. We have said that we are prepared to hear people outside of Winnipeg. I sat on the committee that the previous Conservative Government established, after they had solidified their position, made it known publicly in Federal-Provincial Conferences, but that government established a committee and it went out to three places besides Winnipeg.

We have said, and the Premier said this yesterday, that he would expect that this committee would do at

least the same. So we are prepared to meet outside of Winnipeg, and we are prepared to meet in Winnipeg, and we are prepared to let the committee organize its affairs in such a way that the people of Manitoba get a fair hearing; that's what we want. The best way for that to happen is to let it proceed as quickly as possible. Why the filibuster? Why the extra parliamentary opposition? Why the bell ringing on virtually every single issue? Why? I suspect, Mr. Speaker, it's because the Conservatives don't have a unified position on this particular issue.

I've heard the Leader of the Opposition say that he is in favour of everything in this resolution in terms of its substance, except the entrenchment. I've heard a couple of other Conservative members say the same thing, and I see that the Member for Morris is nodding his head in agreement.

Well, if that is the case, why do we have the Member for Minnedosa getting up yesterday and making the following type of comments? He says - this resolution is the thin edge of the wedge. He said that we would really have people concerned about job retention, about job advancement. He says this is like the Federal Bilingualism Program. Well, if that's the case why doesn't he repudiate his leader because his leader has said that he agrees with all of this, with all of the substance except entrenchment. The Member for Morris nodded his head in agreement just now.

So they can't have it two ways. They can't say that we agree with the substance of this and then go out and try and foment fears amongst the population by misrepresenting what this resolution is about. That is what some of them have been trying to do. I'm not saying that all of them are doing that. I believe that some people, if they adopted that public position, would have a terrible time.

I believe that the Member of Fort Garry has not adopted that position; and the Member for Lakeside hasn't adopted that position; and the Member for St. Norbert hasn't adopted that position. But there have been others who have talked about the fears of creeping bilingualism when indeed the Leader of the Opposition; the Member for Lakeside; the Member for Fort Garry; and the Member for St. Norbert have said that they agree with this resolution except for entrenchment.

Mr. Speaker, we're hearing from the person who never thought in logical terms, because I believe that he has a mind that isn't capable of thinking in logical terms. So, Mr. Speaker, we won't pay any attention to someone who is completely and totally illogical because we're talking about a serious matter. We're not talking about sort of the puffery types of things which require him to stomp out of here, and threaten people in the halls. Mr. Speaker, that is the type of politics that people don't want at this stage. They want to hear about the substance, and I'm trying to talk about the substance, and he doesn't want to let me talk about the substance because, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the substance — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of order. I would like the honourable member to show where I threatened

somebody in the hall. Mr. Speaker, I have called somebody a name in the hall; I have never threatened them in the hall, as he refers to, and I would like the member to withdraw or name the time I did it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I thank the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek for that explanation to the House.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Just to the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I was listening very carefully. I never heard the Minister of Energy and Mines naming the Member for Sturgeon Creek at all. If he has a guilty conscience, then so be it, but I think the record will show very clearly that, in fact, that is what we have here, a guilty conscience on the part of the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard the member refer to myself as illogical, a person who stomps out of the House, and threatens people in the hall. Now if the member can prove the time, etc., I have said, I have called people a name in the hall, I have never threatened anybody in the hall. I would like the member to withdraw.

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

HON. W. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, jabbing the forefinger in someone's chest may, in fact, be conceived by some people as threats. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if in doing that the member was not threatening, I withdraw the remark that the member was indeed threatening.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. At no time did I touch anybody with my finger in the hall. I know of an incidence he may be referring to, but at no time did I, and I would like the member to withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

That is not a point of order affecting members of this House within the Chamber.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. W. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, if I said touching, I know he wasn't doing that. I saw him do that. I think he admits that he was doing it. — (Interjection) — And now the interesting thing about this though is that instead of talking about the substance, he doesn't want to talk about the substance again.

All I'm saying is that we have a set of different positions being put forward by members on the other side, and I think that they should get some coherence in the position that they are putting forward. If they have said - and I think it's a valid position for them to take - that they agree with this policy, but they do not agree with entrenchment then that is a valid debating point. I think we can debate that.

We should hear from the people to see what they have to say about it. They may, in fact, have a lot of false fears about the substance of this resolution. I think it's important for the government, and I think it's

important for the opposition, because they agree with the substance of the resolution, except for entrenchment, to tell the people that their fears are false, or that if their fears in fact do have some validity, that it's important for us to tighten up the wording of the resolution so that their fears are placated and that their fears are dealt with. That would be responsible government. That would be a responsible constructive opposition, but let us get on with that task.

There may be some people on the other side who don't want to do that. There may be some people who don't want to have the facts laid out to the people through a rational open discussion, with the Press there, with Hansard there, because they may in fact want to indulge in what I would call a whisper campaign; fomenting fears - telling people that their jobs may be lost, telling people that this is the thin edge of the wedge, and after that we have the deluge. But they can't have it both ways, so it's important that this be conducted in a public place; it's important that these discussions do take place with Hansard there to record exactly what people are saying, because I think it's wrong for politicians to say one thing publicly, and then go out and privately tell people something that is completely the opposite. So let's have everyone speaking in the open on this issue, with Hansard there, so that if the Conservative position is yes, they agree with the substance but they disagree with entrenchment, that is something that we can discuss with the people. The people will know that there was a difference between entrenchment and something that is just provided by government policy, which is reversible as the Member for Minnedosa said. He said he was concerned, or it might have been the Member for Swan River who said this; he was concerned about the resolution being entrenched because then it would be irreversible.

Well, if you believe in something as fundamental as this, and I've heard Conservatives on the other side say they do, then why would you want to reverse it? Is it something that you throw out for a week and then take back? Do we want to make a political football out of something like this? Do we want to go back to 1890 and the days after that? Let's be clear about what we are talking about.

If we want it to be a policy that both sides of the House agree on in substance, and I've been told by the Leader of the Opposition and about four major speakers on the other side that it is something that they believe in in substantive terms, then let's make it bipartisan and put it forward in an irreversible way; but they aren't saying that, not all of them. So I believe that the ball in this respect is very much in the court of the Conservative Party.

We say that we want to get on with the hearings. We would have been having the hearings under way three weeks ago, two weeks ago, a week ago. The people who are on holidays, who do have time available now, could have come forward. There is enough time to space these hearings in such a way that people can be heard.

I don't expect this House to end in two weeks. We have a lot of business to conclude. We'll be here for four to six weeks if people co-operate and work together. That is surely enough time for all the people of Manitoba to be heard on this issue. It's important

that the committee get under way with this task as soon as possible to organize its affairs to have that happen, but to the extent that the Conservatives filibuster this referral; to the extent that they use extra-parliamentary means; to the extent that they bring in further sub-amendments and sub-amendments to the sub-amendments.

We can continue to discuss this with a lot of innuendo out there without facts being distributed to the people, without responsible politicians on the government side and on the opposition side hearing the concerns of the population, determining whether they are legitimate, clarifying to the people if their concerns are based on falsehoods or on misrepresentations or on misunderstandings about what the resolution is about, but surely we should be getting on with that task. That task will be frustrated not by us, but by the opposition.

So that if people say that it's important to go out of Winnipeg, we'll go out of Winnipeg; that's important. If it's important to hear the people in different spots, we will hear them. I look back on the committee that I served on that did go to three other places. The Government of the Day thought that was a good scattering of meetings to hear, to go into regional centres, to enable people to come into the regional centres and make their presentations. So we could go with centres like that, unless people want to come forward with a few other centres or maybe not exactly the same ones, but surely it's possible for the committee to get under way with that task and organize its affairs if, in fact, it's the will of the people on that side of the House to let the committee get under way.

If people want to again spread the falsehood that somehow this will be rushed through in a week or two, that's wrong. The House will have to sit for some time. We still have a number of other bills to hear. I would expect that we have a number of other committees that have to conduct their work, so let's organize our affairs and get them under way, but to the extent — (Interjection) — and I hear a comment.

I hear a comment that the government shut off hearings. I was at that meeting. I noticed that at that stage there were no people there to make presentations anymore one full hour before the committee rose.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: There was one there.

HON. W. PARASIUK: There was one there who came afterwards who said that he was not prepared at that time. Again, I think it's important that the Member for Roblin-Russell again be more accurate and not be as inaccurate as he was with his hydro bills for about the last 10 years.

I sat on committees from 1977 to 1981, committees that heard representation on family law, and the Member for Fort Garry was there, and people said that people would speak for a certain amount of time because we want to ensure that everyone had a fair chance to be heard, and I think that the member, if he recalls, will remember that. On rent controls, again, sometimes we sat until two or three in the morning, and there were some concerns that maybe those sittings were going too late; that maybe we shouldn't be hearing representation at two or three; that maybe we should have a cut-off time at 12:00 or 12:30.

Those things are sometimes a bit judgmental because if you've had a group of people come in from out of town, and they might be within 30 or 40 or 50 miles of Winnipeg, if they've come in for an evening hearing, they may in fact prefer to wait until 1 o'clock to make their representation rather than going home and having to make the trip again. So I don't know if one can make a hard and fast rule that it has to end at 12:00 or 1:00, but one has to use one's judgment, and I hope the committee will. But, surely, aren't those the things that reasonable people should do? We are prepared, as I said, as a committee to have the committee undertake those tasks.

Now I don't know if the Member for Sturgeon Creek is saying that one will have the committee in a sense sit and reconvene and reconvene if people aren't there to make representation, because I can look through Hansard and I can find a whole set of past circumstances between 1977 and 1981 where that wasn't the case, where people went through the list; they said, are you here to make a presentation? If they're not here, fine, we went to the next name. So let's not make a false issue out of that because Hansard is quite accurate in showing that was the case with respect to committee hearings if, in fact, people want to act in a reasonable manner.

So I think there possibly is some difficulty amongst the Conservatives with respect to their position on this. I know that if the Member for Fort Garry, for example, wants to run federally, I think that he would want to present a factual, reasonable position on this. I don't think he wants to go around talking about something like this as the thin edge of the wedge. I think that would be disastrous for someone who wants to embark or reembark on a career in national politics where I think he could bring a voice to the federal Conservative Caucus which might better reflect a moderate conservative position from an urban milieu; or if he wants to take a run at the provincial leadership, I would think that he again would want to present a moderate position that is a reasonable one; not one that is one that is characterized by Dan McKenzie, because I think that there are probably those forces at work and I think it's important for reasonable conservatives, for the Progressive Conservatives to come forward and put their position forward.

I've heard that position stated in a very articulate way by Lakeside, by Fort Garry and St. Norbert. I've heard the Leader of the Opposition say that he's in favour of the substance of the resolution, although every once in a while some demons take hold of him and he goes off on many other tangents, but that doesn't take away from the fact that he has stated, and it is on the record, that he favours the French Language Services, but not entrenchment. So that's the hang-up.

This is an argument and a debate that I guess we on this side of the House and the Conservative have had for some time, and it goes back to the Charter of Rights, where the Conservatives believe that it shouldn't be entrenched, and generally the New Democrats believe that it should be entrenched. That is a debate that I think is a reasonable debate within the political milieu, so let us have the debate on that.

Let us have the debate on that type of principle. We will go to the people; we'll hear from them. We'll try and tighten up this resolution to, in a sense deal, with

their concerns, but let's not go out and try and foment prejudice because I believe that can be done through a whisper campaign. It's much more effective doing it in a whisper campaign than it is by coming forward in a committee that is open with the press attending with Hansard there.

So I say that the challenge is with the Conservatives now. I ask them to speedily pass this referral resolution, and let's get on with the task of organizing our affairs and hearing from the people of Manitoba. Because if this referral resolution is not passed, it is not the New Democratic Party Government that is not letting the people of Manitoba speak out publicly at properly constituted legislative forums on this issue, it will be the Conservative opposition who is filibustering this and obstructing it for particular reasons of their own, which I would expect, Mr. Speaker, if they will not let a properly constituted legislative or parliamentary body hear from the people, they want to obstruct and filibuster for reasons of doing it in, what I would call, extra-parliamentary ways.

So I say that the challenge is to the Conservatives. I think that we have shown reasonableness on this side of the House. I think we have shown that we are prepared to work with the opposition, to work with the people of Manitoba to come up with a resolution that all of us could support, because I believe that this is important not only for today, Mr. Speaker, but for future generations. We don't want to go backwards, Mr. Speaker. We want to look ahead, and we want to build a solid foundation.

So the challenge is for all of us, but right now the ball is in the Conservative court.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the opportunity a few days ago to speak on the amendment to the resolution. At that time, I spoke in support of the amendment and here, a few days later, I again have the opportunity to address the sub-amendment. Again, I will be speaking in support of the sub-amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy indicated that the ball was in our court. I am glad that he realizes that the ball is in our court, because I have done a lot of thinking about the issue itself. The other day - I have a wife and two teenage kids at home - they wanted to know, how long are you still going to be sitting, dad? What are the issues that are so important that you have to sit there through the best summer what we have possibly had in many many years? Why are you going to be sitting all summer in July and August?

I did a lot of thinking about it, Mr. Speaker, and I have grave concern when the Minister of Energy indicated that at the minimum we'll be sitting another four to six weeks. I don't know where he draws that conclusion from. We're in Speed-up now. I think that we are at the point where possibly we could terminate the business of the House in a relatively short time providing that we have co-operation from both sides of the House.

The members opposite in their speeches have asked why are we so adamant in debating this resolution? I would like to deal with that to some degree. In my speech the other day, I dealt with the procedure, the

process that the government had outlined in terms of dealing with the bilingual issue. I think we have, with the statements made by the First Minister yesterday and by the comments made by the Minister of Energy, there is some compromise coming forward. I think that is the big thing; that is already an indication. I think it is an important indication that government is possibly reconsidering their position to some degree.

After I had the request from my family, why can't we get out, I did a lot of soul-searching on this issue, because the constituency that I represent is basically split into four ethnic backgrounds. I believe, as I indicated in other speeches, that mine is probably the second-highest French-populated constituency in Manitoba. So then I sat back and I figured that, did I want to play politics with this thing, or what basically is the issue? Why are we debating here day after day just on the resolution itself? In thinking the matter through, why would any opposition continually debate one issue this long? As the government indicates, why would we be trying to filibuster it?

In thinking the matter through, it is because we think we are right. We are convinced we are right.

A MEMBER: We are right.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That is where the problem now stands. We have a government - and it was illustrated the other day by the Minister of Natural Resources, especially when he's Acting House Leader, and he has created a lot of problems doing that - he says we are the government, we have the numbers, and we will do it our way. That is what the issue is all about. It's a matter of pride. You feel you are government and you can force these things through. That's where the beauty of the democratic system come in.

You members must realize that we could debate here year-round on one issue, unless you wanted to force closure. You can force closure on us at any given time, but I don't think you feel comfortable enough with the resolution that you'll force closure on us. The issue is too controversial for you to force closure, so we'll be debating it. We will be debating it a long time, because we know in our minds we are right. We are right and how can I be that convinced that we are right?

In looking at the resolution, when we talk of the issue itself, the bilingual issue, I have all kinds of people on my executive that are French-speaking. I have no problem with them. I think what happened in '79 when the law was passed where we had to make certain changes to allow for certain French rights, translations, etc., there was no hullabaloo about it. There was no argument about it. Why then did this government go and make a deal? Why did they change that part of it? Everything was flowing along. The French society, by and large, has got more rights now than they have ever had. The majority are relatively pleased with it. It's moving along in a nice, proper fashion; there was no acrimony.

Now we are developing acrimony. We are. The issue itself, when I look at it, what is it doing? I look back and I figure, well, it won't affect me that much, but it could. The fact that we state the province is bilingual; the impression that is left by that gives me concern. Because if my kids, my children, my grandchildren, my

great-grandchildren do not want to speak French, they can be limited to certain positions that they can attain within government and government services. Those are rights.

Now I'm here speaking on my rights. I want the rights for myself and my children and offspring in the future that they do not have to have certain rights taken away from them. We have had comments here of bigotry, accused of each other of this and that. I don't want to take any French rights away, but I don't want any of my rights taken away, or my children's rights in terms of the jobs that they can qualify for in the future.

Now, we say that is not going to happen. We'll entrench it, and so and so many positions are going to be bilingual. Well, Mr. Speaker, the concern that develops in my mind then is: what happened at the federal scene? We have a bilingual Federal Government. The departments, any positions that you have of worthy nature that unless you're bilingual you can't qualify for them. There are many positions that the people that cannot speak French cannot qualify for. That's what worries me about this issue here; that my children, our children, have a right taken away from them. They will not have the right to apply for certain jobs unless they can speak French and we're taking away rights. I can't accept that fact.

I don't believe in compulsory seat belt legislation. I've spoken against it, voted against it. But those are things I can live with. You know they affect me, but the issues are different and I am concerned. Out there the public perception is at that point where there is concern developing. There's concern developing. I am getting letters pro and con.

I've had the occasion, from the first weekend in June, to attend almost every weekend functions out in the country - centennial celebrations, sports days, fairs, whatever you have, and have been in contact with people, and this thing has gradually started building. The beginning of June nobody was asking me about the bilingual issue. They were talking possibly about things like seat belts, and what have you.

Now the issue is there and I'm pleased, you know, to some degree that there's already a compromise starting with the Government of the Day by saying, we'll go out in the rural areas and have hearings, because there's many people out there in the rural area that don't know what it's all about. Already there's a confrontation situation developing because people don't know what it is all about.

I think that the fact that we're going to be going out and having hearings is good. I think it is good, but I don't think we should try and do it in this Session, take and have hearings. Why are we suspicious about having these hearings? Because we saw the other day, the seat-belt legislation hearings, you can sit every day here, have committee hearings until 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock, and you finally break the people down or they will quite coming, and then you will pass it as you want it. That is what we've said all the time. Why the rush? Why don't we go out to the public, take more time? We've blown the summer.

The other issue is, of course, it is holiday time. We are all here. We don't have holidays, but there are many people out there that are not that concerned necessarily about whether we sit or do not sit. When they have their holidays coming once a year, they go

out and have their holidays. They leave the issues and problems at home. We don't. But why during this time? It is a matter of concern.

Another concern that will happen, when we heard the Minister of Energy and Mines say we'll be sitting another four to six weeks, harvesting is starting at the present time, it's just starting now, and we will by setting up a series of meetings or hearings, we will deny many people the opportunity to come and speak their mind.

This is the question again - why the rush? I would plead with the First Minister, is it not possible that you indicate - I think the Attorney-General indicated some possible amendments were coming. Also I think the Ministers have indicated there's certain amendments in The Farm Lands Bill which we feel very strongly as well, we feel we are right, and that is our obligation then not to pass these things.

I can't understand why the Government of the Day is so hung up on the pride aspect of it. They feel they have the numbers, they will not give, they will not tell us the amendments that they are proposing. If the Minister of Agriculture would indicate to us what the amendments in The Farm Lands Bill are, we could say, yes, they're acceptable, let's get it through. But they don't do that.

I was here on Monday, on the long holiday, and we were debating Bill 110. The Member for Springfield got up and said there are amendments coming, but we can't tell you what they are. Why not tell us what they are? We'll pass the bill if it's acceptable. It's always that little game you're playing - the pride factor - we are government, we'll force you.

The First Minister knows that unless you put closure on us, we can keep this debate going for a long, long time. The one thing that I want to indicate to the First Minister is that we are getting stronger every day in our conviction that we are right, and you are not sure that you are right or you would put closure on, but the issue is such that you do not have the guts to do it, because you are not sure, otherwise we would have closure in this House.

We will debate for a long time because we are that convinced we're right. So why can't we get together and compromise on some of these things, because exactly actually the man that the First Minister's talking to, he's been the problem here in this House for the last month. Everytime he's been Acting House Leader he's created problems. He's going to force us. The beautiful democratic system will not allow us to be forced. We have our responsibility to our people, I have to mine. The French speaking, the Ukrainian speaking, the Anglo Saxon, as well as the German Mennonite people. I have my responsibility to all of them, and I want all their rights properly looked after. That's what they expect from me. I'm here to speak as much for the people for French rights as anybody else, and they have it by in large. Why are you creating a problem with my people, my French friends? You're doing that. Why?

We have a situation I indicated the other day. I have quite a number of French speaking municipalities. There's no problem, they provide a service in French. Walking into the St. Pierre Town Council, walking into the R.M. of De Salaberry, they provide the services that the people want without any enshrinement in the Constitution. Why are we doing this? People ask me,

now what's happening? We're at that point, I think, it is high time that we do some kind of a compromise; that we resolve this issue because it's starting to boil out there and people are getting to be unhappy, largely because they don't understand as I indicated before.

On the weekend when we had the bells ringing, and it was said that we rang the bells very often - we haven't rang them that often, but more than usual - you know what people say to me when I mention bilingual, they say ring the bells. Ring the bells, I don't care if you ring them all summer. It bothers me that kind of thinking, because it's now starting to tear the province apart.

We live in a land and in a province second to none. Why are we trying to just gradually destroy this? We're the most fortunate people in the world in the place that we live here. Things have worked well for 116 years. People of all walks of life have gotten together and built this country and this province. As we go around to all these fairs and centennials we see the reaction of the people, irregardless what their background is, they get along well together; they work; they've lived as neighbors in communities; everybody's participating in all functions. Why are we starting to destroy it now? That is a difficulty you have, Mr. Premier, that is a difficulty you have.

Why? Well, I have my own view on this, but I believe the government made a bad deal, and again because of their pride they cannot change their position. That is, at the present time, creating problems in this province, and it can leave scars that are going to be here for the next 100 years, and you'll be able to take the credit for that. It is time we resolve it.

The Minister of Energy indicated that if enshrinement is a big thing, let's change it a bit, you know, maybe we can compromise. I don't know what kind of deal you've made with the SFM, I don't know what kind of deal you've made. I am concerned though. I am concerned until I know exactly what the implications of it are, and until we get these things sort of straightened out, my gosh, I don't know, I look around both sides of the House, I don't think anybody wants to stay here any longer than we have to. We've already set a record on the time limit that we've debated, and it all hinges basically around this issue. On the farm lands issue I think, you know, that is a thing that we dug in on as well. We believe - the Minister won't tell us, he says he'll come forward with amendments - those kind of things we could resolve.

This is a very very serious matter - I think that's the word that the Minister of Energy used - it is a very serious situation. Why the time limitations for the Session? I'm sure every one of the Ministers of the government must be washed out by now. With the responsibilities that they have they must be tired, and that is why I say, if you believe in your conviction that you're right as we believe in our conviction that we are right, you know what you have to do to resolve the debate. You know what you have to do because we are not giving in and our members, our caucus, is getting stronger every time we get up and speak on this subject because the reaction is coming. The reaction is coming.

So, I suggest to the First Minister, do it now. I don't think they will because they know they are not confident that they're totally on the right track and that public reaction is going to be in their favour. For that reason, they're trying to - well, not pleading with us necessarily

- but the discussion has been, let's proceed, let's get out there with the hearings.

We're not ready to go to the hearings at this stage of the game until we have more commitments from the Attorney-General and the First Minister of exactly what is going to happen, and we'd like to get out of the House because then it's going to be very difficult to have hearings. You've indicated the possibility there will be hearings in the rural area. It'll be very difficult to run a House here in Speed-up and have hearings out in the country. Everybody's under pressure; we still have a lot of work left on the Order Paper and then to deal with the most important thing that probably has happened in the last 100 years, the fundamental rights of people in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have already heard all kinds of versions from all kinds of members pro and con on this issue and we will continue to do so. Concerns that I have - what happened is the process, as I indicated last time, started to lead to doubt in people's minds. When the Attorney-General held his hearings out in Dauphin, Brandon, Thompson and in Winnipeg, that is where a lot of doubt started because it was a two-hour meeting. His side presented their case and all people that wanted to speak had five minutes - and a two-hour meeting - bang, and it was over. Then the impression started in people's minds, they are forcing something on us. They are given the impression or a facade that they're having hearings to introduce people but they have it limited, people could not express. If they had open meetings, that's what we're asking for now, not during Session.

Let's clean up the business of the House in the next few days, set up proper hearings so people can come and speak to this thing. If need be, we can recall a Session for a week to deal with the issue later on in the fall, so you can still meet your deadline and that is why the sub-amendment is there. It says that we shall resolve this before December 31st.

But, no, there is no give. There has been a little give, possibly having the hearings out in the rural areas, I want it aware. I represent 17,000 people in my riding, roughly. Where are they going to get the information? - not through the propaganda pages that have been sent out because that only raises more doubt. As long as we, as opposition, are going to be standing here debating this issue the doubt will remain in people's minds.

So let us compromise; let's work this out. Let's work this out for the betterment of the province, for the betterment of people being able to live together in this province, so that we as a House, a legislative House, can work together.

We will not agree with you on many things, because we don't think you've been running the House very capably. You haven't been running your legislation very capably. We see that with the bills that you have to pull and a lot of it is controversy; it is an aggravation to people that we have been doing in this last Session. One hundred fifteen bills, I don't whether that's a record or not, Mr. Deputy Speaker. — (Interjection) — It's not a record? Why would we want to pass that much legislation and then tie this issue on at the tail end?

A MEMBER: Right on, Al.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It is too much. Maybe the legal minds, like the Attorney-General, can cope with these kind of things. Myself . . .

A MEMBER: No, don't give him credit for that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . I should caution that one a bit, I guess.

A MEMBER: Yes, you should.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Because normally I like to take a shot at him, Mr. Deputy Speaker — (Interjection) — very appropriate at times - we're at that stage in this Session where the government will have to either use a more high-handed position than they have till now or compromise.

A MEMBER: Well, don't encourage him to do that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: We cannot, I don't think, continue on this basis much longer, because the acrimony in the House has developed to the point where it is not functioning properly and you know it.

Now, I would actually like to ask the Premier, you know, it would help if he changed maybe some of his responsible people, especially the Minister of Natural Resources, and I have to refer to that time and time again. He's been a sore on everybody's side, but he says he's going to show us. He's going to show that you're government. That maybe works if you have your own office, something like that, you can tell them that you're boss. In this House nobody can do that. Nobody can do that.

As I indicated, if you want to use your numbers and your authority and move closure, do it. Move closure, but as I indicated before, you are not convinced enough that you are on the right track to do that and that is why the debate will continue. We'll all have a chance to possibly speak I expect maybe three or four more times on this issue because we know we're right. We do not intend to let this issue proceed. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will begin. I thought I saw another person across the way stand up to speak, I was wrong.

I know it's a very important issue and I'm sure there are many people who would love to speak on the issue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that's of course what we're fighting for in this sub-amendment. We're fighting for a procedure that would drive the resolution into intersessional committees so everybody - everybody - can make presentation to the government at a time when they do not feel hurried, at a time when they'll be more properly prepared. I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are countless thousands of people, not 40, not 50, not 60, but I would say 20 times that fold or 30 times that fold that would love to make presentation on this particular subject.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke on the original amendment to the referral motion I think I dealt

specifically with the process of the time. I stayed away from the main issue and I intend to do something similar at this particular time.

So from the outset let me tell you that I do support the sub-amendment and many of the comments that have been made not only by my colleague, the Member for Emerson, but other of those of my colleagues who have chosen to speak on the issue up till this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke I took exception to the Attorney-General and his reference to consensus and whether it could be achieved on this issue. I also I guess made comment to his words "tyranny of the majority." I think the Member for Radisson then picked out those words out of my speech and again was mildly critical in the sense in which I used them. Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that consensus on this issue is totally different from what is being attempted.

We were challenged today, earlier on, by the Minister of Mines to debate principle. He said to us, "If entrenchment is your concern as espoused by your leader, then make that the focal point on the debate. Debate that. Debate the main resolution." Mr. Speaker, I can support that, except when we look at the timetable the government has given themselves, and indeed the province, at which time public representation is to be made. We, I think, in all our actions over the last week-and-a-half have given clear indication how resolute we will remain on this issue that the people must be heard in a proper fashion.

Mr. Speaker, what again is the rush? I know members opposite must be sick of that particular slogan, but I ask it again. I am sure we'll keep posing that particular question.

Mr. Speaker, the government appears frantic on this issue, absolutely frantic. We have seen so many examples of a frantic government. We saw as recently as last night our leader being expelled from the House for challenging the Premier to come forward . . .

HON. R. PENNER: No, challenging the Speaker . . .

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, we also have come to learn that the committee hearings of which we were trying to bring to be by way of this referral motion — (Interjection) — I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the comments of the learned gentleman sitting in the back row . . .

A MEMBER: "Red" Rolly.

MR. C. MANNES: . . . but possibly he'll give me another opportunity to respond. We saw a committee supposedly that was to be ready in place and yet we had not even finished debating the referral motion, and we may not finish for many many days, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The government is frantic to move on with this, and it begs an awful lot of questions when we see how rushed they are. I suppose it's because they realize that it is now or maybe never, and because they realize a number of things, Mr. Speaker. I think they recognize that many many people are on holidays. Many people have sort of tuned out the proceedings of this Legislature. I find it hard to believe, but I know for a

fact that one out of two people in this province don't even know that this House is still sitting. They feel or believe that we are in recess as our federal counterparts are.

I think this government also realizes that rural Manitoba is on the verge of harvesting and is beginning to harvest. Therefore, at this particular point in time, if you want to speed something through without an outcry from certain areas, that certainly in a rural sense this is the time to go forward with committee hearings.

I think they realize that we in opposition are a little tired. Obviously, they are too. I think they realize that, but I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to any of the members who choose to listen, that our resolve is extremely strong. We haven't even begun the fight.

I think they also realize as we push towards fall, as more and more municipalities and their council meetings these days are discussing the logic of holding a referendum on the issue within their jurisdiction, and as they realize that more and more will inevitably come forward and place before the people during fall elections the question - do you support extended French services in the manner in which they are being brought forward - I think the government realizes that more and more municipalities will put that on the ballot.

I think they also know that, to date, the public opposition is not terribly or well-organized, and they realize that, Mr. Speaker. It's because of all these facts, the government says, and I think deep down believe, it's in the month of August or early September or it may not happen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe then these are the reasons why the government is frantic. You know, we have seen many other things, and I spoke to this earlier, of a government, I believe, in many senses prepared to and wants at least to listen, although I question it after one of the committee hearings the other day in regard to Bill 60, but I believe that almost in every other issue, the opposition could convince the government on an issue this important to go to the public.

I saw what happened in the Crow rate committee where we as an opposition asked the government to have and to hold a few more hearings. They saw the logic of that and were prepared to do so. They were prepared to extend it for even a longer period of time, but something's different on this issue, even though in my view it's more important. Something is different, Mr. Speaker, and it begs the question: Why is the government so frantic?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it's because they know that opposition, although it's large in a quantity sense, that it is not well-organized. If it ever becomes that way and groups begin to counter the information that's come forward by way of the government, by way of pamphlet, that indeed they won't be able to have their way.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that the government feels that fall hearings would swamp the committee. That's the way that I said; that those in opposition would be so great in number that it would take a full month to hear all the people of Manitoba who wanted to make presentation on the issue.

They also realize that major lost referendums on the issue would make it impossible for them to proceed. Can you imagine, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the scenario of the councillors of the City of Winnipeg deciding in their wisdom to put on the ballot for fall elections the

question, and having the City of Winnipeg vote it down two to one? Can you imagine, Sir, the political fall-out, and how any government would dare put something through in the face of opposition by two-thirds of the people in the largest city in the province?

So we realize why the government is so frantic, and yet we realize that the people have a right to be heard. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it will come down finally to the determination as to whose resolve is the greatest. I can tell you, Sir, and it should be readily evident to any onlooker who has viewed proceedings over the last two years in this House that we do not break, Sir. At times we bend, but we never break.

So, Mr. Speaker, they are frantic and they are desperate, and they would have us work on long weekends, and they would have the clock go backwards instead of frontwards. Sir, they would do anything to push this through, and we understand why. They will publish ads in advance to pamphlets. Can you imagine that, Mr. Deputy Speaker? To put - and I'd love to know the cost. In time, I suppose we will know the cost of the ad of the picture of the First Minister. We think it's the First Minister. We are not absolutely confident or sure yet, but we have a strong suspicion that was the First Minister. — (Interjection) — He was well-dressed, yes.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, can you imagine putting an ad in the paper; drawing attention to it by the picture of somebody who we think is the First Minister; advising people to do nothing more than to be aware of a pamphlet that's to come into their home or their business within the day, within the week? Can you imagine the logic of that type of advertising?

Sir, it totally escapes me. To me, it reaches a new plateau of, I suppose, casting doubt into the credibility of the people, of the population, that they would fall for something like that; that they have to be warned that something's coming as if it's a proxy almost for a registered letter. Mr. Speaker, I have to chuckle at it. I chuckle at it because it says to me that this government believes that the mentality of the population is such that they have to give notice of a pamphlet. Again, coming back to the serious side, it tells me how frantic this government is.

Like my colleague for Turtle Mountain says; it's government by advertising. The policies are no good; the policies are actually marginal, to give them the benefit of the doubt. The way to sell them, in their minds, to make them feel that they are acceptable is to advertise. Sir, again, I don't know when we will receive the total cost of advertising. I'm sure we still will remember the Jobs Fund, but it will probably be a full year. Won't it be interesting to see the source of all the advertising?

This morning I drove down - a billboard on Main Street somewhere - Jobs Fund - a billboard on the Jobs Fund - just not in the newspaper, Sir, and on the radio and the T.V., but now billboards as if they're selling a beverage. Mr. Speaker, it's called "government by advertising."

Mr. Speaker, we also realize they were frantic and desperate. Very little coverage has been given to a meeting that was held, I believe in the Premier's office, a week ago Monday when representatives from the rural municipalities were invited in on the given notice the Friday before the Monday, I believe, to come in.

Those municipalities, of course, were those that are designated, the some 30 or 40. I don't know how many sent in representatives; I assume that the vast majority did.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the scenario? This is relayed to you second-hand because I received this from somebody that was in attendance. Sir, the municipalities received notice of the meeting with the Premier who was calling them in to dispel some of the doubts surrounding designation. The municipalities were called in on a Friday. They were asked to be in the Premier's office at 3:30 on the Monday. They were there at 3:30. The Premier arrived in his office at 4:00. The Premier spent 20 minutes with them - 20 minutes with the council - 25 minutes, Sir, as I am told.

I realize the pressures of the office. You can't always be where you want to be.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I wouldn't like the member to unfortunately be misinformed and to misinform others. If he is referring to a meeting I had with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, Mr. Harms and Mr. Beachell, the meeting was held in the offices of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The meeting lasted for some two hours, not for 20 minutes.

Subsequent to that, I held a further meeting with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities that carried on for approximately two hours as well. So I know of no 20-minute meetings in my office.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I thank the First Minister for some of that clarification. Again, I want to relate to him the story as I heard it.

The meeting, and I thank him for telling me, was held, as he indicates, in the offices of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Sir, I don't know who extended the invitation to the members; I don't know if it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Premier. The point is, Sir, many of those officials came to that meeting, wanting to speak to the First Minister. They had been moved around and they have not yet received answers to their questions as to what designation . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, again I just want the record to be very very clear because I don't want the honourable member to be embarrassed by misinforming others, because I assume that he's working on the basis of some false report.

I have had two meetings, both meetings arranged mutually between the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and myself; both meetings lasted two hours plus. I know of no meetings in which the Union of Manitoba Municipalities requested and which were either (a) they were stood up, or (b) lasted 20 minutes. I would, therefore, ask the honourable member to avoid, for his own good, misinforming Manitobans because that doesn't work to his benefit or to anyone else's.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my intention is not to misinform. If the First Minister would bear with me, I'll tell him the story as was relayed to me.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Why tell it if it's not true?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, what has come after that particular time at which I am prepared to relate, fine. The Minister can stand and do as he's just done now, and give us the benefit of the detail after that point in time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is this. I know that the First Minister has had a number of meetings with the executive of the UMM. I am talking specifically about the 30 or some number of designated municipalities that were invited in, and I don't know who extended the invitation, Sir. I don't know if it was the First Minister or if it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but the Minister says now that the meeting was held in the offices of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, those members, at least people that I spoke to, came in wanting to speak and pose questions specifically to two people - the First Minister and the Attorney-General - those two people, and they came from those 30 municipalities and some of them came from St. Lazare, Sir, some of them came in - I wish the Member for Virden were here - 250 miles. — (Interjection) — I'm sorry. Sir, they were asked to be in attendance at 3:30. The first one of the two major people they wanted to speak to, either the Premier or the Attorney-General, arrived at 4:00 and left approximately 20 or 25 minutes later.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that for the honourable member's own benefit he should avoid making reference to myself as First Minister being at that meeting only for 20 minutes, because I was there one hour-and-some. The Attorney-General was also present much longer than what the honourable member is indicating. The meeting was called at our request to speak to those municipalities that would be entitled to assistance voluntarily in respect to French Language Services in the Province of Manitoba. It was not called at the request of the municipalities in question. I know personally, myself, I was there for - and I will check my log sheet - well over an hour.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Why not longer?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accept the words of the First Minister.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that these people who have come this distance, to feel free and loose to ask specifically the questions on their mind, were just moving into that type of frame of mind when the First Minister had to leave that meeting. Maybe he came back later and I'll let him address that. I have no way of knowing.

Mr. Speaker, on his departure then, I believe, the Attorney-General came to that meeting also. And, as the Attorney-General of course does, one question leads to a long answer of the history and all that, and I do not believe, at least I'm told, that very few of the real concerns that were brought forward were answered not because the Attorney-General wasn't prepared to answer them, but because time ran out and he had to

leave also. But I do say that the Minister for Municipal Affairs was in attendance, I believe, throughout the whole meeting.

A MEMBER: He never said a word against it.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was told that in fact he carried the rest of the meeting once the two main individuals, the two main architects, had left, the two main people that most of these councillors had come in to which to pose questions, the First Minister and the Attorney-General.

The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Deputy Speaker, was that many of the people that left that meeting, who were coming in and really should have spent a whole day with these two individuals and with the government, left not knowing anything more about what designation meant in their minds, where it would lead and therefore their concerns were not . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Member for Inkster says those people were very dumb.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster said the councillors who were in attendance were very dumb, and of course that's the attitude that prevails. You can tell it by the pamphlet and the literature that comes forward.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, my reference to those people had been . . . The member is accusing me of saying something I haven't quite said is that if they were there for a couple of hours and left with no better understanding whatsoever, then I question how much openness they came to the meeting to listen in the first place. He is the one that is trying to interpret or trying to say that those people left with no greater understanding of the issue. I do not trust, I do not put much faith in the Member for Morris's interpretation of those people's . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, Mr. Speaker, when someone gets up and accuses me of saying something that I haven't said, then I think I have a right to be able to stand and defend myself. When he makes reference to people, I don't think it's responsible for us to accept his interpretation of other person's responses or other person's attitudes towards a meeting that they have had with the First Minister and other Ministers of the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that constitutes a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

The Honourable Member for Pembina to a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, if you ruled the other one wasn't a point of order, that's sufficient, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can take the comments from the First Minister, he was in attendance at that meeting, I accept his word as fact. The Member for Inkster, I have some difficulty, he was not in attendance I believe.

A MEMBER: Nobody takes it for a fact.

MR. C. MANNES: The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that many of the people who I spoke to who were in attendance at that meeting came, in all sincerity, to pose some very specific questions to the First Minister and to the Attorney-General. It's not that they were not afforded that opportunity - I'm not going to make that point - the point is, as you know, when you come from your various areas in the province it takes you time being made to feel comfortable enough and have enough confidence to pose what's specifically on your mind. I say, Sir, that one meeting, as I'm led to believe, was a failure. Many people left early and others obviously stayed; and I haven't spoken to those, Sir, that stayed, maybe some of their questions were answered. But I say that those municipalities that have been designated, I think it's incumbent upon the government to spend the day with them and tell them specifically what they are intending to do, because today the councillors with whom I touch tell me that they are not at all certain where it's headed.

Mr. Speaker, what does designation mean? I don't know what it means and I honestly believe that many of the municipalities do not yet know what it means. I almost question whether the government knows what it means.

Sir, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities put out a news release - I'm sorry, I don't know what day it was, I have it in front of me - it says: "News Release 11:00 a.m." They said a number of things: "That French Language Services" and it skips for awhile and then it comes back, "should not be entrenched in the Constitution and left to the decision of the courts of the law in Canada to enforce." It also goes on to talk about the cost aspect, and I know the Attorney-General, particularly, and the First Minister have taken exception to the cost argument. Well, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have said, "For \$4 per person we are not prepared to give concessions that could plague us for all time to come in costs and legal wrangles."

Now, the government chooses to take that \$4 and make a large issue of it, and say how in fact there would be cost savings, and anybody who talks costs, of course, they'll be the first to point out that, no, argue the case any way that you want, but don't argue it on the basis of cost.

Well, I think there's some truth to both sides of the argument, Mr. Speaker. But I honestly believe that the councillors I'm talking about aren't concerned, even though they say about the \$4 per person, because that's

up front and whether you want to argue that or not in terms of \$4 per person cost and we look at our per capita debt in this province of some \$5,000 per person, \$4 versus \$5,000 in terms of per capita debt sort of puts it into some sort of perspective. But the point is that I believe many of these councillors are saying, okay, the cost today may be \$4, but what will it be in 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, or 40 years. They can't prejudge that, Sir, and neither can this government. So the argument of costs, I believe whoever brings it forward, is one that really cannot be accepted because we can't look that far into the future. I know both sides have used costs. I realize that fully. I think on this issue we really shouldn't put much weight on that argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reference, of course, to 23.1 is a concern also to the municipalities and they say, "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 Federal controlled bilingual program."

Sir, three weeks ago the senior officers of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities at that point realized what the amendment was. Three weeks later, today, councils are beginning to understand, individual councillors throughout rural Manitoba are beginning to see now and hear of 23.1. Sir, I guess it begs the question - Why? We hear it from every member on our side that's spoken to it - Why has the amendment not been spelled out in all the information that's gone forward? Why do most of the municipalities, councillors are finding out just this week and last week as to the amendment and the detail of 23.1. Sir, it's on that one clause alone that many councillor realize the potential divisiveness of the issue.

To take a final quote from that particular release put out by the UMM, it says, "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."

Sir, that's in the back of everybody's mind, and many of the same people who came forward at the invitation of the government to discuss with the First Minister and with the Attorney-General some of the specific lead ons from that particular point and were not, in my view as related to me at least, given complete answers.

Mr. Speaker, we also realize that the government is possibly a little less than sincere and honest in this whole issue. I draw attention again to the pamphlet that has been put out and, of course, the constitutional speaking issue that came forward in July, 1983. I think the government realized, possibly earlier on, that when you put a large, almost a tabloid, of this nature that very few people take the time and the effort to give it close scrutiny. I think that's why, of course, the pamphlet followed it. I guess we also question what'll be coming next. Of course, it is going to be very hard to surpass the ad of the First Minister, I can't imagine any type of advertising surpassing that. But, Sir, in all of it, the point I'm trying to make is, there's no mention of the amendment and of 23.1.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we realize the government is a little less than sincere when up until yesterday they indicated there would be no rural hearings. I challenged

the Minister of Housing on this issue as to why he was not pushing to have the committee hear people in Flin Flon. His report to me was, well, it wasn't a big issue, it wasn't an important issue in Flin Flon at all, it wasn't important and therefore there was no need for the legislators of this province to hear the people in Flin Flon. I took it then that they had the same attitude regarding not only the people of Flin Flon, but possibly the people of Brandon, and maybe of Blrle, and maybe of Dauphin, and maybe of Sifton, and maybe of Ethelbert; and more particular to me, maybe of Elm Creek, and maybe of Morris. Mr. Speaker, that's something I cannot accept. I can't accept the fact that the government, up until yesterday, were in our view not prepared to take the issue to all of the people of the province.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it makes one wonder, even though there are only 50 groups who are prepared to make presentation, at this point, to the committee, which I believe will mushroom many fold, it's hard to believe how you could expect those same councillors, for instance, that drove 300 miles from St. Lazare to be in attendance at a meeting with the First Minister, how you would expect them, or any people from that particular town, to come into Winnipeg for four days, five days, or six days and wait around for their turn to make representation.

So I accept the words of the First Minister last night when he indicated that there may be some flexibility on this issue, and the committee may go out into the rural areas. Although again, before I personally could sanction it, I'd want to see the list of all the places that they would hope to visit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we realize that the government is a little less than sincere when as yet we have not seen the agreement that has been developed with the Society Franco-Manitoba. What is it? The people do not really know for sure what the specific time table is, what have been the secret deals? Where is it written, Sir? Is it written? What amendments are being considered?

We always hear the Attorney-General allude to the fact that there could be some shoring up of wording, particularly he says this after the MGEA and Its President had some things to say about the issue. But where is it? And why can't they come forward now? We ask the question.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that leads to a whole new area and that's the amendments themselves. Why can they not be spelled out right now? Why cannot this wording, the so-called wording that can be tightened up, why can they not come forward right now? I dare say, Sir, that if they were laid on the table something might improve in this impasse that we find ourselves in, if they were laid forward today. Why should people, people that the government are asking to come forward and make public representation, why should they be expected to make representation on something that's almost old, that could be almost passé, when the government already has in their back pocket some of the amendments?

Sir, we went through a Crow process in this province where we took out a standing committee and we went to hear specific representation on a proposal. The very same proposal, at which time we were in the country had changed because the Federal Government had brought in new amendments. Here we were, as a group

of legislators, out on the committee not even being able to discuss the latest amendments because it had been changed. I asked the government that they lay before us the amendments they have in mind so that everybody can make proper representation.

Sir, the issue cannot be rushed, and I think the Member for Fort Garry said it best. He says, "What are you afraid of; why are you so frantic?" And I say: What is the hidden agenda? What is happening? What secret deals have been made with Ottawa of which we are not aware? There must be something. There is something that is not being spelled out in this issue, and I think it's fair to ourselves and the people of Manitoba that they be laid in front of us. Something does not add up, Sir; otherwise the government would not be going to such ends.

Well, Sir, why are we so resolute on the issue? I tell you because the government's credibility, I believe, is at issue. We do not honestly believe the government after some of the things that have happened, and I could refer to the Jobs Fund - I have no time to do so - but, Sir, all I can say is that we are going to stay here and fight this.

Entrenchment is what we are opposed to, and that's the principle issue; and, secondly, we want all the people of the province to have an opportunity to have their say, and we feel that can be done best in intersessional hearings during the fall.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak today on the sub-amendment dealing with the change in the provincial Constitution at a time when I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's in our best interest to be dealing with such an issue as legislators, because I do not believe that the Legislative Assembly and the members of the Legislative Assembly have been given the proper opportunity to truly be told by the people of Manitoba in a reasonable way what their feelings truly are about such a major constitutional change.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, we heard the First Minister of the province; the first time that he has stood up and tried to defend his government's position and his government's action in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest - it was a dismal attempt to lay to rest any of the fears that we have as an opposition to those kinds of concerns that we think the majority of the people of Manitoba have dealing with the particular constitutional change.

The sub-amendment as introduced by my colleague from Gladstone, I think, is one which is very reasonable; one which does in fact tell the government we are prepared to deal with it within a certain time frame; something that, personally, I have certain reservations about, but have certainly agreed to go along and support the particular time; that we do not want to delay the proceedings and the path in which the government wants to proceed. What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is to fully make sure that the proper process is put in place, as has been recommended by the amendment by my colleague from Fort Garry, that there are intersessional hearings; that there are opportunities for everyone who feels so inclined to come

and lay their ideas, their briefs, their comments before a legislative committee and then we can proceed in what I would call a civilized legislative manner, Mr. Speaker.

But we haven't been given the opportunity to do that, Mr. Speaker, and this last weekend and these last few days have demonstrated the kind of desperate situation that the government finds itself in truly because the whole activity of this government has been in question and will continue to be so.

The people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, have lost their trust in the government that has been given the job of administering the affairs of the Province of Manitoba over the last almost two years. The trust is gone, Mr. Speaker, between the people of the Province of Manitoba and the government, and another main reason why they have found to this date and will continue to find a difficult time in passing this resolution through this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister last night made reference as to why we lost the last election; that our leader was spending too much time dealing with our constitutional matters as was laid before us by the Prime Minister of Canada; that he was paying too much attention to national affairs. Mr. Speaker, I want it plainly on the record that thank God it was our Premier Sterling Lyon that was dealing on constitutional matters in a major way rather than Howard Pawley with the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, that has to be very plainly understood, that the people of Manitoba trusted Sterling Lyon; trusted him and his Attorney-General, Gerry Mercier, when it was negotiating on major constitutional changes. There was a bond of trust that isn't there today, Mr. Speaker, with the New Democratic Party, and that's what's at the basic route of the whole problem here today.

Mr. Speaker, we had a man who has probably made one of the best presentations to this Assembly several days ago when the leader of our party made his presentation on this constitutional change, and he understands it probably better than anyone else in this Assembly what the long-term effects of a constitutional change can mean to the overall society in the longer term, and he laid it out very well, Mr. Speaker.

That's why I'm still having difficulty not knowing why some of the members of the New Democratic Party who sit in here haven't stood up to be counted and truly represent their constituents. Yes, we have had one of them stand apart from their socialist government. We've had one of them stand up and be counted, but I'm sure there are more, Mr. Speaker, and in quiet conversation with some of them, there are some serious questions amongst them as to why they're on the path that they're on. Why has it all come about?

Were they knowledgeable, Mr. Speaker, prior to the introduction of this constitutional change? Was the Attorney-General fully telling their caucus the route in which he was taking? Was he sitting down and going through it as was done during our term of office when our leader and our Attorney-General made sure that first of all, Mr. Speaker, it was the Cabinet and the caucus truly understood the direction that the government was going? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the New Democratic Party Cabinet or caucus had the handle on what the Attorney-General

was doing in negotiating with the SFM and negotiating with Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the federal Liberals. I don't think they truly knew what was going on until all at once it was lying on their desks.

A MEMBER: A fait accompli.

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right. It was agreed to and as was said earlier by the Attorney-General, it is in stone. It'll either be passed as it is, or it will be rejected in total. That's what we heard in this Assembly. So now what we are seeing - we have seen the Member for Elmwood shave off from that great socialist party in Manitoba; we've seen some of the other members starting to waver.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if they truly listen to their constituents as they should, then they too will take up the cause. They too will take up the cause that their member for the New Democratic Party has; but the real opposition, Mr. Speaker, is coming from people who are speaking right from their hearts and from the hearts of their constituencies.

We aren't here, Mr. Speaker, trying to make political marks out of this. That has already been done by the government, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba have already made up their minds on this issue and how they're going to vote at the next general election. It's not a matter of whether the New Democrats do this or that or try and sell their project through pamphlets, whether they be telling the full story or whether it be telling part of the story. The people of Manitoba have made their minds up.

There are New Democrats who are tearing their cards up, their membership cards, because they said this government did not have the mandate to do this. The mandate that we gave that government was to make sure that nobody would go bankrupt; that everybody would have a year's notice before they would lose their jobs; that Hydro rates would not go up, and all those falsehoods, Mr. Speaker. That's what they voted for the New Democratic Party on. It wasn't on making a major constitutional change to introduce bilingualism into the Province of Manitoba once and forever, Mr. Speaker, and that's what they are trying to give the people of Manitoba. But you can't fool them. You cannot fool the people of Manitoba. It is in their minds today that what this government is doing is wrong, is wrong, is wrong, is wrong. They have no base from which to operate from, no mandate other than from a small group in society who they negotiated agreement with, and the other partner to this agreement, Mr. Speaker - goodness sakes, who would make an agreement with Pierre Elliott Trudeau and try and gain popularity with the people of Manitoba through that kind of action? That is political insanity, Mr. Speaker, and they have approached onto that path. It's an irreversible approach, Mr. Speaker, and they'll not be able to return.

All the advertising in the world, all the informational meetings of the world, where people won't be able to be told what is really happening to them because there isn't enough time by the Attorney-General, will not be sold this bill of goods because it is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong, and the people will not swallow it.

That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely why we are insisting, not on a narrow, political basis to try and win that next

election - as I said, that has already been accomplished - but what we want, Mr. Speaker, is to allow the public of Manitoba to come into an intersessional hearing set-up system, where, in fact, they can truly be heard about the way they feel. So it isn't a matter of us standing here in a partisan way debating it, but it truly is getting to the grass roots of the people of Manitoba on such a major issue.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the leader of our party and the presentation that he made to this House and this Assembly, I would hope that each member of the government party would go back over those comments that he laid on this record, would go over them in detail, and try and lay aside their philosophical thoughts on this particular issue, because he is right. He is right, Mr. Speaker, and as the days go on, the entrenchment that you see take place on this side of the House proves again and again how committed we are to truly stand up for our constituents and the people within the province. Mr. Speaker, to do less would be an injustice to our jobs as MLAs. To do less than stay here on a long weekend in August and July would be committing a sin or be committing an omission that, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't afford to happen. It was by the government's choice that they decided to push through on a long weekend, when a few of our members were here, an item of such major importance.

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with why they don't want public hearings. They don't want public hearings, Mr. Speaker, because they are going to hear what they don't want to hear. The best way not to hear it, I guess, is not to have the hearings or be committing an omission that, Mr. Speaker, we couldn't afford to happen. It was by the government's choice that they decided to push through on a long weekend, when a few of our members were here, an item of such major importance.

Mr. Speaker, let us deal with why they don't want public hearings. They don't want public hearings, Mr. Speaker, because they are going to hear what they don't want to hear. The best way not to hear it, I guess, is not to have the hearings - very simple - but they will pay the price as will the people of Manitoba pay the price.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of order.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: On a point of House privilege, Mr. Speaker. The former Minister of Agriculture has just stated to the House that the government does not want this matter, the issue of the amendment to our Constitution, to go to public hearings at a time when he is debating a resolution put forward by the government requesting that the matter go to the public for hearings, at a time when over 30 people and groups have applied to tell the government what they think about that particular item, and he has the gall to stand here and say, when we have a government motion on the Order Paper - a motion that he is debating right now - that we don't want public hearings. That is just as far from the truth as even a Conservative could get.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Finance thought he had a point of order, Sir, then I will . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Point of House privilege. We don't have to listen to that kind of absolute untruth . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There was no point of privilege raised. There was no point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: If the Minister has a point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to it, but if he's simply interrupting proceedings in order to try and participate in debate, then it's not worth responding to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur may proceed.

MR. J. DOWNEY: If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to hear what the people of Manitoba say, then they can support my colleague's sub-amendment, an amendment that is proposed to have it dealt with by December 31st this year.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to have it go to intersessional meetings, intersessional legislative committee hearings, so that all the people throughout all of the province have a chance to go to those hearings and present their thoughts. That, Mr. Speaker, will be evidence.

If the Minister of Finance has enough intestinal fortitude to stand up and support those, then what he has just put on the record will be supported, Mr. Speaker. Otherwise, he is not telling the full story, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, why have all the municipalities, why have the Union of Municipalities come out so adamantly opposed to this particular issue? Is it because they aren't hearing what the grass-roots people are saying throughout the municipalities? Why are they talking about having plebiscites during this fall's election, Mr. Speaker? Is it because they are sure, Mr. Speaker, that what the government is doing is correct?

No, Mr. Speaker, it is because they do not like to see what the government is doing, and they don't trust the government. As I said earlier, the people of Manitoba trusted Sterling Lyon. They trusted the Progressive Conservative Party, but they don't trust the NDP, and daily they are proving it in spades.

The Union of Municipalities have said we are going to ask our people of the Province of Manitoba what they think about the government's proposed constitutional change, because they may do something within that constitutional change that will force the courts or will allow the courts to force something upon them which is not in the best interests of their electorate, Mr. Speaker. That is a responsible action taken by the Union of Municipalities.

It's not, Mr. Speaker, a leftist fringe group in society. They are the mainstay of the province, Mr. Speaker. They aren't a fringe group of people who are elected for four years to show how incompetent they are, such as we have governing the Province of Manitoba today.

I want to compliment my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, who, as I have said, I have never heard such good speeches come from them on an issue of such

importance. They are speaking from the heart, Mr. Speaker, from the heart, as I said, from themselves and from their constituents on such a major issue.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this government use the taxpayers' money to traipse around the province to try and gain a political advantage for the New Democratic Party. Yes, we saw that, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues on the Agriculture Committee went through that fiasco with them. Yes, we were forced to do it.

What did we do, Mr. Speaker? We were listening to the community of Manitoba on a Crow rate change, an area that is totally outside of our jurisdiction. We have nothing to do with the Crow Rate change at all. We couldn't do anything to influence it, Mr. Speaker; yet we have to window dress on behalf of the NDP Party to go through their constituents to try and gain some political marks for them. But when it works the other way, Mr. Speaker, when it's against the political betterment of the New Democratic Party, they say, no, Mr. Speaker, we'll do it in 254 some quite evening when we can get the whole thing trumped up to benefit us.

Why don't they go to every community in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, as did a great leader of this province when it came to the changing of such a major issue as the school debate? I remember that as a young person living in rural Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I remember that as a young person and the Premier of the province of that day, the Honourable Duff Roblin, didn't back away from the people. He went out and he talked to them and he debated with them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, he didn't be cowardly like the New Democratic Premier that we have today that hides behind the Attorney-General when it comes to this whole issue. He is afraid to face the people, Mr. Speaker, and when you have a government who is so cowardly, so misdirected, then it's time to change them and that's what the people of Manitoba want to do. They don't want any truck or trade with this kind of mistrusted government, this ill-conceived and ill-informed group of people. They want a change in government, Mr. Speaker. That's what they're telling each one of us as we go through our constituents. They can't tolerate them any longer.

But dealing with the Honourable Duff Roblin's approach, and the then Attorney-General, Sterling Lyon, they faced the issue head on, Mr. Speaker, they didn't cowardly around it, they faced it head on. What did they do, Mr. Speaker? Because they were on the right road, they went out and debated, and then they put the question to the public, and they went for it as it was indicated with some 90 percent support. What is wrong with that process? Tell me, why doesn't one member of the government party stand up and tell us what is wrong with that process? I, for the life of me, can't figure it out. Unless, Mr. Speaker, there is a little feeling, as the Member for Elmwood has demonstrated, that they aren't right. There is a question mark there in the minds of many. Not the Attorney-General because people coming from his background are never wrong, never wrong in their own minds, but I'll tell you they'll find out where they're wrong if they put the question to the public, they will find out.

You know, there have been some good comments made here about the kinds of division that this has created. The First Minister stands up and tries to say that we have to do this to give us national unity. Mr. Speaker, this Premier will destroy the social fabric of

the Province of Manitoba to try and pretend that he's going to get national unity.

He talks about separatists last night, separatists. It's his kind of action, Mr. Speaker, and his government's action that creates and brings about separatist thinking people, because he's not moving in the best interests of all the people of Manitoba and that's what his job is. Our job of legislating in this province is to keep a balance in society, not to pit the minorities against the majorities, not to have the majorities take advantage of the minorities. That's not our job. Our job is to see that there is a balance in society and that we can all live together.

Our history has proven that we can do that, but we have one historical event before us now, Mr. Speaker,

that we have dug in on, one historical event that will disrupt the social fabric, that will disrupt the direction that the Manitoba province was going, or the fine province that I have been a native of or lived in all my life. That is gone, Mr. Speaker, that is gone, and it will take generations of people to change that back again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member will have 22 minutes remaining when this motion is next before the House.

The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. (Wednesday).