



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. 132 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 4 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	Virден	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

Thursday, 4 August, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Government capital investment

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development. The latest statistics from Statistics Canada, the upgrading of the capital investment in the provinces, which is July 25th, shows Manitoba as being fourth in Canada which is a decline. The previous statistics showed that Manitoba's total investment was the second in Canada, and now it shows fourth in Canada. I wonder if the Minister could explain why the total investment in Manitoba is declining steadily, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, stats such as that have a very complex set of explanations, but I would draw the member's attention to the fact that the investment figures that are within our capacity; namely, the public sector are in fact not showing a decline. The private sector ones, I think, we discussed the other day.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the public sector spending is now at 70 percent, gone from 40 percent to 70 percent, and the private investment has gone down which leads to my supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba, the new capital investment manufacturing in the province is down 44.5 from 1982, Mr. Speaker, which is the seventh lowest in Canada, which is steadily moving down; 1982 was down from '81; 1983 is down from '82. When we are seventh in Canada with a 44.5 decrease in manufacturing investment in this province, and I wonder if the Minister can give us some explanation as to what the government is doing to change this steadily declining trend in all investment, manufacturing and manufacturing shipments in this province.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, one of the main points we were making in the statement to the House over a week ago - I was going to say, the honourable member was not present but I gather that I'm not supposed to make that sort of reference - was to the point that in

Manitoba the rate of investment in the private sector on a per business base over the last 10-15 years has in fact been low, relative to the rest of the country.

I think what we're seeing is the accumulative effect of a trend that's been there and that is one reason why a recognition by the Federal Government of structural problems in an economy like Manitoba's are so important and why we are calling upon the Federal Government to alter their new plans such that it would take recognition of these factors and would in fact funnel more incentive investment money into the province.

"Manitoba's Investment Activities"

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economic Development puts out a "Manitoba's Investment Activities" every six months. I have before me January-June, 1982; July-December, 1982. Can the Minister please inform the House when January-June, 1983, will be available to the members?

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Saskeram Wildlife Management Area

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

Some time ago the question was asked whether or not the government was going to renew a long-term contract with Ducks Unlimited involving their activities at the Saskeram Wildlife Management Area. Has that agreement been renewed with Ducks Unlimited?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there have been ongoing discussions, a good deal of consultation in respect to this matter and I expect to be making an announcement in due course on that matter.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me - and I'm going from memory - that some conclusion of the ongoing discussions that the Minister referred to had to be arrived at on or about sometime in July; we're not in August. Has the agreement run out? Is there an agreement in effect? Does the government intend to continue on a co-operative development of the Saskeram Wildlife Sanctuary Marsh in co-operation with Ducks Unlimited?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite right. The lease period that was in existence did come to an end, but we extended the life of that arrangement on a temporary basis pending the further consultation that we felt was necessary. I have been in close consultation with all parties, including

Ducks Unlimited. They are aware of the reason for a further extension of time. As I indicate, Mr. Speaker, there will be announcement in the very near future.

Beaver Control Program

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, regarding the beaver problem around the periphery of the Riding Mountain National Park and the Duck Mountain Provincial Park, I wonder if the Minister can advise me what action he, his staff, or the government have taken since I raised the matter last week and earlier.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I know that my staff is in frequent consultation with interested parties concerning the oversupply of beavers in the vicinity of the Riding Mountain Park. It was my intention to personally look at some of that area, but because of the filibustering in this House, I haven't been able to get away and look at those things personally, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well then, you'd better forget about going.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister for his answer. Regardless of whether the beavers will go away or not, the debate is not going to go away on the issue that's before us.

So can I ask him again, does he not consider this to be a serious matter, and the losses that those people in the area are incurring should be dealt with by he or his staff or the government? Can I also ask him, Mr. Speaker, if he has had any phone calls, correspondence, or meetings with the Government of Canada and the staff or the officials from the Government of Canada regarding their interest and their actions to try and deal with the problem?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, someone of a less serious interest in this matter would consider that the honourable member's repetitious questions are almost as redundant as the beavers. But, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter from a departmental point of view, and from the view of those who are affected by this oversupply of beavers.

We have a program. We have the Federal Government involved in that program, and we have ongoing consultation in respect to the problems.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, you get the same old class answer from this government and this Minister especially on these matters.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask him what government policy or policy regarding this government

can deal with the losses that these farmers are incurring in the area, which I sent some more to the Honourable Minister yesterday of losses these farmers are experiencing through no fault of their own whatsoever? They are expected to bear the brunt by themselves, or is the Minister and this government and the Federal Government going to assist those people that are experiencing those losses?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member knows that these problems have been ongoing for many years and there's been a high percentage and a high population of beaver that have been causing problems for many years. Certainly those problems existed prior to this Minister being in the Ministry of Natural Resources. As a result of those problems there have been . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . arrangements made in respect to the monitoring of the problem. Beaver dams are regularly being removed, beaver are regularly being trapped, and where they cannot be trapped and they're in overabundance they are disposed of in less favourable circumstances. There's no question that the damage does occur, and at this stage I readily admit that all of the damage that does occur is not compensated to those farmers.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: This government's got all kinds of money to blow in advertising and various propaganda, Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister will he consider it again to go out there and sit down with those people and discuss with them and try and help them come up with some solution to deal with the losses they are experiencing at this time?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to be able to have the assurance from my colleagues that I could go out and attend to problems like that, see things like that, without having a pair cancelled as happened with the Premier of this province because of the obstruction and the denial of a traditional right in this House by a filibustering opposition.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that there are now 52 individuals and organizations indicating that they are going to present briefs on bilingualism through the public hearings, and that there has now been a formal notification to the Clerk's Office from the municipal level of government that they may have 125 submissions, and given that there are going to be additional briefs, perhaps numbering a total of some 200 to 300 in all; is the government prepared to allocate at least three to four weeks for public hearings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: We are prepared to allocate, as was being made clear by myself and by the Premier, such time as is necessary to hear those of the public who want to make their representations. We, in fact, are most anxious that these people and the hundreds who will come after them and are waiting for the announcement have that opportunity. We, Mr. Speaker, are not the ones who are denying them that opportunity. It is the filibustering tactics of the opposition which is denying them that opportunity. A more shameful denial of the right of these people to make their representations has, I think, never been heard in the history of this Legislature.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the Attorney-General give the assurance that the public, who want to appear and speak on this important question, can they expect reasonable notice and reasonable hours of committee, for example, from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., or is the Attorney-General going to have the type of hours that he suggested a number of weeks ago; namely, that he would go till 1:00 or 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning? Can he give the assurance that reasonable hours will, in fact, be the order of the day?

HON. R. PENNER: I would remind the Member for Elmwood and other members of the House that the referral motion which is before the House, but which is being blocked from being dealt with, calls for the committee to set such times and places as the committee feels appropriate to do the business of that committee; that is, to accommodate those members of the public who want to make representations. It will be for the committee.

I can only say, speaking on behalf of the government, that we would be willing to make sure that the time is available, to do everything possible to make the time available, and furthermore, that it is not the intention of the government to extend hours to a point where that creates difficulties for members of the public who are there and want to make briefs.

It will sometimes happen. It has sometimes happened in committee meetings. Committees themselves make those decisions, that there are members of the public who have come from a long way, have sat through the course of an evening, and that sometimes means that by extending a meeting from 10:00 to 11:00 or from 11:00 to 12:00 or sometimes even after 12:00, you can accommodate those people, who are often asked, as they should be, by the Chairperson of the committee whether they would want to wait an additional period of time in order to make their representations then, rather than come back.

The committee is there essentially to accommodate the public, not the members of the committee. I am sure that with good will, but that has to be there, the committee in fact can accommodate the public in a reasonable and responsible way.

But give the public a chance. Stop obstructing the public. We say that again and again and again, and we will continue to say it. Let the public be heard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Jobs Fund - allocation of funds

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I asked the Minister of Labour this morning if she could give an indication of any projects under the Jobs Fund that had been initiated either by the private sector or by agencies outside of government that would use the non-budgetary or self-sustaining funds that are contained within the Jobs Fund. Can the Minister advise the House at this time of any such projects?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have asked for that information. Staff is involved in meetings and will get it to me as soon as possible.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House when she will be able to provide a list of all projects undertaken through the Jobs Fund, and have them categorized as to whether the funds come from the budgetary side or whether they are from the non-budgetary or self-sustaining side of the funding?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I tried to explain this morning that the Jobs Fund and its activities is an ongoing process. It's not something that is decided at the end of one week and is over with for the year. It's an ongoing process of program development and approval and implementation.

All of the information that the member has asking for will be available after the end of the fiscal year.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Labour. Surely she realizes that the government has approved some projects. Lord knows they've announced them often enough.

For the programs that have been approved, can the Minister list them? Can she simply list those projects, the amount of money attached to them and where the money comes from; whether it's from the budgetary side or from the non-budgetary side? Would the Minister undertake to do that at the earliest opportunity?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we certainly intend to do that. The member knows that we had already tabled specifics for up to \$131 million, which brought in more than \$80 million from other sectors, the private sector, the Federal Government, municipal, etc., which meant that the \$200 million we started out with, \$100 million of which was new funds, had already by that time brought in an additional \$80 million from other sectors, and we will provide further information. I'll see how much we can provide quickly. There will obviously not be a final report for some time to come because, as the Minister of Labour has indicated, it's an ongoing process.

I told the Member for Turtle Mountain the other day that when I indicated that we had allocated certainly

more than the \$72 million in budgetary funds in total, that meant that some of this will be spent next year or the year after, etc., but for this year the cash flow will be the \$72 million and we do have some flexibility within that amount.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister of Finance for undertaking to provide the information quickly, which the Minister of Labour indicated that she couldn't provide until the end of the fiscal year, but the Minister of Finance has indicated now - has given an answer that is contrary to an answer given by the Minister of Labour this morning. The Minister of Labour assured the House this morning that there had not been greater commitments made to Jobs Fund projects than there was money available to actually fund those projects.

Can the Minister of Finance perhaps clear up that contradiction in terms, because we have contradictory information from two Ministers, Mr. Speaker.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is really a contradiction in that as I understand what the Minister of Labour said was that we're not going to spend more than what we budgeted for in 1983-84. Within that, we expect and we know that we have some room to move because there are some block amounts from the budgetary portion that we had allocated for specific projects that appear not to be required for this year and, therefore, there is some room to manoeuvre.

On the other hand, this does mean that some funds will have to be committed now in the sense that the government will know that for next year there will be some projects that we've committed ourselves to which we had expected initially to spend this year, we will have to spend next year.

That had been explained to the member yesterday and if he wants further information on it, I suppose he can ask more questions.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the money then that the government has in its own estimates for the Jobs Fund has clearly all been allocated and, in fact, more has been allocated than the government really has to spend. They're simply counting on some of it not flowing during the period of time.

Mr. Speaker, why are we continuing to see on almost a daily basis, certainly on a weekly basis, these huge almost full-page ads - this one happens to be August 3rd in the Brandon Sun. The government continues to spend tens of thousands of dollars every week to advertise a fund for which the government seems to have no money left in their own estimates for that fund, Mr. Speaker. What is the purpose of continuing to spend the taxpayers' money on this kind of propaganda when the funds in the government's own estimates is broke.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the member opposite asking such questions. I know that he was in government at one point in time in the past. I'm sure that he understands that in an ongoing program there are announced programs; there are programs that are under way; there are programs that are just coming on-stream; there are people out there who can

still apply for programs; there are programs that have not yet been announced. All of these things are out there and they will come on-stream in due course in a rational and reasonable fashion.

For people not to know that these programs were available, that these programs could be discussed, could be evaluated, and that we invite the comments of the public on our programs would be us not doing our jobs, in my estimation. I have no qualms about asking the public how they feel about our Jobs Fund. I think they feel very good about it.

Jobs Fund - Capital

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Labour then. Can she give the House and the public assurance that anyone applying through the Jobs Fund will not be rejected on the basis that there are no funds left, that there's no money left in the Jobs Fund?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Perhaps you can have a double answer on this one. I will certainly give you an example, Mr. Speaker. Again, let's use the NEED Program since that seems to be very visible to everybody. There is money allocated for the NEED Program. It's over an 18-month period if members recall the initial agreement. That 18-month period was three months in the last fiscal year, all of this fiscal year, three months into the next fiscal year. As it turned out, projects did not get under way in the last fiscal year, so none of the \$12 million of provincial money was expended. We still have money in that pot, if you will, for the NEED Program. Applications can be made to the NEED staff and to the NEED Advisory Board for programs within that allocation.

On the one hand, that's considered allocated money; on the other hand, projects can be applied for and can commence expending that money. It has not all been expended; it may not all flow this fiscal year. It will probably lapse over into the three months of the next fiscal year, which is the last part of the 18 months of the program. Surely, the member, having been in government and I think a Finance Minister, should understand the flow of cash in programs throughout the fiscal years and beyond fiscal years.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Labour could give a straight answer then to the question, because I'm sure the public would like to know. Can she assure the public that they will not turn down applications made through the Jobs Fund on the basis that there's no money left?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite and the members on this side of the House voted a \$200 million Jobs Fund. The former Minister of Finance apparently is now embracing some Social Credit or other philosophy that would say that \$200 million can just be added to, and it can be \$300 million or \$400 million. Of course, at a certain stage if we've run out of funds for this year in terms of the cash flow for the \$200 million for 1983-84, then at the end of that point we would say that there are no more funds available in the Jobs Fund.

The Honourable Member for Emerson keeps saying there's no money; he doesn't understand. The fact of the matter is that there are still funds available for 1983-84, although they had been allocated to projects where we know that the cash flow for '83-84 simply will not be what we allocated. That means that whatever is left will have to be spent next year, and we then have the option of not spending the \$200 million this year, which would provide us with some criticism from the opposition because they would say well, here you had an opportunity and you didn't use it; or we look at other projects and that's precisely what we're doing, but certainly when we get to the point where we know that we will have a cash flow of the \$200 million as broken up between budgetary and non-budgetary, there will be no more funds left in the Jobs Fund. At that point, our course is clear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs: In light of the fact that the government has announced projects which they have admitted are in excess of the amount of money that they have in the Jobs Fund - so for all intents and purposes the Jobs Fund is broke or bankrupt, if you want to call it that, Mr. Speaker - and in light of the fact that the government continues to advertise, I wonder if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs can tell me whether or not there is a law in the Province of Manitoba against people advertising commodities for sale, or services for sale, which indeed aren't for sale or are not available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the member obviously chooses not to understand, but I will give an example. Let us say, for instance, that the government decides to buy a CL-215 water bomber. We would be allocating funds - and I am not saying it would be from the Jobs Fund - knowing that in 1985 or 1986, we would have to spend several million dollars. That would have no impact on the 1983-84 amount but, nevertheless, we would have had to make a commitment now to spend that money later on.

In the Jobs Fund, we had funds, for instance, \$20 million for downtown redevelopment. It may or may not take place. As we get closer to the end of the year, it may be more likely or less likely that it will take place. If it does not take place, then we will have the option of reallocating those funds. There are other instances where we already know that we will not spend all the money this year that we allocated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the point is this. Therefore, we will be making further announcements on projects that have not yet been announced to date. There will be further negotiations on other projects that have not been agreed to, to date. There will be further expenditures from the Jobs Fund in the year 1983-84. The statement that the Member for La Verendrye makes is simply totally incorrect.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Finance: Has the government indicated to

any of the applicants under the NEED Program or under the Jobs Fund that their projects could not be advanced or would not be accepted because there was a lack of funds?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, there have been people turned down. There were people turned down right in the beginning.

A MEMBER: Because of the lack of funding.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I know of nobody who has been turned down on the basis that we don't have any money left. Now if somebody came along and said I want \$50 million from the Jobs Fund, from the budgetary portion, then clearly we would say we don't have that kind of money, but we will see what we can do if you're looking at considerably less.

That surely was understood all along, that there have to be some criteria in the program; but I know of nobody who has been simply told that the only reason they're turned down is that there is no money left in the pot.

Brandon University Music Building

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education advise the House whether or not a decision has been made by the Jobs Fund Board as to whether the Jobs Fund will provide money in order that the Brandon University Music Building may proceed as announced by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, the issue regarding the Brandon University Music Building is not related to money in the Jobs Fund. The question there is how much space and what quality of space is acceptable and is going to be approved.

I think I mentioned the other day when I was talking about it that the original request that came in, when the former NDP Government, was for just a little over .5 million. They wanted an addition for half-a-million dollars. They quickly changed that to 1.3, and then went up to \$1.6 million. They then went to \$4.5 million, and the last proposal was for \$6 million.

The approval in principle for the building given by the Universities Grants Commission was on the understanding that they would raise \$4.5 million. In other words, they said that this is more space than you need; it is certainly more space than we think that the public of Manitoba should bear the cost. If you want to build it, you can, but you are going to have to raise the money yourself, and they agreed.

They have only raised half-a-million dollars, Mr. Speaker, so what we are going to have to determine is how much space is reasonable and how much is justified, so that we know how much of the \$6 million project that they are proposing should be supported by the people of Manitoba.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Education aware that the "Wish List" circulated by the

Minister of Finance in February which listed capital projects, in fact included the Brandon University Music Building at a cost of \$6 million?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: I am not sure what the point of that is. We had accepted the \$6 million project, providing they could get support for it. I suppose if some of the support could come from the Federal Government, that's all right.

The Province of Manitoba is going to have to make a decision on how much money they will give out of the revenues of Manitoba's revenues, how much is justified for the Music Building, and their decision is that to go from a .5 million addition to a \$6 million project is not warranted.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Education confirm that there has been no change in the plans for Brandon University's Music Building from the time that this government distributed their "Wish List" and included that building at a cost of \$6 million until the present time, when they are finally being asked to fulfill their promise that they made in the October, 1981 election?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, no, there has not been a change since the "Wish List" was handed in. There has been a major change though in that they have tripled their space requirements from the original proposal. They have tripled the amount of space that they're asking for.

The government's commitment is, I believe, about \$2.2 million. That was the Provincial Government's commitment, and in no way could we be expected to, I think, or have indicated any obligation or commitment by the Provincial Government to pick up the additional money that would be required to bring in a building of \$6 million.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Education doesn't feel it's justified for the province to pick up this kind of funding, what justification was there to ask the Federal Government, which is really just the federal taxpayers, to pick up half of the \$6 million costs?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, each of the programs that a government has has its own criteria and has its own priorities. I think when a Provincial Government submits a list to the Federal Government, that they put a number of items on the list for consideration for that program by the Federal Government, and they will review the proposals and make a decision based on the priorities and the criteria of their program.

Wayside parks

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister if he or his staff have replaced the toilets and the picnic table and the barbecues, which I raised last week, on

the east side of the Lake of the Prairies for the local campers to go in there and fish and have some fun?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting the Lake of the Prairies earlier on this year, and I again indicate the excellence of those facilities. I know the honourable member is quite concerned about the pit privies out there in the camps, and I thought I would personally inspect them if I could get a pair to get out and do that, but they have been obstructing this House and I can't do that.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye on a point of order.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Deputy House Leader insists on saying that this side is not pairing, I ask him to turn around and talk to his Whip. We have indicated that for last weekend, where we thought we had an agreement with the government, the pairs were off. Right now the First Minister is out of this House. He has been paired by this side and I have a good working arrangement with the Whip on the other side, so let him not get up and cast aspersions on this side of the House, because if he really doesn't want any pairs, that can be arranged.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted that the honourable member now has put it on the public record that they are prepared to honour pairs for government business. I think that's a very honourable thing for the member to do and I congratulate him for that and we will certainly — (Interjection) — The Honourable Member for Emerson wants to interrupt what I think is a very conciliatory statement on my part, to the Member for La Verendrye, who is the Whip for the opposition party and I thank the Honourable Member for La Verendrye for his conciliatory statement as well. I certainly will take full advantage of that opportunity then and, if it's possible to do so, I would like to be assured of a pair so I can go out and look at some of those problems. I will make those arrangements.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

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

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a new point of order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for La Verendrye state his point of order?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say, on a point of order, that if it is the intention of the Minister of Natural Resources to go out and inspect some of the parks, in light of the sometime large problems that he causes in this Legislature, it might be arranged that we can provide two people on this side to pair with him. We would be willing to possibly pair two people if he would just get out of the House and let the House move in a proper manner.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Nor was that a point of order.

Clear Lake - flooding

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've known before I even raised these questions how lazy this Minister is. He's not going to look after the wishes of the people in my constituency.

Can I ask him - at Clear Lake last weekend when I was there, his aide, the Honourable Member for Inkster, was there and spoke at great length. Can I ask him, was his Executive Assistant, the Member for Inkster, did he meet with the municipalities; did he meet with the Park Superintendent; did he go out and look at the problems in the area there with the local farmers who are flooding, while he was right at Clear Lake? Did he do that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members can't have it both ways. They want me to go out and look at the problems and yet they want me here to answer their questions.

I know that the Honourable Member for Inkster - he's not my Executive Assistant, he's my Legislative Assistant - is a very dedicated Legislative Assistant and he has, on my behalf, looked at many areas of the province to give me advice. I know that he has been in the Riding Mountain area and looked at some of the natural problems there and he has advised me on them. I think he's a very hard working, able Legislative Assistant and I'm proud to have him as my Legislative Assistant.

Beaver Control Program

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Can I ask the honourable member if he brought back a report on the problem with beavers around Riding Mountain National Park?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster has spent considerable time with me talking about the beaver problem, and I can assure the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell that the Member for Inkster is as much an expert as the

Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell is, perhaps more so, in respect to those forms of natural life and he's very much concerned about the problem and our approach to it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not arguing who's an expert, and who isn't an expert. Can I ask him again, did the Honourable Member for Inkster, who was in Clear Lake, I think, for three days, at least two days, did he meet with the municipalities, did he meet with the Park Superintendent, did he meet with the farmers in the area while he was there, to discuss the problem?

MR. H. ENNS: Come on, Al, let's try a clean, honest answer.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside said, let's try an honest answer. My face will turn as red as the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek if I don't tell the truth in this House.

MR. R. BANMAN: How about as red as the Member for Inkster?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I haven't asked the Member for Inkster, my Legislative Assistant, that precise question, and of course I'd have to take it as notice; but I know that he has talked to me about the problems of the beaver in the area of Riding Mountain and I assume that he has had conversations, but I haven't asked him about that. I sure will do that.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, before calling the order for this afternoon, I would just to announce that there will be sittings of the House tomorrow and Saturday in accordance with the Speed-up Motion.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call the referral resolution as it stands on the Order Paper with respect to the referral of the proposed amendment to Section 23 to a Standing Committee of the House on Privileges and Elections? I believe that someone opposite was speaking at the time.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTIONS

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and the proposed sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Arthur, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has 33 minutes remaining.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we adjourned before lunch I was in the process of bringing the House up to date on the actions that were taken by the previous government headed by the Honourable Sterling Lyon with respect to the actions that they have taken towards the translation services.

I'll go back to the date of January 25th of 1980, where a news service report states with regard to the translation services, "The Manitoba Government is expanding its translation services substantially, in what Attorney-General Gerry Mercier describes as a major first step to meet both the spirit and the legal requirements of the recent Supreme Court decision on Manitoba's language legislation."

Again, as I spoke earlier, with regard to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870, "Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of the Legislature and both those languages shall be used in the respective records and Journals of the Houses. Either of those languages may be used by any person or in any pleading or process, in or issuing from any court of Canada established under The British North America Act of 1867, or in or from all of any of the courts of the province."

The acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both official languages - sorry, I added a word in there that is not here - in those languages, and again, nowhere in The Manitoba Act of 1870 does it prescribe that English or French are official languages. Either of the languages, English or French, can be used, but they are not designated as official languages.

Then, on April 11, 1980, the French language bill introduced in the House. Premier Sterling Lyon has introduced a bill to implement the use of French as an official - this is the first place that I know of that the word "official" language is stated. Now, whether that was a matter of interpretation or not, I'm not sure, but this is the only place that I know of, until in the amendment that is coming forth that we are speaking on, that it is referred to - I believe it's in the First Minister's letter - that it is designated as the official language.

Now further on in this April 11th News Service, "The Premier's bill is the first to appear in the Manitoba Legislature in both languages in 90 years, and the work of translating statutes is proceeding. The bill repeals the 1890 act entitled, An Act to provide that the English language shall be the official language of the Province of Manitoba, but that is the 1890 act, not the 1870. It also provides that the first language in which legislation is distributed in the Legislature will take precedence over translated versions whenever any conflict arises over interpretation.

Further on he said "The Provincial Government will continue to study the further implications of the Supreme Court decision and will count on the traditional wisdom and fair mindedness of Manitobans in bringing our province fully within the provisions of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act."

Going on again to the date of October 6th, we are speaking again of the French Language Services in Manitoba, that is October 6th of 1980 - now, we're speaking of French Language Services in Manitoba, not bilingualism as it known or determined by the Federal Government. In this statement to the Cabinet or communication to the Cabinet: "Last May, by

agreement between the Minister of Cultural Affairs and myself, it was agreed that Mr. Rene Prefontaine, Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs and Historical Resources, would make a report on the availability of French Language Services within the Manitoba Government service and would make suggestions for our consideration on how much service could most effectively and reasonably be made available in the future."

Later on, I believe it was the Government of Sterling Lyon, hired Mr. Kerr Twaddle, Q.C. to look into the same thing. In his response of June 23, 1983, re the proposed constitutional amendments, he says, "You have asked me to attempt to identify those boards, commissions, corporations, and agencies which will be subject to the bilingual language requirements of proposed Section 23.8 of The Manitoba Act. I have reviewed and identified some 126 bodies as potentially falling within the requirement. In forming an opinion as to whether or not a body does fall within the requirement I have considered: (a) whether or not the function of the body is that of government; (b) the mode of the appointment of members of the body; and (c) the extent, if any, that it deals with the public. These criteria are not precise, and in consequence it is impossible in some cases to say with any certainty whether or not the court could hold the body to fall within the requirement. Following my review, I have prepared a list of bodies which in my opinion fall within the requirement: (1) quasi-judicial and administrative bodies of the Government of Manitoba; (2) Crown corporations; and 3) agencies of the Government of Manitoba."

Then, he goes on to say that he has prepared the list, and the list I believe has been already set before the House, and if it has not I would be prepared to put it on the table. This lists 41 to start with, and then another 10, Crown corporations, and maybe this should be placed on the table, Mr. Speaker. I'm prepared to move it there.

Now, going from here I think you were pretty sure in knowing from the documents that I've been quoting from where the opposition is coming from, and how we stand on French Language Services. We have taken every opportunity available to make our stance known. We are willing to extend French Language Services, but we are not willing to have those services entrenched in the Constitution. The motion becomes almost irreversible and takes away from the elected representatives decisions on matters of importance, leaving those decisions to be concluded by the courts.

The sub-amendment to the resolution requests referral to an intersessional committee that would listen to the citizens and organizations that are concerned, take time to have full and open hearings. I think we have enough legislation on our plate to last us this Session. Again, I ask on behalf of the opposition, give the people of Manitoba the opportunity to contribute to this debate. This is a subject of great importance and concern to all Manitobans, and they cannot be heard in a hurried manner.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government, as so many of my colleagues have already done, take your take time, don't rush into amending the Constitution. Let's hear from our constituents. I'm sure members opposite must be hearing from theirs as we are from ours. If

they're getting the same message that we're getting, I can't understand why they can't see. Maybe it's all too close to them; maybe they can't see the forest for the trees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge again, it's important that we make the right decision now, and the right move now is to refer that resolution to an intersessional committee.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, it's with some regret that I feel compelled to enter this debate this afternoon, not because I have some difficulty addressing the question, but because of the frustration with which I approach the behaviour of the opposition over the last several weeks in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's become growingly apparent to the people of Manitoba that members opposite have no intention of expediting the business of the province; have no intention of facilitating the passage of legislation; have no intention of assuring that this very institution has the respect and confidence of the people of Manitoba, who've come to believe that this Legislature is the place where decisions affecting their future are made.

Mr. Speaker, the tyranny that has been observed by members of the public of this province has reached the point where the very confidence in the foundations of this institution has been shaken in recent weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite may have problems with particular pieces of legislation or resolutions before this House, however, the very denial of their belief in parliamentary democracy is what lies at the root of the lack of confidence that the public of this province has. They are denying the very basis of parliamentary democracy, which is in essence that government has a mandate to bring in legislation, raise funds and spend funds, and must be allowed to implement that mandate; that opposition has a mandate and a responsibility based on their loyalty to the Crown, that's why they're called Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition; to oppose reasonably; to oppose responsibly; but also to allow the government to carry out its mandate.

Mr. Speaker, that's not what's happening. Mr. Speaker, that makes me sad, that also makes me frustrated, because I cannot understand the reasons why the opposition has taken this tact.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this morning, an amendment was moved to the main amendment on this resolution, to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privilege and Elections. This new sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, exposed the opposition's strategy and their immediate tactics for all to see. I'm inclined, Mr. Speaker, if it isn't unparliamentary, to call the opposition the August flashers. The weather is so hot, I can appreciate their desire to expose their strategy, to expose their very souls to the people of Manitoba in terms of the tactics they are applying in this House. But, Mr. Speaker, these August flashers, in the dog days of a long hot summer, have exposed themselves just one point too far. They have exposed a strategy of obstruction and filibuster, which goes to the very core of my frustration with their performance; the very core of their refusal to accept

their obligations as a responsible opposition in a parliamentary Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the other point which is rather an anomaly for members opposite, is that during the months of June and July, we heard them argue that members in this Assembly should all have other occupations; should all have other jobs or businesses to which to return; that being here was really only, Mr. Speaker, a part-time job. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what job you wish to return to. I certainly have no desire to go anywhere else, but now members opposite are putting up this vaunted front of not wanting to go anywhere else themselves. All of a sudden, these gentlemen and ladies, who claimed that they could be better MLAs if they were out doing business with their constituents, farming in their constituencies, being part-time MLAs, are now claiming that they are full-time MLAs and want to sit and sit and sit. Well, Mr. Speaker, it can clearly be said that this summer that's all they're doing, they're sitting for their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose on the other hand that has one positive benefit. Perhaps some members opposite will finally recognize the wisdom of those on this side who have suggested for a very long time that this job has grown of the last 30 years to be one to which members must dedicate themselves on a full-time basis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal in more detail with the amendment, which I have described as both a filibustering amendment and obstructionism. Mr. Speaker, it's a frivolous amendment. It proposes to change one digit. It proposed that instead of having the committee report on December 31st, 1983, which was the amendment defeated last night, the committee shall now report on December 30th, 1983. Mr. Speaker, although a point of order was not raised by anyone on this side regarding the admissibility of the proposed subamendment, that lack of objection by members on this side does not for one minute mean that we accept the propriety of such an amendment.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it a frivolous amendment meant to obstruct the business of this House and the mandate of this government. The change in date only almost implies to this House - and certainly some members opposite, both privately and publicly, have sustained that implication - that this amendment is to be followed by others. Will the next amendment be December 29th, or, Mr. Speaker, will the next amendment be Boxing Day, December 26th, or even better yet, Christmas Day, December 25th? I checked my calendar, Mr. Speaker, I think not, because December 24th, 25th and 26th this year is a long weekend, and we know that members opposite do not want to work on a long weekend.

Mr. Speaker, even a more interesting question, and I ask members opposite - I know all of them will be speaking, so any one of them will have an opportunity to reply - will they carry this filibustering, frivolous nonsense to its logical extreme and schedule the report of the committee for December 8th, 1983? For those members, Mr. Speaker, who haven't been following the press relating to the activities of many members opposite, December 8th, 1983 is the date of the coronation of the new Leader opposite. Mr. Speaker, do they want to be sitting in this Legislature on that day? Is that their tactic? Are they really serious, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, all the evidence in the speech of the Member for Emerson, in the speech of the Member for Assiniboia, and the speech of the Member for Kirkfield Park last night, is that this is not only a frivolous amendment, but that it is deliberately intended as a sustained filibuster against the will of the people of Manitoba, against the mandate of this government, to govern the province.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson has a problem, except it's now as serious for him - even though he calls from his seat so frequently - as it is for some others. Mr. Speaker, he will be active, but he will not be a prime contender for the leadership of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, when we started taking about December 8th, it occurred to me that members opposite, particularly the leadership aspirants have a problem and I'm not sure they know it, so I want to place a question in their minds. I want the Member for Tuxedo; the Member for St. Norbert; the Member for Sturgeon Creek, that's not an announcement, but it's certainly an indication of my belief in his great ability; the Member for Fort Garry; the Member for Lakeside, without a doubt, and he has been wearing his good federal external affairs blue pin-striped suit now so frequently that there's no question that he's building the image; the Member for Arthur; the Member for Pembina as of today, I believe, is now considering entering the race. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you as an aside that he will have a lot of support on this side, the Member for Pembina.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of those members, and for those who are unavoidably absent today, I say to their colleagues, please ask them the question: What's happening here? Are you watching the tactics and the antics of the Member for Turtle Mountain? Do you believe it's possible you're being held up to Ransom? Do you believe that this strategy of obstruction and filibuster by frivolous and foolish and cute amendments is possibly designed only for personal self-aggrandizement to create a charger on which the Member for Turtle Mountain will ride all the way to the leadership convention? Is that possible?

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to impute motives. I only ask the question of those leadership aspirants opposite if this is the charger designed by their House Leader to ride his way in glory to December 8th?

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a danger that members opposite should countenance; I think there is a danger that this is a foolish grandstanding for leadership purposes and I think they should analyze that and be sure of where they stand. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Emerson needs not my advice as to who he should support in the leadership now that his candidate has withdrawn for fear that the Member for Emerson might support him. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson is found wanting for a candidate to support himself.

Mr. Speaker, what do members opposite really want? What's the problem that they have had over the last two or three weeks in this Legislature? Well, I talked about that briefly last Thursday; my Deputy House Leader, the Member for St. James and Minister of Natural Resources, talked about it briefly last Thursday as well. Members opposite have seen no movement in the last seven days in this Legislature; virtually nothing has been accomplished. Why?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we had another period like that the third week of July. Virtually nothing happened despite the best intentions and diligence of members on this side; despite the valiant efforts of our House Leader and our Deputy House Leader, progress would not come. Why? Well, Mr. Speaker, it took a while, but even the media and, through them, the public of this province came to be aware of one thing: That members opposite weren't going to move until Speed-up was brought in. Late in June, whispering in the halls, members opposite to members on this side, was bring in Speed-up, bring in Speed-up. Members on this side refused; many members on this side have an aversion to legislation by exhaustion. We tried to accomplish the legislative process without speed-up, but members opposite did their best to frustrate that.

Finally, publicly members opposite, for all intents and purposes, forced the government under threat of a long bell-ringing incident to bring in Speed-up, and it was done. But, Mr. Speaker, there were no calls from the media; there were no calls from the public; there was no criticism of the government for bringing in Speed-up even though there was major legislation, a major constitutional amendment before the House. Why? Because the opposition had forced the issue, because the opposition had frustrated the democratic process for several weeks under the pretence that only Speed-up would allow the work to be done.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, a duplicate mirror image strategy has been undertaken by members opposite. What do I mean? Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm the first to enunciate it; perhaps the first in the Chamber, but the Member for Emerson gave it away yesterday. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Emerson said yesterday that the government - and I paraphrase because I don't have the Hansard with me, it hasn't come yet - had virtually no choice but to bring in closure. That's what he said. The Member for Sturgeon Creek from his seat earlier today, in reference to the sub-amendment that was moved this morning, said, "and again and again and again, the 29th, the 28th, the 25th, the 26th and the 8th of December." I don't know if the dates are accurate, Mr. Speaker, but certainly "and again and again and again."

What's the tactic? I don't want to speculate on why members opposite want or are beginning to demand closure; that would be imputing motives, but clearly, Mr. Speaker, members opposite have now shown their hand. Privately, several members opposite have suggested to various members on this side that that would be the only way this matter would be dealt with by the Legislature, would be for us to bring in closure. We haven't even talked about it. No member on this side - I believe I'm the first to tell this Legislature that this government does not want to bring in closure; that we have opposed any possible suggestion just as we opposed Speed-up; that this matter should not receive the fullest possible consideration of the people of Manitoba.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, if the opposition continues to prevail in their frivolous, obstructive way with their filibuster, we may be forced to the wall. I would never say that it will never happen, but this government will resist virtually to the wall any suggestion that closure should be used to deal with the constitutional amendment that is of serious significance to every

Manitoban and perhaps in many ways to every Canadian.

Mr. Speaker, certain tactics are clear and were elucidated last week by my Deputy House Leader, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and it fits with this scenario of members opposite demanding closure. Maybe they'll change their tune because I exaggerate slightly. They haven't quite demanded closure yet; they're building up to it just the way they did on the Speed-up Motion. They're building up to a demand that this matter be resolved with closure.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have a problem. They don't want to oppose this resolution because they feel compelled to support it in principle, but virtually all of their speeches have belied that support. Out of one side of their mouths come statements that they support this in principle; out of the other come statements such as the Member for Kirkfield Park who last night suggested that there was . . .

A MEMBER: Because that's a genetic defect that you have, don't subscribe that to us.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Lakeside, when I refer to the Member for Kirkfield Park, starts talking about genetic defects. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter of privilege that the Member for Lakeside should not refer that way to one of his colleagues in her absence.

MR. H. ENNS: It's a matter of privilege and a matter of record that they are forever speaking out of both sides of their mouths, on most issues.

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

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have a federal problem called Brian Mulroney, and I understand that earlier this week John Crosbie as well. Mr. Speaker, it's glorious, I heard the Gallup Poll this morning and I smiled - 55 percent, that puts them even more on the horns of dilemma. How can they say to the people of this province and project an image of support in principle for something that they know they must be perceived as supporting in principle, when down inside, and by their own comments, they belie that support, they really don't believe in it.

The Member for Kirkfield Park last night talked in opposition to providing French language court services in this province, something required under Section 23 of The British North America Act, something instituted by the previous Lyon administration of this province, instituted by members opposite. The Member for Kirkfield Park served that administration as a political appointee and yet she now expresses some concern about providing those services.

Mr. Speaker, now when we get down to the nuts and bolts of what will and will not happen after the implementation of this amendment and we hear the concerns of members opposite; we hear the Member for La Verendrye expressing concerns about what might happen on the ground in La Verendrye, then we get the real picture of where they stand on this issue, but federally they must project this image of support.

In 1979, they blew it for Joe Clark. Had they turned in only the three or four more seats that the NDP took from them, Joe Clark would have had a majority and the fiasco of '79 and '80 would never have occurred. That government denied Joe Clark a majority and allowed the reincarnation of Pierre Trudeau. That previous government. Joe Clark didn't do it, the Lyon Tories defeated Joe Clark.

Mr. Speaker, that's a cross they bear, but now they have a problem. Now they have a very serious problem. The National Tory Executive, the federal caucus are saying, "Manitoba Tories, don't do it again. You put it to us once." Every time that support for Mulroney goes up, every time the Federal Progressive Conservative Party looks better, the pressure is greater on the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Caucus. It puts them in the position of having to support in principle something in which the vast majority of them do not believe. Their statements in this House and, Mr. Speaker, I've gone through their speeches, members on this side could give you 100 citations of individual statements, from the Member for Niakwa, the Member for Kirkfield Park, the Member for La Verendrye, Emerson, virtually every member, there's less than one handful on that side who have not come up with statements which belie their support of this resolution in principle.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite then have to find a way to support this agreement in principle, but because they know that the vast majority of the people of this province have a tremendous antipathy to the federal bilingualism program, and because the efforts of the Member for Elmwood, irresponsible that they have been, and the speeches of members opposite, have attempted to associate this French Language Services Agreement with federal bilingualism with which there is absolutely no comparison, but because that association has been made and because the vast majority of the public have now begun to accept that association, members opposite know that to score the political points they want to score on this issue, they must reinforce that false association. They must reinforce that connection and that's what they're doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish them luck in their conundrum. How do you support Brian Mulroney and convince the people of Canada that you agree with the French Language Services constitutional amendment in principle that Mulroney and Crosbie and the Federal Tory caucus is a good amendment and a good agreement, and at the same time build up a charade of opposing anything that resembles Trudeau's federal bilingualism?

Mr. Speaker, you do it very simply and the cat has been out of the bag. You filibuster, you make all kinds of statements containing all kinds of minor concerns about the impact which emphasizes its similarity with the federal agreement - that false assumption that members opposite have been pushing - and then you find a way to kick it around the block and you call that entrenchment.

Mr. Speaker, what's the basis of the whole entrenchment argument? I see it very simply - and I don't want to dwell on it because I said I wanted to dwell on the process of what was happening in this Legislature, rather than on the substance of the main motion, which I don't think is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain, as well as his colleagues, talk about entrenchment in the

context of the courts. They talk about it in the context of the judiciary of this nation and they say that Manitoba should not allow the courts to decide any questions relating to the interpretation of the Constitution of this province and to avoid going to court in the future, we should go to court now.

We should allow the courts to decide today and every day thereafter, rather than giving the courts any authority to decide these questions for all time. Rather than resolve the issue, let's go to court forever. Mr. Speaker, even that argument might have a smidgeon of logic to it if they were dealing with the Charter of Rights and only the Charter of Rights.

I have to conceive I was one of those reluctant New Democrats, as I know you may have been in your days before you took the Chair, in agreeing that the Charter of Rights should be entrenched in the Canadian Constitution. I was one of those who had some reservations and who had great faith in the unwritten British parliamentary tradition. But, Mr. Speaker, I always agreed that one matter could be entrenched, and in any comments I made at that time about entrenchment and about the Charter of Rights, I said our forefathers made a compact, and in that compact, Mr. Speaker, they placed Section 133. They felt that British parliamentary tradition meant that there was no requirement for a guarantee of freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of association, freedom of political belief, just as members opposite felt when they were carrying on the affairs of this province and negotiating the new Constitution. They felt that those guarantees would be sustained by our British Parliamentary tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that there was some merit in that argument, but I acceded to the greater wisdom of the New Democratic Party and of the federal agreement which finally came to the conclusion that a Charter of Rights, subject to certain conditions, would be the best way to resolve a constitutional impasse. That's what's done, that's what happened, and the Member for Charleswood, the Official Leader of the Opposition, also came to that conclusion and agreed to that constitutional proposal.

But, Mr. Speaker, at no time during those discussions was it suggested that language rights which had always been entrenched should not be entrenched. The Leader of the Opposition and no members opposite during the debate on the Constitution in this Legislature or in the negotiations in Ottawa argued that those language rights that had been entrenched in 1867 should be removed. Now, Mr. Speaker, if they believe what they say about entrenchment, if this dog that they found to kick around the block they really want to kick, then I issue a challenge.

Bring in a constitutional amendment, a Notice of Motion tomorrow. We'll start debating it Monday. Bring it in to remove all language guarantees not only from The Manitoba Act, but from the Constitution of Canada. Turn the clock back 116 years if that's really what you believe. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, this is a false claim members opposite make. This argument against entrenchment is not an argument against entrenchment in the Charter of Rights, it's an argument to turn the clock back 116 years and remove something that was entrenched then as part of a compact, as a convention. Now, Mr. Speaker,

members opposite know about compacts and conventions, because their government was the government that led the fight about compacts and conventions across this nation for a full year during the constitutional negotiations. Mr. Speaker, if they now want to deny compacts and conventions, let them do it, let them bring in that resolution and we'll debate it, and we'll tell the people of Manitoba where they stand on entrenchment, because that's where they stand. They stand opposed to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights, and many people share that, although certainly those many are still a small minority in this province, but they also stand opposed to the guarantees that were the very basis of this nation that were entrenched, that were not part of a Charter of Rights, but were entrenched rights of a very very different kind.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba will see that difference, and the people of Manitoba will see it soon. The longer this filibuster and obstruction continues, the greater the opportunity is for members on this side, for the members of the media who have been amazingly responsible on this issue. I say that in no sense of derogation about their sense of responsibilities on other issues, but the media has been amazingly responsible on this issue and has presented it fairly to the people of Manitoba. I believe that the distinction between a Charter of Rights and convention and compact on language rights will be brought home to the people of Manitoba by a responsible media and by a responsible government caucus.

Mr. Speaker, there is another fundamental problem in this Legislature that I referred to at the beginning of my remarks. Mr. Speaker, there is a problem in terms of the very fundamental faith in democracy that members on this side feel and that up until recently I very devoutly believed was shared equally by members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking this morning after the sub-amendment was moved by the Member for Arthur about how the effectiveness of a Parliament can be destroyed. Mr. Speaker, my thoughts took me back in history - it'd be interesting for the Member for Elmwood who claims to be an historian to read my remarks because it might bear some witness for him as well - to 1917 across the ocean to a country where a group of social democrats called Mensheviks were trying to develop a parliamentary democracy in which an old order was represented, an old aristocracy of feudal origin, a new group called Democratic Socialists, or Mensheviks in their native Russian, and a group of terrible communists who hardly wanted to participate and call themselves Bolsheviks. Mr. Speaker, within nine months those Bolsheviks had destroyed that attempt at parliamentary democracy by frustration, by filibustering, by refusing to attend, by deliberately disrupting the proceedings.

A MEMBER: Ringing the bells.

MR. A. ANSTETT: They didn't ring the bells, but they did everything but. I don't they'd developed to the point where they had bells yet in their Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, nine months after that attempt at parliamentary democracy had begun, a communist revolution overturned that government, destroyed the

faith of those people in parliamentary democracy and parliamentary institutions, and to this day the prospect of a return of those institutions to those shores is not good.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years later, on the same continent, but in the Iberian Peninsula, another group of people who called themselves Loyalists made up primarily of Liberals and a few Democratic Socialists tried to form a parliamentary democracy. It was also a constitutional monarchy, which I would think would appeal to members opposite, but because there were a few communists involved, members opposite in those days and still today, as we found out this spring, would have nothing to do with it. It was alien to them and yet it was a parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Speaker, within months those who opposed that democracy refused to participate, blockaded the Parliament, refused to allow its Sessions to proceed, refused to allow the Loyalists and their king to represent the people of Spain. Mr. Speaker, within less than a year a government of reaction, a government opposed to parliamentary democracy, a government that was a symbol for fascism in the free world was formed. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's how far obstructionism can go in a parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fragile institution. This is an institution which cannot withstand the denial of the opposition to do its job. Mr. Speaker, democracy would fail if any government ever tried to railroad, ram or disrupt to the point where the opposition was not allowed to do the job they pledged to the Queen they will do.

Mr. Speaker, the Pipeline Debate in 1956 was evidence of the intolerance of the people of Manitoba and of all of Canada to any government which tries to prevent the opposition from doing its job. Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba and the people of Canada will also not accept the obstruction of an opposition which prevents a government from fulfilling its mandate. Mr. Speaker, they may not use the labels "communist" or "fascist" to describe the chaos which results from the destruction in confidence in parliamentary democracy, but let me tell you, there is no other choice. No one opposite would describe this institution as anything but fragile.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask members opposite: Why do we then tolerate those who would go about breaking china in a china shop? Why would we tolerate those who would deal with that kind of fragile institution in the way members opposite have in the past few weeks? We do, Mr. Speaker, because we believe in the institution, but I warn members opposite the people of Manitoba believe in this institution too, are aware of its fragility and will not tolerate the kind of obstructionism that is being used by members opposite for long.

Mr. Speaker, the issue will no longer be important; members opposite run that risk. If parliament is threatened, the people of this province will not consider French Language Services to be the issue. If the Legislature is incapable of doing its work, the people will not consider the role of the opposition to be responsible. Mr. Speaker, the opposition has responsibility in this issue, the government has responsibility; but obstructionism and filibusters will not be tolerated by the people. If the people of this

province demand it, the government will have no choice but to proceed as it sees fit to resolve this impasse.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see that. I said before, I don't want closure; I said before, I don't want the House prorogued. I want to see these matters dealt with, but the opprobrium of the people of Manitoba will be brought down on the heads of those who treat Parliament lightly and try to destroy the most fundamental institution in this province; will recall in the minds of the people of Manitoba and the people of Virden where a former Speaker is leading a filibuster and an obstruction in this House, will recall in their minds that all that stands between law, order and democracy in this province and in this nation is this Legislature, its traditions, its conventions and its compacts. Take that away and you have either fascism or you have communism. Mr. Speaker, which will it be? It is their choice.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't believe the childish remarks we just heard from the Honourable Member for Springfield; remarks that I would expect from a five or six year old child dealing with the subject matter that's on the table.

Mr. Speaker, a man that sat at the desk of this House and is supposed to understand and know something about Parliament, and put those kind of comments into the record, I think he's an insult not only to his own constituents, but he is an insult to Parliament. He doesn't understand Parliament; he doesn't understand what we're here about; he doesn't understand the issue, and he doesn't understand how to deal with it. He stood in his place this day, Mr. Speaker, and says that this is an irresponsible opposition. He said we are obstructionists, that we are part-time MLAs.

Well, let me tell him very quickly, Mr. Speaker. He has a lot of things he can do. He can either get his Premier to call an election, they can withdraw the resolution, or they can accept our amendments. There are three choices he's got, and he's screaming over here about destroying Parliament. They are the ones who are destroying parliament because they don't think that our amendment and our position on this matter is worth dealing with, Mr. Speaker.

I think it's the most childish remarks that I have heard all the years I've been in the House, the remarks that were just put in the record by the Honourable Member for Springfield. I expected a lot more; I really did, and yet when you hear other things that he does and says in this place and the way he guides the members opposite, we do expect that he from time to time gets mucked up in his philosophy, in his dreaming, and gets this place in one heck of a mess. If we were to listen to him on this matter that's before us here, Mr. Speaker, what a place this Parliament would be and what a place this province would be.

Mr. Speaker, this controversy that we're facing in this House here where we're standing toe-to-toe on an issue, the most extreme and important issue that this province has ever seen, and for some reason or reasons we on this side and the Government of the Day can't agree and can't seem to settle the issue. As we stand here,

Mr. Speaker, and debate day after day, the heat of the subject matter grows, the number of phone calls grows, and I know phone calls that are coming into our caucuses today from campaign managers of members opposite, telling us to hang in here, you guys. Hang in here, you Tories; your NDP Government is wrong, they're wrong wrong, and stay there until you clean them out of office. That's their supporters and they still can't see that there's a problem, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll offer the government several opportunities this afternoon to try and clear up this impasse and see if we can't settle it amicably or if we can't, the debate will carry on. Let's drop the resolution and go back to square one and come up with a Green Paper and then a White Paper. There's one alternative; why not try that on for size? That's the way it should have been done in the first place.

Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, can't blame us for the crude and shoddy manner in which this resolution has been dealt with to date. We are not at fault, we didn't bring the resolution in; that's one alternative. Drop the resolution; let's go back and draft a Green Paper, work with us on it and then come out with a White Paper and show the people of Manitoba where we intend to go as a Legislature. That's one alternative, but I suspect, Mr. Speaker, they're not going to do that.

So let's then call an election. Let's call an election; let's go to the people on this issue. I'm sure we're going to be talking here till Christmas and we're not going to settle it unless one side or the other gives. I think, rather than the honourable member that just spoke, from Springfield, matters of this nature can be solved because we can always go to the people.

If the debate's going to continue in the tone and in the frame that it's been in up till now on this subject matter, and the Government House Leader is seeing fit to set all the other government business aside and only deal with this matter day after day, then let's go to the people on it. Let's get the Premier here and go over to the Lieutenant-Governor's office and call an election and let the people settle it. That's a very sane, simple solution to the problem because the people in my constituency tell me: McKenzie, stay there till next year if necessary to make sure that they don't pass this accord in its present form. That's what I'm being told everyday.

A MEMBER: Stick with it.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Well, stick with it, someone says. Maybe that's what we're going to do. I suspect we are, because I would not be a very good MLA for the people in Roblin-Russell with the number of notes, phone calls and messages I'm getting if I walked away from this issue. I would be a very poor MLA.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know where all this problem started, who cooked up this deal and where did it all start? In whose office and who was the author of it all. Where did the mandate come to this government asking them to bring in this accord and these changes to the Constitution. Manitoba's first change in the Constitution of Canada, where did it come from? Was it in the election literature? No, it wasn't in the election literature? Did any members in the Chamber sitting in their seats today or of those who are absent, did you

go and tell the people in your constituency during the last campaign you were going to put this matter before the Legislature in the Session of 1983? No, they didn't. Their New Democratic supporters and friends that contacted me said they had no knowledge of it whatsoever, none whatsoever.

Well, why then, Mr. Speaker? Don't you think that we have right to take this thing out to the people of the province and let everybody have an input into it that wants to have some input into it when they don't have a mandate to do it.

As the Attorney-General said when he spoke in the House on July 26th, he said there should be a consensus. There certainly should be a consensus, and I don't think there's any member opposite that would disagree with that that we should have a consensus from the people of this province before we make these changes. Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

The Throne Speech - was it mentioned in the Throne Speech? I'm sure the Honourable Member for Inkster would know if it's in the Throne Speech, because, I think, he either moved or seconded the motion.

MR. H. ENNS: That usually signals the government's intention about what they want to do.

MR. W. McKENZIE: That generally does. I don't think it was in the Throne Speech, so there's the second reason or maybe the third or maybe the fourth why we're standing in our places today in opposition to the manner in which the government has handled this matter, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, who's at fault. Now, the Premier says the Feds are at fault. He said in interview that was reported in The Sun: "Premier Howard Pawley said yesterday the Federal Cabinet Ministers have said Manitoba is becoming a bilingual province, increasing the people's fears." So it's the Feds that are at fault.

Was it the Federal Government, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that started this ball of wax rolling that we've got on our desks today, this resolution and this proposed amendment to our Charter? Was Trudeau at fault? Was he the one that started it? That's the strange thing. The Honourable Member for Springfield just rose in his place, he said a lot of things, but you're not answering the questions that they're asking on this subject matter. If Trudeau didn't call the first meeting, who did? Was it the Society of Franco-Manitoban? Did they call the first meeting or did the Attorney-General or the Premier call the first meeting that started this thing on its way and the momentum?

MR. H. ENNS: Or maybe Mr. Trudeau.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Well, maybe it was, but we don't know. That's why I ask time and time again for the honourable members to stand in their place and tell us how we arrived at this place we're at today with this problem which we can't resolve. We don't have basically any information, Very very little information has been offered.

I noticed in one of the articles in the paper today the Attorney-General has loaded the MGEA with stacks of information; we don't have any. All we've got is the wishes of the people - the people of my constituency

telling me to stand in there, McKenzie, and fight these guys toe-to-toe and fight them till next year if necessary on this issue until we clean up the impasse, stand in there McKenzie. Even though I'm getting old, senile, tired, I'll hang in here, have no fear, because that's my job to represent the wishes of the people.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Minister of Energy, why weren't some of our members invited to those so-called secret meetings when this deal was cooked up? Why was the opposition left out on the first time that Canada's Constitution would be amended until it arrived in this Chamber or the Honourable Member for St. Norbert got a note from the government? We don't know, we don't know, but we keep asking. Where was that first meeting held? Do any of the members opposite know where that first meeting was held? My people are phoning me and asking me all these questions on this subject matter. Who called the meeting; where was it held; who was there; who brought the subject matter up; how did they arrive at this consensus; who proposed the package that we got in its present form? The Minister of Natural Resources, I wonder was he there? I doubt it. I wonder. We don't know those things, and that's the second problem we have in debating this thing, Mr. Speaker.

Was the City of Winnipeg, half the people in this province, representing 500,000 people, was the City of Winnipeg at that opening meeting, or did they get the same treatment that we got on this very very important subject matter? I don't think the city was invited, I don't think they have any more knowledge than we have on it, and yet they're going to ram that thing through, Mr. Speaker, and they're going to tell us over here we don't have the right to stand up and fight. That's what the Honourable Member for Springfield said, we're going to destroy Parliament. Huh, what a joke! What a childish remark from a man that sat at the Clerk's table in this House and is supposed to have some knowledge of the workings of Parliament. He's got about as much knowledge of Parliament as a three-year-old child and we don't take him very seriously any more when he stands in his place, because we've learned some things about this Honourable Member for Springfield that scares us.

Mr. Speaker, I now come to the matter of the Union of Municipalities in this province. How are we going to deal with these people who are now some 125 municipalities elected by the people and they've come out strongly opposed to the manner in which this government has handled this.

Mr. Speaker, what are some of these municipalities saying? What's some of their resolutions saying? It's too bad the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs isn't in his place this afternoon, because, Mr. Speaker, I see here that on May 20th, the Executive of the Union of Municipalities, Mr. Harms, Mr. Beachell, and Mr. Rusk, and the Honourable Peter Adam and the Attorney-General along with Mr. Greenslade and Mr. Shead of the Town of Selkirk, they were called to this meeting on May 20th. That's their first inking, I guess, of what the province was intending to do. They were informed, according to this article here, at that time that the Provincial Government had reached accord with the Federal Government. Now, this is different than I've heard it. I didn't know they had reached an accord with the Federal Government. They said it's still

negotiable, but this says that the thing was fine with the Franco-Manitoban Society of Manitoba for Manitoba to be declared a bilingual province.

That's what the Attorney-General and the First Minister of this province told the Union of Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association.

So, Mr. Speaker, that created a turmoil in the Union of Municipalities in this province. I wonder, do members opposite have any idea how many people the Union of Municipalities in this province represent? People that elect them to office and are opposed to the way the government is handling this resolution and this change to the Charter of Canada. Are we going to tell those municipalities that they're wrong; that they shouldn't be sending resolutions in some 120 strong in opposition to this subject? Should we walk away from our chairs in this place and leave those municipalities high and dry to those gangsters over there? No way, no way, am I going to let the municipalities down in this province and leave them to them wolves over there? Mr. Speaker, never, never will we let the municipalities in this province down, even though they're prepared to sell them down the river, because the municipalities are concerned.

I'll read a resolution here. This is from the R.M. of Shellmouth which is in my constituency and here's the resolution:

"WHEREAS the Council of the Rural Municipality of Shellmouth is unanimous in belief that we can live in Canada and that we are Canadians;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that council is in disagreement that Manitoba be declared a bilingual province.

"FURTHER we are in unanimous agreement that we are neither English nor French nor Ukrainian, Rumanian, German, Polish, Jewish, Japanese, Chinese, etc. We are Canadians and we favour legislation so that the affairs of our country, especially the province we live in, can be conducted in Canadian only. Council is confident that we are speaking for 99 percent of the people in our municipality."

The Member for Springfield says we should back off on this resolution and walk out of this place, when, as an example, one municipality has 99 percent of its residents opposed to what this government is doing. Well, I can assure the Union of Rural Municipalities in this province and the Rural Municipality of Shellmouth that my colleagues and I will be here. We'll be here if it's necessary even to go to the people, we'll be here till this thing gets settled, so that we don't have 99 percent of the people in the Rural Municipality of Shellmouth opposed to what this government is trying to do.

Does the Cabinet, the Ministers of the Treasury Bench think that we are wrong by what we are doing here today, standing up and fighting for 99 percent of the people in the Municipality of Shellmouth? If they think so, stand up. What kind of an MLA would I be, Mr. Speaker, if I walked out and left 99 percent of the people in that municipality, which is in my constituency, hanging high and dry at the mercy of this government? I would never do it, Mr. Speaker, and we never will. None of us in this caucus are going to back one inch away from this, until they finally come to their senses and recognize they're a bad government; they got bad ideas; and we're not going to accept these changes in their present form.

Mr. Speaker, where is all these changes that they're proposing? Where is this package of new ideas that are going to make it more palatable? I haven't seen any.

The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs just brought some literature over here what he's sending around the province, because I raised that in my speech - was it yesterday or the day before - wondering what kind of letters . . . that's the first information that I've got since this debate started. That's the first and he's telling us — (Interjection) — Well, we have the pamphlets, the propaganda, but, Mr. Speaker, when are we going to get some of this information? When am I going to get something for the Municipality of Shellmouth, so I can take it out to them and show them and say, look, the government has proposed to make some changes in this package? — (Interjection) — Well, give it to me so I can take it out to them. But they're not going to give us anything. They are going to ram it through by hell or high water and let the municipalities in this province sing for their food or sing for their money, because they've got them over a barrel now. If the municipalities don't tow the line, they won't give them any grants. They're on the horns of a dilemma. Don't think that this government wouldn't do it, Mr. Speaker. They haven't made the threat yet, but as this debate goes on, I wonder and I wonder and I wonder and so do they.

How far will they go? How far will this government go on this issue, Mr. Speaker? We saw what they did in the seat-belt hearings; we saw how they handled the Crow hearings around this province; we saw what they did to the farmers in this province the other day, the beef producers when they put the boots to them. We saw all that, so they are a ruthless cruel type of government, Mr. Speaker. They're not a government with compassion; they're not a government with understanding; they're not a government that has any compassion for the municipalities in this province and think, as they sit there today, the municipalities, or at least 123 of them are wrong. That's what they say. We say they're right. At least we're going to hang with them until we get some answers and some understanding from this government of what this is all about.

Even if the Member for Springfield - oh, what a concession he made today, we're not going to have to face closure. Now, wasn't that a tremendous concession that we are not going to face closure on debating this issue! Well, I think on this issue, if this government's got the guts and the courage and the audacity to invoke closure, the first time that the Constitution of this Canada has been amended for this province, wouldn't that be a precedent to set for all time? For generations yet unborn; for the ordinary man in the street who says, we'll get you guys whether you like it or not. Either you line up and march behind us and we're going to knock on the door in the House of Commons and we're going to enshrine this thing, whether you like it or not. I say that's wrong. I say that's wrong and I want the committee, which they say, yeah, we're going to get a committee, but they still haven't promised me that I can take that committee out to my constituency to let the people in my constituency express their opinions on this matter; to let the Rural Municipality of Shellmouth express their opinions on this.

As I said in my remarks the other day, there's two Indian Bands in my constituency, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Shouldn't they be heard on this subject matter? Shouldn't this committee go out and talk to those people on this matter? You don't get an answer. They don't even heckle, Mr. Speaker, and they don't speak. They're speechless on this subject, they don't even heckle, they're not giving us any answers, they don't have any solutions, and they have no proposals to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister of Natural Resources doesn't want to go out and deal with the beavers at this time, and he doesn't want to deal with the problem I have with picnic tables and barbecues, etc., etc., but maybe when this committee is set up, he would be one, he could look at the park and he could look at the beaver problem when we're on our way to have the hearings in Roblin-Russell. Solve it and kill two birds with one stone. Simple. But no, he ain't going to do that. He's going to vote against this proposal, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we were offering the people in this government an easy out. He could deal with the beavers, he could clean up the problems in Asessippi, and we could listen to the two Indian bands and the people in Roblin constituency, and we could even go to San Clara and Boggy Creek and listen to my Metis friends on this subject matter. That could be done, but they're not going to allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker, unless they change their minds in the next few days.

Up to now they haven't. We've been debating this matter now for close to a week, sort of a marathon-type of debate, and they don't budge an inch. They are not going to budge an inch. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can assure them, I'm not going to budge an inch either; and we may end up having to go to the people to settle this matter, because once you get a conflict in this place, and I've never seen one as bitter and as deep rooted as this one all the years that I have been here, and I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Concordia can vouch of those of us that came in '66 . . .

A MEMBER: The old '66 bunch.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I've never seen both sides locked in struggle in this Chamber so deep and neither side willing to give an inch.

So maybe that's the answer, but I know, Mr. Speaker, they wouldn't call an election on this issue. You know what? I bet they wouldn't come back with three seats if we went to the people. I doubt if they'd get three, because as I said in my opening remarks today, you should listen to what some of your New Democratic friends are saying, and these are key people in your organization. They're not just the ordinary voters; these are some of the key dogs are telling us, come on over, we'll give you a hand to clean this government out of here. We're going to clean you out, have no fear. It's going to happen sooner or later. On this issue alone, you can never be re-elected as a government; that's for sure. So why not back off, why not back off and take the offer that I've made at this time; pull the resolution.

Pull the resolution and let's try a Green Paper across the Province of Manitoba and see what their wishes are on this subject matter. Then after the Green Paper has been circulated around this province, Mr. Speaker,

let's produce a White Paper for the people to take a look at to see where we in this Legislature and the government is misguiding the destiny of our people for the next 100 years and more. There's two things you can do. They're not going to do it. See, they're all looking down at their papers as if I wasn't here. They're not interested. They're not interested in anything that we offer them, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are not interested at all. They've got themselves locked in on this issue and they're not going to budge. Well, we're not going to budge either. You're the ones that's going to have to make the decision because the Honourable Member for Springfield said Parliament can't carry on this way.

Your House Leader has the right to call - he can stand in his place any day here and call all these matters on the Order Paper that are not yet settled. — (interjection) — We'll deal with them gladly, but he's not going to call them because he's going to ram this thing down our throats - at least he thinks he is - in its present form and we are not going to accept it.

They won't call all these other matters that are before us, Mr. Speaker. They're not going to call that; they're going to blame us. I don't think by blaming us is going to get them anywhere because this is the gut issue; this is the big issue. This is the issue on which this government is going to stand or fall unless they back off, because the people of this province have had them up to there on the way they've handled this matter. No mandate, no consensus, not in the Throne Speech, never mentioned and they're proceeding to change our Constitution, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

That's an insult to every citizen in this province and, of course, we know the hard known left-wingers that they've got on those benches over there who would like to see those kind of things happen. That's the way they think government should govern. You govern with your feet; you tramp the little people down in the ground and push all over them, but the tragedy is, Mr. Speaker, we are over here; we are here and we're 23 strong, not very easy to move and not very easy to change because we are the opposition.

We are the opposition, and by the Constitution of this province and this country, we are here to oppose the government unless they come up with solutions that meet the wishes of the majority of the people of our province. On this issue, they have not carried out that mandate. They don't have a mandate; they don't have a consensus. They never had it in the Speech from the Throne and they still think that we should stand here and pass it? Never, never, never, Mr. Deputy Speaker, never.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, and I know it was raised, if the First Minister has sent out corrections to the Town of Grandview on this so-called error that he made, so-called typographical error, and that matter was raised also to the Municipality of Swan River when the First Minister of this province, in responding to the municipalities and the municipal governments in this province, sent out a type of a chain letter or a circular letter and said the acts of the Legislature shall be printed and published in both official languages. I wonder has he sent an apology to the Town of Grandview or has he sent a correction, because that has been raised several times.

I wonder if the Honourable Member for Swan River has got any information back from the government or

from the First Minister on this same subject matter; and if we're not getting any more action out of the First Minister on this issue than I've seen up-to-date, I doubt very much that either Grandview or Swan River have a response to this date.

That's the shoddy manner in which they're handling this thing, Mr. Speaker. That's another example of their lack of interest in the wishes of the people, their lack of interest in what's going on out in the country, the lot of things about this resolution and these changes that are before us, Mr. Speaker, complete chaos. What other word can I say?

I would like now to deal with the proposal that's been laid on our desk by the Union of Municipalities in the province, and that is an interesting one; a proposal whereby the Union of Municipalities has seen fit, Mr. Speaker, to lay their concerns on the desk for this government to deal with. To the best of my knowledge, they have not received any answers to date. In fact, the last I heard was that the First Minister and the Attorney-General didn't stay long enough at the meeting to give them some of the information that they were looking for; but here is what the 123 municipalities in this province were opposed to the way the government's handling this resolution in its present form have said. It says that a very significant majority of the members of the union and a very large percentage of the citizens of this province oppose the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as presented by the Government of Manitoba.

Is anybody prepared to stand up there and dispute that statement? Has anybody stood toe-to-toe with your reeves and councillors and said you're wrong, your figures are wrong, your facts are wrong. No, they haven't Mr. Speaker.

It goes on here, Mr. Speaker, the municipality says, "It's not that we oppose French language services when it's needed or requested, but we feel that the application of such service should be entirely up to the Provincial Government to administer and should not be entrenched in the Constitution and left to the decisions of the courts of law in Canada to enforce."

Is the Attorney-General prepared to deal with that one and assure the Union of Municipalities in this province that he'll provide amendments for the Union of Municipalities on that subject matter and alleviate those concerns, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I doubt it. I don't think he has. That's another reason why we're standing here today debating, struggling and fighting this issue.

It goes on here, Mr. Speaker, and the municipalities say, "The program, as suggested, leaves itself wide open to challenge by any person or group, as to the limited service given or significant demand made for such services. We would forever be faced with court rulings by any individual or groups of people."

Did the Attorney-General or the First Minister or the Minister of Municipal Affairs or any Minister of Government tell the Union of Municipalities like Shellmouth, who are in my constituency, that they're wrong on this matter, that they're going to bring in amendments or changes in this package to satisfy their needs? No, I don't think they have, Mr. Speaker. So until the municipalities of the province get some answers and get some solutions to the matters they raised, do you think that we're going to walk away and leave them? You think the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs

will walk away and leave the municipalities in Gimli out to dry on this issue? He shouldn't, if he does. He shouldn't do it. I wouldn't do it. My colleagues over here wouldn't leave the municipalities out to dry on this issue, no way. I think that's one of the problems the members opposite have got. The Member for Dauphin, I think, has a real problem, because he's got himself dug in on this issue. I talked to the reeve the other day about the problems that the Member for Dauphin faces on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the municipalities go on and they go through this paper and they raise many many points. "We know for a fact," it says, "that it will affect the Civil Service, agriculture reps, nurses, labour, teachers and many more in the hundreds of government agencies and Crown Corporations." Has any member over there told the municipalities that's not going to happen; that they're wrong; that they're not interpreting this accord correctly?

They just sit there like a bunch of dummies, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they don't say anything. I don't think they know anything; they don't hear anything; they don't say anything on this issue. They're absolutely scared to open their mouths and that's too bad, that is too bad, Mr. Speaker, on a matter such as this. This shoddy, careless, ill-informed government don't have the guts and courage to stand up and debate and fight this issue the way it should be fought and give us the package, give us the amendments, give us the whole deal. Tell us who had the first meeting; tell us where the whole thing started; and tell us why you don't have a mandate; why you don't have a consensus; why it wasn't in the Throne Speech. Why? Those are all legitimate questions on this subject, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and they deserve answers.

Let's look at some more things that the municipalities have raised in their paper. They get into the cost factor and I wonder how the Attorney-General or the First Minister - it says here, "The French Language Program as it exists today costs the taxpayers \$1.7 million annually. If it's expanded as indicated to all departments and government agencies, Crown Corporations, electoral office, Office of the Ombudsman, it's conceivable to see the cost double and triple from year to year."

Are the Union of Municipalities who are trying to protect the interest of the taxpayer in this province wrong, by making those calculations and estimations, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Has the First Minister or the Attorney-General given them new figures in there, to assure them that their estimate is wrong? No, they haven't said a word. Why doesn't the Minister of Government Services come into the debate and correct some of these things that the Union of Municipalities are asking? He's got a lot of municipalities in his constituency; he's the Minister of Government Services. Why doesn't he stand up and answer all these many questions that we're asking? Give us the answers.

I don't know why they don't, Mr. Speaker, and until they do, we're not going to go away, because as the union said, for four bucks a person, we are not prepared to give concessions that could plunge you for all time to come in costs and legal wranglings. So, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and the people of this province and these honourable members opposite, I will be here until this matter is resolved if, for no other reason, on behalf

of the people in my constituency and for the municipalities in this province, who I think have to be recognized. We have to stand behind them and we have to fight on their behalf, because they can't sit in these seats today and deal with this matter.

I am also concerned about this government, their lack of courage; their lack of fortitude; their lack of integrity; their lack of honesty; their lack of dealing and understanding as to what the people of this province want to do on subject matters such as this. I ask them again and I plead; please listen to what we're saying; please support our amendments. If not, you are the ones that are going to pay the consequences because, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, when we go to the people on this issue, I doubt if they'll come back with more than three of the members sitting opposite there right today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think I heard somebody yell the question on the other side, and I wonder if that individual has been attending the House in the last few days or not, because he must be dreaming, because the message has been given very clearly from us, it's not going to be dealt with that easily.

Mr. Speaker, I found the remarks of the Member for Springfield very interesting. I think he's feeling his oats a little bit now, today after the announcement of Jake Epp, that he would not be in the provincial leadership. I think even his colour looked a little better today because I think he's been having a nightmare for months, and one of the reasons for the pallor on his face has been the fact that I think he expected that a federal member would be running for the provincial leadership and maybe running in his seat. I think he looks a lot better today, but I think he should maybe reconsider that position because that will not help him anyway. He will not be here anyway after the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to speak to this resolution yesterday and have the occasion again today. I have no difficulty speaking on the resolution again, on the amendment, and as I indicated yesterday in my remarks, why is it that speaker after speaker on this side can get up and speak with dedication and conviction on this subject, and as I indicated yesterday, because we know we are right. In debating this issue here day after day, hour after hour, the one impression that I've got is - and it brings an old saying to mind - none are so deaf as those that do not want to hear, and that's exactly what's happening with the Government of the Day. They don't want to listen to us in this House; they do not want to listen to the public outside, because if members would go out and make contact with their constituencies and their people, their advisors, they would be starting to get a message. I believe, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid to go out there because we've had indications already and it's building all the time, that their own organizations are getting upset with their position. And they refuse to change their position. It's been overheard and one should not necessarily repeat

comments or gossip in the halls, but it's been heard to say one of the Ministers of the Crown had indicated we'd better move this through fast because we're in trouble with this one. That's just what we've heard down the halls, Mr. Speaker, but we believe that is the case. That is the message that we're getting out from the constituency.

Every time after we've been through a day of debate on this issue here, and it gets tiring in this heat, we go back home and I check around with the people, talk to various business people, constituents, people from other constituencies, and I ask are we on the right track? Are we doing the right thing? What is the message? And it comes back stronger and clearer all the time, stay in there and fight because what the government is doing or trying to do is not right. It is not acceptable and this is what we've been telling them and telling them and telling them.

That's why yesterday in my remarks I said, if you are convinced of being right as we are, then you should have no trouble bringing in closure on the resolution and then go out and have the hearings, but you're not convinced that you are right. The message is coming to each one of you whether you admit it or not, you're getting a lot of negative reaction; you have within your own caucus. There are members already that have bolted and created big problems for you. The Member for Elmwood has been doing on his own and I don't like to give a member of the NDP necessarily any credit, but you have to say as many other people have said, he's had the guts of his conviction and his constituency to stand up and fight his own government, and he's been ridiculed by his colleagues, by his Ministers. They like to shunt him out. They don't have the guts to do it. They want to throw him out of there, but they don't have the guts to do it

A MEMBER: Why don't they throw him out?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Because of the issue, Mr. Speaker. They are not sure of their ground or else they would have kicked out anybody that would rebel as the Member for Elmwood has to the government, should have been heisted out of that seat and sitting over here with the Member for Brandon West.

Then they play the shell game. The Member for Springfield all over the place telling us our problems with Mulroney at a time when the polls are indicating 55 percent for the PCs and Mulroney, and he says we have a problem with that. Well, look at your problem. You have a problem right in this House, more than one. Many of your members are starting to have second thoughts because the people are getting to them. You must be getting phone calls like we are getting - and not in support. There is a small core that is giving support, and you've been snookered in a bad deal with the Attorney-General, the Premier, the Federal Government. You've been snookered and you can't get out of it. You can, but you'll have to bend, and nobody wants to do that, you don't want to do that.

I know for a fact that the Member for St. Johns must be having all kinds of qualms in his mind. He sits here because he's a token member in the government. I don't mean that as an insult. I mean he's sitting on the backbench, and he has to go the way the front bench says, but he knows in his guts he is wrong.

The Member for The Pas, you know, I sort of find the man an enjoyable individual, and I think he's got relatively strong principles. He doesn't feel comfortable with this in spite of the fact that he smiles and says - it's okay, my people are for it. They are not. But he's a likeable guy and, you know, I'll accept that to some degree.

The Member for Springfield could not defend the position what they were doing. He was all over the field or all over the House, let's say, in his comments about his position.

Yes, then there's the Member for Ellice who is running for the mayorship in this fair city of ours, who's been on Peter Warren and on all kinds of programs indicating that maybe the government has not been moving in the right direction. It's there all over; everybody knows it, and you know it. Then they say we're filibustering. I don't care what you call it, we are here to defend the rights of Manitobans and will continue to do that. Call it filibuster if you like but I say we are sure of our ground and you are not of yours. I don't think anybody on that side is.

Yes, possibly the Member for Radisson because I think he's - I think the Member for Radisson is, you know, believes in that cause. I think he's sincere and I don't necessarily agree with the position that he's taken when we, some of us, defend our rights; that we are called bigots, things of that nature. But, Mr. Speaker, I still will allow him that. But there are so many members out there on that side who must have great difficulty with this. Now, continue from there.

Why is there suspicion developing out there? I covered some of that ground yesterday in my remarks. Why would we, and why would the public start having suspicions? Why do we have that deep conviction that we're right? Because of the way you're handling the whole situation. You're handling it poorly. Much of your controversial legislation you've handled very poorly. You have. I'll refer to the seat belt legislation. Why are you imposing things on people in this province that are not desired, not wanted?

Bill 90, I want to just refer back to that famous manifesto and we've used that many times but - quality of life it says here. This is the Howard Pawley manifesto signed by him where he says, a fair chance for all. And a little quotation that I'd like to put in, "Discrimination and prejudice still tarnish our social fabric. As Manitobans, we want a government which will protect the rights of all our people." That was Pawley's statement. And are they doing that? Are they following the wishes of public? We have in Bill 90, and I would just warrant a guess, but I'd say anywhere in the percentage of 90 percent of the beef people in this province were supportive of the MCPA. I think about 10 percent opposed it, and that 10 percent, of course, supported Bill 90. They forced it through.

This is a government that indicated all the time, we're going to be an open government and we're going to listen to people. Well, we've seen their example of how they listen to people. They have, yes. Sometimes they've listened a little bit, but they've always gone their way and never have gone with the way the people wanted. Ironically, we all get elected in this House on the basis of a majority, each individual. The government gets elected on the basis of a majority. They had more seats than us in '81; as a result they're the government,

unfortunate as that is now in the eyes of the people of Manitoba because if they could redo that now, there would be major changes.

Anyway, be that as it may, we all work on the basis of majority. Why would we not then, on a contentious issue of this nature, why would we not use that same approach? Why do we not let the majority of the people decide? I think that's the fairest way that anything could be handled especially something that is turning out to be a very, very important controversial issue.

You know, the Member for Roblin-Russell invited them to call an election on it. Well, with the kind of material that these people have submitted in this Session, aside from this very important bilingual issue it would be - we would welcome it. I think the people of Manitoba would welcome it. But we know, realistically, that this is not the kind of approach they will take to this. But I also have a suggestion, and for people who have said all the time, tell us what you would want us to do and we will listen - they don't listen, Mr. Speaker. They never change their position. They've had all kinds of advice on this issue from people here and they've had it from their own people. We know many key organizers have been phoning them and telling them, change your position. This is big trouble, and it will stick with you a long time.

You think that, because you've indicated in your brochure that the effects are not going to be felt until 1986 in terms of translation, 1987 in terms of some of the services provided - uh-uh, this issue's going to stick. The restraint that you hung on us at a time when we were giving good government, starting in '77, stuck to some degree and one of the reasons why possibly we lost the election. It's going to be interesting to see how the Minister of Finance is going to cope with the situation in the next year.

I think many words and speeches may be read back to him that happened. I don't know whether it's necessarily right. I believe that possibly the position they've taken may be needed, more needed because of the stupid squandering of money that they've done in many of their programs, in much of their advertising. What I would like to suggest is that if we believe in democracy and that majority rules, why don't we allow the Municipal Councils to have a ballot on this, a referendum on it? Many of them will have anyway. You know they're going to be having those. The City of Winnipeg is contemplating having one. That would give a listening government the best consensus you could ever have. Why don't the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Attorney-General and the First Minister indicate to the councils, put it on a referendum basis?

The elections are automatically being held this year, I believe the 23rd of October, if I'm correct. Why not tag this on? In the meantime, you can do all the promotion work you want. You go out and sell your position to everybody in Manitoba, every Manitoban. You'd have lots of time. You've spent a lot of money now; you might as well spend more. Tell them all your story.

A MEMBER: The Attorney-General calls that the tyranny of the majority.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I realize that, Member for Morris, but I also indicated we all got elected on the basis of

a majority in this House here, so I feel that would be a reasonable approach, that each municipality put it on their ballots. Simple, not very costly. It would be interesting.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Roblin-Russell indicated that 90 percent or 99 percent were opposed to it. I cannot really venture to guess - or the opposition - but anybody who is in politics and gets out and speaks to people can get a feedback, and we've been getting that and they've been getting it, but they don't want to hear it. They want to shy away from that. Why would you not allow the municipalities to do that? Many are going to do it and it's going to make you look foolish when you see the results.

You could save yourself the embarrassment of having them do it on their own, piecemeal, and then see the results and know that you've made an error. The results of the Member for Elmwood, to date, should be an indication to you - and he still calls himself an NDP. I don't know why, after the treatment that you gave him.

A MEMBER: I wouldn't treat my dog that way.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I don't think anybody would stand that abuse, but he is a gutsy man . . .

A MEMBER: If he were an animal, you'd report the situation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . he is staying there in that seat calling himself an NDP, voting with them on other issues of his principle and you have to admire him for that. Knowing the spending habits of the NDP and I want to say this tongue-in-cheek to the Member for Elmwood, I will be watching how he spends all that money that he's been collecting. I hope it will be spent for a good cause.

As I indicated, the Member for St. Johns is here now. I wonder what his feeling is as an individual about this issue, aside from party lines now. What would happen to the group over there if the Whip got taken off. We'd see the splintering. I suspect there might only be the Attorney-General and the Member for Radisson that would support it with conviction. Others, I would have my doubts about — (Interjection) —

Well, the Minister of Natural Resources, I have difficulty with him at the best of times, and I have just given him permission to go out and check out the beaver situation. I told him that I would be one of the fellows that would be prepared to pair with him, because I told him that the acrimony in the House would lessen by 50 percent if he's out there checking the beavers.

Mr. Speaker, the process is another thing that has, I think, everybody concerned and has raised suspicion. It has raised suspicion. I wonder who has done the planning behind this. Is it the Member for Transcona who is the brain child in terms of the promotional program, how the steps are supposed to be taken? He did a remarkable job in the last election, maybe too good a job.

Why, for example, would this kind of advertising have to go out? The money was spent sending out this brochure, and it's been raised again. Why would you put an expensive ad in papers telling there is a brochure coming? We all have — (Interjection) — yes, I made

reference to the paper before. We all have the opportunity to send out franking pieces. This is our way. I think each member here has a privilege of sending a franking piece once a year. We have legislation now that will allow - I don't know how many franking pieces a year. It's part of the propaganda machine, but this kind of machine here that has been used, I have great difficulty, very much difficulty with that.

If the members opposite do not believe that the public is not concerned about it, we have had very little defense coming from anybody on the issue or on the process. The debate, those few that have spoken in a vacuum, and indicating that we're filibustering.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some comments on the brochure that was sent out. There are a few things that I find very interesting with this, and I want to read part of it. "Limited services simply means most people will not be affected. Limited services will allow Manitobans to communicate with certain Provincial Government offices and agencies in the official language of their choice if they desire. This is nothing new," it says. "A French Language Services Program has existed here since 1980, and will continue." Then what is this all about?

"By 1987, French language services will be provided in those areas of the province where there is significant demand." Now how do we establish significant demand? I find it very interesting. I can see significant demand in some of my municipalities, some of my communities, but supposing in Dominion City. Let's suppose that an individual comes in there, talks to the secretary of the Franklin Municipality in French, and the poor secretary, man or woman, cannot respond in French. Does that then justify that individual to take that case to court to have his proper rights, or who would decide that question? See, this is the concern that is developing.

I'm getting on the issue a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose it's hard to keep away from that, but I can imagine many instances where an individual, once this is through, would take and test it. We're concerned about the court issues, and there is reference to this, too.

"What is this French language business all about?" it says. "Simply, it's a proposed solution to a possible legal challenge in the Supreme Court of Canada which could have struck down all of Manitoba laws." And underlined it says, "To avoid the possibility of legal chaos which might have resulted from a Supreme Court imposed ruling on language rights, your Manitoba government worked out a proposal which would bring the legal challenge to an end."

Mr. Speaker, I'm not an attorney; I'm not a lawyer; I'm just a layman. But to me, my impression would be that by passing this kind of a thing we would open up everything to the legal challenge. I would think so. I think everybody would want to go the legal route and have the courts decide as to whether you had French rights or whether you had English rights. There must be an endless realm of possibilities of court cases stemming from something like this, plus the fact that we have just got actually our Constitution here. We're talking of amending it and, in my mind at least, and maybe in the minds of many people, is this the only opportunity that Manitobans will have to change the Constitution? I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, I would like

somebody to answer that. December 31, 1983, is that the deadline and no more changes forever? Do we only have one chance to change the Constitution? If it is, if we only have one chance, all the more reason, let's take our time, because it is a contentious issue at this present time, it's getting to be more so and will continue to be more so unless they know what they are doing.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker. It seems that we get caught up in the activity of this House and there's been speculation that we'll be sitting here, maybe adjourning for Christmas. The Member for Springfield was being satirical when he says, well, we probably won't have a long weekend off at Christmas because we didn't like to work long weekends. It's that kind of philosophy on a serious issue that sort of bothers me a little bit.

I want to continue with some of this in the brochure here, Mr. Speaker. "At the same time it will provide limited French language services in the province through a constitutional amendment." That is, I think, what the fight is about - the entrenchment of that kind of thing. It says, "Since 1870, Manitoba's Constitution, The Manitoba Act," and my colleague from Assiniboia covered that real well in reading out exactly what The Manitoba Act read and the provisions that it made, "has allowed for us the use of English or French in debates of the Legislature and require that both languages be used in the records and Journals of the House." The Manitoba Act also said, "Either language can be used in either court. Further, the act then required that all our laws had to be enacted in both languages. The Supreme Court challenged our rules out of a law passed in 1890 which declared Manitoba an English-only province, and it was this law the Supreme Court declared invalid in 1979. In 1983, the Supreme Court could have ruled all Manitoba laws invalid as they were passed and printed in English only. The agreement between Manitoba and Canada avoids this risk and offers an acceptable and reasonable settlement for all."

Mr. Speaker, that borders on scare tactics, this kind of thing, to indicate if they had not settled under the agreement that they have, and they still haven't told us what it is, how it was arrived at. That, they keep behind the scenes. But they use this kind of scare tactic to say, if we hadn't settled with the SFM on that particular case there would have been chaos in the province; no laws have been valid.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine some countries in this world maybe, where that might have been the case, depending on the governments, but certainly in spite of the fact that we criticize our Liberal Federal Government from time to time about being a bit of a derelict kind of government, certainly the judges that are in our system at the present time would never allow this kind of thing. But they use that. They use it to try and scare people to accept this. This whole brochure is on the verge of being deceitful. If they had wanted to be sincere, why didn't they put the whole agreement in here and then let everybody interpret it, and those who had questions - you know they have a phone number on here, you can phone if you had any question - if they had the agreement in there and those that had problems with the agreement, they could then phone. They could phone and check out what the problem was or their interpretation of it. But the Government of the Day is handling it in a suspicious

manner, and the more we push, the more they put the brakes on, the more suspicious everybody gets.

Then, on the brochure as well, a personal message from the Attorney-General: "Dear Fellow Manitobans," and I have my doubts whether that is genuine. "This folder has been prepared for you to explain the fact that Manitoba is not going bilingual. We are meeting our constitutional obligations. I urge you to take time to read it. Our government has a constitutional commitment to Manitobans and to Canadians. With your support and understanding we look forward to fulfilling that commitment in a practical, just and economical way." Then, again, the phone number where you could get the information.

Mr. Speaker, the way the brochure was presented when questioning the price of it - we were told it costs \$28,000 - why didn't the Attorney-General frankly indicate the cost, plus the mailing, the whole ball of wax. We almost have to use a crowbar to pry out the information on these things, making us more suspicious all the time and basically that they're not forward with us.

Now, we say, let's take our time, let's go to the people and get the gut reaction. As I indicated yesterday in my remarks, the hearings that were held - well, they weren't really hearings, they were propaganda meetings that were held, in my opinion, with time limits on, rush rush job in a few key areas - all they did was arouse more suspicion. And, Mr. Speaker, I know by the fact that we are debating it here on a daily basis, that it is creating more suspicions in the minds of people because they are finally starting to question things that they took for granted before, that this government was honourable and forthright.

They now realize what we have known for a long time, that they are not capable of running a government properly, and certainly not this issue. At a time, and I have to repeat this, during August, the hottest days of the year - and we are in the midst of it, the Minister of Energy yesterday said another four to six weeks, we've already broken the record, I think, a couple of weeks ago or 10 days ago - we're still not going anywhere. Why won't you listen? None are so deaf as those who refuse to hear, and you are refusing to hear. You are not listening to your people; you're not listening to the opposition. But we will be here; we will be here as long as it takes for you to treat the people of Manitoba in a proper manner.

Maybe it would be advisable if the members opposite, maybe if we took a break, I think the fact that they've been tied up here for a long time in this House with government business or whether it is a certain amount of fear that they have of going back and really hearing the message, but it might be advisable if we maybe took off for a month. Everybody go back home and listen to your people, and then come back and let's see what everybody has to say. You might change your position as government on many things. We might not proceed with third readings on many of these things, but you've been here; you have been hiding in this House. You have been not getting out there and getting the message from the people, in spite of what you say.

You can get out there and you can convince individuals on a one-to-one basis, yes, we're doing the right thing. But if you go out there and just ask, what do you think? What do you think of seat belt legislation?

What do you think of Bill 90? What do you think of The School Tax Act or The School Act - I had them listed here somewhere, a bunch of these things - Elections Finance Act. Just ask them without trying to influence them. Ask them what their gut reaction is so far.

A MEMBER: Don't you tell them. Just ask them.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Then we'll come back in a month's time. Acrimony might have been gone. You might want to change your position in many of these cases, because maybe you will have had the time to listen to people.

A government that listens is what you've told us. That's what you actually sold the people initially. You sold the people of Manitoba the thought initially, we are an open government, we will listen to you. You know what? You snookered them. They elected you as government and are paying the price now. They are paying the price now, and it has been indicated by many members. If we had an election now - never mind, on this issue alone - I'll tell you something. — (Interjection) — You said it. We could put them right into this corner here, in the opposition. That's where they would be sitting.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to some of the members. Would that not be a reasonable suggestion? We have a lot of work left ahead of us. It will give you a chance to have a breather. Give everybody a chance to have a little holiday. We'll kick off our leadership campaign somewhere along the line. You can have fun with this when you come back. But it would give everybody a breather. It gives a chance to get the gut reaction from the people, because you're not going out to your constituencies and touring. Go out and tour. Don't go and see the ones that are convinced, dedicated NDP. Even they will tell you.

Many of the calls that we are receiving in our office, much of the response we're getting is from your support. They say, you know what? We are sorry we voted NDP. We will never do that again. I personally believe, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP have defeated themselves already regardless of what happens, because they let the people down. They will not listen to the people.

When they had these informational meetings, they stacked them as much as they could. We know that. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take very much to figure out the percentage of people that are supportive of this. It doesn't. When you have 6 percent of the people of Manitoba who are French-speaking and out of those, Mr. Speaker - I have a bunch of them - to them, it's a non-issue, many of them. It is a handful of people, and you are catering to them.

You did that with Bill 90 under The Manitoba Cattle Producers Association bill, to a handful of people, the National Farmers Union. But for the teachers now, when we look at The Schools Act, now because they have a bunch of teachers there, that's a little different game. I think they are going to be getting a message on that one too at the mass meetings that are being conducted right now. I am sure they are getting a strong, strong message. The Minister won't meet them now. See, this is the government that listens.

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, why? Why are we so adamant? Why do we feel so confident that we're right?

Because we are right. That is where the doubt is in the government's mind. There is doubt in your minds, almost every one of you. Why do you push then? You know, anybody that has been getting up to make a speech on the matter, especially there haven't been too many, there is virtually no defense. There is no defense from your side. You try to gloss the thing over, but we have drawn up enough concerns.

Almost every one of our speakers, some have spoken three and four times on the issue. You know what? The speeches aren't that repetitive, because we speak from the heart. We speak with conviction. Many of us aren't that polished speakers as you have, for example, in the front benches, some of our front bench. Why can we speak that way? Because we know we are right. When will you accept that fact?

You are treating the people of Manitoba in a very derogatory manner. You got elected first by saying you'll listen. You do not listen. You do not even want to have proper hearings out in the area. The Premier gave in a little bit, says we'll have a few rural hearings. Where are you going to have one? Are you going to have one in Vita or St. Pierre? Oh no, that's not big enough, because you want to ram this through. But rightfully, you should have one in every constituency. Every constituency should have the right to have a meeting and not to have a railroad job done on them or propaganda machine put to work on them, to have a proper hearing. Have both sides express their views; all ethnic groups express their views. Why won't you do it? Because you know you're wrong and you are afraid to do it.

The Attorney-General has got you all where he wants you, in the palm of his hand. I'm sure even the Premier isn't satisfied with the situation. Nobody is. You cannot defend your position to the people of Manitoba. Now that is, I believe, why you didn't want to have the intersessional hearings. You know already what the message is going to be. You know you're going to get slaughtered on it. That is why you're trying to ram this through here. Then you figured, you'd have the hearings in there; you'd sit four nights right around the clock; everybody would wear out. The last ones you can cut off like you did with the seat belt legislation and - bang! - you come back and put it through. Uh-uh, uh-uh. It's not going to happen that way. The issue is too vital. We will accept it with some of the other legislation, but we won't with this.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all have a moral obligation to get up here and defend, first of all, what we think is right. I think we also have a moral obligation to defend what our people think is right, what our constituents think. It is for that reason that I am suggesting, let's have a meeting in every constituency so that the people know what you're doing with something like this, because we are affecting rights here. We are affecting fundamental rights. I could tell you - it's not proper to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to have my dad and my granddad - well he's not around anymore - but I would like to have my dad come in here and tell you about rights, what rights they had when they were in Russia.

Gradually what you are doing, you're taking away the rights of people. You are. You don't believe it, but every time we pass a law, we take away a few more rights. That's what happened to my forefathers. They

fled that country with nothing and were happy to come here, asked very little to build in this country, living neighbour with neighbour. They didn't care who it was. My Mennonite parents didn't care whether it was Ukrainian or French or Anglo Saxon - they don't care who was living beside them. When they needed help, then went and asked. When the neighbour asked, they gave help. That kind of relationship built this country, made us strong. And what are we doing? We're starting to rip the guts out of it. Seemingly you don't care. I find it most amazing.

Mr. Speaker, there's one little point that I forgot to mention here. I want to get back to the propaganda sheet. I find that actually, you know, looking at it it's a very colorful type of thing. I'm looking at it to get the impression that the people that are on there, they're basically from all walks of life and these would be the people that are very supportive of it.

I don't know where they got the pictures from, Mr. Speaker. I just happen to know that some of these people that are in the pictures here, that those pictures were taken 12 years ago, and those people have never been asked whether it can be used. But they used it to give the impression, you know, this is the concept, everybody's supportive of it. This is the kind of thing that is getting people upset out there.

Mr. Speaker, I can start my speech all over again, and I realize that I'm running on a bit of a time schedule here but I assume I will have more opportunities to debate this unless this government is finally going to wake up and go out and listen to what we're saying, and listen to what the people are saying.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to be able to cover all my material, I suppose, because my throat's getting dry, but I'm sure not running out of ideas.

I wonder how many of the members of the government side have received copies of the - well, they must be receiving mail, we're all receiving mail. But there's one specific one that was addressed to Honourable Howard Pawley, QC - and they didn't use the letter "A." either. That's quite a document and most of our people have copies of it. But I won't read it all, I just want to read portions of it. I don't mind tabling it but I'm sure everybody has one. If they haven't on the other side I think it might be an enlightening thing.

Anyway on Page 3, and this individual is writing a very comprehensive letter covering it all, and I have to feel so strongly in agreeing with her. The area that'll cover those: "Mr. Penner speaks of unity. Unity cannot be legislated. There was more unity and pride in Canada when I was a child than there is today," this individual says. "There were no freebies. Everybody worked hard and knew how to have fun with little money. Flags decked the outsides of our homes. Picnics were the order of the day. Each family had a display of fireworks, not necessarily elaborate but adequate, on Dominion Day. We didn't require a government to expend millions of our dollars on advertising to tell us to celebrate Canada's birthday. We did that on our own. Nor was taxpayers' money thrown at us to pay for our celebrations. We had self respect, and our commemorative expenses, meagre or otherwise were our responsibility."

I take that out of the whole concept of the four-page letter; I'll save some of that for the later speech, Mr.

Speaker, but that is the guts of what it's all about. You cannot legislate unity. That has to be developed. I don't know where they get the concept that they can do it with this kind of thing because what they're doing, they are creating acrimony in the province. They're creating problems, and they will not listen. They have let down the people of Manitoba to such an extent that I personally feel they should not continue running this province. If they were conscientious about it - but of course they are not - they would call an election on the issue.

Many suggestions have flowed from our side, some probably a little bit far-fetched, but some good stuff has come forward in terms of how you can handle the situation. As you can see here today, you know, the interest in any of the comments that I have made, nobody cares. You're time will come when you will think back on this. The people of Manitoba will tell you, and if we have a choice right now we will give that choice to them a lot sooner than you may be anticipating.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've sat and listened to the very eloquent dissertation by my colleague, the Member for Emerson. Before that I heard a speech that I feel rates with some of the great speeches that have been made in this House, and it was made by my friend and colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell. Both those speeches, Mr. Speaker, deal with people and how people are used by government and various levels of government. I think that is so fundamentally important to this issue that until somebody on the other side removes their blinkers, takes their blind-headed approach and shoves it, and says, okay, we will listen to reason; until that happens, Mr. Speaker, we, the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition will fulfill the mandate that is ours at the present time, and we will oppose bad legislation. We will oppose it with every ounce of strength we have, with every legitimate means possible to us, and we will do it within the confines of this Assembly and within the confines of the Rules of the House regardless of what the Member for Springfield may say. We will do it in the proper manner.

That is something maybe the Member for Springfield doesn't understand. I know there are many things he doesn't understand, but I don't wish to deal too much with the Member for Springfield at this particular time. If there's any time left at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I may deal with some of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, why are we doing this? Well, I can tell you some of the reasons why. Some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, are because this government cannot be trusted. You cannot believe anything that this government tells you and take it for gospel truth because it almost always ends up as something different occurring.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a press release of March 21, 1982. Now that's some 16 - 17 months ago, Mr. Speaker. The headline of the press release is "Pawley announces French language services policy. A series of policy

guidelines concerning the provision of French language services in the Government of Manitoba was announced March 21st by Premier Howard Pawley in an address to the annual meeting of the Société Franco-Manitobaine in St. Boniface."

He didn't say this in the House. It was a policy of the government. Surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, the House was sitting at the time but he didn't announce it in the House. Maybe they have no respect for the parliamentary system. I have to come to that conclusion. But it has been a time-honoured tradition, Mr. Speaker, that whenever policy of government is announced and the House is in Session, that it be announced in the House - but so much for tradition and so much for protocol and so much for the Legislative Assembly. I believe, and I have to because I have seen many other announcements by the Premier, that he doesn't really care too much for this Assembly. I would only have to assume that because he makes most of his announcements outside of this place and heaven knows what kind of announcements he's making now because - I apologize, Mr. Speaker, you're not supposed to talk about the presence or absence of any member - well, I'll go on anyway.

"The announcement follows a period of consultation within government departments and with the Franco-Manitoban community to identify areas where a practical and reasonable application of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act should be in business. The validity of Section 23 giving official status to English and French was reaffirmed in December, 1979 by the Supreme Court of Canada. Premier Pawley said that parallel to the policy on French language services, the Provincial Government will establish a multicultural council and formulate a policy in multiculturalism in Manitoba."

So far, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with anything that the Premier has said up to that point, but his next paragraph is where the Premier goes off the tracks and I would suggest that having once gone off the track, he has convinced many of his other colleagues to follow that course of action and that's probably why we're in the debate today, and this is what the Premier said: "Manitoba is the only province that is officially bilingual and fully multicultural." That was the statement of the Premier of the province on March 21, 1982.

Sure, it's a wrong statement. It's a wrong statement because we just had it the other day from the Attorney-General who put out a \$28,000 brochure and it says, headlines: "Manitoba is not becoming bilingual." Well, who do you believe? Do you believe the Attorney-General, or do you believe the Premier, or do you half believe the Premier and half believe the Attorney-General, because I suspect if you study the statements that have been put out by the various Ministers on the other side, there are more that are half truths than there are that are gospel truth.

So, I point that out, Mr. Speaker, and I borrowed this pamphlet from the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek just to verify what I was sure was in that pamphlet, but the headline on the pamphlet, it says: "Facts about French language services." And the very first statement is: "Manitoba is not becoming bilingual." Well, somebody is wrong. I will now return this pamphlet to you.

Mr. Speaker, if you start from that premise as the Premier did when he said Manitoba is the only province

that is officially bilingual and fully multicultural; now, I don't know about the multiculturalism that exists in New Brunswick, but I was always of the belief that New Brunswick was the only officially bilingual province in Canada. So, maybe the Premier is correct when he says that Manitoba is the only official bilingual province, but I would suspect that the Premier is wrong. I would suspect the Premier was wrong on March 21, 1982; I suspect the Premier was wrong in April, 1982 and again in May and in June, 1982. I suspect he was wrong in December of 1983; I suspect he is wrong in July and even in August of 1983 because, Mr. Speaker, there is seldom anything that this Premier has done that is right. There is seldom anything that he has done that is right.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier said on another occasion, it may have been a typographical error, but this happened 16 months ago. There was no hint at that time of correcting it as a typographical error, so I would suspect that the Premier wishes to use typographical errors only when he's caught in a trap and uses it as a means of escape.

He is not the only one, Mr. Speaker, he is not the only one. I understand that we had another one of his colleagues today who appeared before a hearing, a federal hearing, and in answer to questions that were put to him this morning by my colleague, the Member for Arthur, he said he was going to present a brief that did not reflect the views expressed by Manitobans, did not reflect the views expressed by a committee of this legislature that was set up to travel around the province to hear the views of Manitobans. On the contrary, he said, "We are going to present our views. I will add a little thing at the bottom that these are the views of the committee, but I'm going to tell them that's what I think. It doesn't matter what the rest of the province thinks."

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the action of a government that represents people? Is that the action of a government that is responsible to the wishes and the needs of the community? Is that the action of a government that listens to people? Is that the action of a government that is acting in the best interests of people?

A MEMBER: No, no.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I think we are getting a fairly consistent message that this government is not acting in the interests of people; it's only acting in the interests of their own self-centred little tunnel-vision type programs that start from a false premise. I suggest they all started from the Premier's press release in March of last year, and I would think it was from that press release that this buildup started, because he was talking to the Franco-Manitoban Society then and he offered them hope and encouragement. I have nothing against the Franco-Manitoban Society. I do have something against this Premier, but I talked to members of the Franco-Manitoban Society. I talked to members of dozens and dozens of societies over the time, over the course of several years, and I find all of them to be excellent people and very interested in their own particular concerns.

I would suspect at that time that the Premier offered encouragement to the Franco-Manitoban Society,

probably encouraging them to bring forward their views. They would encourage them to try and do something that would bring into effect and would make effective a false statement of the Premier's, because the Premier had said that Manitoba is the only officially bilingual province. Well maybe, he recognized he had made a mistake but rather than correct it as a typographical error, he said, well, seeing as how I have said it, I will now go out and create it. I suspect that is what he has done.

So I would think that maybe this whole program has been orchestrated over a course of a year and a half and it is done by design, because I know they had numerous meetings. I know there were several proposals put forward. Some of them were fairly reasonable proposals. I know that there were also some suggestions put forward by the Honourable Serge Joyal. I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that in essence, if there were any major changes made, it was in response to the request, and I would even suggest maybe even demand, of the Honourable Serge Joyal.

I don't know what conditions were placed on that. I know the Honourable Minister of Finance doesn't do something for nothing. I know when he's looking for a tax shelter, he scurries all over the place. So I would suspect that the Minister of Finance, if he was involved in the transactions at all, would want his pound of flesh for making some concessions.

So what is the under-the-table deal from the Federal Government? We heard the Honourable Member for Elmwood ask the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, how much was available to the various ethnic groups in the province for this type of deal. I would suspect that really the big money, the big ante, is in the federal-provincial sweetheart deal. We will know in due course after this becomes a *fait accompli*, if it ever happens.

We would then know, because we do have a fairly good accounting system here in the Province of Manitoba. I take my hat off to the Department of Finance; I take my hat off to the Provincial Auditor. There is a fairly good system of accounting and if there is any wrongdoing, at some time or another it will show up, and we would be able to get the figures maybe two or three years from now. But by that time, Mr. Speaker, what is being proposed would be a *fait accompli*.

The interesting thing is that none of the proposals being put forward would come into effect until 1987. That is shades of George Orwell. Mr. Speaker, what is so important about 1987, to have this thing come into effect? I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even in the blackest of hearts of members opposite that there is some little sense of propriety and decency. There was that little whispering voice in the back says, but if we push it off until 1987, we know we're going to be defeated and the implementation of this, all the blame will fall on the next government. I would think that there is a little bit of - deep down in their hearts, they knew that if they pushed this thing through, that they are finished politically. But they said, we will get our pound of flesh and we will arrange it so that the blame will fall on those that assume government once they are properly and soundly defeated at the polls.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder — (Interjection) — All right. I know he's a kindly old gentleman. If he thinks

it is wrong, I will give him a chance. He can stand up afterwards and refute it. Why would you want 1987 as the implementation date? Just give me one good, quick reason. You can't, unless you want to tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered him the chance. When I have completed my remarks, I will expect the member to stand up and take part in the debate and give me his answer. I know he won't, because he hasn't got the heart to debate this amendment. He hasn't got it. Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the member that we are now on a new sub-amendment, so you have the opportunity. It's correct, it's a different — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. James chirps as usual from his seat, and he talks about principle. That's surprising, because everything I have seen of that gentleman in this House does not evidence one ounce of principle in the fellow. So when he talks about principle, let him be sure what he's talking about.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, when this amendment came up and it was accepted by the House, there was no outcry, no hue, no disagreement, but now the member chirps from his seat, the sparrow for St. James. Mr. Speaker, it makes me a little bit annoyed to have watched the actions of that honourable gentleman over the past several weeks in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I was persuaded to digress a bit from what really concerned me. When you see a government that goes through all the motions, goes out and holds hearings, sets up a legislative committee to travel the country on a very fundamental, important issue, according to their argument, and then when they have the results back - today we saw the evidence that they totally ignored that legislative committee, totally ignored the views expressed by Manitobans, and the cost of those hearings, Mr. Speaker, should be something that is a real concern.

If the people know that their views are going to be totally ignored, then I have to say that maybe we are in error when we suggest that this be referred to a committee of this Assembly. Maybe we are in error, because this government has just demonstrated today the dictatorial attitude that they take and the total disregard they have for the views of people as expressed in committees.

I would hope that the Minister of Transportation has the decency - the very least he could do is to send a copy of his brief to every person that attended the hearings and made presentations before that committee with a letter of explanation as to why he ignored the advice they gave him. I would think that's the very least that that Minister should do. If he chooses to ignore their advice, he had better tell them why, and he had better tell them what he did. So I would hope that the Minister of Transportation, the Minister of Highways, the former Minister of Agriculture and a man of many years standing in this House, a man whom I, at one time, had a great deal of respect for, why he would choose to ignore the advice that is given to him by a committee of this Assembly, a committee that he himself recommended be struck. If that is his attitude to the parliamentary system, then maybe the Member for Springfield is right . . .

A MEMBER: Shame, shame.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . when he says there is only one choice, either communism or fascism. But I think the Member for Springfield was only half right, and I'll deal with that after supper.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield talks about communism. He probably is sitting closer to it than I am but, Mr. Speaker, I have had experience with communism over the years. I well recall some 35 years ago or more attending school with a young person, at that time a very young person, who was quite fanatical in his espousing the communist cause. I was rather surprised over 35 years later to run across him again in this Assembly, but I was not surprised, as some other members of my caucus were, to hear him stand up on his very first speech in this House and say that his political philosophy has not changed. That didn't surprise me at all. So, Mr. Speaker, I fully understand why the Member for Springfield would make reference to communism.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have that type of government, bringing in legislation or proposals or resolutions of this kind, does it really mean anything? What will be the effect? Mr. Speaker, there are democratic communist governments elected in other parts of the country, this world. They have constitutions, and they have constitutions with far more clauses than ours. What does it do for the people that it is supposed to protect? What does it do for them? Is that what Manitobans are heading for?

Mr. Speaker, communism, in its finest form, claims to be a democratic government. They do hold elections. They hold elections in Russia. There's a crime if you don't vote, but you don't have much choice when it comes to marking your ballot. There isn't much choice on the ballot — (Interjection) — that's right. There isn't much choice left in Manitoba. We are seeing an example today of one party wiping themselves off the electoral ballot. That's provided that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . democracy is allowed to prevail when the next election is held.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few things about this proposed sub-amendment that I think we should really be concerned about. If this government is unwilling to listen to people, and we have seen evidence of that today; if this government is unwilling to go out and talk to people, and we have seen evidence of that again, they want to sit in here and hide; if this government continues to not tell the story as it exists and, Mr. Speaker, there is another word that could be used to describe that, then we have to fight for all that is common and decent in this province.

I heard the Honourable Member for Springfield trying to say that we were holding up the passage of legislation in this House. What a misconception of the truth. Mr. Speaker, we don't control the Order Paper, it's the Government House Leader. The Government House Leader has the control. Now, mind you, Mr. Speaker, there were many times in the past while, when we weren't too sure if the Government House Leader knew what he was doing. We do know that he has the control

of the order of business; he has the right to call a bill; he has the right to call a resolution. He has two or three resolutions on the Order Paper. He also has the right, if he so desires, to force this issue to an end. I don't think he would dare use that, because that would be stifling the expression of democracy and the opportunity for the opposition to do what it is supposed to do, and that is to oppose bad bad legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard an interesting proposal from the Honourable Member for Springfield. He threw out a challenge to this side of the House to bring in a resolution on the Constitution and we would get it on the floor immediately. What a laugh. My friend, the

Honourable Member for St. Norbert, did that on the first day that this House sat and they haven't called it yet. He did exactly that on the 3rd of December, 1982. — (Interjection)— Again, you hear the ignorance coming from the backbench over there.

Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

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

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