



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. 159A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 12 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 12 January, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement. More good news.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today this government has signed as part of the Economic Regional Development Agreements a Memorandum of Understanding with the Honourable Eugene Whelan, the Minister of Agriculture for Canada, to undertake initiatives in the entire agriculture community and the food processing industry. And I am proud to say as well that this is the first such agreement to be signed anywhere in Canada.

This agreement with a term of five years and worth \$38.3 million is more than double the \$18.5 million that was included in the previous Agro-Man Agreement. Manitoba's contribution to this new economic action is about \$15.3 million. The cost-sharing in the agreement, as in Agro-Man, is on a 60/40 basis.

In addition, the initiatives to be undertaken will be larger in scope than under Agro-Man.

It is significant to note that consultations with Manitoba's farm communities and farmers have and will continue to aid the process of identifying initiatives and determining priorities under this agreement.

Although the actual programs under the new subsidiary agreement are still being developed, initiatives encouraging greater productivity and improved market development for such key commodities as cereals and oilseeds, horticultural products, and livestock are being examined.

In addition, programs designed to improve the soil and water base of the province along with improving farm management are being investigated.

But, Mr. Speaker, this memorandum is just one of the economic initiatives and agreements that have been signed or are currently under way.

Agreements that will play a key role in strengthening the Manitoba economic base and in broadening and sustaining our recovery over the next several years.

For the information of members, I will table copies of these agreements now and provide a brief status report on the negotiations.

On November 25th, we were able to conclude negotiations on a new Canada-Manitoba Economic and Regional Development Agreement, a general co-ordinating or "umbrella" agreement, which will take place for 10 years, through March of 1994. The new agreement is a successor to the ten-year Canada-

Manitoba General Development Agreement, which expires a little less than three months from now, at the end of March.

Members will be aware that Manitoba was the first province in Canada to enter into a new "ERDA." We wanted to proceed as quickly as possible toward a new agreement to ensure that our economic development and our budget planning could proceed without undue delay. We did not want our plans and our priorities to be thrown off-track by last minute negotiating pressures.

In addition, of course, we recognized that the Federal Government has set aside only limited funds for regional development initiatives. It is this government's view that through our economic action we have been able to secure a fair share of those funds for the Province of Manitoba.

On November 25th, we finalized the Canada-Manitoba Subsidiary Agreement for Economic Development Planning. This is a five-year agreement which commits a total of \$3 million to a jointly-sponsored planning activity in Manitoba. A schedule attached to the agreement that has been tabled identifies initial priorities for federal-provincial review.

The same day, the Canada-Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement was concluded as well. Under that agreement, which has a five-year term, the Government of Canada has committed \$14.8 million and the Government of Manitoba \$9.9 million for a total of \$24.7 million in support of expanded mineral development in Manitoba. A summary of program plans is included in the agreement.

Our two governments also reached agreement on a document called the "Course of Action" for the coming year. Members will note that the "Course of Action" sets out a series of priorities for consultation and negotiation of further agreements. These include: Agricultural Development; Forest Renewal; Communications and Cultural Development; Tourism; and Transportation Development.

Overall, then, the agreements and memoranda concluded up to now specify combined federal and provincial economic development expenditures in Manitoba of more than \$340 million to be expended over the next five years. But that is not the final total, for the information of members of this Chamber.

It is our hope, it is our expectation, that by the end of the current fiscal year, we will have in place a full set of new agreements as outlined in the course of action.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that we would not have been able to come to this result as quickly if there had not been considerable goodwill and a major effort to co-operate on both sides.

I think these agreements are clear evidence that co-operative federalism can and will work; and most important, Mr. Speaker, what it will demonstrate is achievement for the future development of the progress of Manitoba in the years to come.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side, are always pleased to hear of new initiatives that are arrived at by the government on that side, in co-operation with the Federal Government, bringing announcements of substantial new investments of money in our province in areas of need.

In particular, we are pleased to hear that this is a continuation and perhaps even an expansion of the Agro-Manitoba Agreement that was signed by our government, by our former Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur, which was, at that time, a new initiative and a new thrust forward. We're delighted that that initiative continues under this government.

We're pleased, as well, to see that much of the dollars are going to be invested in the development of new market areas, new products, new agro-business opportunities in Manitoba, because those are things that have been sadly lacking under this government. Those are things that have been foregone opportunities for the past couple of years. In fact, that is one of the things that, as we travelled throughout the province in the past few months, Manitobans in rural agricultural areas told us that there was a tremendous need for and we're pleased that the government has finally become aware of the opportunities for further agro-business development.

We hope, since one of the components of this agreement will be things such as research, that the excellent facilities available at the University of Manitoba and the Department of Agriculture will be considered for part of the delivery of the research component, so that the staff and the facilities at the University of Manitoba Agriculture Faculty can continue to be of use in agricultural development in Manitoba. They have, of course, in the past been responsible for world renown developments of new products and new techniques and their facilities ought to be, we hope, a very substantial part of the initiatives that flow from this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we were surprised on this side, in arriving at an agreement to do with agriculture for our province, that part of the component of the agreement didn't involve a new federal-provincial beef or hog stabilization plan, one that the Minister has talked about and said has been a very high priority on his behalf. He has indicated this is something that his government wanted to work towards and we're surprised that in this initiative it is not a part nor it is a major part of the initiative that he has, in the past I suppose, been content to use only provincial tax dollars in those programs rather than transferred onto the kind of federal-provincial sharing that should be there for such a livestock stabilization program. However, perhaps that will be the subject of a future announcement.

Mr. Speaker, as well, of course, we wonder whether or not in these discussions the government brought to the attention of the Federal Government that Manitoba has led the way for all of Canada in terms of increases in farm bankruptcies during the past couple of years of the term of this government, that, in fact, during their term of office, farm bankruptcies are up some 400 percent in Manitoba. Those are things we wonder

whether or not this government is taking into consideration as it arrives at its federal-provincial agreements in cost-sharing.

We wonder as well whether or not the government brought up the plight of farmers caught in the cost-price squeeze that they are and whether or not they are working towards some long-term solutions in terms of long-term funding for the young farmer who is finding it difficult to obtain that kind of financing to stay in existence today in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see the government come forward with this agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: It is, of course, at this point in time a Memorandum of Understanding which, of course, gives rise to the very real possibility that there will be more news to come and that when eventually the government puts the funds to back up and make the memorandum a reality, puts those funds into the Estimates for the coming year, then, of course, it will be good for a dozen more announcements, but it will, in fact, then have more meaning.

We're pleased, Mr. Speaker, at the fact that they were able to arrive at a 60-40 cost-sharing which, of course, is substantially better than the 75-25 sharing that they arrived at for the Manfor expansion that they just recently announced. At that point, of course, the government was able only to achieve 25 percent federal funding for again a much needed project in Northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the text of this announcement makes the statement that Manitoba was the first province to enter into a new ERDA. I think that we, on this side, would rather see us enter into a new era, a new era that provides for incentives for private investment in this province, that rather than leaves us lagging the rest of the country in private capital investment, that sees us provide incentives to once again attract private capital investment so that the sum and substance of all the announcements in this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, of course the members opposite are having difficulty listening to the truth. They don't appreciate the fact that all of these announcements to do with additional tax dollars being spent on things that should be done by the private sector but aren't being done because there is no incentive for a fair return on investment in this province, that's the whole secret to what they're doing. We're glad to have more dollars being spent in this province, Mr. Speaker, but we're concerned about the fact that all of these dollars are coming out of the taxpayer's pocket because that beleaguered taxpayer has been carried to the limit and we're at the point where there's no further incentive for any private sector development to take place.

We hope that the next announcement on behalf of this government will be that there will be more incentive, that there will be renewed opportunity for fair returns on investment so we don't have to any longer be only relying on federal and provincial tax dollars to provide any sort of activity in this province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Memorandum of Understanding between Manitoba and Canada which commits us to an expenditure over five years of \$38.3 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Memorandum of Understanding for Transportation with the Federal Government. I have a statement to make on that Memorandum.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, we believe the Memorandum of Understanding which we have signed with the Federal Government goes some distance toward the objective of strengthening our Transportation sector, an objective that was set by our government more than 18 months ago, and one that has remained central to economic planning.

Many of the initiatives listed in the Memorandum were first launched at the Manitoba Economic Conference held at Portage la Prairie in October of 1982. There have been two features that have marked the negotiations with federal officials, Mr. Speaker: a spirit of co-operation and a lack of jurisdictional hang-ups. We believe the results speak for themselves.

The Memorandum provides for three Transportation Sub-Agreements to be negotiated by March 15th of this year. The first, related to Churchill and its longer term prospects; the second, revolving around broader provincial transportation matters; the third, relating to urban bus industrial development opportunities.

The recognition of Churchill is of long-term strategic importance and is a major step by both governments. This recognition is the first initiative by any government toward maintaining and expanding the Port of Churchill. But make no mistake, we want and we expect a strong commitment and a greater financial commitment by the Federal Government and all of the federal agencies involved in the operation of Churchill. The Memorandum of Agreement in this area is only a beginning. We need icebreakers for a longer shipping season, we need a deeper harbour, and we need a better rail bed, Mr. Speaker.

Churchill has potential for more than the grain trade of Western Canada. Churchill has the potential for much greater contribution toward making Canada more competitive internationally, and we expect full co-operation as a result of our initiatives from the other western provinces to fulfill this new role.

The second part of the sub-agreement deals with the vital role of the railway. We all know how technological change has affected the number of men and women who work in that industry. Improving and expanding our research and development capacity within this area, whether it be for new lightweight hopper cars, more efficient diesels, or new methods of building

line over muskeg, it is essential to keep Manitoba a transportation leader. It is essential for more and better jobs for Manitobans.

Thirdly, the Memorandum addresses the expansion of an urban transportation industry which will have far-reaching consequences for the city, for the province, and for our position in international markets. I am pleased to see the speed with which both the Federal and Provincial Governments are prepared to move in this area.

It is within this sector that our governments not only invites private enterprise participation - and this will be of interest to the Leader of the Opposition as a result of his remarks - but also we see it as essential to the success of this program. I expect that the research and development initiatives outlined will lay the groundwork for a state-of-the-art industry, and there is no reason why Winnipeg shouldn't be the national headquarters for that industry, Mr. Speaker.

The Memorandum, overall, provides a commitment of a minimum of \$275 million to these initiatives: \$170 million plus complementary C.N. services and facilities from the Federal Government, and \$105 million from the province.

Overall, then, the Agreements and Memoranda concluded up to now specify combined federal and provincial economic development expenditures in Manitoba, as my Premier has mentioned, of more than \$300 million over the next five years.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we, in the Manitoba Government, look forward to completing the Agreements quickly and in the same spirit of co-operation that has guided us to date.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Speaker, it gives me some great deal of pleasure to respond to the new Minister of Highways and Transportation's initiative today. Maybe now we are going to see the new dawning of construction of highways in the Province of Manitoba, a new era where roads will be built, pavement will be laid, under this new Minister's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, all it takes is a shuffle of the Cabinet maybe to accomplish this. Because I might remind the House that under last year's Budget, under the former Minister of Highways and Transportation's jurisdiction, this government robbed the construction budget of the Department of Highways of \$20 million to relocate that money into the phony Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker, and now they stand up today and announce initiatives in the transportation industry.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about transportation initiatives in general, I remind the government last year that while they were cutting the construction and maintenance budget for the Highways Department in the Province of Manitoba they were also reducing funding to vital safety programming in the Province of Manitoba. Now they announce today, in conjunction with the Federal Government, that they are embarking on a new transportation era.

One thing that the Minister failed to mention is that this renewed initiative on the federal level of funding

to transportation follows close on the heels, Mr. Speaker, of the passage of the Crow rate reform legislation, legislation which New Democrats on that side of the House opposed vehemently, legislation which has triggered some \$7 billion to \$8 billion of transportation investment in the rail system in Western Canada.

Today the Minister is proud to announce that there may be as much as \$170 million of that \$7 billion to \$8 billion come into Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased with the \$170 million contribution to Manitoba federally but we ask this Minister, this government, where they were hiding when the other \$7.8 billion was going to other provinces in the rail transportation sector alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister makes a very bold and I might say somewhat incorrect statement in this announcement of his today in saying that this government, this Minister, this administration, were the first who dealt with Churchill. That, Mr. Speaker, is patently false. The Minister has said this recognition is the first initiative of any government towards maintaining Churchill. Mr. Speaker, that is patently false and the Minister and the government should know that.

— (Interjection) —

I want to draw honourable members' attention, if they would have the moment and the courtesy to listen, that in 1980 the Lyon administration, under the leadership of the then Minister of Agriculture, my colleague, the MLA for Arthur; the Minister of Municipal and Northern Affairs, my colleague, the MLA for Swan River; and myself, in responsibility of Highways and Transportation, initiated a meeting held in Dauphin, Manitoba, and in Churchill, Manitoba, with the invited guests to participate in a meeting of the other two Provincial Governments, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the Federal Government. That meeting, Sir - and the media was there as well - of the three provincial provinces, plus the Federal Government, focused attention exclusively on the Port of Churchill, on the rail transportation problems, the harbour transportation problems, the port facility problems at the Port of Churchill. I note with a great deal of cynicism on that side of the House that they are now talking about the need for a better rail bed.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that during our administration Canadian National Railways started out with the cryo-anchor experiment to stabilize the permafrost on the Herchmer subdivision in Northern Manitoba. Those initiatives, Mr. Speaker, were taken by our administration during our term in government and have led today in no small way to the recognition of the problems of Churchill and the focus of the Federal Government funding on the Port of Churchill, the rail transportation to it and the port improvement itself.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the sub-agreement deals with a number of aspects of transportation including rail line abandonment. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to remind those honourable colleagues in the government who are members of the eight-year Schreyer administration, that during their term of office there was wholesale abandonment of prairie branch lines in the Province of Manitoba, wholesale abandonment. Mr. Speaker, that wholesale abandonment was stopped during the Lyon administration because our government focused efforts and backed up the communities involved in lobbying

the Canadian Transport Commission to prevent that wholesale abandonment that was occurring, when the MLA for Brandon East was responsible for preventing rail line abandonment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the program of community support and of the backup of the full provincial resources to community branch line retention committees, rail line abandonment would have proceeded wholesale in the Province of Manitoba and would not have been stopped as it was during the Lyon administration. So this government now has wisely kept the policy and the program established by the Lyon administration in place and have now saved one subdivision from abandonment.

Our record, Mr. Speaker, is very very large in that in the Rossmere sub, the Morris to Hartney sub, the Waskada sub; those are victories that we can speak to, we can point to during our administration. I thank honourable members opposite for carrying on with that good format of policy and assistance to the community.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister goes on in talking about keeping Manitoba a transportation leader. And I pointed out this to the Honourable Finance Minister some two Budgets ago and, indeed, in last year's Budget when they fail to recognize Manitoba as a transportation centre for the trucking industry. During two successive budgets, this New Democratic Government imposed a payroll tax; higher diesel fuel tax; surcharge on higher incomes; all to the detriment of the trucking industry in the Province of Manitoba. And now they stand up and say that they believe it is essential to keep Manitoba a transportation leader.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they should have thought of that during their term in their two Budgets that they brought down in which they taxed exclusively the trucking industry in Manitoba, an industry that I will point out employs many, many Manitobans, has many many head offices of trucking transportation companies located here in this province in this city. They didn't recognize it one year and two years ago and now they have been bludgeoned to their senses and they recognize it today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also point out to the Minister that he is talking about a research and development initiative. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that some of the money will come quickly to aid our bus-manufacturing industry in solving the problem with the contract of electric buses in Vancouver right now and that some of the research and development money will improve that technology and prevent further losses to the company.

Mr. Speaker, I accept in broad terms the initiative the Minister has announced. I in no way, shape or form accept some of the premises under which he has stated it in this House. No. 1, that it is the first government to address Churchill. That program was put in place by our administration during our term and what is happening today is simply a follow-through and a recognition by the Federal Government of Churchill under our initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the Minister that he is not completely telling Manitobans the truth when he speaks of rail line abandonment and the efforts they

have made to retain rail lines. It is our initiatives that they are carrying on, that allowed rail line retention committees in the local community to have the full support of the Provincial Government in fighting the abandonment efforts of CP and CN in the Province of Manitoba. That initiative was established, carried on by this government, to their credit. They accepted a good policy and they've carried on with it.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would hope that the Minister of Transportation, the Premier and others who have the ability to negotiate with Ottawa, will attempt to get more than simply \$170 million for the Province of Manitoba. Out of the total transportation initiative of \$8 billion to be spent in Western Canada, surely Manitoba deserves more than \$170 million of a total of \$8 billion invested in transportation on the rail system in Western Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before calling on the next member, may I remind the honourable member about Section 19.4 of our rules which says ". . . a spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government may make a brief comment with respect to the announcement or statement and the comments shall be limited to the facts which it is deemed necessary to make known to the House and should not be designed to provoke debate at the time."

I hope that all members will remember that.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table The Canada Manitoba Mineral Development Agreement for \$24.7 million.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Gallery. We have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the St. George School. The students are under the direction of Mr. Harvey. The school is in the constituency of St. Vital.

There are 25 students of Grade 11 standing from the Tuxedo Shaftesbury High School under the direction of Mr. Semotok. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

On behalf of all of the members. I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Canada Health Act

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him, how much money does Manitoba stand to lose under the dollar-for-dollar penalties proposed under The Canada Health Act as a penalty for extra billing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice. There is more information that we would need and I think we would want to present the complete picture. Are we going to lose just that penalty or could it be worse by accepting to pay for it ourselves?

This is something that I'll try to get the information for the House.

Health care system - hospitals

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week, I asked the Honourable Minister of Health if he could tell the House how many Manitoba hospitals came in over-budget or came in with a deficit in fiscal 1982-83. I wonder if he has that information now.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I've asked for this information and I'll inform the House as soon as I can.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A final question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask the Minister whether he received any warnings last summer and this past autumn from medical professionals, from hospital administrators, or from his own advisers, as to an extreme and severe pressure that would be facing the hospital bed supply in Winnipeg and indeed in other Manitoba urban centres this winter, that is, separate from the context of the normal demand that builds up in the wintertime? Did he receive any warnings that there would be severe and excessive pressures on hospital bed supply in Winnipeg and other urban centres in Manitoba this winter, from his advisors, from medical professionals, or from the hospital administrators last summer and last autumn?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, certainly not from our advisors, and my advisors and I certainly don't recollect anything such as that except of course the concern that we have every year, and I'm sure that the Member for Fort Garry received when he was the Minister. I don't recall anything other than that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the Minister's answer, just for clarification, as I would appreciate a check on the situation from him. He has pointed out that Ministers of Health normally receive indications that winter pressure on bed supply will be heavy. That's customary, particularly in this climate, but I'm talking about a warning or an advice that there was going to be excessive pressure due to the build-up of chronic care cases, the lack of availability of acute care beds. That has occurred in the past. Some governments in the past have responded with particular special emergency measures to increase that bed supply and that's what I'm asking the Minister about. Did he receive any warnings of that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Not that I recall, Mr. Speaker. I know that we have opened certain beds at Deer Lodge to help the situation at one time. We have responded in that way, and of course my honourable friend knows that there will be construction going on in Deer Lodge that will help with the bed situation.

Agro-Man Agreement

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture, following the announcement made by the Premier and by the Federal Minister of Agriculture. Was all the money expended out of the last Agro-Man Agreement and will it all be new money that he's announcing here today, the money that he's announcing, the \$15 million of provincial money that's going into the program? Will part of that be made up from funds left over from the initial \$18 million in the Agro-Man Agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice and supply that information to the honourable member.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that some of the projects that have been undertaken under the Agro-Man Agreement, such as the Cooks Creek Drain Project and many other worthwhile programs, have been carried out on farm trials and that type of thing? Will they be carried out even though the program does end at the end of this particular year, March?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, as during the announcement of the Memorandum of Understanding, we did pay tribute to the Agro-Man Agreement and we were not critical of the agreement that is now in place. What we have done is said that we have doubled the amount of money that was available under the previous agreement and we have been working under that. We hope that some of the good projects and some of the information that we were unable to get from demonstrations under the Agro-Man Agreement, we would want to continue them and carry them on so that full technical information is available to the department and to farmers of Manitoba so that they can better equip themselves to improve their methods of production and better equip themselves to a farm in this day and age.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, so as the Minister is not allowed to mislead the public and the media who put the message to the public, would he check with the Minister of Natural Resources who, unilaterally, as a Minister in a political decision, cut off some of the Agro-Man projects which he didn't feel were in his best interest or his department's best interest? I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to check that out. The question was, and I didn't say whether or not they were criticizing the Agro-Man Agreement, will they continue to complete the projects that were started and well under way under the Agro-Man Agreement? Will those projects be completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in his question to the Minister of Agriculture, the Member for Arthur

impugned the actions of this Minister, and let me say that this Minister exercises discretion in respect to the projects that we carry out, and I didn't believe it was necessary to demonstrate to farmers that on-farm drainage was important. In pursuant to an agreement that was signed by the previous government, the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada was going to pay for on-farm drainage in Manitoba at taxpayers' expense, whereas farmers for 100 years in this province have been funding their own on-farm drainage. Mr. Speaker, I thought that part of the agreement was excessive and that part was removed.

MR. H. ENNS: How many years have people been insulating homes?

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, under the program, the \$15 million of money which we're not sure of as new money or a carry-on of some prior commitment, how much of that money will flow directly into the hands of the farm community which are under extreme pressure due to high input costs and low returns on their commodities? Will there be any of this money actually received into the hands of the farmers directly?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, to try and answer that question as clearly as I can, one has to understand that the current financial situation that many farmers face did not occur overnight. It occurred as a result of a number of years of total disregard for the agricultural community by members on that side. How did many farmers get into the situation they're in today? There was a destruction of a Beef Income Stabilization Program by that administration.

Mr. Speaker, not until approximately one-third of the hog producers of Manitoba, be it small producers, ceased production did they institute a short-term, band-aid approach into income stabilization for the hog industry. In those two programs alone, Sir, we have put in more than \$23 million into those two industries in two years of this government. Mr. Speaker, long-term income stability is the policy of this government and we want national income stabilization for our farmers in this province.

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

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do appeal to you, in our efforts in trying to conduct our affairs according to the rules, as we ourselves have laid them down, and as you quite often have had to remind us of, the Member for Arthur asked a short question to which a simple answer is available, not a speech. If we want to debate the issue, then let's debate the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would hope that all questions would be short, concise and to the point and that the answers would also be short, concise and to the point.

Had the Honourable Minister finished his explanation or his answer?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I was trying to finish my answer as to the impact on the agricultural community of provincial programming and agreements. Sir, we have also instituted the Interest Rate Relief Program assisting over more than 1,000 farmers; Mr. Speaker, approximately between 400 and 500 farmers on the Loan Guarantee Program; the high interest rates at MACC, the Buy-Down Program, which will save Manitoba farmers over \$18 million over the term of the agreements that they had under the high interest rates, that that administration supported, Sir.

The Honourable Member for Arthur has the gall to ask how much of this money will flow directly to farmers. He will know, Sir, as being a former Minister of Agriculture, that monies in terms of on farm demonstrations will flow into the farmers in the usual way, Sir.

Creamery plants - closure

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. A few days ago the Minister of Agriculture was made aware of the problems of the cream shippers who are about to lose their quotas. I wonder, has the Minister resolved this situation as yet.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I've asked for a report on this situation because I was advised by creameries myself and I am concerned about the situation. When I have all the details dealing with this matter, I certainly will want to relay the information to the House.

But for the member's information, he should be aware that the supply of dairy products not only in this country but across the world, Sir, have piled up. The honourable member knows what is happening south of the border, where dairy farmers themselves are contributing billions of dollars to try and reduce the stocks and supply of dairy products. The same is happening in Europe, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba is part of a National Dairy Agreement and we want to make sure that all producers in the province producing milk are treated fairly, and as soon as I have the information I will be providing it to the House.

MR. A. BROWN: My question is to the same Minister. To many cream shippers this is the only cash flow that they have at the present time. This is the money that buys their groceries. Unless this situation is resolved immediately, then these people will have to be placed on welfare and it is imperative that these people know how long they will have to wait before this situation is going to be resolved.

Can the Minister give us some indication as to what frame length of time he is looking at?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation - and I don't have all the facts and that's why I want to be careful of how I respond to the

honourable member - is that people who are in production today will not be forced out of business, but there is a penalty system that is imposed by the Canadian Dairy Commission subject to the agreement that we have with the provinces. That levy for overproduction is levied presently, as I understand it, against producers of milk and that any overproduction in other areas would not be paid by those producers.

As I understand it, the Milk Board is attempting to bring about an equity situation, but I don't have the full details, and as soon as I have them I will bring them to this House. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland wishes to, or has some ideas on this matter, I'd be pleased to hear from him.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether the Minister of Environment was speaking for the government last Friday when he said, "Services in French should be offered as soon as possible, as much as technically feasible, because if one wants to be consistent everything should be put in place before 1987. Also, the more one has put machinery in place, the more it will be difficult for a government with less goodwill to repeal the law."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a matter that is presently before the Chamber, presently being debated.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I must ask if the First Minister would be so kind as to repeat that. I could not hear of his answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would point out for the benefit of the House, Citation 359 in Beauchesne, (10), "A question ought not to refer to a statement made outside the House by a Minister."

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

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the new House Leader for the government side, is obviously taking great delight in demonstrating his familiarity with Beauchesne, but, Mr. Speaker, we are first and foremost government by our rules.

It is only when our rules and our traditions and our practices are somewhat in question that we refer to Beauchesne. Mr. Speaker, I must remind you that if we were limited or prevented from asking questions, particularly this government and their Ministers make and the kind of statements they make outside of this Chamber, we'd have precious little to ask them about. — (Interjection) — You're the government that started making statements outside of this House. You hold a

press conference outside of this House - and we're going to ask you questions about them.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I believe that the question is in order and the Minister can choose to answer or not to answer, as he pleases.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat the question and simply indicate that the Minister apparently made this statement in an interview in La Liberté on January 6th, last Friday, indicating that as many French services as possible should be implemented, regardless of whether the act is proclaimed in 1987 or not.

I want to know whether the Minister was speaking for the government or on his own accord.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if indeed that question is in order, I'm delighted to have the opportunity to respond to the question because the Honourable Member for Elmwood must not be aware of the fact that has been the policy of previous administration and this administration ever since 1980, and I believe, and I'm reminded by honourable members, that the Honourable Member for Elmwood also voted in 1980 in the same way.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it's all a matter of degree.

My second question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs is this: is the Provincial Government attempting to respond to needs, looking for sufficient demand or attempting to create needs, expectations and habits in view of the remarks of the Minister of the Environment who said as follows, "If services are offered, one can hope that once the habit has been created Francophones will want more services?"

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure that I completely follow the honourable member's question. He asked previously as to whether the statement by a Minister represented the government policy. Members will find that is referred to in Beauchesne's 357(z). Perhaps the honourable member would wish to repeat his last question.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the question is this: is the government responding to need, responding to demands, or are they attempting to create needs and to encourage people to ask for even more? That is the position, I believe, of the Minister of the Environment. Is that the government's position?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, clearly the Member for Elmwood . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood, No. 1, has translated, because I did not

see the original article which he is asking for some verification upon, he has translated and I don't know if his translation is accurate and I have not seen the original article - however, Mr. Speaker, the report that the member has provided to the House is not one which describes the policy of this government.

Port of Churchill - upgrading

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I represent the constituency which would benefit by increased activity at the Port of Churchill. I wonder if the Minister of Highways would elaborate on how the Memorandum of Agreement that was tabled today will help strengthen the position of Churchill as a port.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I can say that our government has put some tangible evidence in the House today and tabled in the House that we have a commitment to Churchill, and I want to answer that question. It's something in the range of \$80 to \$100 million will be included in the sub-agreement for Churchill for the development of that port and make it viable, Mr. Speaker. That is something that is quite different than the honourable members opposite in the previous government when the Minister of Agriculture at that time came riding in on his high horse into Dauphin in the summer and held a meeting, lots of meetings, Mr. Speaker, and lots of talking. That's all they had. It was in the darkest days before the election.

A MEMBER: In 1980?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: In 1981, he came riding into Dauphin with his meeting and, of course, that's all there was from it, nothing more - words only, Mr. Speaker. We are doing much more than that. First of all, we're going to be looking for a firm commitment from the Canadian Wheat Board that they will maximize the use of the shipments out of the Port of Churchill. That is one area. I am writing to the Ministers of Agriculture, of Transportation in the other Western provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta and ask them to indicate that they are supporting the Port of Churchill and ask them to move in that direction as well. I will outline our commitment to them and invite them to meet to discuss the commitment that the other provinces in Western Canada can also make in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

I can tell you that it is very important that adequate rolling stock be available for the Port of Churchill, otherwise it would be closed as a result of the Ministers of Agriculture when he was in government, Mr. Speaker, there was no effort made. And that port would have to be closed down at this time if we did not take positive action for adequate rolling stock. So that's where part of the money will be going Mr. Speaker - to rehabilitate box cars and to do the research and development necessary to have lightweight hopper cars available for that line, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I request a ruling whether or not the answer that is now being supplied by the Minister of Transportation is in order according to our rules? Does he get a chance to debate it? Can he take the adjournment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Harry, why don't you cite a rule for a change?

MR. H. ENNS: I don't need to cite rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: I've been in this House long enough to know what is in the rules and what is not in the rules, you're damn right. — (Interjection) — You bunch of socialists jump the rules and regulations, common sense prevails, and we know what's common sense in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: The Speaker knows that was out of order and so does the Government House Leader know that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I will repeat again that questions should be short, concise and to the point, and that answers should be short and concise and particularly to the point.

The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will keep the answer short, but I think the member is entitled to an answer for his constituents and the people of Northern Manitoba.

Modernization of the elevator and port facilities is absolutely important and will be included in that agreement as well, Mr. Speaker, because we feel the shipping season in the Port of Churchill must be extended. There has been a lot of work done in the Scandinavian countries and so on. There is research that's necessary to lengthen the shipping season at the Port of Churchill and we intend to do that as part of this agreement as well, Mr. Speaker. Those are a couple of very important aspects of that port.

The last one, the commitment we have shown is that we're prepared to build the Hydro transmission lines so there is a permanent source of power to the Port of Churchill, Mr. Speaker. That indicates our commitment.

Pension registration

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and would ask her, in light of the fact that the City of Winnipeg Council pension plan has to be registered, I believe, with the Manitoba Pension Board, I wonder if she could inform the House whether or not she will be examining that plan to make sure that it is a reasonable one? And I'm wondering if she is contemplating making any changes to that before the Provincial Government allows that plan to be registered?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased to have the opportunity to explain that the Pension Commission, as members may know if they've worked in that area before, is an arms-length group that is in place to look at pension plans in Manitoba.

The Superintendent of Pensions is the person who is employed by the government, for the Pension Commission, as an employee to do the actual work that is necessary for the Pension Commission.

It is the commission that will be looking at the pension plan determining whether, under our act, it can be registered and suggesting to the city, if they do in fact file for registration, suggesting to them ways in which they could comply if, in fact, the Pension Commission decides that don't comply with the act or it cannot be registered. That is in the hands of the Commission, it is not something that comes to the Minister.

MTS retirement program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

My question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can the Minister indicate how many employees with the Manitoba Telephone System, took advantage of the government's early retirement program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the member not having given notice of that question, I'm afraid I can't give him a specific answer but will take the matter under advisement.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I appreciate the Minister would not possibly have those numbers on his fingertips.

I wonder if he might also attempt to determine how many of those employees have been hired back onto the MTS staff on a contractual basis after taking early retirement.

HON. S. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to take both of those questions under advisement.

Construction starts

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Housing. I realize the opposition doesn't like the Minister to bring progress reports if they're favourable but I wonder if, now that the statistics are released if, the Minister for Housing can give us an indication of the record of the housing construction industry for 1983?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I would hope that honourable members do not intend to ask extremely open-ended questions which would provoke a speech or a long report which would surely be an abuse of the question period.

If the Honourable Minister perhaps has something in writing as a report that he would like to give to Minister that surely would move along our question period much quicker.

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will keep my remarks very short.

I don't have the year-end figures. There was some reference to Manitoba housing starts in the Free Press, I believe, two or three days ago which indicated that we were at a five-year high. I do have some Statistics Canada figures up until the end of the third quarter. With respect to dwelling unit starts in Manitoba, at the end of the third quarter there were some 3,184 housing starts which is the best record since 1978.

The other figure that I would like to refer to is the number of apartments and other dwellings that have been started. By way of comparison in 1981 there were some 281 apartments; 1982 - 863. The latest figure I have from Statistics Canada at the end of the third quarter is 1,861. The unofficial figure that I have from Canada Mortgage and Housing is 2,005 which indicates almost a 1,200 percent increase over 1981.

MR. P. EYLER: I'd like to remind the House of a question that the Member for Tuxedo asked here 13 months ago, on December 6th, and said "Will the Minister now admit that his government's housing initiatives have been a total failure and a waste of taxpayers' dollars?" Is there anything in the most recent statistics which would make the Minister change his mind on answering that question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order.

I believe it is only the Speaker that is entitled to remind the House of various things and I think the member is out of order. He is the Deputy Speaker but he is not in the Chair.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the point of order raised by the Member for Virden. Clearly the Member for River East, by a very carefully structured, short preamble has asked a question. It was less than one sentence, was carefully structured,

certainly within all the guidance that you've provided to this Chamber. If anything, the members opposite who are so loudly complaining could learn from that example on how to pose a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I didn't hear the question posed by the Honourable Member for River East. Would he kindly repeat it.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to remind the House of a question which was asked by the Member for Tuxedo on December 6, 1982, when he said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Would the honourable member pose his question if he has one.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The last time that the question was asked there was another Minister in that particular portfolio. I would like to ask the present Minister if there are any statistics that have been revealed in the last year, which would indicate that there has been a failure, or a waste of money, on housing programs in this province as indicated?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The answer to that would be very short - no.

MR. P. EYLER: On June 2, 1982, the Member for Tuxedo was asking whether or not the former Minister of Housing was going to recommend that the Rent Control Acts be removed in order to avoid, as he said, a serious loss of construction jobs. Has there been any indication that The Rent Control Act has resulted in a serious loss of construction jobs?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I believe the figures speak for themselves. I notice that in 1978 when there was rent control we had probably one of the highest number of apartment starts in Manitoba. At the time of the previous administration, when there was some deregulation, we had some of the lowest number of starts; and 1983 figures of something like over 2,000 apartment starts would indicate that rent regulations has very little impact on a number of apartment starts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the incredible Carnac better known as the Housing Minister. Can the Minister confirm that in the year 1982, which was the first full year of the New Democratic administration, it was the worst year for housing starts in Manitoba in over a decade? Can he confirm that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the figures for 1982, the first full year, in terms of single detached

housing starts, Stats Canada figures indicate that there were some 1,101 housing starts. That was about half of what there was in 1981. On the other hand, the number of apartment starts in 1981, and that's almost the last full year of the previous administration, 281 starts; 1982, the first full year of the administration of the present government, 863 starts.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Can the Minister indicate, how many of those apartment starts were subsidized by either federal or provincial housing dollars?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly take that question as notice.

I should also indicate that with respect to the housing starts, this might well be an indication of the increase in the population of Manitoba, an increase we haven't seen for the past 20 years.

Seat belt legislation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Highways, in view of the fact that seat belts, helmets, etc., are compulsory, can the Minister indicate whether those convicted of not wearing seat belts, helmets or using child restraint systems, when convicted will have demerit points on their driving licences?

A MEMBER: Good question.

A MEMBER: He doesn't know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice for the honourable member.

A MEMBER: Who's Minister?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in a brief preamble to my supplementary question, possibly the Minister might provide all members of the House with the copy of the regulations that should be attached to the enactment of compulsory seat belts, helmets. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the child restraint systems are now compulsory for children weighing less than 50 pounds or younger than 5 years, could the Minister indicate whether the parent's or guardian's word as to the age and weight of the child in their vehicle will be taken by the police officers as fact?

A MEMBER: They're all going to have mobile scales.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table the regulations for the honourable member in the House regarding seat belts, child restraints and helmets, certainly.

I think the honourable member should know that in normal practice, of course, that would probably be the case. The police officer is there, first of all, and we've indicated a grace period where the police officer would be providing information wherever possible. As they come into enforcement of the law, beginning in April, there will be instances where the police officer is going to ask the questions, of course, in certain situations and he will make the determination at that time. I'm certainly not going to be doing that from this position, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's your law.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call the Adjourned Debate on Bill 115, please?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 115. (Stand)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, would you call the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Penner, amended by myself and adjourned in the name of the Member for La Verendrye?

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Government House Leader, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak on a subject matter and a resolution which I think is probably, in my 11 years in politics and this Legislature, one of the most controversial ones as well as probably one of the most emotional ones that we have dealt with in those 11 years here.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues have pointed out, that the government has exercised extremely bad judgment in the way they have handled this issue and dealt with this matter.

I also believe that they are beginning to recognize the fact that what they have done is not only one which is going to hurt them politically but is really going to cause alienation in Manitoba, the kind which none of us want to see and the kind which we, when we were a government in the previous administration, wanted to avoid.

We have seen, in the last number of years, something developing which will not help to bind the fabric of

Manitoba. One of my colleagues yesterday mentioned that we were entering the third calendar year of this Session. We started back in December of '82 and ran through the '84 year, and now we're back here again facing this particular issue. It has taken, I guess, one of the longest sittings. I guess, if somebody was to check, it's probably one of the longest sittings of the Manitoba Legislature that we've ever had.

However, Mr. Speaker, if the government is intent on pursuing the course of action of entrenching this particular resolution, I believe that maybe the time we are spending here is well taken, because the ramifications of what can happen here are pretty significant.

I'd like to just briefly mention, Mr. Speaker, in a chronological way, what has happened and where I think the government has gone wrong and really where the people of Manitoba, in the final analysis aside from the politics involved in this issue, will be the real losers.

We started back in 1979, Mr. Speaker, when I happened to be part of a government who went to the Supreme Court on the Forest case. It was decided at that time the act of 1890 was invalid and indeed that the original act of 1870 was to be upheld. It was the then Lyon administration that had to deal with that particular ruling of the Supreme Court and it was, at that time decided, Mr. Speaker, without any protest, without any objection, to start implementing what we believed was the context and the authority that the 1870 act gave us.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, at this time, there were many people that were not happy with the Conservatives' actions with regard to moving on that particular Supreme Court ruling. There were a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, who were not happy with the Conservative Government at that time because they felt they were moving too quickly. They felt that there were too many things happening with regard to the provision of services to the Francophone community.

Mr. Speaker, the thing we saw happen was that there was a certain amount of objection to providing those services, but we, as a government realized that if the law was to be upheld and the spirit of the law was to be upheld, those things would have to go forward. In recognizing that we brought in a bill in 1980 which laid out the proposal for the passing on of French Language Services in the Legislature and in the courts.

Mr. Speaker, there were also people on the other side of the equation in the Francophone community who felt we weren't moving fast enough and, of course, we had representation from them also. So here we were. We had some people on the one side who said it was too much, others on the other side that said well it's not quite enough.

I believe though, Mr. Speaker, and I think it's evidenced by the fact that it was not a political issue in the last election, that the majority of Manitobans felt that particular move, the 1980 bill, was a move in the right direction and a move that the majority of Manitobans could live with, and therefore it did not become a major point of confrontation between any of the ethnic groups or any of the politicians in that 1981 election.

Mr. Speaker, it should also be pointed out that in 1982, when the new NDP Government was dealing with this matter, legislatively, we, as an opposition, did not

voice any objection to the fact that the government was going to try and speed up some of the processes involved in trying to provide more services to the Francophone community in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there was no hue and outcry from the public when that happened, because as I've mentioned in my previous speeches, there was a growing understanding and a growing concern that not only should the Supreme Court ruling, the law of 1870 be upheld, but because of the nature of Canada, because just about one-third of the population of Canada is French-speaking, there should be some support, some help, and some infrastructure put in place to deal with this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of people in this Manitoba of ours are common-sense people and they realize when something is moving too quickly or something is not following the best interests of the majority of people in this province. So, as a number of my other colleagues have pointed out, given that backdrop, it is my belief that the New Democratic Government - headed at that time by the Member for Fort Rouge, the Attorney-General - decided because there had not really been a large outcry by the rank and file Manitobans from what happened in 1979 and 1980 and 1982, that maybe this was the time now to move and take this issue all the way and bring it down to a point where a resolution should be introduced, the Manitoba Constitution be changed, and deal with this matter in that manner.

Now I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there was a lot of prodding - and we'll never know this because we haven't seen any transcripts or copies of Minutes from meetings held between the Attorney-General, the SFM, Bilodeau and the other actors involved in this particular so-called agreement back in the spring of 1982 - but I really believe there was a lot of prodding on behalf of the Federal Government for this Provincial Government to do that. And, of course, there would have been a certain amount of prodding from people in the Francophone community who were not, as I mentioned earlier, happy with what was happening from Square One.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am the first to realize that you cannot please all of the people all of the time and I think most everybody that have been in politics for a long time knows there is a time when, no matter what you do, there are a certain amount of people that just never will be happy. I believe that's the case on either side of this equation.

There are people within the non-Francophone community, people who come from other ethnic groups or other walks of life, who believe that any French in Manitoba is not good. There are also people on the other extreme that will not rest till they try and bring their point across that we should be totally bilingual and everything should be bilingual and that all services at the municipal, school board, every level, should be bilingual. So we have those two extremes on both sides of this equation.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, I was part of a government in bringing forward the bill and in dealing with the 1979 problem that saw to move in a manner in which this government has moved would cause great concern and great division and would be a divisive tactic in this province. Mr. Speaker, I think that this particular last eight, nine months has proven that.

We are now seeing ads in the papers. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing ads, not only by people who are against

the resolution, we have seen a lot of money spent on the other side, by the SFM and other people who were involved in this particular resolution which really has become more of a confrontation resolution than a Constitution resolution.

The other thing which has really aggravated this situation, Mr. Speaker, is the further bad judgment that the government has shown with regard to the changing of The Municipal Act which allowed the referendum. I have to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I have never been one for allowing municipal or any referendum with regard to an issue that really you have no control over. If a municipal council wants to hold a referendum to decide whether a certain street in town should be paved, whether or not a certain sewer and water project should go forward, Mr. Speaker, that is one way of asking the public on an issue of finances, or if they want a library built, or, as in the case of the Town of Steinbach this last time, whether or not they want to allow a mixed drinking establishment, that is a matter of local option. And I've always believed and have expressed that belief in this House that should be allowed, that the municipal authority or the school board in many instances, should be allowed the right to do that, because they are deciding an issue on which those elected people have jurisdiction over. But, this government, in an effort to get on the anti-cruise, the anti-nuclear bandwagon, allowed this change in The Municipal Act to take place.

Now, it isn't as though they weren't warned by the opposition at that time also, Mr. Speaker. They were warned. Because what happens when you allow these referendums to deal with something that you have no control over, it can be very frivolous and also be very, to put it very bluntly, very knotty.

So, I believe that the government showed bad judgment, not only introducing the resolution, but also showed bad judgment in amending The Municipal Act to allow that referendum. Having done that, Mr. Speaker, they allowed for something which has caused them further problems with regard to dealing with this resolution.

I'm happy to say that there are many municipalities, who, even though they have written the First Minister, or through the municipal association have expressed their concerns over this resolution, there are many towns and villages that did not hold those referendums.

I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one of the biggest problems we could have had out in my area in Steinbach, in Ste. Anne, in La Broquerie, in the R.M. of Hanover is to have these referendums go on. It would have divided the communities to such an extent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we would have had communities which are now working side by side, are playing together in sports, are doing other things are far as employment and that, together, it would have really divided them, because you would have seen the lines drawn. That was not the driving force behind the previous administration in bringing in this Bill 2, which was passed in 1980, and I think has been the biggest problem with this government. This resolution, which we are dealing with, has been one of the most divisive things that this province has seen in many years. It's one of the most divisive things, as I mentioned before, that I have seen in my 11 years here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are having a backlash right now as is evidenced by the opponents to this. Mr.

Speaker, the Member for Inkster just shouted something from his seat, and it's the other thing that I wanted to come to and deal with. The opposition has been accused of stirring up this issue. I want to tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have not mentioned in any of my press releases to my local paper, I have not said to my constituency, which is fairly large in size as well as fairly large in the different ethnic make-ups, that they should either approach this thing from one side or the other. It has not been my intention and never will be to have them make up or try to tell them how they should react to this issue.

This issue has grown, not from the members of the opposition or from one of the government defectors trying to stir this thing up. You don't get the kind of ground swell from the people that is happening right now by just the opposition or one member from Elmwood doing what he's doing. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government can see that. Because if they feel that the opposition has that much power, Mr. Speaker, they give us a lot more credit than we deserve because this is an issue that has really stirred up the people of Manitoba on both sides.

Now, what really are we dealing with? Are we dealing with people who don't want French, people who are opposed to any change in the structure of languages in this province, or what are we really dealing with?

I think, Mr. Speaker, if you were to talk to the majority of people in this province than the so-called 95 percent non-Francophone, I would say that behind the majority of people's concerns is one thing and that is jobs. Now, you say, job, what do you mean by jobs? Mr. Speaker, there is a fear among the people who have not had the opportunity, or have not availed themselves of the opportunity to learn French, that they will be limited in their future endeavours, in their future work. They will be limited and hampered from getting the jobs they want because they do not have that second language. Mr. Speaker, I say that to you knowing full well in talking to people, after you push aside a lot of the other things that are sort of the periphery, that is the main concern.

It has already been established in this country that it becomes very difficult or virtually impossible to try and be Prime Minister of this country if you're not bilingual. We just saw that happen at a convention which the Conservative Party held a mere eight months ago. It's a real problem. We saw what happened because it is virtually impossible to do that.

Mr. Speaker, will it be virtually impossible - and this is the question people ask - if we entrench this - and we come down to the nub of the problem - and we cannot change it and some court 10 to 15 years from now decides that, well, I think their Legislature decided when they passed this in the House of Commons that it should be interpreted this way, and we are then stuck with that interpretation, will that mean, for instance - we've got a bill before us which says services have to be provided in French - the Deputy Minister has to be bilingual? Does it mean that if Steinbach and surrounding areas are designated as having a large Francophone population, which we do, and we'd be designated a Francophone area, does that then mean in 10, 15 years the secretary answering the phone in the Department of Agriculture will have to be bilingual?

Mr. Speaker, that is the whole crux of this whole amendment which we face. If the House Leader, the

Member for Springfield, would care to listen, that's the problem. That's the whole problem; that's why people are worried about this.

Someone that has a child, who is graduating from Grade 12, and comes to me and says, listen, we wanted our child to learn German or Ukrainian, will he or she be hampered in the next 10, 15 years from getting a job in the federal Civil Service or the provincial Civil Service if they don't know French? Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is at the nub of this.

I fully believe that in my constituency the people who are nervous about this bill are not anti-French. We've lived in that community together and worked side by side and not had any confrontations as long as I've been there and I've lived there all my life. It didn't matter whether you were Mennonite, German, Ukrainian or French, we've lived side by side. So the concern is not an anti-French or a bigoted concern, as many people would have us believe, but the concern is a real one.

I reiterate again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what's happening to me, to me as an ethnic, to me as someone who has a second language, who speaks German. I have my children in school and I made this point the other day, but I think it's worth emphasizing again. I have children in school. I have a son who just entered junior high. I also have a daughter who is in Grade 3. Up until this year, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my son, because there wasn't a large enough demand and because many of the Mennonites and the Germans in the Steinbach area wanted their children to learn German because that is part of our cultural heritage, did not have the children take French. As a result there was in Steinbach, until about three years ago, not one single French course offered, with the exception of the SRSS, which is the regional school.

So, Mr. Speaker, after having seen what is happening in the federal system, I realized this summer that I had to make a choice. As he now entered junior high, either my child was going to take the German, which is part of my culture - and I challenge anybody in this House to say that once your children lose the basic - I would call it mother tongue because I didn't speak anything but German until I was five years old and then I went to kindergarten and had to learn English - but I challenge any one of you to say that this particular piece of legislation, if interpreted by the courts, if entrenched 10, 15 years from now, when a court interprets it in a different manner than this Legislature wanted it to be passed - and we can't pass that - I challenge anybody to say that that is going to help my cultural heritage. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it won't. So when ethnic groups get up and say the entrenchment is a fantastic thing, I say to you, they know not what they speak of. I want to say that the rank and file members of the associations, whether it be Ukrainian, German or whatever, realize that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to tell you what is happening in this country and how people's attitudes are changing. I mentioned before that I was faced with a choice this year of continuing my son in the German program, which he had taken for the last six years, or go ahead and enroll him in the French program. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made a decision which was hard on me but was even harder on my parents, who realized what this really meant in the continuation of our cultural

heritage, but I made a decision that my son is taking French this year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was not enforced on me by any government. There wasn't a resolution in this House. There was no bill that said I had to do that, but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a growing realization in this country, whether you like it or not or whether this House likes it or not, that you will have some edge if you know French, if you want to get a job with Air Canada, if you want to be a stewardess with Air Canada. That is a fact of life.

So what we have here is a situation developing - and I come back and reiterate that point - because I think it's jobs. I really think in the back of people's minds this issue is jobs, an opportunity to advance, that's what it is all about.

Now, we come back to a point which I think is at the crux of this whole matter; that is, if we are to move in the direction that we are talking about here today with this resolution and entrenchment, we have failed dismally in setting up the infrastructure to deal with that. That, Mr. Deputy Speaker is the school and education system. How can you ask someone who is graduating today, who hasn't had an opportunity to learn the second language, because either it wasn't available or because somebody just felt it wasn't necessary? But we have failed those people if we move on this resolution too quickly.

That's why this government has got themselves into the jackpot they've gotten themselves into. You move in a manner which they did and they wanted to move quickly and they wanted to move swiftly - and all we have to do is read the Hansards back in April and I won't do that because my colleagues have read it - but all we have to do is read them and see how inflexible the Attorney-General was at that time. The First Minister said no hearings, no, this is going through, this is it. The Attorney-General said we won't change a comma, we won't change a period, we're moving on this, and what do they do? The day before yesterday we heard the new House Leader, the new guy that's going to pilot this thing through the House smoothly, say that there are no deadlines, and yet they put out "Constitutionally Speaking," a big folder and say Canada and Manitoba have to adopt this program - when? - by December 31, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, they tried to do something which the people of Manitoba were not ready for and they then have the nerve to say it's the opposition that whipped it up. Well I want to tell you, as I mentioned earlier, if they want to give us that credit, that's terrific, but I will tell them right away, it's the people this time that are speaking, no opposition. If you have a look at the polls or the breakdown of the last referendum here in the city, you'll notice where the heaviest vote against was. It wasn't in the Conservative ridings. It was in your NDP ridings. That's where the problem is and you're saying that the opposition is doing it. But what is happening here is that you have found yourself in an unbelievable position because No. 1, you misread the people of Manitoba, you misread them and what's happened now is that you're trying to wriggle your way out of this one.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield all through this debate ignores one basic feature that the opposition has said all along - that we are not for entrenchment.

We have a resolution which I am speaking on, Mr. Speaker, and dealing with right now, which we've all dealt with, which entrenches this. We have been consistent all the way through. We have said not entrenchment. Bill yes, but not entrenchment.

I think the other thing that has happened here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is we have had another thing in play here which I believe, after having been here 11 years I can comment on, because I have to admit that I'm a little bit concerned about this particular issue too. After you spend a certain amount of time in this place and after you've served in several different capacities, one of the things that starts to concern you is what the history books are going to say about you. What are they going to say? How will you be judged or written up in the annals of history with regard to the contribution and the time that you spend here because many of us spent 10, 12 years here and it's a major portion of one's life and it's a dedication - the family suffers, there's all kinds of things that happen and it crosses all political boundaries.

But I believe that the original negotiations and the original thrust was taken by the Attorney-General on this issue. I think what he was trying to do, to a large extent, was try to go ahead and show the people of Manitoba that he was the forerunner, he was the champion of human rights, of minority rights, and this was going to be his big victory or triumph and sort of a little bit vindicating his somewhat - I will be generous to him - his somewhat dubious or shady past affiliation with certain other parties. I truly believe that he was concerned more about his own history book and what the future writers of the French language issue and the Manitoba Legislature on this issue would say, than he was concerned about the people of Manitoba. He was so convincing that he did convince his colleagues, the back row, and many other people to enter headlong into this sensitive area without really sitting down and thinking what the people really wanted.

So we now have the unbelievable situation of a government who has alienated a large segment of the population, who has allowed a referendum to go forward, and after the referendum decisively says no, to say well, the people really don't know what they want because it hasn't been explained properly to them and therefore we know better - and don't think that hasn't infuriated a lot of people. We have a government who, instead of moving on this matter in a methodical way, have really caused a lot of damage in this country of ours. It's unfortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they have proceeded in that manner.

I believe it would have been in the best interests of the Francophone community and of people in Manitoba if we had undertaken the path that we started in 1980, continued in 1982 by this government - and I'm not chastising - I was in the House when they got up and announced that they were going to move along some of the translations a little faster and do some of the other things with the French Secretariat, I didn't complain. Nobody on this side got up. There were no howls from the opposition. There were some people in the public that weren't happy with them. They said they're moving too fast, look what they're doing. But the opposition wasn't concerned about it because we knew that was a direction that things were going.

We knew, Mr. Speaker, that that had to be done. I've said time and time again, whether it be with my

constituents in Ste. Anne, or wherever, that I have never in this Legislature or ever, said that I am not in favour of providing French Language Services to them in a common-sense approach, Mr. Speaker. I voted for that bill in 1980 - no problem, and as I mentioned, didn't give any problems on the 1982 one.

One of the things I just want to mention, which I think undergirds the problem we face within the educational system in trying to gear up to match something like this, is the fact that neither do we have the teaching capacity, I believe, nor do we have the infrastructure in place to deal with the type of demand that's going to be created on the system if this type of resolution goes through. That should have been put in place systematically years ago. We can't even get enough people to translate the statutes fast enough. One of our biggest problems since 1980, and a problem that this government has had, is that we have had a hard time getting people with the legal background to translate the statutes fast enough, and they know that. They know that. One has to move on these issues in a rational, organized, systematic fashion. You can't just one day walk in and say here it is, we're going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not one of black or white. It is not one of bigot, of being anti-French, or anti-ethnic; it is one of genuine concern by all the people, including the Francophone people, who are beginning to realize, I believe - the ones that are thinking about it - that this government has done them a big disservice. This government has managed in a short eight months to drive such a wedge . . .

A MEMBER: Get the message, Andy.

A MEMBER: Call an election, Howard.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . between different groups that it is absolutely one of the worst political things that any government has ever done.

So I say to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in closing, that the opposition has been consistent from Day One. You've introduced a bill, let's deal with it, fine. You know, I want to, in closing, just say one thing.

Yesterday the Minister introduced a bill, the Minister in charge of piloting this thing through and he said one of the reasons we're introducing a bill is that it's going to give us a little more flexibility because it'll deal with some things which may later on maybe we didn't quite see and we might want to change.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. B. BANMAN: So we'll deal with it on a statute basis, Page 3771. I'm sorry not 3771 - we've got it here - Page 5488. I think there were some real concerns expressed in that area that in the future an amendment to The Manitoba Act might not have the flexibility that a statute would have. That's one of the reasons they've introduced this.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, by their own admission they realize now that they've moved to quickly, they've misjudged the people of Manitoba. They have done the people of Manitoba a great injustice, have done them a disservice; and we say bring the bill, let's deal

with the bill, let's give the Francophone people services, but let's not entrench something, Mr. Speaker. But let's withdraw this resolution . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

MR. B. BANMAN: . . . and deal with things that will be in the future within our control, not some Supreme Court Judge.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

Order please, order please. Order please.

MR. H. CARROLL: Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. — (Interjection) — You already said that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to participate in this debate. My learned friend from La Verendrye indicated that he felt that this would be a very very historic debate and I tend to agree with him. I think that this debate will be looked back upon for many many years to come. I'm firstly pleased to be able to participate in it; and second, proud to be able to participate in it on the side that I'm participating on.

MR. H. ENNS: That comes from a fellow that was elected as an NDPer.

A MEMBER: Pour it on, Henry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my approach is somewhat different from that of the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, but I should say that although my approach may be somewhat different I am as firm in my opposition as any member of the opposition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, last Friday, on my way home to Brandon, I listened to the Minister of Municipal Affairs speaking on the CBC Questionnaire Program. It wasn't so much the Minister that impressed me, but the intelligence of some of the questions that were posed to him.

There are an awful lot of people in opposition to the government's policy who are speaking very well, very strongly in opposition. I understand the Minister seemed to recognize the voice of one of the callers, and I'm led to believe it was somebody named Bill Hutton, a former President of the New Democratic Party of Manitoba. This man in his soft, very gentle way virtually destroyed the Minister in his little question. He questioned gently and the Minister, I felt, really didn't handle himself terribly well.

Before I get into the major text I'd like to recall to the House something that I heard the Minister say on this particular program. The Minister said the government has done all of the compromising, and what has the opposition done? What are you going to do? - was the Minister's question.

This reminded me of the old story. I'm talking about the olden days, I'm sure that there are no used car dealers today that would use tactics such as this.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. CARROLL: Oh, but Pete was not one of these kind of people.

The old trick was a customer would come into the car lot and there was a car worth \$100 and the customer would offer \$100.00. The car dealer would say that's a \$1,000 car, but I'll give it to for \$900.00. The customer says, well, it's \$100 car. The car dealer says, okay, make it \$900, make it \$800.00. Would you believe \$700.00? The customer would say that's a \$100 car, why would I pay \$700 for it? The car dealer would say \$600 is my bottom price. The customer would say but it's only worth \$100 - at which point the car dealer is terribly upset, he reminds me very much of the Minister of Municipal Affairs - and he would say you're not compromising at all, you're not giving in a bit.

Here we have the Minister doing the same thing in the House. He is saying that there is no compromise, because what the people who oppose this bill are saying is we think it's worth \$100 and that's what we're going to pay. We're not going to pay \$1,000, or we're not going to pay \$900, we're not going to pay \$700, because that's not what it's worth. That's where it's really at, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: You're making them look bad, Henry.

MR. H. CARROLL: The Minister of Municipal Affairs indicated that the wording in the amendment is, I think his words were, "declaratory", that it really wasn't that significant, but that he wanted them in there because - I'm not sure if he did use the word, but my word is that it has a very very important symbolic effect. I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, feel that symbolism is very important in our society. I think I'd like to point out to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that symbolism works both ways.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the symbolism that the government says is that: firstly, by doing what we are doing we are showing tolerance to our French-speaking brethren of Manitoba who have had a rough deal. I'm prepared to agree that some horrible things have taken place in Manitoba, but I'm not prepared to concede that this amendment is the way to satisfy the wrongs that took place over nearly a hundred year period. The symbolism, he indicates, is that we are brethren with those in Quebec who speak French only, that we are Canadians and that by doing this amendment we are standing steadfast with our fellows right across the country. Well, you know there is a lot to that. I'm not going to say that there isn't some strength to that argument, but I'm saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker that there is the other side of the coin.

Firstly, how long will this symbolic gesture will have any effect? Can you see, let's pretend we're in Rene Levesque's office and he gets news that Manitoba has passed this amendment. I can see him butting out his cigarette and shrugging his shoulders and saying: "Huh?" That's as far as Rene Levesque will consider it. Pierre Trudeau, I think will consider it somewhat more highly. I think he will like it very much, and I think if he had the opportunity he would pat the Premier of Manitoba over the head and say: "Well done, Mr. Premier."

A MEMBER: . . . be upset in Quebec because you backed him up.

MR. H. CARROLL: No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Trudeau would be very very pleased, but then again, I don't know that Mr. Trudeau is going to be around that much longer, and that's not an area I want to speculate on.

MR. R. DOERN: Henry, the SFM backed Levesque . . .

MR. H. CARROLL: There are going to be some people in Quebec who will be very pleased about this amendment, and they should be, because I'm saying that this is an important symbolic gesture that the government is making.

But there is the other side of the coin that is terribly important. It is what is this government symbolizing to the people of Manitoba and the symbolic gesture that we're getting?

I just want to diverge, just before I go into what our symbolic gesture is. I'm told by the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the MGEA is now prepared to go along with the government on this particular amendment, and the government is saying to the opposition: "Now how can you possibly object?" Well, I would think the problem is the government has missed the whole point. From my perspective the objection to this amendment is a very very symbolic gesture. The people of Manitoba do not want to see what is being put into this amendment. They do not want the wording as it is. The government says it's symbolic only, but the people of Manitoba have indicated that they don't want this form of symbolism.

So, what do we have? We have the government saying, for a small minority we will stand by this symbol, and we are telegraphing to the people of Manitoba as a whole that we will forego your feelings, we will ignore your feelings, and we will go with the small 5 percent. Now, it's fine for the government to say that, but it's not fine for the rest of us in Manitoba. You know, it's fine for people to say that everyone who doesn't agree with the government is a bigot. That's not so. The symbolic effect of this amendment is terribly significant. It is saying that the government doesn't listen to its people. This government is made up of people of every ethnic background, a truly ethnic government is saying that we are symbolically preferring one ethnic group over all of the other ones.

I know all the historical background, I don't want to spend time in this speech. I know what The Manitoba Act of 1870 says and I know the history and I don't want to go over all that. What I am suggesting is that the government is ignoring things that are important to it as a government and to the people of Manitoba.

An interesting situation has developed, and I know it more so than I would think most members of this House. I represent Brandon West, and I was indicating just a moment ago that the government wasn't listening on that particular issue of the amendment. I go home every night and pick up the Brandon Sun. I read the Brandon Sun very avidly, Mr. Speaker, to find out what new disaster has taken place in my constituency. On one headline in the Brandon Sun we'll have McKenzie Seed; on the other headline, we'll have the Brandon University situation. Then the French language issue is the one that's right in the middle. All that I can say is that the problem on all three of those issues is a government that won't listen.

A MEMBER: Might is right.

MR. R. DOERN: Very seedy government.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's very very important, at least on some occasions, for the people to feel that those who are governing them understand them. Once in awhile, the people have to feel that the government - even though the government doesn't do precisely what they want - at least it understands where they are. The people of Manitoba, at this particular moment, feel that this government doesn't understand them.

Mr. Speaker, what I find so fascinating about this issue is that I could speak on it from a different perspective. I'm an Independent. I would like to think of myself as a Social Democrat and this is not a democratic issue. I can see the government going to the trenches protecting Medicare. I can see the government going to the trenches on Autopac type of issues, but for this government to self-destruct on an issue that the people it represents don't even want, is absurdity - Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak for a moment about my own area of the province, southwestern Manitoba, a very very interesting display of thought when the hearings took place last September. I believe there was something like 53 municipalities, the reeves and councillors spoke, in addition to a few people who spoke in favour of the amendment; but the municipalities spoke virtually as a man. It is so easy to tar somebody, it's so easy to say all those renecks, those bigots from out in the country. Well, I hear that said and when I don't hear it said, which is even worse, I hear it implicated. If you speak to the reeves, to the councillors, to the people that are closest to the people of Manitoba - at least in the southwest - you'll find that these are sensitive, intelligent people who understand the issue.

It's not a question that they don't understand what they're doing, that the government is doing what is best for them, because the people out there, the great unwashed don't know. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that the people of southwestern Manitoba know what this issue is about, know what the government's position is, know what the opposition's position is, and they are speaking out.

At least once a week a reeve calls in on me in Brandon, a different one - people that I don't know come in and they chat intelligently. They tell me what they are hearing and what they are seeing. They ask me if I think that the government is going to go ahead with this particular bill and I say the government hasn't learned anything yet, so I assume that it's going to go ahead. They just shake their heads and ask if there's anything they can do. I say continue encouraging your MLAs and your MPs. Write a letter to the Premier - you may not get a reply - but write a letter to the Premier on it.

This is the feeling that is out there and it's not a partisan feeling, Mr. Speaker. The people that are coming to me are not coming to me because they're Conservatives or because they're New Democrats or whatever that third group used to be - they're not coming to me for that reason. They're coming to me because they are people that are concerned with what is happening to their province.

When the government doesn't listen, as it hasn't been listening and continues on its own merry way, it reminds me of an old expression we used to use when I was a young fellow at the farm going to the barn dances and all that. It was always, "Don't forget who brung ya." I would think that this government should remember. "Don't forget who elected ya."

An interesting situation came up in my law office last week, a client of mine came in with a Francophone name. I've known him for quite a number of years - a man of middle years - and I asked him what his position or what his feelings were on the Société franco-manitobaine. He said, well, he didn't think there was a branch in Brandon, he didn't know very much about it. Then I asked him, in general, what he thought about this whole amendment and the issue. He came right to the crux of it. He said, Henry, they're a generation too late. It's terrible what happened, but it's a generation too late. I asked him a bit about this background and why he thought it was a generation too late. He said, well, my grandfather came from France and spoke only French until he got settled into western Manitoba. I don't speak French, he said, because - here's why it is a generation too late - my mother is German. We can't unscramble an omelette. What's happened has happened.

We can do things in terms of services and none of us on any side are arguing on terms of services, but in terms of constitutional amendments, we can't unscramble the sorry past. We've got to live with it and by trying to give this symbolic gesture that the government is putting forward - it's a horrendous mistake.

What I find so difficult to understand is the difficulty that the government has in understanding us. Our position seems so very very clear and yet they don't seem to understand. They don't seem to want to understand. — (Interjection) — Yes, one of my friends across has said that they could say the same of us and they're absolutely right of course, they can.

I read an interesting article in one of the newspapers recently. It was commenting on the government and the performance and the Premier. And it indicated that the Premier probably can't get his act together because he keeps repeating his mistakes and he doesn't learn from them. I would like to go one step further. Not only doesn't he learn from them — (Interjection) — precisely, he can't accept the fact that he has made mistakes.

You know, there was an expression going back years ago talking about Quebec vis-a-vis the rest of Canada. It was known as the two solitudes. I think we're back to two solitudes again in this House. We have the government versus the opposition and two others. But there are two other solitudes, and I think that it's more important. These solitudes are the government and the people of Manitoba. We have the sad, sad situation where we have a government that's virtually fighting the people. — (Interjection) —

I don't know what I would do without Don or the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. He brightens my day with his wonderful comments.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to discuss bigotry because there are bigots out there but not as many as a lot of people think. It's not, to misquote Shakespeare again. I love Shakespeare, especially misquoting him . . .

MR. R. DOERN: What's his constituency?

MR. H. CARROLL: I hear he's running in Brandon East next time.

It's not that I love Quebec or Canada less, it's that I love Manitoba more. I think that is what we're saying - those of us that are opposing it - that we love Manitoba and that our prime concern is Manitoba without being totally, and absolutely, I was going to say conservative, but in a small "c" sense, without being reactionary, our first priority is Manitoba. Manitoba's our home. Gestures to Quebec, and gestures to Ottawa, are not my prime concern. My prime concern is what is happening right here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I'm in a position to say what I'm saying now where many of my friends to the right cannot say. I think the Premier and the government had a higher duty. They not only are New Democrats but they claim to be social Democrats. They are a party, the only Social Democratic Party in the North American continent. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they have a trust to their philosophy. They have a trust to uphold. What they are doing instead of upholding this flame of social democracy, they are taking what I would call a hurricane to it, an issue that has nothing to do with social democracy and destroying a movement that's been 50 years of building in this country. They're destroying it for a symbol, a symbol that is not significant to the people of Manitoba.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government has a lot to account for, not only to the people of Manitoba, but to its own constituents.

Mr. Speaker, it's sad. I think the government is making a terrible mistake. I wish they would listen a little. They had one chance, Mr. Speaker. They had one chance. The Premier had an opportunity when he appointed the Minister of Municipal Affairs to be in charge of this particular amendment. At that point he could have saved a little bit of face if he would have instructed his Minister to withdraw the amendment. He instead decided to go deeper into the quicksand. He's thrown the Minister into the quicksand and I sympathize with him because I think this particular Minister has an awful lot of potential. I'm sad that he's going to have to go down on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue. Symbolically it'll be remembered as the flag debate was remembered on the federal scene because we are talking about symbols. The government should recognize that we're talking about symbols and it should withdraw this amendment for the good of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was waiting in quiet anticipation for a member opposite to address the resolution. But as they've done in too much frequency over the past number of days they've decided again not to debate, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, when I last spoke on the whole issue - it was sometime in the past summer - I spoke on, at that time, the referral motions. I criticized the government, as did many members of our side, on the process they had adopted throughout the late spring and the summer, as they brought this issue forward to the House and, of course, the people of the province.

At that time we spent considerable time indicated in pleading with them to take the issue to the people directly by way of public hearing. Of course, they acceded to that request of ours.

So although, Mr. Speaker, because I was involved in other things I was not actively able to be part of many of the committee hearings through the fall, I can tell you that I spoke to many Manitobans over that period of time, and also to many of my colleagues, who were in attendance during the hearing process. Having talked to that larger constituency of people I can tell you most definitely, Mr. Speaker, my views on the issue certainly have not changed one iota during that time. We stayed in touch and we watched closely as the government has wrestled with this issue, as they've attempted through various changes, not only within the issue itself, but through various responsibilities as to who was handling it on their behalf. We've watched carefully and closely and now we are at today. They've had so many opportunities, in my view, to explain their actions and yet have chosen not to.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened also very carefully to the presentation made by the Attorney-General the other day and I found it significant. I enjoyed the presentation. It would be a concern, I would suppose, of members opposite and that is the expansionary . . . (inaudible) . . . what side of the issue we're on in 23.1, and I've had occasion to read his speech a number of times and a number of issues stand out when you read his presentation.

First of all, not only did he touch most of the issues, but most definitely he focused on our concerns related to 23.1, mainly the expansionary aspects of it. But, there was a tenor throughout his speech, it was also obvious too, if you read it, and that was of a desperate person pleading for people to understand, pleading for, supposedly, an opposition and the people to understand the so-called enlightened view, you could just read it and you could just see it.

Also something else stood out. It stood out that still it is that individual's main concern that this be taken through to its final completion. In spite of the fact that it may rest today in the hands of the new Minister, the Member for Springfield, still it is the Attorney-General's major responsibility. It was indicated here earlier, I believe by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye, it is what will take him into the history annals of this province. You can see then why this Attorney-General so desperately wants to see some compromise, some attempt by all people to work towards some solution so that his understanding of the issue is the one that will be said and carved into stone for all time.

I must say, in reading and listening to the Attorney-General, I was somewhat saddened because it was a pleading of sorts. Anybody that wants to read it, they will find that same conclusion, I'm sure.

Today, I, too, will focus on 23.1 as my leader basically did on his address on Monday when he said, and I'll quote from Page 5423: "We come down essentially to Section 23.1, because really that's where all of the criticism and all the concern and all the anxiety funnels down to, 23.1. When all is said and done it still continues to be the crux of the problem. This is the area upon which any expansionary interpretation could rest and could result in a court imposed extension of French language rights in Manitoba for all time and future."

So we agree, I believe, both sides of this House agree as to whose the problem is in this resolution, it's 23.1.

Mr. Speaker, I had many things to say on this particular issue throughout our leadership campaign this fall and I'd like to reiterate just a couple of them at this time to give you my personal views as to how I see the issue.

To me, it breaks down into two solitudes: Firstly, the reality of 1870 and the reality of today. I think there are those in our midst and certainly the government that believes there is some compromise, that there is some mutual ground that exists between those two. I'd like to tell you or at least explain to you why I don't believe that there is.

First of all the reality of 1870. What does the present Section 23 really mean? Yes, we know it guarantees French in the courts, in the Legislature and in the statutes, but does it really mean more than that? At that time did it mean bilingualism or as we know it today, I should add, did it mean that? More importantly, did it mean that French is or was an official language of the province?

Of course, these are very crucial and important questions. There is no doubt in the Attorney-General's mind because he says, I believe on Page 5431: "One word about this question of official languages, look what you're doing. You're saying that French and English are official languages, and that never was the case. Well let's see. What is the official language, Sir, of the Province of Manitoba? In 1870 when Manitoba came into existence the Constitution of the province said that, with respect to the then existing institutions of government - and that's . . . "and there's the key, Mr. Speaker, ". . . really what they're talking about when you talk about official languages, never mind dictionary definitions - you're talking about the legal use of language in official institutions. They said the courts, the statutes and the records. Right? That's what they said. That's all there was. They didn't have these 1,001 administrative tribunals and agencies that we now have or, if you will, are plagued with. The dealt with what they had."

So, there's no doubt in reading that, that in the Attorney-General's mind, at least, by my interpretation of what he said that it's his view that Section 23 as it now is interpreted in his mind means that bilingualism was and should have been since 1870.

Mr. Speaker, in the mind of the Attorney-General and the government and the Société franco-manitobaine, existing Section 23 should be interpreted as meaning official bilingual or whatever. That may be what they want it to be, the wide interpretation, and I confess, I could listen to that argument because there could be some substance to it. That maybe is what was meant 113 years ago. I know it's an emotional issue to those who support it and that's why I deem it to be the historic reality. It should be treated seriously. I know I treat it seriously and I believe all members of our side treat it seriously.

But many events, as you realize, Sir, have occurred since that point in time that have brought us to today and to the other reality, today's reality. On this side of the issue, the emotion probably is as great, the logic is as well-defined and as sound by the people who adopt and support the position of those people who would say no entrenchment.

To show how the argument can be interpreted one way or the other I'll give you various examples of what I call today's reality, of where we are today, some 113 years later, and such that it will not allow for any expansion of 23.1.

My arguments stray somewhat from the legal arguments, but they are important. I know when we're discussing issues like this, we always like to debate specifically on a legal plane, but it's not always easy and we must remember that the vast majority of Manitobans cannot debate on that plane. So, consequently, if we are to be responsible legislators, we must also bring in some of the emotional aspects also.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first items that, in my view, relates to what I call the reality of today is obviously the job situation. It was referred earlier by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye. I'd like to use, again, the Attorney-General's words, again on 5431, ending at the same quote I read earlier: "They didn't have these 1,001 administrative tribunals and agencies that we now have or, if you will, are plagued with. They dealt with what they had."

Of course, he's making reference to the fact that in 1870 they didn't exist. But every reasoned Manitoba today knows they do exist, knows that they are increasing in number and knows there is a very good chance that their children, if they're employed at all, will be employed by government or some agency of government. That's what is the fundamental issue. That's the bottom line to such a vast majority of Manitobans. That's what brings them together on the issue, and for attempts by the new House Leader or by the Attorney-General to say we'll argue the question on a legal perspective, one can never move away from this consideration, because today people are fearful of what the future holds for themselves and for their children. When language becomes the major criteria, Sir, I would suggest you can't really blame them. The examples are countless and some of them are stretched out of all proportion, I understand, but they're out there and it's what motivates so many people - not only to fear but to speaking out against the government action.

I'll tell you the latest one I heard and I heard it when I was in the attendance - not within the privacy - but within the attendance of the Member for Springfield on Sunday at Ste. Agathe. We were there at an official opening of another phase of a community recreation plant and I was speaking to an individual, a constituent of mine, who said that she had just received an opportunity to work at a new job. She offered the advice to me. She told me the story - all I said was, is that right. She said you know I shouldn't have had the job. I was not qualified. I said, well how come you got it? She said, they asked me if I spoke French and I said yes and I got the job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as you can imagine, and as you know within your own constituency, these examples of the criteria of language being used for the rationale of getting a job are very real and they cause a tremendous amount of emotional outpourings from those who do not qualify. Of course the best example and I heard it from my colleague, the Member for Rhineland, some time in the summer where a young person from his constituency was applying for a federal job at the Winkler Employment Office and the very first question

asked was do you speak French. The answer given was no and the interviewer suggested to that young person that they go home, the interview was not required.

Yes I realize that one and maybe two of these examples are federal jurisdictional matters, but that's what is out there today. That's what is out there and that's the reality of today, Mr. Speaker. Anyway the members opposite, through cute turns of phrase or through wording, are going to attempt to, in any way, dampen that effect and that emotion. They are not able to do it because nobody can and that's today's reality - both, as I said, they're real in the minds of non French-speaking Manitobans.

I think probably to sum up this whole area and I don't want to dwell on it, Mr. Speaker - probably it was best said by Mr. Green when he made his presentation to committee and I'm reading from Page 214 from the Hansard on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He said, "Mr. Chairman, the worst one of all - and I heard this with my own ears - I heard the Attorney-General of this province say that no English-speaking person who doesn't speak French will be disadvantaged by the legislation. That is false, Mr. Chairman, and never mind the legislation. Why does not the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba tell the people of this bilingual country, which he wants to be bilingual or at least he says he does, that it will be an advantage in this country if you speak both languages. Mr. Chairman, if it's an advantage to have both languages, then there is some disadvantage in only having one."

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that is the crux of the issue for so many of us and so many Manitobans as they look at 23.1, the so-called symbolic action as spoken by the government, the so-called reaching out to the historic understanding of the province, but yet not really knowing for sure how that will be interpreted in years to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of today's realities is fear and it is genuine. As I have said earlier, because of the many many government agencies that are springing up around us almost daily and to have senior people fluently bilingual as Bill 115 may or may not - I haven't spent the time on it as yet but I will - it's going to require, of course, anyone aspiring to a top job within the Civil Service or within any major area of government to be bilingual.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, not many of my younger constituents are bilingual today. Their parents and grandparents were - maybe not bilingual in French and English - but they were bilingual. Many of my constituents were - at least their parents and grandparents were - but in many cases their own languages were dropped. They were dropped to make a commitment to the nation as a whole. These people will be disadvantaged and that's why they do not want 23.1 which may - I stress the word "may" - allow for a wider interpretation of Section 23 to their advantage. Mr. Speaker, almost every other reality in today's sense can be tied into people's concern as to the future of employment for themselves and for their children.

The reality of cost - I hesitate even to mention. In some cases it is and has been blown out of proportion, but I'll dwell on it for a moment because in my view should 23.1 go through and the wider interpretation,

the one I've spoken to - which speaks against and works against so many rural Manitobans - should it go through and I think that rural Manitoba, which is always fighting to maintain educational equality with urban Manitoba, and should they now be expected to give and offer to their citizenry full French learning opportunity, then of course the costs of education will increase tremendously. I have no doubt in my mind that that will occur, given again the interpretation that may come out of 23.1. That's the cost factor. To me it's not in the municipal area, Mr. Speaker. It's more in the educational area.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNESS: Right today, every parent - I don't care where they're a resident in this province - if they sense that one of the criteria for job employment is language, naturally they are going to assist and demand of the government the same opportunity to have their children educated. Of course, that's when the cost aspect becomes tremendously large and enormous and I'll be no different than any other parent. I will demand it, and of course I will demand of the government to find some reason and some method to pay for it. But really can the government guarantee that access and that equality or is rural Manitoba again, is it going to lose out again?

MR. H. HARAPIAK: No.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear a loud resounding "no" from the Member for the Pas. I suppose one has to understand what it takes to support our educational system today. It has to take some total understanding to realize . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNESS: Mr. Speaker, and that's why when I talk, at least in my mind, about cost, to me in an educational sense they're very very real.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there's one other reality today that I would like to address. I call again the today's reality on the issue, and that's the reality of divisiveness. Again, Mr. Green before committee said that in his view it would push back the cause of bilingualism - talking about the government's initiative in this issue - a minimum of 50 years. I can tell you, Sir, that the bitterness evident today did not begin by being English versus French. I don't believe that at all. In my view it started by being all minorities including English versus French.

Let's spend a moment on that, Mr. Speaker. There's the view used by so many opposite that there's a majority out there that are against the minorities. Everywhere I've gone, people that have dragged up the government's argument to me, and the few times I had an opportunity to sit in committee, the Standing Committee on Privileges, and listened to some of the presentations, everywhere the inference was led by those who were supporting the government position that there was minorities and a majority.

I've never seen the government yet come clean on one occasion and tell us who the majority is because as I review the statistics there are no majorities in this province. Each and every one of us are a minority. For the members opposite to try and use that as an instrument towards helping their own cause I think is deplorable.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, to me the issue isn't English versus French. No, to me it's all the minorities, including English, against the NDP, Société franco-manitobaine and the so-called enlightened society. Those people that by virtue of their positions, particularly within the community, particularly in higher learning institutions, believe that is the way to go because they're the educated ones and they have the answers. To me, when we talk about divisiveness and the original context, that's where it was at. But today, of course, as we keep talking about the issue, and as we keep bringing forward the examples of which I related to you just previously, it becomes a non-French versus French issue. There is a major, major difference, Mr. Speaker.

I say the government must totally withdraw 23.1 because to argue around words, and all the attempts to bend the words, and to introduce semantics into the issue, to me, it takes the subject away from the people even more so. It entrusts and puts it in the hands of the lawyers and the courts. My constituents, Sir, trust themselves collectively more so than they trust the lawyers and the courts. They are opposed to 23.1. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought the Member for Flin Flon understood the issue somewhat. I've come to the conclusion obviously he does not.

Mr. Speaker, these are today's realities and, to me, when you place them and you weigh them against what I described earlier as the historic reality of 1870 which I understand and obviously has a strong basis, to me, when you weigh one versus the other, there is no compromise as far as the entrenchment between the two, and that's why today's reality must be paramount. That's why, to my view, the resolution entrenching the additional powers and rights of the French language within our Constitution cannot be allowed to proceed because I believe that 23.1 will never, never appease 78 percent, or to 80 percent, of Manitobans.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there were other issues raised by the Attorney-General and other speakers that I think are worth discussing. I'd like to quote the Member for Elmwood only for a short period because he brought up an interesting aspect. It was on Page 5455 of Hansard, and it deals with the word "official" and what it means.

Mr. Speaker, we noticed last year, particularly when a letter went out to the Municipality of Swan River, that there was an attempt by the government to insert that word into that letter. Of course, now we see it's being used within 23.1 amended, and of course it was in the original version of 23.1.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood said this. He said "that if the government is" - let's see, I have to start here at the right place. He's talking about Georges Forest, that's right. He said: "He even made a point

during the plebiscites and he has made this point on a number of occasions - that if the government is prepared to say that English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, then everything else follows." He also went on to say: "He knows if he has that sentence, that over time all the replacements that come into the Civil Service, starting with secretaries and so on and moving up higher and higher through the administration, that in a period of time all the new people who come in will be bilingual, and as the older unilingual people are phased out and retired that eventually you will have a Civil Service that is bilingual."

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is the interpretation of the word "official." I can tell you it concerns me. I know that where that same word is included within Bill 2, which the former government passed, well, I believe the word, although it has the same meaning in both areas, certainly the consequences of it being entrenched are much different and can be ever so much greater.

So what does the word "official" mean? Well, the Attorney-General mocked my leader for attempting to find a dictionary definition. I can tell you I have been provided with a couple of definitions. None of them satisfy me at all, because to me the whole issue centres around that one word, that one word "official," and therefore the referring back to Section 23 as was passed in 1870 and what was meant at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General can mock us all he wishes, but to me that word is of great significance. Because the Attorney-General mocked all of us for talking about the remote possibilities, and of course, we had the learned - and I use that word advisedly, Mr. Speaker - the learned Minister of Natural Resources say, well we live in a world of reasoned likelihood and we should look at this issue in that respect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is something else the Attorney-General said, and again on 5431 he made this comment: "We are elected to be responsible legislators. We are elected not only to make but to defend laws." Well, it's very true, but today, I submit today's lawyers and courts can dream up many different interpretations to the meaning that I, as a legislator, may endorse. I want, and we can, change or more clearly define the word in the statute. We must be able to clearly define the word "official." And although again, we may be able to be loose within statute and then we can come back here and again change it, there is no way we can do that within the area of an entrenched constitutional change. Mr. Speaker, personally, I'd have to be absolutely certain as to what the word "official" means before I could vote for its usage in the Constitution in any manner.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General also made reference to the operative part of 23.1, and he used the words, and again he challenged us, he said: "The revised form of Section 23.1 does not declare English and French as official languages. Indeed instead it provides that because they already are the official languages." Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say: "The operative part of the section is the restraint on restricting existing freedoms. The section does not create official languages. It gives as the reason for the enactment of the restraint the existing fact that the two languages are official."

To me, Mr. Speaker, the government claims that the official languages are already in effect. I believe that's

what they're saying. In their view, that their official languages already are in effect. I can tell you, I am not sold on that as yet. My interpretation of 23 as it now exists is too narrow to allow for that.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it brings me also to another aspect, the Attorney-General talks about the political will. He says - and then he went through the history of the repatriated federal Constitution, and he says: "The will of all political people was there to work towards the repatriation of that Charter." He tries to say that we have to have that here. He's saying that we have to work together towards this change. Of course, Mr. Speaker, he obviously forgets that the political will is not here to proceed on this. In our mind, we represent too large of a constituency of people who do not want to see it proceed, and that to be responsible legislators that we could not in any way, as they say, work with them to find the political will. He asks us basically to go against the wishes of our own constituents.

Mr. Speaker, what should we do? In my view, I'd like to tell you what I think we should do. I think we should reaffirm Section 23 as it exists today. Let's make no reference to official languages. How do we know what language will be spoken in 100 years? You know, I listened to the Attorney-General, I don't believe it's on Hansard, but he made the reference across the floor, he said: "How do you know there won't be a holocaust and that 100 years from now within this province Ukrainian and German will be the language in majority?" I guess my answer to him is: "We don't." That's why I say: why do we need to protect any language? Because we're in the process of very rapid change, not only within society as a whole, but I even think to some degree within languages. How do we know what technology, what role it'll play, within the way we communicate 100 years from now? Do we know, do we doubt, do we have any doubt whatsoever that languages are dynamic, that they change, and that technology, as I said earlier, is reigning down upon us? Who knows what the language of the future will be? Could it be computer-based and could it be universal? We don't know that.

So, I'm not hung up, Mr. Speaker, on tying into Constitution the guarantees of any language, of any language whatsoever. But, today, within Manitoba, it happens to be English although every nationality is a minority.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the issue is emotional in terms of today's reality, but it must be dealt with openly and I'm glad that we had the ability to pressure the government to at least take it to public hearings so that the people of this province could make some presentation.

Sir, my Constituents do not want to see a change in Section 23. We support the narrow interpretation as it now exists. We do not want to take the chance, remote as it is, we don't want to take the chance that the amended 23.1, with the remote chance that it may be interpreted as being expansionary. We do not want to take that chance because that official might be something other than we believe - the word "official."

Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken about the other sections of the resolution. I will so on another speaking time, but I think at this time it must be fully realized that the whole debate falls down upon 23.1 and the chances of it being interpreted in a way beyond which

the vast majority of people in this province are prepared to accept.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas. I would not wish to deprive the honourable member of his opportunity to speak. If by some mistake I recognize him when he did not intend to enter it into debate - I wonder if he would clarify that matter please.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Mr. Speaker, I was standing in our Whip seat reading a note from the Whip when you recognized me.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for The Pas didn't want to speak. I'm sure we would have benefited by the opinions of his . . . perhaps he would tell us the opinions of some of his constituents on this matter and we would maybe be swayed by their arguments.

Now it is a privilege to take part in this debate and place before the House my impressions of what has happened over the last few months and of this amendment to the resolution which is currently occupying our time and the attention of all the people of Manitoba.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to come up with something new and different on this topic. There have been so many things said — (Interjection) — well that's right, Clayton said it all. But there have been so many speeches given and so many briefs presented, so many letters to the editor written and most of them said pretty well the same thing.

The government told us last week that they had come up with something new and different. They told us that this amendment was something that we could all live with, that this was an exciting new amendment that they were bringing forward, but on closer scrutiny it is evident that there is nothing really new involved here. Some change from what was first proposed perhaps, but not enough change, not enough change to satisfy the majority of the people of Manitoba.

For some obscure reason, the government, the NDP Government seemed to think that when they brought this new idea in and we had a chance to have a Christmas break and all of the rest of the things that have happened over the last few months that we would suddenly turn over a new leaf, I suppose they thought, and side with the government on this issue. Well, I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that they have misread both the opposition and the ideas of the people of Manitoba.

We and the people of Manitoba have no intention of supporting entrenched bilingualism because the people of Manitoba don't want it and they feel they do not need it.

Now it seems a long long time ago that we stood in this House debating, hour after hour and day after day asking the government to take the resolution on entrenchment of French and English to a committee and have hearings so that the people of Manitoba could say what they wanted to say on the issue, to express

their opinions, tell the government whether they thought it was right or wrong.

After long and often bitter debate, the government did decide to have hearings and they had decided to hold them in eight locations after negotiating with the opposition party and refusing some of the locations that had been suggested. Finally eight locations were agreed upon and the Attorney-General who was then in charge of the resolution informed the House that there would be hearings. After he had informed us, he and the Premier had informed us, first of all that there would be no hearings, that no useful purpose could be gained by having hearings. No changes could be made anyway to this agreement which had been drawn up by three parties so why would there be hearings?

We often heard about this agreement that had been drawn up. It had been negotiated in private meetings, attended by a few privileged people, a few privileged people who all happened to be working for the same thing, official bilingualism. We had not heard of the meetings when they were going on, Mr. Speaker. No notices were sent out about the meetings or no reports were issued, no interim reports were circulated in the House as to how the progress of the meetings was going, nothing of that sort until suddenly the agreement was ready. We were treated to the news by the Attorney-General that we were now entering a new era in Manitoba, an era of official bilingualism.

The government seemed surprised at the reaction of the opposition. The opposition had not been party to any of these meetings nor the discussions, nor were they signators to the so-called agreement. The government was surprised at how shocked and amazed the opposition party was, that they had arrived at this position in the name of the people of Manitoba.

The people of Manitoba in their turn, expressed amazement and concern as to what was happening without their consent or their endorsement. They immediately asked themselves and asked each other if this matter had been raised during the election of November 1981. Did the government announce anything of this nature in the Throne Speeches that were given in 1982 and in December of '82? Did they mention in any of their literature? Remember that "Clear Choice for Manitoba".

A MEMBER: Nothing.

MRS. C. OLESON: No mention was made in that of asking for a mandate or telling the people that they would be entrenching bilingualism.

A quick reading of the Throne Speeches didn't unearth any reference to official bilingualism. The NDP clearly had not, did not and still does not have a mandate to force this onto the people of Manitoba. The people did not vote this group into office to tamper with the Constitution as with regard to language.

As others of my colleagues has stated there is a way out of this problem for the NDP Government. They should call an election on the issue and find out once and for all what the people of Manitoba think of a government which will force its wishes onto the majority of the people without regard for their opinion.

They claim they have great regard for the opinions of the people of Manitoba but they have proved time

and again on this issue if not on others that they do not respect the opinions of the majority of Manitobans. So it is time we heard the results at the polling booths of what people really think of this issue.

A MEMBER: Right on. There couldn't be a better time.

MRS. C. OLESON: It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to reflect on what has taken place in the last few months both inside and outside this House. From an initial declaration by the Attorney-General that not even a comma could be changed in the agreement and to the purportedly huge changes that have taken place recently by the Member for Springfield, we have some strange vacillations taking place.

From brochures circulated by the Attorney-General we learned that Manitoba is not going bilingual. This, when the resolution clearly stated in Section 23.1 and I quote, "English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." People were asked to attend information meetings in several points in the province when we had been told that no meetings would be held; indeed they could not be held. There was no useful purpose in holding them.

These meetings, these meetings that could not be held but were held, at these meetings the Attorney-General circulated yet more propaganda telling the people that Manitoba was not going bilingual in the style of Trudeau. The brochure also implied as others had done that somehow this agreement with the federally-funded Société Franco-Manitobain and the Federal Government would somehow be of great benefit to other groups in society, that somehow further rights and privileges would be theirs with this constitutional amendment if it were to become a reality. In fact the brochure so watered down the effects of the amendment that it certainly begged the question why have the amendment at all?

Meanwhile back in the Legislature the government finally arranged for hearings which the Attorney-General had said, and the Premier had said, would never be held. But, Mr. Speaker, the meetings were held and people by the dozens, and dozens, were heard on the matter. And what did we get in the way of a report after all these briefs were given, all these people had spoken? We got a one-and-a-quarter page report which stated that the government was going to go ahead with its plans to amend The Manitoba Act. This, in spite of all the controversy surrounding the matter, there we have it, this huge document, one-and-a-quarter pages telling us, well, we listened to you but we're going to do what we like anyway.

A MEMBER: What about the changes?

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, what about the changes?

Now let's look at some of the briefs that were presented at those hearings and see if we can find a rationale for the amendment to the resolution which we have before us.

Mr. Speaker, during those long days and evenings of the bilingual hearings we heard a great deal about righting wrongs, restoring rights, correcting history, stopping injustice, Canadian unity, finally honouring Louis Riel, and a great deal about bigots.

Many of the individuals who presented briefs supporting the government position were doing just that, supporting the government. They launched into lengthy discussions on righting wrongs, correcting history, restoring rights, and the importance of helping ethnic groups by passing this legislation. It certainly became evident somehow, by some method at which we could only guess, the NDP had led the minority groups to believe that entrenching the French language will give other majorities more rights. How's this to be done?

We were soon to see hastily formed groups come forward supporting the government position, one of them being Manitoba 23. Now Manitoba 23 is apparently a very concerned group made up of several ethnic groups who are all of a sudden concerned with the right of French-speaking people in this province to be served in French. Just a concerned group, they told us. Volunteers suddenly imbued with great feelings of social conscience, social justice and concern for their fellow man, especially minority groups. Questioning failed to elicit any information on the source of funding which they had, which caused some curiosity, since they were able to spend considerable sums on advertising their position. Questions were asked with regard to their funding but answers were refused. Manitoba 23 came up with a proposed amendment to the resolution which would entrench all minority languages in the school program.

I'd like to quote that amendment just for interest's sake to see what that group had in mind, if maybe someone can understand what they had in mind when they proposed that amendment. I read from 1065 of the Monday, October 3, 1983 of Hansard.

"The new amendment would read as follows:

Every resident in every school division in Manitoba shall have the right to have his or her child receive his or her primary and secondary education in English and/or French and in any other language, provided, however, that the right to receive his or her education in a language in addition to English and/or French shall only occur when there is a sufficient number of children located in a school division which warrants the provision to them, out of public funds, of such education, including the necessary educational facilities and transportation."

Now the author of this amendment obviously lives in a large urban area, probably the City of Winnipeg where transportation to and from different schools for different language classes might not be the problem it would in an area such as my constituency. Now that would cite only one of the problems. We won't go into the rest but I can envision what would happen in a large rural school division if this program, or if this amendment were to go through.

It boggles the mind to envision some of the dozens of language buses crisscrossing school divisions to transport students this way, and that way, and to and from, and back and forth to a language class. Probably two or three children in one school would have to go 20 miles at least to another school where they taught that language and some of those students would go - it just boggles the mind to think of this. The big language bus industry that would be developed by an idea like this. But I, of course, have not seen any evidence of that particular amendment coming in so perhaps we don't have to worry about it. But it does

cause one some concern when they think of the things that could happen.

Other groups rallied around the government and spoke in support of the resolution. For instance the Manitoba Association for the Promotion of Ancestral Languages was formed, according to the spokesman for that group, on September 24, 1983. The spokesman also informed the committee during questioning that they had been having preliminary meetings because of the intercultural council set up by the Minister of Cultural Affairs in April or March. But it stepped up their activities during the latter part of September and had decided to present a brief to the Committee on Privileges and Elections in support of the government's position.

Some of the reasons for supporting the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act are as follows. This I will read from Page 1002, of Friday, September 30, 1983. "The rationale of the steering committee for its position was:

"No. 1, it believes that proposed amendments are concerned with the reinstatement of linguistic rights that the Franco-Manitobans were deprived of in 1890."

Obviously the NDP Government had neglected to tell this group that the legislation of 1890 was not valid and the rights of the Franco Manitobans had been restored in 1979 by the Supreme Court of Canada and further in 1980 by an act of the Legislature. I quote again from their position.

"No. 2. It believes that the restoration of these rights is essential to the development of a firm Canadian identity routed in official bilingualism and multiculturalism.

"No. 3. It feels that the aspirations and rights of the Franco-Manitoban community are intrinsically linked to those of Manitoba's other communities and that the denial of rights to one minority constitutes a denial to all others.

"No. 4. It believes that a responsible government must recognize the legitimacy of the proposed amendments to Section 23. We, therefore, congratulate the Provincial Government for its courage in introducing the amendment. The board of a newly formed association did not yet have the opportunity to thoroughly discuss the entire amendment." This, they go on to say about the amendments they had proposed before.

"It is, however, clear that we, representatives of 32 language groups of Manitoba, cannot be indifferent in face of the injustice committed to one minority group by revoking linguistic rights that were bestowed upon them in The Manitoba Act of 1870."

I will repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this is an example of somewhere along the line - who knows where - this government got the idea that by this amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act we would be restoring rights when, in fact, those rights had already been restored. So these people, probably through no fault of their own, were presenting briefs to the government on rather a false premise. That was one example, Mr. Speaker, of some of the briefs heard by the committee, briefs supporting the NDP Government.

Somewhere along the line many of the groups in Manitoba were led to believe that this proposed amendment to the Constitution was designed to restore rights. In reality, when we looked at it closely, we could tell that it was designed to extend rights and to entrench them.

Has one to wonder why there was this idea of restoring rights and righting wrongs. Did this government think that by entrenching something today, it would wipe out the pages of history from what had happened before and everyone would live happily ever after and nothing would ever be said or thought of again about the things that had happened before? Well that is impossible. History cannot be rewritten.

The committee also heard many many briefs from mayors, reeves, and other officials of the province who expressed their deep concern about what the NDP Government was doing, or trying to do. These people spoke on behalf of hundreds of Manitobans. They tried to convey to the government the wishes of their people, the people they represent and the people they work for, the people who sent them to the hearings to speak on their behalf.

In connection with that I'd like to make a comment or two on how some of the reeves and mayors were treated by a certain member of the committee, particularly at the hearings - particularly the hearings in Brandon at which I was a member of the committee. Clearly an attempt was made to make these people look foolish and lacking in knowledge. They were badgered by questions on legalities and statistics. They were asked countless questions designed to expose them as bigots.

Many in the audience were both annoyed and dismayed by the tactics of the Attorney-General and that, together with the extremely long wait to be heard, caused several of these people who had prepared briefs and had expected to present them, they either did not present them or they sent them in written form because they would not want to face what turned out almost to be a tribunal and not a committee; a disgraceful way to treat the people of Manitoba who were there at the request of their councils to express their opinion on what the government was doing. In fact one reeve - I can't recall his name at the moment - before he presented his brief, he gave a very good lecture to the committee on the subject of why he was in fear and trepidation of presenting a brief at that committee.

We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that a great many of these people had never appeared before a committee of this nature before. They wondered, as they went to the committee, what would happen; then they had to sit through hours and hours and days and days waiting their turn. You can imagine the feelings they must have felt as they heard other people, elected officials like themselves, treated in that way. So it wasn't a great surprise to me that some of the people, when they came to present their brief, asked that no questions be asked by the committee.

Now this brings us to the amendment to the resolution which we have before us today. The Attorney-General and the Premier had told us that nothing in the resolution could be changed, no meetings could be held, no hearings would be held. Now we have a new Minister in charge of this thorny problem.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, twice in the comments from the Honourable Member for Gladstone reference has been made to a statement by the Attorney-General suggesting that he said nothing in the resolution could

be changed. What he said was that nothing could be changed unilaterally since there were five parties to the accord. That's a very different statement than saying nothing could be changed. I think that should be put to rest, otherwise, what this House is hearing is a constant distortion of that quote.

MR. H. ENNS: On the same point of order, and I don't have the Hansard before me, but I believe my colleague from La Verendrye has, the actual words of the Attorney-General, and I remember them well, that not a jot or hittle will be changed. Now if the Honourable

House Leader wants to argue as to the differences between those meanings, I think it does demonstrate that the remarks by the Honourable Member for Gladstone were accurate.

MR. SPEAKER: Members I'm sure are aware a difference of opinion as to the facts does not constitute a point of order.

The time being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening, at which time the honourable member will have 17 minutes remaining.