



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. 115 - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 26 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 26 July, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a short statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I should inform the honourable members that this is the only statement being made on this subject today.

I would like to report on the status of the Aerial Spraying Program to combat a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis. Last evening, aerial spraying was conducted over the communities of Morden and Winkler.

Aerial spraying planned for the communities of Selkirk, Stonewall and Stony Mountain was not undertaken this morning due to high winds. These three communities remain as a high priority in the Aerial Spraying Program, and will be done this evening if weather conditions permit. If the weather is not suitable this evening, the three communities will be rescheduled to Wednesday morning.

Alternate sites for aerial spraying this evening and tomorrow include: Portage, Carman, Morris, Niverville, Gimli and the beaches.

Officials from the Department of Municipal Affairs are keeping in constant touch with local municipal officials of communities designated to receive the aerial spraying application.

I would also like to report today that monitoring of viral activity in western Manitoba is being increased, and I expect to report the monitoring results to the House at the earliest opportunity next week.

So there is no confusion, let me restate the communities that have received the aerial application: Winnipeg, Headingley, Steinbach, Ste. Anne, Morden and Winkler.

The communities currently designated to be sprayed include Selkirk, Stonewall, Stony Mountain, Carman, Portage, Gimli and the beaches, Beausejour, Oakbank, Morris, Niverville and Altona.

The Emergency Information Centre has now handled over 6,000 telephone calls since becoming operational last Wednesday afternoon. Again, I invite Manitobans with questions regarding Western Equine Encephalitis or the Aerial Spraying Program to call our information centre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and we thank the Minister for his exclusive statement on the situation today.

I note the reference to Gimli and the beaches as intended targets sites for aerial spraying this evening and tomorrow, on an alternate basis, should weather dictate that kind of decision. I believe I discussed during question period yesterday with the Minister the matter of whether the beach communities, the Lake Winnipeg Beach communities and Gimli, had been included in the Aerial Spraying Program or not. I got the impression from the Minister at that time that they had been but I would infer from this statement, Mr. Speaker, they have not yet been covered by the aerial spraying operation; they are simply alternate possible sites depending on the dictates of the weather.

As yet, despite the level of mosquito populations in those areas, I take it and I assume from the Minister's nod of assent that those communities have not been included in the spraying operation. I would hope, because of the intensity, both of human population and insect population in those communities, that he will be giving very conscientious thought to including them very early in the spraying operation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: A point of clarification, if I could. I misunderstood the question. It was my understanding that the question was, will they be sprayed as opposed to had they been sprayed, and from the information we've given, I answered it with the understanding that we were including them as designated areas, high-risk areas, but not that they had been sprayed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Members will have before them a leaflet entitled "The Facts About French Language Services." I wish to inform the House that this is a household mailer being distributed to every home and business in the Province of Manitoba.

There has been concern that Manitobans have not received enough information on this matter. In order to rectify this situation, four informational meetings have been held throughout the province. The pamphlet before you has been produced for the same purpose. It will help Manitobans understand the proposed amendment and to help answer any questions they may have regarding the government's proposed French Language Services Program.

The government has attempted to inform Manitobans about the proposed French Language Service Program in the most cost efficient manner. The household mailer will cost 2.8 cents per Manitoba resident - a method which is far less costly than television advertising.

The distribution of this leaflet is in line with the practice that has been followed by many provinces in Canada, including this one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can hardly find fault with the government's intention to extend to as many Manitobans as possible, the import and the substance of the proposal that they had for an amendment to the Constitution of Manitoba. And although I think Manitoba taxpayers will be less than enthusiastic about the additional cost to them that is involved in the distribution of this kind of mailer, it would not be our intention to take a critical position on the subject at this point in time, Mr. Speaker.

The one point we would like to emphasize is that this, we would hope should not be interpreted, or presented, in any way as a be-all and an end-all by this government in terms of the discussion of this problem and the relay of information and the exchange of information. It does not detract one iota from the request that we believe has come legitimately from this side of the House and many other spokesmen in this province for an opportunity for the public to provide the government with its views, and its considered views in depth on this very important subject.

So we accept the initiative presented by the Attorney-General at this point in time but in doing so, couple that with a reiteration of our request, Sir, for intersessional public hearings on the government's proposed course of action.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Miami Feeders - feedlot closure

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

The opposition this morning was shocked to hear the comments made by the agricultural community presenting briefs to the Agriculture Committee in where we found out, or were told, that Manitoba's largest feedlot, the Miami Feeders, this week have closed their doors from doing business and that they will not be providing the beef animals to go to the slaughterhouse industry and provide a valued market for feed grains, and for feeder cattle, that it is a major blow to Manitoba.

The question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture, is he now prepared to change his criteria and his stabilization program so that those feedlot industries, or those people in the feedlot industry who are now left in business can qualify and get stabilization equal to those of other provinces in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, I feel compelled to raise a point of order from Beausheue, Page 131, Citation 357 (hh), which requires the question should not "seek information about proceedings in a committee

which has not yet made its report to the House." Any discussion, Mr. Speaker, of a matter that has been referred to a committee, in this House in question period, is inappropriate because of the standing reference of the policy matter to the committee.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the question raised by my colleague, the Member for Arthur, is not the question which is before the committee. His question arises from information which has been publicly provided, including to that committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the honourable member would care to rephrase his question so that it does not reflect upon matters that are before a committee which has not yet reported.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I'll speak to the point of order. The point of order that the Member for Springfield raised, I do not believe has substance to it. The comments that were made at the committee were dealing with Manitoba's feedlot industry and the loss of a feedlot because of inaction of this government. The committee was sitting to discuss and to hear submissions on Bill 90, which is the removal of the Cattle Producers' Association, which is objected to by the majority of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: A further blow to the cattle industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question?

Feedlot industry in Manitoba

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll rephrase my question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba's feedlot industry is under extreme pressure, losing a lot of money; removing it from the marketplace for feeder cattle this fall; removing it from the feed grain market; removing the job opportunities that are provided in Manitoba's packing house industry and employment opportunities, will the Minister reconsider his position and now support the feedlot industry with a stabilization program in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to reply to that speech made by the Member for Arthur.

First of all, there is a misinformation provided to this House by the Member for Arthur, where he indicates that the present program does not allow for the feedlot industry to participate in our Beef Stabilization Plan. That is inaccurate, Sir.

The fact of the matter is that any feedlot operator is able to participate in the program presently by offering to finish cattle for any producer in the province and

he is able to feed. It is only on the basis of the individual choice of that operator, that he or she feels that they may not wish to participate in the plan.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, there has been a . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: He's a fool.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have been called certain names here. Mr. Speaker, if the members don't like my answer, they can get up and ask another question that they may wish to be clarified.

Sir, as I was saying, there has been a proposal made to the Provincial Government, and the terms of the proposal were unacceptable in light of the assistance provided to other beef producers within the province, one area - and implicit in the honourable member's question - is that the province, the taxpayers of Manitoba, should subsidize the investment opportunities of people investing in the feeding of cattle. We are and have tried to stabilize the basic industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, the honourable member makes note that there are other provinces with stabilization. We have attempted to co-operate with other provinces, including the provinces of Alberta, Ontario, which have no stabilization programs, and we hope that we will find co-operation between the Federal Government and the provinces in setting up a national stabilization plan in which there will be a commonality of support to the entire industry.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know and I want the Minister of Agriculture to know that in the next question that I ask, it is a new question to the Minister of Agriculture.

I would like the Minister of Agriculture to tell me, how many feedlots - tell this House - in the Province of Manitoba are now within the guidelines and working within a program which he has established. How many feedlots are getting direct support under a beef stabilization from the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that there was no direct support provided under the plan. Mr. Speaker, what he didn't say as well, and that's how I answered the question, that it is open to any feedlot operator. In fact, the feedlot industry participated with the Manitoba Beef Commission just a month ago through a set of more than a dozen rural meetings, encouraging and working with the Beef Commission to have farmers put their cattle into the feedlot industry and custom finish them so that they can be finished within the province.

That support is there, Sir, and their returns can be guaranteed under the program so that they know what their costs are and they can offer those kinds of costs to the producers who put their cattle in. Then there is no uncertainty in terms of their costs; they can have them covered. The beef producer has their finished product covered under stabilization, and everybody makes a living, Mr. Speaker. What is wrong with that?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that it was evidenced today, it's been evidenced over the

last few weeks by the feedlot industry, and the Minister has admitted that he has had submissions from the feedlot industry asking for direct support; in view of the fact that his watered-down support, as he would indicate that it is, that if you custom feed for a farmer in Manitoba, then you will get support indirectly; in view of the fact that that is not working, will he now implement a program that has been recommended by the feedlot industry in Manitoba to support that feedlot industry and support the workers in the packing house industry who need that watered-down support that he's saying the feedlot industry should get? Will he change it, Mr. Speaker, so there is direct support to the feedlot industry?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I guess the matter of the question comes down to whether the support should be direct or indirect. The additional information that has been provided to the initial brief made by the feedlot component of the cattle producers is being looked at by the department. I should tell the honourable member that we have attempted to set up a meeting with them. Part of the problem is that we are involved, our staff is involved in the national negotiations with the Federal Government into a national plan and we will attempt to co-ordinate that as early as possible.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture, who purports to be a spokesman for the cattle industry of Manitoba, who indicates that he is trying to support them; will he take seriously the difficulties that they are now encountering as an industry? Will he do that, Mr. Speaker, to save the packing house industry jobs and the packing house industry, which has been reported, very recently, as being endangered in the Province of Manitoba and, in fact, we could be in danger of losing further packing house industries in Manitoba? Will he take action to save the packing house industry, to get support from his city colleagues, who I'm sure must be concerned about the economic environment of the City of Winnipeg? Will he, in fact, move on their benefit, if he won't move on the fact that the farmers of this province are having difficulties?

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the honourable member now admitting that when he was in office and when he was approached by the cattle producers of this province for assistance, he turned them down. It took a commitment, on behalf of this party and this government, to put in a plan of long-term stability to the beef industry and the hog industry in this province. It took large and long-term financial contribution and commitment by this government to this industry to provide long-term support.

In the short term, there is no doubt that there are problems within the industry but, Mr. Speaker, the losses we have sustained to our cattle herd over the last number of years will take a period of time to rebuild, and we have started on that rebuilding, and without that cow-calf industry - there is no beef industry in this province.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to confirm that during our term of office

there were very few, if any, farmers went bankrupt; there were very few, if any, feedlot producers that went bankrupt; but during his term in office, since 1981 of November, there have been numerous - in fact the farm bankruptcies have increased by 380 percent in the Province of Manitoba? Can he confirm this, Mr. Speaker? By 380 percent increase in bankruptcies in Manitoba and numerous feedlots and this week, the largest feedlot in Manitoba has gone broke under his government's administration, or in fact, closed the doors, I rephrase that.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, what I can confirm is that we are harvesting part of the holocaust of four years of Tory administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pose some similar questions to the Minister of Agriculture if I could.

I would ask him if it is a fact that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. MANNES: I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it's a fact that potentially 75 percent of our feeders this year will be exported to other provinces for feeding; that compared to 40 percent, traditionally, which have been exported, this number really represents the destruction of our feeding industry in this province?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the Ontario Government recently conducted a study in which they purported as one of their difficulties to their feeding industry was: (1) The quality of cattle that they received from the United States in terms of south of Ontario; and (2) the advent of the Beef Stabilization Program in Manitoba, which would have an impact on the number of feeder animals coming to their province.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to encourage the greater feeding of animals in this province twofold; either by the setting up of co-operative approaches which the farmers can undertake themselves on farm, or use the custom feeding measures as well. We are, as well, in discussion with the feedlot group as to whether or not there should be an additional component of the custom finishing through feedlot operators in the province, Mr. Speaker. We have not finalized our discussions with them, and we will work on those as the weeks go by.

MR. C. MANNES: Inasmuch as the Minister has chosen not to refute the fact that 75 percent or more of our feeders are now leaving this province, I am wondering when he and his government will give a response to the feedlot committee of the Manitoba Cattle Producers' Association, who have presented for a second time a program dealing with a voluntary income stabilization program. When will he see fit to give a response to them on that particular program?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, one can't refute a figure that is taken out of the air as to whether it will be 40

percent, 50 percent, 60 percent. Our hope, and in fact, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there has been, as the member well knows, that last fall the program started long after the sale of calves began, and there was no impact on the number of movement of calves out of the province. We certainly are hopeful that the number of calves retained this fall through the beef program will increase; and we have put measures into place, such as cash advances to farmers, and we are working with the feedlot industry to provide that assistance.

The honourable member asks when we will give an answer to the feedlot industry. Mr. Speaker, we have been working with the feedlot industry, and the member well knows that the feedlot industry has an ability to jump into business just as quickly as they can go out of business, depending on the cyclical nature of the markets and prices of cattle.

Cost of bilingualism pamphlet

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General and ask him if he could clarify a point.

He is passing out a pamphlet which is going to be sent to everyone in Manitoba, or every household in Manitoba, and he indicates that it will cost 2.8 cents per Manitoba resident. Does that mean that you multiply that figure times a million and get \$280,000 for this . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. DOERN: Well, you know, the members may laugh, but it says "per resident" with a "t" - not residence.

I'd like the Honourable Attorney-General to tell us, is this \$280,000 for printing costs, or is it a quarter of that? What is the amount?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Even in this House, Mr. Speaker, 2.8 times one million is \$28,000.00. The total cost is \$28,000.00.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney-General for that correction.

I would also like to ask him what his total budget is. What is his total budget for this program? He's handing out this; sending this for \$28,000 to everyone in Manitoba. I would be rather suspicious of that. I would like to ask him how much this pamphlet costs, and I would like to ask him what his total budget is for printing and other costs to promote the government's bilingual policy?

HON. R. PENNER: I'll take that question as notice.

Bilingualism - referendums

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs a question.

The City of Brandon passed a resolution last night at its council meeting, calling for a referendum in the City of Brandon on October 26th on the question of bilingualism. I would also like to ask the Minister, in view of the fact that other municipalities are holding referendums - I think Hamiota is planning one and other towns, cities, villages and rural municipalities are planning one - my question simply is: What indication does he have to date; what number can he provide the House with of planned referendums on this question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . to whom the question was directed.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, I have not received any requests from any municipality indicating that they would be holding a referendum on extension of French Language Services to the province, but they may do so if they so desire.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the Minister whether, in his opinion, he favours the holding of referendums on this question across the province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member please phrase his question so that it seeks information and not opinion?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to return to the problems of the cattle industry and indicate to you, Sir, firstly, on a House privilege matter that I object to word "holocaust" used to describe the actions of a government that I was privileged to be a part of. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture may think that that is funny, but I don't accept that.

Bill 90 - withdrawal

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the responses that the Minister of Agriculture has given to the Honourable Member for Morris, and my colleague, the Honourable Member for Arthur, about this government's unwillingness to help the particular segment of the cattle industry; and in view of the representations made this morning about the willingness on the part of the Manitoba Cattlemens' Association to try to help themselves by virtue of keeping their organization together, will the Minister consider withdrawing Bill 90,

which has the net effect of destroying that organization totally and completely?

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the member's question, asked to the Minister of Agriculture, is dealing with a bill that is standing referred by this Chamber to a committee. If the member wants to bring the bill back to the House, to deal with it in the House, he's perfectly free to move a motion for transferring it back to the House for debate and pulling it out of committee.

MR. H. ENNS: I'll do that. I'll do that, Andy.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside wish to rephrase his question so that it does not refer to proceedings before the committee?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I've been known to always bow to the wishes of this House, and you, Sir, in terms of rules and regulations that we set for ourselves, and I'm certainly prepared to do so in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I accept the honourable member's question and his comment that . . .

MR. H. ENNS: If my question is out of order, surely the Minister's potential answer's equally out of order.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney-General.

Having just had the opportunity of perusing his multi-coloured, eight page folder, which he claims he had printed and distributed for \$28,000, which is an Aladdin's lamp trick if ever I heard of one, may I bring to his attention, Sir, one statement in this printed brochure, and I quote - "Putting this agreement into the Constitution guarantees exactly what services are legal rights, and therefore is not the beginning of, 'creeping bilingualism'."

Mr. Speaker, I ask him how that statement, which is very dubious on the face of it, how does that statement square with the advice that he had from Mr. Twaddle, the constitutional adviser to the Government of Manitoba, when Mr. Twaddle stated - "The difficulty with the suggested extension of constitutional rights is that the extent to which bilingual services must be made available is unknown. At present the government can itself decide, and alter, the provision of such services on grounds of cost, or lack of demand, as perceived by the government. If the obligation is constitutionally entrenched the courts will determine what 'significant demand' is and when 'it is reasonable due to the nature of the office'. If the obligation is construed more widely than the government thought would be the case the

government is nonetheless bound by the interpretation of the courts."

Mr. Speaker, that was the advice from legal counsel to the government. How does the Attorney-General make the statement in his brief to the people of Manitoba, putting this agreement into the constitution guarantees exactly what services are legal rights, and therefore is not the beginning of creeping bilingualism, when that's the opposite of what his legal adviser told him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to seek your direction.

I'll be pleased to answer the question but since this is a matter presently ordered for debate in the House, whether or not I should answer it is a question for you to rule. I don't think that it would be proper but if I'm to answer it, I would take some time in answering it because it is not a simple question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General is quite right about a matter being referred to the House for future discussion. However, I hear the question as asking about a specific pamphlet which was tabled in the House this afternoon and I will permit the question on that basis.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question relates to a statement in the pamphlet. "Putting this agreement into the Constitution guarantees exactly what services are legal rights and therefore is not the beginning of 'creeping bilingualism'."

I refer members, first of all, to 23.7(1) of the proposed agreement. 23.7(1) of the agreement sets out step-by-step the confines, and they are confines, on government and government alone for the delivery of French language services. It speaks of the head, or central offices, of any department of government; of any court; of any quasi-judicial or administrative body of the Government of Manitoba; of any Crown Corporation; or any agency of the Government of Manitoba established by or pursuant to an act of the Legislature of Manitoba, which is in itself very definitive and confining; the office of the Chief Electoral Officer; and the offices of the Ombudsman for the Province of Manitoba. That's in 23.7(1).

Then 23.7(2) goes on to say - that any member of the public in Manitoba has the right to communicate in English, or French with, and to receive available services in English or French from, any office not referred to in Subsection (1) of an institution described in Paragraph 1(a) or (b) - and that should not be lost sight of - so it's confined to those specifically-named institutions and only deals then with offices other than head, or central offices of those named institutions, so again clearly defined, and where there is significant demand that communications with, and services from that office in that language; or (b) due to the nature of office it is reasonable that communications with and services from that office be available in both English and French.

So now the point of the question and the specific answer is this - that by the opening words of 23.8(1) - and again this should not be lost sight of - anyone whose rights under Section 23.7 have been infringed - so only in case of an alleged infringement of those defined items relating to defined offices do the courts even have a window on the process, and then the court can only say with respect to a government plan whether or not the government plan is adequate. That's all it can do, and in doing so it must do so in relationship to the defined offices so that the definition of the offices, as carefully and tightly as it is there - and it can be tighter - we're looking at tightening the definition of those offices - that is what makes it not creeping bilingualism because it can't get out of those doors. It can't get over those defined offices.

Now, I could go on with this answer but I'll wait for the supplementary. So we're having a debate on the resolution in question period, that's all right.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Attorney-General's attempt to answer the question but I repeat it because he didn't answer the question.

How does that statement of fact contained in this expensive brochure that he's sending to all of the people of Manitoba, guarantees exactly what services are legal rights and therefore is not the beginning of creeping bilingualism, how does that statement square with the legal advice that he got from his own constitutional lawyer, Mr. Twaddle, which I have read to the House and to the honourable member which says quite the opposite, namely, that the courts will determine what bilingual services will be offered, particularly in view of the fact, as my honourable friend will acknowledge, he left out the first section of the amendment which says: "23.1 English and French are the official languages of Manitoba"?

HON. R. PENNER: With respect to the latter part of the question, the purely declaratory statement at the beginning of the proposed amendment is not a matter that in any way affects the specific rights that are defined in 23.7, because the opening words of 23.8, which I emphasized, specifically confine the power of the courts to the named offices in 23.7.

Secondly, with respect to the legal opinion, and I have always respected the legal opinion of eminent counsel but I'm not bound by it slavishly, that legal opinion was given on the 14th of April, 1982, before these words were even written. It was not in response - (interjection) - yes. You're a lawyer. Listen. That opinion was given on the question in general. That response or that opinion of Mr. Twaddle's was given on April 14, 1982. These particular words did not come into existence until May of 1983, so there is no legal opinion of Mr. Twaddle on the significance of these words in the way in which it is suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. His double shuffle will not wash with me in any event.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, it was not I who tabled Mr. Twaddle's opinion, it was the Attorney-General. We thank him for tabling the opinion, giving advice to the government as to how they should proceed. The shame and the pity, Mr. Speaker, is that they did not proceed

according to that advice. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, if the fanatic would like to keep his emotions under control, perhaps the rest of us could get on with the business of Manitoba. We don't need advice from the kindergarten bunch in the back row, Mr. Speaker.

In this expensive brochure that was tabled by the Attorney-General today, this statement is made, Mr. Speaker. "1983, Manitoba agreement for constitutional amendment is proposed to settle once and for all in a fair and practical way the status of the English and French languages. By doing so, we avoid further court cases."

Mr. Speaker, how does that statement square with the opinion of Mr. Twaddle which says as follows on Page 6, "Amendment before a Supreme Court ruling could presumably be made pursuant to Section 43 of The Constitution Act, 1981, although it would be open to someone to challenge the validity of such an amendment on the ground that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba was not properly constituted? This would reintroduce the issue presently before the Supreme Court in *Bilodeau versus A.G., Manitoba*. If however the amendments had the approval of the French-speaking population of Manitoba, perhaps the issue would never be raised. There would remain, however, the right for someone now or at a future date to challenge the authority of the Manitoba Legislature to act at all."

Mr. Speaker, how does that statement and the expense of the NDP brochure, paid for by the taxpayers, square with the good legal advice that this government is getting? One, Mr. Speaker, tells the facts. The brochure, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, does not tell the truth. What does the Attorney-General say about that?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I guess we're into the debate on the resolution in question period, but I continue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Attorney-General.

A MEMBER: The one-sided brochure.

HON. R. PENNER: The legal opinion that was given on April 14, 1982, in the context of April 14, 1982, in that particular portion from which the Leader of the Opposition quotes selectively went over a number of options with respect to the way in which, under present law, the Constitution of Canada of which The Manitoba Act by Schedule 1 is a part and explored the possibilities with respect to amendments pursuant to Section 43 of The Constitution Act, 1982; explored the options with respect to Section 38 of The Constitution Act, 1982; and offered, as a good lawyer will, a number of alternatives. That is what that opinion was.

Mr. Twaddle did not purport to say that we would be involved in an endless series of court battles. In fact - and this is tremendously important - the validation of our statutes is the key part of the agreement. What the thrust of the opinion is and of my statement is, that is that the taking of our statute piecemeal, one after the other, all or some of them, The Highway Traffic

Act, The Liquor Control Act, Public Utilities Act, all of them, taking them to court one after another and bleeding us to death in terms of court costs and the uncertainty as to where we stood with every piece of legislation that has been finalized, or will be, on the passage of this resolution. We will know that our laws are valid, despite the fact that they were improperly passed in one language only.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, then very simply, how does the Attorney-General of Manitoba square his statement that he had just made that this will be the end of all court actions with the statement made by his own constitutional lawyer which says, and I repeat, "There would remain, however, the right for someone now or at a future date to challenge the authority of the Manitoba Legislature to act at all"?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

When the honourable member phrases his question having to do with a matter which is before the House, it is out of order. When he phrases his question having to do with a statement of a pamphlet that is distributed in the House, then it is in order.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that's precisely what I did. I was asking the Attorney-General to square his statement that he made in response to the first question with a statement from Mr. Twaddle. He obviously can't do it. He assaults the House with a barrage of words and balderdash and expects that to be taken as an answer. I am asking for a simple answer to a simple question. How does he square the statement in the publication that he tabled today with the statements made by Mr. Twaddle which are 180 degrees apart?

HON. R. PENNER: To the contrary, my statement in the pamphlet is not inconsistent with the opinions given by Mr. Twaddle then and since.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General introduces a new item. Will he then table any opinions that he has had from Mr. Twaddle since, which would countermand any of the opinions that he gave in April of 1982, which the Attorney-General saw fit to table?

HON. R. PENNER: I did not say that Mr. Twaddle had countermanded. The Leader of the Opposition has a neat but palpable way of putting words in the mouths of others and then purporting to deal with that as if it were the answer. Well again, that will not wash with me.

I, at least, have a sufficient memory to remember what I said 30 seconds ago, and that I did not say; nor will I answer a question of that kind of hectoring, cross-examining way suitable to a court room but not to a Legislature where we're trying in a responsible way to articulate public policy that affects Manitobans in a fairly basic way.

The legal opinion of Mr. Twaddle was precisely that. It was guidelines for the province, and I pointed out, when it was given, under what circumstances it was given. It was not the only legal opinion obtained by the province. It was not the only legal opinion by which I

developed with the rest of government a course of action. We had the legal opinion of Professor Gibson; we had the legal opinion of legislative counsel; we had legal opinions of that kind that helped us shape the policy.

I say again, in emphatic terms, that the agreement which is being proposed indeed is one which validates our statutes and makes it impossible to take a statute of the Province of Manitoba pursuant to someone who may be charged or which deals with the rights of a person, and say, no, that statute does not apply because it is invalid on account of not being passed in both of the languages of the Legislature.

Brandon University - construction

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister announce whether or not the government has made the decision to allow Brandon University to proceed with construction of the Music Building?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, that matter is under review by the members of the Jobs Fund Committee, along with the Minister of Education.

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

The Brandon Music Building was included in the government's "Wish List" which was distributed at the time that the Minister of Finance brought down his budget. The project has since been announced again under the NEED Program, a joint program between the province and the Federal Government.

My question to the First Minister, Sir: In view of the fact that this was promised in the election, was listed in the "Wish List" and has been announced under the NEED Program, when will the government actually approve the construction of this Music Building to go ahead?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Member for Turtle Mountain that it will be more speedily, more hastily than did the former government of the Province of Manitoba.

HON. S. LYON: You won't win a seat in Brandon anyway, Howard, so don't worry.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Earth Sciences Building which the government has approved . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . was not on the "Wish List," but the government was still able to provide \$3.5 million

from the Jobs Fund to allow the Earth Sciences Building to go ahead.

Will the First Minister not seriously reconsider the fact that his government promised that approval for that Music Building during the election; has since announced it a number of times? Will the First Minister just please carry through on one of the commitments that he made during the election?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what indeed the honourable member is referring to when he suggests reconsider. I indicated yesterday; I've indicated today that is a matter that is under careful review by the Jobs Fund Board and by the Minister of Education. We will be making appropriate announcement in respect to same. It is a question of scale, size, etc., and that is presently under review by the appropriate Ministers and this government, so there is nothing to reconsider. There are serious considerations being given now to the form of any assistance and how that assistance should be matched up with other forms of assistance.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, we have committee changes on the Standing Committee of Statutory Orders and Regulations: Hammond for Nordman, and Mercier for Orchard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill 105 as it appears on Page 9, standing in the name of the Member for Swan River; and then call the adjourned debate on the referral resolution with respect to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as it appears on Page 10, standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert; to be followed, time permitting, with the calling of the adjourned debate on Bill 3 on Page 6, standing in the name of the Member for River Heights.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL 105 - THE MUNICIPAL ASSESSMENT ACT (2)

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill 105.
The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've had a chance to look over this bill and I'd like to thank the Minister of Municipal Affairs for providing me with a copy of his speaking notes; also, he provided section-by-section explanations to simplify the understanding of the intent of Bill 105.

I would like to congratulate the Minister for bringing in this bill, which deals with basically the recommendations that came out in the MARC Report back in March of 1982. Basically, those recommendations which were included in the recommendations covered as well the extending of the Bill 100 to the end of December, 1983. We know that the Minister of Municipal Affairs last Session decided to extend the freeze which was provided for in Bill 100 not to the end of December, 1983, but extended the freeze indefinitely.

The other recommendations that were contained in the MARC Report, and appear on Page 77 of the summary of the report, recommends other legislation that should be taken into consideration; not this year, however. It should have been looked at in 1982 so that the recommendations of the report could have been implemented, or at least part of them could have been implemented and some progress could have been already under way with respect to the recommendations contained in the MARC Report.

Last year, the Minister, as I indicated, had brought in a bill to extend the freeze until indefinitely as far as the assessment is concerned.

Another recommendation which has brought in Bill 105 is the freeze on the equalized assessment. Of course, Bill 105 deals with that and also extends indefinitely the freeze with respect to the equalized assessment. Basically, the Minister finds it's necessary because the recommendations were not proceeded with as suggested by this side and, of course, it is now necessary to extend the freeze on the equalized assessment as well as the assessment itself.

I think it's fair to say that we have been appealing to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for over a year now to move on the assessment recommendations. We didn't expect him to move without some caution and to seek advice from the various municipal organizations with respect to the recommendations, but the Minister has chosen to study this further. We know that we had the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs go out to the people this past year to seek further information and advice from the municipal people and individuals at large with respect to assessment reform. They basically said let's get on with the recommendations that the MARC Report had indicated some 15 months ago.

The inequities that are very evident throughout Manitoba and also with respect to the City of Winnipeg are major inequities that are causing a lot of concern to many taxpayers in this province. By just extending and studying the recommendations further, I can advise the Minister that these problems are not going to go away. They are only compounding, and the fact that the Minister has chosen to undertake some more study with respect to the portioning of values of each class of property that would be used in the taxation purposes, the recommendations are spelled out very clearly by the MARC Report. Sure, they recognize the fact that all of the information to come up with the exact percentages of portioning are maybe not there as yet, but they come up with a reasonable close percentage factor. That could be used at this time. As more information is provided by the assessors, then the percentages of portioning can be fine-tuned so that it reduces further the inequities that will be existent.

So on the one hand, I congratulate the Minister for bringing in this necessary legislation at this time, albeit as late. There is no reason why this legislation couldn't have been brought in last year. At the same time, the Minister indicates that the importance of selecting the precise portions of value to be utilized in implementing this section was highlighted in the report to the Legislature of the Municipal Affairs Committee. Research into this area is ongoing, and this section of the bill will not be proclaimed until this research has been completed.

We know in the Standing Committee of Municipal Affairs that the Minister indicated to us that this information would not be available for possibly another couple of years, so this is going to delay further the implementation of many of the recommendations contained in the MARC Report.

However, I don't have any further comments with respect to Bill 105. We are prepared to let it go to committee at this stage. However, we may have further questions when the bill reaches committee stage.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution by the Honourable Attorney-General, appearing on Page 10, and the amendment proposed thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak to the amendment introduced yesterday in a reasonable and eloquently put argument with respect to the timing of the hearings of the legislative committee with respect to the amendment by the government on bilingualism.

Since yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in fact, since the opening of question period and the opening of the House today, I see the need for setting over the legislative committee hearings as even more urgent, because we have had put before us a document which is, to say the least, misleading. If the public of Manitoba are going to be able to make a properly informed decision with respect to the acceptability of the government's proposal, then they are going to have to become familiar with the true facts of the situation, Mr. Speaker, as it exists.

This document, Mr. Speaker, starts off by saying: Today, Manitoba is able to fulfill its constitutional obligations. What obligation in the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, is there to the extension of French-speaking services in Manitoba? There is none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. There never has been, there isn't, and there never will be under the Constitution as it exists now, Mr. Speaker.

The document goes on to state that the province has no intention of using the federal approach. When my leader spoke to this matter some days ago, he pointed out, for the information of the House, that the wording used by the government in its section differs

only in respect of one word "institution" from that used by the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. So the suggestion that the province has no intention of using the federal approach is not wholly accurate, Mr. Speaker.

The document goes on to say, by 1987, people requesting service in French will be served in French by certain specified provincial departments and agencies. Well, that's true to a certain extent, Mr. Speaker, but it does not clearly indicate to Manitobans that it is the court that is going to interpret the proposal put forward by the Attorney-General and the government; and it is the courts that are going to tell the taxpayers in Manitoba as to where and when the obligations under their proposal will have to be used and where the government will have to provide services in French. They are not just specified. They are quite open, Mr. Speaker, and we've heard the concerns expressed by the Manitoba Government Employees Association on that issue.

On the next page, the Attorney-General's pamphlet states that Manitoba intends to fulfill its legal obligations. What legal obligations, Mr. Speaker? This government seems intent on attempting to fool the people of Manitoba by saying that they have no alternative other than to do what they are proposing to do, and that is not the case, Mr. Speaker. If they want to make the decision to proceed with what they're planning on doing, then at least tell the people this is what we want to do. Don't tell them we are forced into it when they're not forced into it, Mr. Speaker. There is no legal obligation in the Constitution to extend services in the way the government is proposing, so that is an untrue statement, Mr. Speaker.

The document goes on to say, "Putting this agreement into the Constitution guarantees exactly what services are legal rights." As my leader indicated in his questions to the Attorney-General during question period, there is no exact guarantee as to what services are legal rights, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney-General well knows, and over the past year in fact has even made some comments, and expressed a concern about how the judges in our courts might interpret the Charter of Rights. He knows very well that the comments he made in the past few months on that issue are just as applicable to this issue, Mr. Speaker, as they are to the rest of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, on the following page, the pamphlet indicates that setting these language rights into our Constitution does not diminish the rights of others. The Attorney-General and the government cannot guarantee that statement, Mr. Speaker, because it is the courts that are going to determine what the words mean that he is using. He goes on to state, "to avoid the possibility of legal chaos," but he doesn't include in the pamphlet the opinions of the Mr. Twaddle, his legal advisor, to the effect that they said there remains an excellent chance of success in the courts. We don't see that statement anywhere, Mr. Speaker, and that is a very important statement. That tells us, Mr. Speaker, what the likelihood would be of a decision in the Supreme Court with respect to this matter.

There is continuous reference to limited services. Mr. Speaker, again, it is the courts that are going to determine what services will be required under the wording of this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, there is a paragraph on saving your tax dollars, and the government makes an argument on the basis of what they say will be done under the proposal, but there is no guarantee to the taxpayers of Manitoba that the courts will not expand the interpretation of the wording used by the government and thus multiply many times over the estimated costs that are used in this document.

The document goes on to say "to settle for once and for all" - again, my leader has referred to that and the opinions of legal counsel that this may well not for once and for all decide this particular issue, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the government on an important constitutional issue, having delivered to the residents of this province, an informational pamphlet. What I do become concerned about, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the agreement and see that in a number of very significant and very important areas the information contained in the pamphlet is not accurate and is likely to be misleading to the reader.

So, Mr. Speaker, that becomes all the more important in view of what the government has announced today and distributed to us in the Legislature, that the legislative committee meet after the end of this Session of the Legislature when people have an opportunity to discover the real facts of what is before them and to discover what a correct interpretation is of the proposal before them, so that they're able to make a well-informed judgment.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, discussed yesterday, we also have before us in this Legislature a great deal of business to complete. Every day we sit simply adds to the record of the longest Session of the Manitoba Legislature. I've been sitting in a number of committees on a number of bills, Mr. Speaker, and there are dozens of people appearing before various committees of the Legislature on bills that the government has passed into second reading. Mr. Speaker, there are somewhat over 40 people yet to be heard after two meetings of the committee on seat belts. That is going to take a good number of sittings before that work is concluded.

We just concluded this morning, hearing close to 20 people on The Law Enforcement Review Act, a bill that has some 44 sections, in 16 pages, but the amendments almost exceed the bill itself. There is a great deal of controversy over that bill, an important bill affecting the police forces in Manitoba and the work which they are able to do in order to protect the citizens of this province.

There are dozens of people, I understand, who appeared before the Agriculture Committee today with respect to the Cattle Producers' Association Bill. We have not yet completed hearing the public on the Family Law Bills. There are important bills, Mr. Speaker, which have not yet even reached committee, and many of them I hope do not ever reach committee, but if they do there's going to be a large number of people who want to make representations with respect to The Farm Lands Ownership, for example.

Mr. Speaker, for the committee of the Legislature to hold public hearings on this important issue throughout the province would in my estimation require, at a very minimum, at least two weeks of solid sittings throughout the Province of Manitoba. That probably wouldn't be

enough, Mr. Speaker. It's probably fairer to say that the absolute minimum of time that would be required would be three weeks throughout the Province of Manitoba and that's sitting all day long and probably with a sitting in the evening.

Mr. Speaker, it is not to my mind appropriate and proper. I'm not proud of the fact that we had to do it in 1980 on a number of bills, but not on such an important matter as a resolution affecting the Constitution, to require the public of Manitoba to attend these meetings and make their representations in the middle of summer. It is more appropriate and proper that they be allowed to make these representations and make their comments known to the committee in the fall, Mr. Speaker, after the school year has begun, when they have returned from their holidays and vacations.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General made a comment one day in the Legislature that according to some sort of a survey only 5 percent of the people in the city were away from their homes at any one particular time during the summer.

Mr. Speaker, I have great doubt in that survey. I would like to see that survey, because I think the numbers are much more significant than that in the City of Winnipeg; particularly in what has been for Manitobans who are not members of the Legislature a fairly enjoyable summer in terms of the weather that we've had and people have been able to enjoy away from the city at resorts and lakes and cottages. So the summer is not an appropriate time for them to be required to come to the Legislature and to make representations on this important issue. The work that the Legislature has before it in order to complete is of such a magnitude, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to take us a great deal of time to complete that, unless the government is prepared to withdraw some of the bills that are still before the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter that I wish to address, speaking in support of the amendment to this resolution introduced by the Member for Fort Garry. That is with reference to what do the people of Manitoba want their representatives to be concerned with, to work on and to help along. I think what that is is the economy, Mr. Speaker, and unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, this government has said in the past, and the First Minister has said, that unemployment is the major problem facing their government and facing Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, I agree there's a very serious problem. There are now over some 20,000 more Manitobans unemployed than there were when this government took office. Mr. Speaker, there are disturbing signs in the economy. There's no question unemployment dropped from May to June, and we indicated we were happy to see that, Mr. Speaker. We only hope it continues; but there are factors that indicate that the situation is not going to improve in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, Manitoba is not going to do as well as other provinces as the economy improves elsewhere. The latest Conference Board statistics bear that out very clearly, Mr. Speaker. The Consumer Price Index, which indicates that of all major cities in Canada, the City of Winnipeg has had the second highest percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index at 7 percent, second only to St. Johns, New Brunswick, which is 7.3 percent.

Now about 4 months ago, Mr. Speaker, when it became evident from the statistics that the Consumer Price Index in the City of Winnipeg was going up faster than in any other major Canadian city, despite the fact that under our government we had the lowest Consumer Price Index increase and that it continued over into 1982, but then the effects of government-imposed taxation took hold and have caused this huge increase in the Consumer Price Index in the City of Winnipeg; when the First Minister was asked about that a number of months ago, he said, well, the problem is that we introduced the first budget and the other provinces haven't introduced their budgets yet; but as soon as they do, then we'll be back to our rightful position in the City of Winnipeg with the lowest Consumer Price Index increase as we had under a Progressive Conservative Government. But it's now June, 1983, according to the statistics, Mr. Speaker, and all of those terrible provincial budgets that the First Minister likes to refer to in other provinces have been introduced, and the City of Winnipeg is the second highest over the past year.

So my suggestion to the government, Mr. Speaker, is this: They had better attend to the economy in Manitoba and they had better attend to the reasons why the Consumer Price Index in the City of Winnipeg has increased at such a phenomenal rate to take us from the lowest in the country to the second highest in the country. They better look at the Conference Board's statistics, Mr. Speaker, which have come out recently, and their predictions for how Manitoba is going to fare in the next year.

Take a look at retail sales. Manitoba is expected to be tenth in increase in retail sales, Mr. Speaker. Those are the kinds of problems, Mr. Speaker, that really affect Manitobans, and those are the kinds of problems that Manitobans want solved and are very very concerned about.

I've had a few French people, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency telephone me; very few on this issue. In fact, I'm a little disappointed that I haven't heard from more of them, but a few phoned me, and I wanted to find out from them their views of this particular issue. One of them, Mr. Speaker, said to me, the only thing I'm concerned about with right now is finding out how much interest rates are going to increase, or whether or not they're going to increase, and about my business, because people are still very much concerned with the economy.

When there are close to 50,000 people unemployed in the province, Mr. Speaker, and we see the increase in the Consumer Price Index and we see the Conference Board statistics, that is what they're really concerned about. They're concerned about keeping their job, being able to make their mortgage payments, being able to buy their groceries and the essentials of getting along and living and supporting themselves and their families, Mr. Speaker. That's what the people are really concerned about, and that's what the government has got to pay some attention to.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to hoist upon the people of Manitoba their ideological positions on bills like The Farm Lands Ownership, The Elections Finances Act and on some of these other matters, they should be trying today to say to the opposition, "We've got to end this Session; we can't afford to waste all

of our time in this Legislature. We've got to deal with the real problems of the economy in Manitoba; we've got to end the Session. We're prepared to accommodate the wishes of Manitoba because we want to turn our attention to the economy to try to solve some of the problems."

When they look at some of the problems, they'll find that they've created many of the problems in terms of their payroll tax and their sales tax increases, the impositions they've made on business and the cost of doing business in this province, Mr. Speaker. That's the area that they should be looking at. That's what should be commanding all of the attention of the First Minister and his Ministers and his caucus, because all of the statistics indicate, Mr. Speaker, that in this coming fall and this coming winter Manitoba is going to tend to have the least growth, to have the largest growth in unemployment, and to fare very badly compared to all other provinces in Canada. And that's going to be the real problem and that is the real concern of Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons the incorrect information that is contained in this pamphlet, the business that is presently before the House and the large amount of business we have to complete, in order to convenience the citizens of Manitoba who will want to make representations, and so this government can get on with doing the first priority that it was elected to do and that was to deal with the economy. They were going to turn the economy around, Mr. Speaker. Well, they're turning it around, Mr. Speaker, all right, but it's the wrong way, and they better concentrate on that issue for the sake of the well-being of Manitobans who are very much concerned with the direction the economy has taken under this government.

So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General and the government to give careful consideration to the amendment and to thoughtfully consider it, consider their responsibilities and their obligations to the public of Manitoba. Because if they do, Mr. Speaker, I think they will see that it is a reasonable amendment and one that should be commended to them and one that should be adopted, then we could get on quickly, I would hope, to finish the business of this Legislature and they can move their attention to the economy, which is deserving of a great deal of attention and action by this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I believe I gave you notice that I've been designated by the First Minister with respect to time on this, although I don't think I will in fact take much time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that there's a great deal of what might be called "smoke and mirrors" about this debate on the proposal of the Member for Fort Garry - perhaps inadvertent, it doesn't matter, but a covering up of the issue. Certainly the speech of the Member for St. Norbert, redolent as it was, with talk about interest rates and mortgages and farm lands and a hundred and other one issues, but not the issue which is in fact before us.

So, too, as I will endeavour to point out, at least at the beginning of my remarks, was the speech of the

Member for Fort Garry. I thank him for the flattering remarks; I don't disavow any of them. He came close to describing my near perfection, and if he keeps at it he might get it right in due course.

But leaving that particular smoke and mirror aside from the Wizard of Oz on the opposite bench, let me deal with one of the apparently appealing cries that he uttered - the appeal to reason. And I am, it is true, I will readily admit, one who will listen to reason, and reason has an appeal for me. I would like to hope that there should be an element of rationality about all of us in this House and, Mr. Speaker, in this debate. He said what there should be is a consensus. Now, that sounds terrific. All those in favour of Mother's Day consensus and Happy Birthdays, raise your hand. Of course, that is an ideal devoutly to be wished for, but let's look at the principles of the bill, and very briefly because I don't intend to debate the bill in this debate on a referral.

Just take two issues. We have said with respect to minority rights that there is an important principle in terms of constitutional protection, namely, that they should be entrenched. That is a point of principle with us. They, through the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition, have said categorically, unequivocally, no entrenchment. Now, tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where is the consensus possible between those points of principle and they are points of principle? Where is the dividing, or where is the common ground to be found between entrench and not entrench? So to talk about consensus, well, we try a little harder, maybe we'll find a synonym for entrenchment that doesn't mean entrenchment; or a synonym for non-entrenchment that means entrenchment is smoke and mirrors. It's shuffling the deck with a little bit of legerdemain, a little bit of sleight of hand.

Let's take another principle. Indeed, it was being spoken about in the debate today, namely, whether or not there should be, with respect to a constitutional remedy, recourse to the courts. We say that with respect to a constitutional remedy there must be some recourse to the courts. What we're proposing is a limited recourse to the courts. They say no recourse to the courts. Tell me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where is there a consensus obtainable between recourse to the courts and no recourse to the courts? It's smoke and mirrors. It sounds appealing, but when you get down to what the principles are, rather than the particulars, I will deal briefly with the particulars where there is the possibility of arriving at some substantial agreement. But on the principles, the dividing line is clear and that dividing line will always be here as long at least as that Member for Charleswood is the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps that view is shared by the majority of his caucus, I don't go into that. It's certainly not shared by the majority of the federal members on that question, but as long as that is the view of the opposition, no entrenchment, and we believe that minority rights deserving of the protection should be entrenched, there is no possibility of consensus on that issue.

So, too, with respect to the question of whether or not services to the citizens of Manitoba, where warranted, should be in both official languages, in both French and English. Now, we have said indeed that should be the case; that is in fact an historic obligation. Indeed I would argue at the appropriate time it is a

constitutional obligation, and I reject the assertion made by the Member for St. Norbert that it is not a constitutional obligation, but I do not deal with it now. We have said that.

The Union of Manitoba Municipalities, in the news release tabled in this House and quoted with approval by the opposition, says let's go back to 1890 and wipe out the obligation that we undertook as part of the social contract which brought this province into existence. Where is the consensus between living up to our obligation and not living up to our obligation? So to talk about consensus, and that's very appealing - maybe if we talk about it, we'll find a middle ground - it's smoke and mirrors. There is no basis of reality in that kind of salesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, these are points of principle upon which in my view a government, indeed an opposition, must take a stand one way or another. We have taken our stand on both points of principle. We have set them forth clearly, and we have said that we will stand on those points of principle. They have said that they will fight to the end those points of principle.

Being points of principle, Mr. Speaker, these do not in our view stand to be determined on the basis of numbers. The principle of minority rights - surely one shouldn't have to explain it but apparently one does - means that there are some things we consider to be fundamental, so fundamental that they ought not to be subjected to the tyranny of the majority. They are so important in a civilized and democratic society that they ought not to be the subject of political football; that they ought not to be sacrificed on the altar of immediate political advantage.

It doesn't matter in our view that the minority is more of a minority now than it was then if it is something that is part of the social contract, is part of the fabric of our society, is part of something that which we believe to be fundamental, must be entrenched, then it must be entrenched regardless of the numbers.

I would like in this context, because it's been put to us in the debate on this referral motion that it's a question of numbers. The Member for Elmwood plays the numbers game, and I will refer to that in a moment. The Constitution Act, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms - fundamental freedoms - everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: Freedom of conscience and religion; freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communications; freedom of peaceful assembly; and freedom of association. Should those be the subject of a referendum? If we believed that, we would not have put them - we being the vast majority of the Canadian people - in our fundamental law, the supreme law of the country, the constitutional law of the country.

We remember, and the Member for Elmwood should remember what happened to J.S. Woodsworth when that kind of protection of free speech was denied both with respect to his role and his advocacy of the social gospel at the time of the general strike in 1919, and later with respect to his principles of conscience on pacifism at the outbreak of the Second World War. Should those have been subjected to the tyranny of the majority? Not at all.

Would we countenance now in the more mature days of our political development the situation where, let us

say, in Quebec under Duplessis, somebody who was a Jehovah's Witness, because that person was a Jehovah's Witness, was trampled on by the majority, no doubt; but by the tyranny of the majority because there was lacking constitutional protection?

So too, and I would like to point this out because that ought not to be lost sight of, under Section 15.1 of this Charter: "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination," and in particular, Mr. Deputy Speaker, "based on race, national or ethnic origin, religion, sex, age, or mental or physical disability."

This section which comes into force in a year-and-a-half time, much before indeed our amendment would come into force, is a fundamental principle upon which indeed I would venture to guess that even if we hadn't been proceeding with this particular amendment, would give a legal recourse within the framework of the Charter to those who could claim discrimination with respect to matters of "race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, or mental or physical disability." It would not matter that they constituted 2 percent of the population. We would have said, and we do say that it is the fundamental law that these minority rights are to be protected. So let's not play the numbers game.

Minority rights cannot be sacrificed on the altar of numbers, but I continue on the question of consensus and public input. There are matters, and I said so at the beginning, which are not matters of principle - I enunciated what I thought to be the main matters of principle - but are important nonetheless. These are things which can, in the course of the dealing of this resolution, be dealt with and can be altered. We have said this; we can and indeed are benefiting from the ongoing discussion which is taking place. So we had the public meetings, the four public meetings. Indeed there were some people, regrettably all too few, who addressed the matter of that which is new; namely, portions of 23.7, and had some concern about particular words and particular phrases.

So there are ongoing discussions with the Civil Service, both individually and as represented by their certified bargaining agents. Those too are proving useful and productive and may well lead - indeed, I hope they do lead - to a consensus on sharpening the terminology in 23.7.

There are discussions with the Franco-Manitoban community, both individually and collectively. There, too, I am heartened by what I sense is a real desire there as well to make sure that the terms used are the best possible terms, the most sharply defined terms.

There are discussions with the appellant himself through his counsel. One must not forget at all times that there is still a case pending in the Supreme Court; so those discussions are ongoing and I may say I am heartened by those discussions.

There will be the further opportunity of the public to make representations before a standing committee of the Legislature; that which we consider to be, as we deal with very important pieces of legislation, something of fundamental importance in our process.

I want to say to the members in this House that I and the First Minister and the Minister of Municipal Affairs met with some representatives of close to 40

municipalities — (Interjection) — That's close, between 30 and 40 municipalities — (Interjection) — Were you there? Were you counting?

HON. S. LYON: It depends whether they even bothered going to talk to you.

HON. R. PENNER: Right, and they did bother to come to talk to us, and it was a fruitful, productive, pleasant discussion, in which questions were asked and answered, statements of support were made with respect to what was being proposed once it was clearly understood, and to tell us or seek to say that all of the municipalities of Manitoba are opposed is not in accordance with the facts or the truth, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and hereto we have found that when, instead of untruths and distortion of facts, rational people are rationally presented with the facts, that indeed opposition changes to support. That is true.

And there will be the public hearings, and I want to point out as I did in my opening remarks that there should not be, and I hope there will not be, an attempt to delay the referral of this matter to a committee because the public is already registering with the Clerk of the House saying that they would like to come and be heard.

The debate is now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, very much a matter in the public consciousness and to now cut off that debate as proposed, to now deny those people who have expressed a desire to speak on the issue, to deny that when the issue is hot on the burner is, I think, wrong and would be a serious mistake.

I would like to appeal to the members opposite to pass our resolution, to defeat the amendment, to pass our resolution, to demonstrate that it isn't, in fact, smoke and mirrors, but they do want the people of Manitoba to be heard, otherwise why are they seeking to prevent them being heard when they want to be heard. I think that should happen.

We would not call that committee, clearly, over the long weekend, we would wait until next week to give further announcements to the people and we would set, in co-operation with the members opposite - my, how they're amused - they're easily amused, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I'm speaking to a serious issue in a serious way and I will continue to do so. I don't mind the laughter of the hyenas in the woods, let it be. I'm speaking to the people of Manitoba, through you, as I am entitled to do and will do.

The matter will be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections will meet and determine the hearings and the hearings will take place.

We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, as I said, to bring in amendments on specific wordings re the services. Now, let me just deal with that for a moment so that we understand the process. It is not being seriously suggested, at least I have not heard it seriously suggested from that side of the House, that that part of the proposal, which would validate our statutes, should be thrown out or needs amendment. I have not heard it proposed from members opposite to the extent that they have spoken on the issue, that the obligation to translate only 500 out of the 4,500 statutes, that that should be somehow changed. Both of those are very much in our favour.

No, the concentration is, if it is not on the matter of principle, entrenchment and recourse to the courts, then it deals with very important issues - I readily admit - having to do with the details of the services to be provided, the obligation on government. Just as important, of course, for the government as for the people directly affected to know where and in what manner they may obtain services.

A question is asked by two of those who spoke on the issue. So far - what is the rush? First of all, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been on the agenda clearly and palpably and without question since 1890 - 113 years. So don't talk to us of rush. This is hardly a panic reaction.

Again, there has been public discussion on this matter for over a year. I refer, and I have here in my hand major press stories with details for those who can read or who want to read: from the Sun, July 12, 1982; from the Free Press, July 14, 1982; from the Free Press, October 27, 1982; from the Free Press, October 30, 1982; from The Sun, January 5, 1983; from The Globe and Mail, January 13, 1983; from The Sun, January 20, 1983; from The Sun, March 3, 1983; from the Free Press, March 3, 1983; from the Free Press, April 8, 1983; from the Free Press, April 8, 1983, and that was before the announcement that we had come up with an agreement. That was discussion in detail.

So there has been major public discussion because there were also Letters to the Editor for over a year. For over a year. Never mind the 113 years that preceded, there has been discussion for over a year.

I point out, for example, that in the Free Press of July 14, 1982, the lead editorial, *Settling out of Court*, July 14, 1982, and I read with some immodesty the concluding words: "The creative approach Mr. Penner has adopted is far more promising than the passive strategy of awaiting a Supreme Court decision and then either whining about the awkwardness of complying as the Lyon Government did following the Forest decision or watching contentedly as the courts strip the substance out of French Language rights. The arduous task of amending the Constitution is worth undertaking if it produces a set of rules that meets the real needs of the French-speaking community without laying an onerous burden on the government."

We have been working on that since prior to July 14, 1982, but it has been a subject of public discussion for those who can read and want to read. And did we hear from the opposition or any other form of opposition at that time? - not a murmur, not a peep - nothing.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I point out later on, an editorial in the Sun of January 5, 1983: "Bilingualism time has come. A lack of national unity of a Canadian dream has been one of the great obstacles to our progress as a nation." It goes on to support this kind of program. I point, Mr. Speaker, I want this on the record, it's important it be on the record so that we can put an end, hopefully, to the distortions that have taken place from time to time in the course of the general debate. I point to, again, April 8, 1983, a full analysis of what discussion was taking place leading to the proposal by Terence Moore on the editorial page of the Free Press. I think that too is necessary in order to complete the record. I point, Mr. Speaker, to all of these articles, and there are more in which the issue has been the subject of protracted, prolonged, in-depth, and on the

whole responsible public debate by those who would treat this issue responsibly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been since that time, as you well know, continued discussion, continued debate. Indeed, there have been several hundred people who have turned out, over 1,000 people to the public meetings; there have been Letters to the Editor; there have been editorial comments; there have been descriptive articles. To talk about indecent haste is to talk palpable nonsense. There is no other piece of legislation that has been as much that is presently before the House, indeed that I can recall, with respect to a matter before the House in the last Session that has been as much discussed and as much known as this.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is, as pointed out in the editorial in the Free Press to which I referred a few moments ago, that one of the alternatives of course is a court-imposed solution. We have taken the ground, and we will stand that ground that that would be wrong in principle. Oh, yes, it's always possible that we might be forced into that stance, and indeed that is something that can always happen. I would regret very much if it did. I don't think that it will, but we are certainly doing everything that we can in terms of the kinds of discussions that have taken place to prevent that happening.

I quote on that subject from an editorial in the Montreal Gazette, July 11, 1983, entitled "Proud Times in Manitoba." I want to say here, as I've said before, I stand proud on this issue: The Provincial Government is trying hard to allay the fears and the bigoted reaction. It is unfortunately getting no help from Mr. Lyon, who rails about the rush to pass this amendment. He seems to agree, Mr. Lyon, with the peculiar reasoning of former Federal Conservative Leader, Joe Clark, who said the province should have waited for a new Supreme Court ruling, that it had no choice but to give Franco-Manitobans their rights. In other words, that point of view, Premier Pawley's government should have waited until it could argue that French was being rammed down Manitoba throats by Ottawa. A more explosive divisive policy is hard to imagine, and we took that position that it would be explosive; it would be divisive to wait until the Supreme Court said, here, you've got to do it, when we had the opportunity as we still have the opportunity of doing it in a reasonable and intelligent and a rational way.

Instead, the editorial concludes: "The NDP Government took the high road of compromise. People of goodwill in Manitoba and throughout Canada should come to the support now, to tell Manitobans that what is happening there is not a disaster, but rather one of the proudest and most welcome advances in all of Canadian history." I believe that is right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is being proposed. First of all, this notion of indecent haste is pure nonsense. There is not an element of haste, never mind indecent haste about it. Part of the agreement was for very good and sound reasons that the matter be determined in terms of the action of the respective Legislatures, our Legislature, the House of Commons, and the Senate by December the 31st. The reason for that is indeed that the appellant has his rights in court, and no one can take those rights in court away from him. Those rights spelled to be determined by a hearing on the

26th of May, 1983, and were as part of the package adjourned pending the dealing of this matter in the House. But although adjourned without a date being fixed were adjourned on the understanding - it was announced right at the beginning - that the matter would be determined one way or another by legislative action by December the 31st.

Now if, as is being proposed, we were to attempt to deal with the matter intersessionally, it means of necessity. If the agreement is to be lived up to and we're not to end up where we should not end up, in court, in that divisive way spoken of eloquently in the language of the editorial in the Montreal Gazette, then such a return to the Legislature as is envisaged in the resolution would have to be some time during the fall.

First of all, there is, as I have attempted to point out in my remarks to this point, no need for that in any event because we've had and are having the debate, the participation, the interest now.

Secondly, it's simply not possible nor indeed is it desirable, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for the government to prepare as it should prepare, as a responsible government, its total program for a new Session in a matter of a few weeks; with the best will in the world we've got, I would say, a couple of weeks of work left on the bills that are presently before the House. To suggest that we could in any rational way prepare a Session of the Legislature, a Throne Speech Debate, or legislative program of the Estimates, the Budget, and do all of that so that we could come back on one issue, which is presently before the House, is ridiculous. It is simply and palpably ridiculous.

What's the rush, we're being asked? And I ask the question, what's the desire to cut off the debate in full stride, what's that all about? Why is it that they want this debate stopped? Why is it, when the people of Manitoba are discussing it and have been discussing it for a year, do they want the debate stopped? I haven't heard a reason that I'd give a plugged nickel for. If it's said, and that was the rational appeal of the Member for Fort Garry whose stock in trade is rationality, that why we could find consensus, then I have to tell them again, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, what are you talking about? Are you saying to us that you, the opposition, will agree with entrenchment? Right, we've got a consensus. Stand up and tell us you'll agree with entrenchment, we've got a consensus on principle No. 1. Will you agree with us on recourse to the courts? Tell us, stand up and tell us that you'll agree with recourse to the courts, and we've got a consensus. Consensus isn't that difficult. I've got the recipe for consensus. Now you're talking, now you're talking, now we can do business. Once I hear that from those members opposite, but I'll not hear those as long as the Member for Charleswood is Leader of the Opposition. You know that I'll not hear that, nor will any member of this House. It's been said, why. I note, however, unless I have missed something and I may well have - not from the members opposite - it has been said that there should be a referendum. That's interesting, because I don't think that they think that there should be a referendum. If so, then they should stand up and say so, and tell us that they believe in government by referendum.

A MEMBER: They didn't believe that last year.

HON. R. PENNER: No, they didn't. Nor should they, and I'll explain the reason why in a moment.

A MEMBER: You believe it on certain issues.

HON. R. PENNER: No. Well, it seems to me palpable, but I stand to be corrected, that the members opposite do not believe in government by referendum in general and do not believe in government by referendum in particular on this issue. Let me just deal with that very briefly.

First of all, is it to be - and I address this in all seriousness to those who I think have the will to listen, to the councillors of the City of Brandon, the councillors of the City of Winnipeg. Think what is it that you are going to put on your ballot. Is it going to be a referendum in the style of the Member for Elmwood who sends out a ballot to the people of Elmwood and after giving his own particular version of bilingualism, says, "Do you support . . ." - maybe you like this wording - ". . . or do you oppose the extension of French language services in Manitoba, as outlined in the agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments?" - and does not send out the agreement.

Now is that exactly what is going to happen? — (Interjection) — Well, I am raising the question; you'll have your chance. You've had your chance. You call a press conference everyday; call one tomorrow. Is that what it is, and I'm asking this of the members of councils? What are you going to do to put out a referendum that represents for the people of Manitoba or your communities a rational choice? — (Interjection) — Well, you ask people whether or not they support a particular agreement. Are you telling me that they are not entitled to know what that agreement is, and that type of thing repeated in that ad in the Free Press and that plea for money in the Free Press? Again, I am opposed, not asking people whether they favour or not, but I am opposed to the extension of French Language Services in Manitoba as outlined in the agreement, without sending the agreement, is a piece of chicanery.

Let me just put this issue to the people in this House who want to discuss in a rational way the issue of the referendum that is being proposed. There would have to be on the ballot, because people are entitled to know all parts of it, would have to know the good, the bad and the indifferent as they might see it. So, in my view, for there to be a referendum that had any meaning and could be taken as a guide by anybody, opposition or government, all of the provisions of the agreement which set out the validation of our statutes, that would have to be there. Or is it suggested that people shouldn't know about this in voting on it?

There would have to be those provisions of the agreement, not necessarily in the legal, technical language, but in substance which says that only 500 of our 4,500 statutes need be translated. That would have to be there, unless you are asking people to vote on part of the agreement. Nobody, I hope, is suggesting that; at least nobody in their right mind, I hope, is suggesting that. Are you going to set out in this ballot, which is now six pages long, those parts of the matter that's set out, the schedule of acts to be translated? I think some people might be interested in knowing

what the 500 statutes are. Surely that should be on if you are asking intelligent people to vote intelligently on a matter of legislation.

Once you get to the business of submitting legislation to a vote, then in my view you can't do it piecemeal. If that's what you want to do, you put the legislation as is, not as somebody interprets it, not as somebody supposes. You put that to the people.

When, in the Province of Quebec, there was a resolution on the question of separation, a complex question but far less complex than what is being proposed here, it took the Legislature of Quebec months and a great deal of debate between the respective members of the Legislature on how to word that question.

Now, government by referendum is wrong generally, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a denial of political responsibility. It is a denial of parliamentary supremacy of which the Leader of the Opposition huffs and puffs so much. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a question of minority rights, it is absolutely wrong in principle to say that whether or not these rights, or whether or not part of our social contract is to be fulfilled, that these should be a matter of numbers on a ballot.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Norbert, in a rambling speech on just about everything but, says that we've got to end the Session. Yet, as I have pointed out, he talked about everything but the particular amendment to the referral motion which is before the House. Mr. Speaker, yes, at some point, the Session must be ended. It can be ended; it will be ended in an orderly way. There has been this public debate going on for an extensive period of time; it continues. There is the opportunity which will not be short cut of people to come to the Legislature, to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to present their briefs. I have said before; I'll say again; we will listen very carefully.

Some will come, no doubt, who will say that we want no part of it at all. Some will come who will say that it's fine as it is; indeed you should go further. Those statements we will listen to, but of particular interest to us and, I'm sure, to members of the opposition will be those who will come and say, well, look, in this section dealing with services, you should do this or that, or it's too wide or it's not wide enough. We will listen, and there may be ways, as I have said, of sharpening the language.

So the issue that really can, in fact, be determined by this Legislature, that will not change. If there is the referral of the matter intersessionally, what will change? Certainly it will not be those questions of principle. Certainly - and I go back to the smoke and mirrors in coming to the end of my speech - it will not be that we'll find a consensus, a halfway house between entrenchment and non-entrenchment, between referral to the court and not referral to the court, between providing services and not providing services.

A MEMBER: Maybe they'll change their minds because they couldn't deal with Mulroney on that issue.

HON. R. PENNER: No, they couldn't deal with Mulroney on that issue, and that's known. They can't, other than in a pseudo-tactical way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place to speak against the motion. Indeed, we will listen to whoever wants to get up and speak. I have advised the Opposition House Leader that we would like to have this matter debated extensively as necessary. We'll call it and we have called it today; we'll call it tomorrow morning; we'll call it tomorrow afternoon, but we believe that it should be resolved by the Legislature by the end of tomorrow afternoon, if at all possible, so that the appropriate steps can be taken. Let the people be heard. That is the democratic way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the honourable member permit a question? Is the honourable member inferring that debate will be stopped tomorrow afternoon on this resolution, because that is what I got from his last statement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Could he indicate why - although he criticized myself and others for not sending out a copy of the agreement - in the two pamphlets that he has sent out and had prepared by the government he didn't attach an agreement to either one?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, I don't mind answering the question, Mr. Speaker. Our pamphlet, constitutionally speaking, did not have a coupon attached - send in this coupon and tell us whether or not you agree with the agreement. The brochure, which was distributed in the House today, did not have a coupon attached - tell us whether or not you agree with the agreement one way or another. That answers the question very simply and directly.

At the informational meetings, the agreement in fact was distributed and was there for whoever wanted it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My intention is to debate the process at this time, not so much the issue, although I would like to take issue with a few of the remarks made by the Attorney-General to begin with.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General has decided through many of his remarks this afternoon to again debate the issue, although in his last portion of his speech, he did move into some of the area of the process. One underlying theme he seemed to bring up throughout the presentation that he made, he said that consensus should not apply in this case.

HON. R. PENNER: No, I did not.

MR. C. MANNES: Oh, I'm sorry, that was my interpretation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I did not say that consensus should not apply. I said, in fact, that consensus is a desirable thing, a consummation to be devoutly wished for - those were my words. Don't put words in my mouth that I did not utter or did not say. What I said was between these polarized positions of entrenchment and not entrenchment, I don't see where there's a consensus possible. Let the Member for Morris tell us, if he thinks where there is a consensus between those two, where it's at.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Attorney-General for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: In my view, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General seemed to be making the point that consensus was impossible in this issue. I believe he just has restated that, and that in this case he seemed to indicate we had to fight for a point of principle. A principle was at issue and that's what we had to consider.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, it begs the question, when are the people right and when are the people wrong, or is it important? In my view, Sir, it is very important, and I think it's making comments like the tyranny of the majority that tend to confuse the whole issue and put out of focus whether people should be considered to be right or wrong. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to be with the people on all issues, and certainly this has to be the most important issue in our time.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General made comments that again - and I believe that this was the interpretation, at least, that I took out of it - that it's the responsibility of an elected person to act responsibly, and at times that may be out of synchronization with the so-called feeling of the majority of the people. He, I think, wants to use that particular type of argument on this particular case. And yet I guess it begs the question - and he made reference to it later on when he was attempting to say that you can't rule this issue by referendum - why referendum powers have been given to municipalities?

I think we've posed the questions in question period a number of times over the last few days, because we believe that the government is talking out of both sides of their mouth. They seem to be saying, on one hand, consensus is important, and they've given the tools to the people, by way of changes in The Municipal Act, to allow them to express their opinions, regardless of how much and how many different varying sources of information are available to them, or whether indeed the people, before they come to make a mark on the ballot for the referendum, even taken the time to read an issue, read one source of the material. They have the opportunity to come there "uneducated" and yet vote and they become part of the consensus. That's been given to all the people and those municipalities that choose to use that tool, because this government is deemed the consensus of the people is important. But on this issue, it isn't; it isn't because of the tyranny of the majority. I think those are the words used by the Attorney-General.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm at a loss to try and determine the difference there because if people do not

understand history - history in this case - and if the government wants to overrule the consensus and ignore them and yet expect them to live in harmony because of an issue that is again the most potentially disruptive in our time, tell me whose fault it is? Is it the fault of the legislators like ourselves that come here and say, no, we know what's right; you, the people, do not know? Yet the people, because of some of the main parts of the resolution, the main resolution, which I'll not enter into, find some parts of it totally unacceptable and which lead to divisive communities, who is to be blamed in situations like that? Is it the legislators, or is it the people who do not know? That has never been spelled out to me, Sir, it really hasn't, and I'm hoping sometime the Attorney-General and other members of the government will take a little time to explain that.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has also indicated to us that the R.M.s were in attendance yesterday with the Premier.

A MEMBER: Some.

MR. C. MANNES: Some, and I believe he indicates there were between 30 and 40. I believe that they were hastily called into a meeting on Friday to be in attendance yesterday with the Premier, no doubt, as a result of the position paper put down by the UMM the day before.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very strong divergence of opinion. The Attorney-General says, in being in attendance at yesterday's meeting - of course of which I was not - indicated there were some meaningful questions that came forward. Once they had an opportunity - they, meaning the government - to give reasoned answers to many of the questions that many of these councillors from these 30 designated municipalities went away somewhat happier.

Mr. Speaker, what I find disturbing about that particular categorical statement by the Attorney-General is that it flies in the face of a letter that I received just yesterday, as a matter of fact, from one of those 30 rural municipalities. I think what is significant - and I was planning to read this at the time I debated the main resolution, but I feel I have to do so now - I was waiting for the R.M. of Grey, and that is one of the five municipalities that make up my riding.

Within the R.M. of Grey are the towns of Elm Creek; of Fannystelle, which is a French-Canadian town; of Haywood, which is French Canadian and the largest French-Canadian community in my riding of St. Claude. Three out of the four large towns are French-Canadian and make up the R.M. of Grey. I haven't talked to that municipality at all, and yet on my desk arrived this resolution. It's obvious that that particular municipality took an awful long time. They didn't rush forward maybe like the original 70 or 80 municipalities within the province who fully wanted to put their position forward quickly. I feel that they took some considerable length of time, and I would like to read the resolution.

First of all, it was moved by Ed Pilloud, who is the councillor from St. Claude; seconded by Gaston Souque, the councillor from Haywood, and it says:

"WHEREAS the Provincial Government are presently considering passing legislation that would make bilingualism compulsory for the Province of Manitoba; and

"WHEREAS it is council feeling that passing of such legislation would not only have devastating financial implications, but would also be contrary to what the majority of Manitobans want;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the rural municipality of Grey would hereby like to go on record with the Government of Manitoba as being opposed to any legislation that would make bilingualism compulsory in the Province of Manitoba."

It's carried unanimously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that resolution coming from that specific particular rural municipality carries significant weight to my whole thinking on this subject. It's with that in mind that I find somewhat distressing the comment made by the Attorney-General just a few minutes ago when he said that councillors, after having met yesterday with himself and I believe the Premier and whoever else may have been in attendance from the government, did have an opportunity to ask questions. At least, he left me with the interpretation that those same councillors left with a feeling that they more fully understood the issue and were maybe more amenable to some of its provisions. I have a hard time accepting that interpretation, Mr. Speaker. I tell you I do, because I'm searching as one - like I've told you before - who has, I would say, a full 20 percent of my constituency made up of French-Canadian origin.

Well, Mr. Speaker, moving on, the Attorney-General in his comments here, he moved to the process finally, and he says he wonders why we're concerned. He says that the government will not hold hearings on the long weekend. Well, Mr. Speaker, aren't we fortunate?

A MEMBER: Whoop-de-do!

MR. C. MANNES: That is a very major concession on the part of this Attorney-General. He says that he may bring some amendments forward dealing with specific wordings, but it begs the question: Why did he not confer with the MGEA or other municipalities in the original resolution? Why, now, does he feel and the government feel obliged to sit and develop amendments to it?

A MEMBER: Got to do a selling job.

MR. C. MANNES: He goes on to say that the people have known for over a year, and he's quoted all the dates of press reports of all the articles that have been written on the subject over the past year; and I fully acknowledge that. He says the people have known for a year that the government was negotiating this issue. He seems to be inferring that the people know what the issue is, that they know what is happening. Then I guess that whole conclusion, if that's the one he arrives at, begs these questions: Why is there such an outcry now? Why are the municipalities forwarding these resolutions now, if they've known about the issue for one year? And why are thousands of people taking the time and the effort to respond to a questionnaire by the Member for Elmwood? Why are they doing those things now if we've all been fully apprised of this situation for the past year?

Well, it's obvious the people are just beginning to realize now what has happened, and I think they want

to be heard now. Let's define "now." It's not the next two weeks; they want to be heard "now." They want to be heard over the next few months because that's how long it takes.

Obviously, the government can't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the people know. Otherwise, they wouldn't have sent this out today. Obviously, the government believes there are some things about this the people as a whole do not know, and yet they expect the people to fully comprehend it in a period of one week or two weeks to be ready for these hearings that are supposed to occur within the month.

A MEMBER: Good point, Clayton.

MR. C. MANNES: And that's what I say now. My definition of "now," Sir, is something like was spoken to by the Member for Fort Garry yesterday - the fall period - and I'll move on to later. To be totally fair to the rural residents of this province, you can't debate this issue in the month of August. You can't do it in the month of September for the very same reasons you do not hold elections during those months. You do so in the fall period.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the members, the government, the Attorney-General says that we want the debate stopped. He claims that we're the ones that want the debate stopped today. Well, Mr. Speaker, we don't. Categorically, I can say we do not; but I think, realistically, we believe that the issue is one that can't be signed, sealed and delivered in the period of two or three more weeks. It's one that will take many more months.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I felt I had to make those comments in response to a few of the remarks made by the Attorney-General. I'd like to make some specific remarks regarding the referral resolution and say, as you can probably tell, that I support the amended motion.

I guess I ask the very same question that the Attorney-General chastises and challenges us for using, that is, what is the rush? I think it sort of was laced all the way through his presentation. I think it's very very important that this particular issue not be rushed.

You know, everybody that has spoken on the issue has made reference to the point that wrongdoing has been done to the French-Canadian community in this province for some 90, for some 113 years, and it can't last any longer. I don't want to move into that main debate right now, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly do so when I speak on the main resolution. But I think it begs the question, if you believe that, surely you can't believe that all those wrongs and all those ills can be patched up or fixed up in a period of five weeks, six weeks, of seven weeks. It logically cannot be done. So again that's why I am going to be using as my theme, what is the rush?

Mr. Speaker, the importance of the issue again, and certainly as a new member it's the most important issue that I have seen come to this House, I really believe it's one of the most important issues that I will see in my spell here as a member for however long that may be. I see some other things, Mr. Speaker. I see all the safeguards that the people have in either supporting or opposing new legislation. Again, as a new member,

it's intriguing to see the powers of opposition, firstly; and secondly, seeing the opportunities the people have to make representation not only through their representative, but through committees, and I say it's a good system.

I have seen the expansion of that through two or three other issues, particularly the Crow. We debated Crow resolutions. The Minister responsible for that has taken that particular process onto the road on two different occasions. I have seen the Minister of Municipal Affairs also take that standing committee onto the road to listen to hearings regarding assessment. I am basically impressed with those types of systems. In 1982, we saw the Minister of Transportation go out to the country and have seven or eight informational meetings on the Crow issue. I believe he had a total attendance on that particular issue at some seven or eight sites of maybe 100, 200 people, bona fide farmers, I would say. There were more in total, but bona fide farmers — (Interjection) — about 100 then. I am corrected.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, I think the government felt somewhat right in following that procedure. I hope they did, otherwise, it was a wasted expense, but they followed that. In 1983, the same issue was taken out to the country with formal hearings in this case, again another seven or eight hearings. Again, as I said earlier, the Municipal Affairs group went out into another seven or eight locations to hear presentations made on assessment.

What all these committees held in common was simply this: First of all, they were presented by in some cases an informational release, I suppose, to present the government viewpoint - some would say the government slant; in some cases to educate the people so that they could come forward and make more meaningful comment than otherwise they may. After the presentation of material there was some time for study, supposedly. Then there were either orderly hearings or informational meetings. Then, of course, we came back and we debated in committee, and we worked towards a report.

I understood that system and I accepted it, but in each case, particularly going through the Crow where we took several months to do that. In the municipal area, again, a very majorly important issue to rural Maitoba, it seems to be taking years towards some resolution of that particular problem.

Yet we move to the most important issue of our time, without doubt, and the time of the process - a few months at the very most. I say that is not enough time, Mr. Speaker, the timing of the process is completely wrong.

I guess I ask the question, how am I to attain within the next two or three weeks the strong view or consensus view of the constituents that I represent, Mr. Speaker? We all know the timetable that we'll be working under over the next two or three weeks. Last night, one committee sat until 12:00. I believe the Minister of Agriculture is calling another committee tonight that may very well sit until 1:00. That's the time and the legislative process that we find ourselves, and we accept that. But how do you mix in with that the most important issue of our time?

After having given to my constituents and all the people of Manitoba, even though it may be slanted,

the material that has come forward by this pamphlet - possibly the first opportunity that they have had to read something printed on the issue - how do I and all the other members of this House attempt to find out the consensus within our own areas within the next three weeks? I think it's a legitimate question, or is it important to know what the people think? I think that's again my interpretation that I took out of some of the remarks made by the Attorney-General, that maybe it's not that important if you know what the people are doing. — (Interjection) — That's right, as elected people, we are supposed to be mindful of history. We are supposed to be mindful of other things and make our decision based on those facts, not the consensus of the people.

Again, Mr. Speaker, what is the rush? I can tell you that within my area, three-quarters of the residents in my constituency starting 10 days from now will be fully involved in harvest. That process, which is the most important process to those people, will last for a full two months. Yes, and I should clarify that to this province, by the way, the harvest process, just about the most important economic activity to this whole province, that's what will be happening on the farm, Mr. Speaker, for the next two months.

Yet does the Attorney-General even tell us whether there will be a hearing in the largest town in my riding, in Morris? Does he tell us that? No. Does he expect my constituents to shut down their harvest machinery during that period of time? Does he expect them to drive to one of the four locations at which public informational meetings were held this past three weeks? None of these matters are laid out; so I think any criticisms that we have of the process are legitimate. Again, what is the rush? I would say in the best interests of everybody, the legislators and the people, that the hearings must be held off until fall.

Mr. Speaker, people cannot feel rushed on this issue. Speakers on the main resolution may suggest - and I made this comment just a few moments ago, but I'll make it again - that the French Canadians in Manitoba have been wrong for 90 years, and that may be correct. I'm not going to debate that at this time but, again, to attempt to relieve or resolve that problem in three short months is totally unconscionable and totally unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, forever is a long time and, you know, I find it interesting that bills that we pass here, legislation that we pass here within this very House, which can be changed should a new government come forward and are changed, as we're finding out by Bill 90 today, are given proper times to proceed to that change. Yet, the most important issue of our time, something that will be entrenched in the Constitution if the government has their way, is given a short time. Sir, when you put something into a Constitution, how long do you want it to last? You want it to last forever - that long - however long you can define that period of time. Yet we're given some two months to debate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I claim that municipalities need time, and I wonder - I wish the Attorney-General was here to almost take the question as notice - but I wonder where he considers the municipal councillors in this area of the people. Are they on our side like those legislators here who should be aware of history and who should know the issue? Are they like the people

who should be ignored? What is their role in this whole issue? Well, Mr. Speaker, I say they have a very very vital role and that they have to be listened to. If it's their consensus that the province not proceed with this, that has to be given close and heavy weight.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the municipalities are just beginning to understand the issue. It must be, and again, I won't reread this resolution that has just come forward from the R.M. of Grey, because I have done so and I've told you why I find it so relevant in this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saying I don't believe that there is a rush; that there can't be a rush on this particular issue; that there should be intersessional hearings; that they should be held this fall, in late fall; and that the whole main resolution should be debated after we've had an opportunity to hear what the people of this province say and whether we can determine whether we can reach and work towards a consensus. I feel it's vitally important for this province and for its future.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for leave of the House to revert to statements.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? (Agreed)

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Member for Turtle Mountain asked for a status report on the auditor's investigation concerning certain officers of A.E. McKenzie Co. Ltd.

I advised him that the auditor had made an interim report on his investigation, and that the conclusions of the report had been reviewed by the McKenzie Board at a meeting last Friday.

I am advised this afternoon that the three officers have been given their termination notices by the Board of Directors.

In making this decision, the Board of Directors of A.E. McKenzie stated that the Provincial Auditor's preliminary report concludes "that the three officers were involved in a conflict of interest by transacting with A.E. McKenzie Co. Ltd., of which they were senior officers, for personal gain without proper disclosure of the transactions to the Board of Directors of A.E. McKenzie Co. Ltd."

Until a new president is appointed, the company's affairs will be managed by a Supervisory Committee of the Board consisting of: Mr. George McDowell as Chairman; William Paton as Vice-Chairman; John Coombs, Director; Hugh Jones, Director; and Mr. Harold Grant, who has been appointed Interim Chief Executive Officer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for making that announcement. It is never a pleasant situation to contemplate to find people working in the public sector becoming involved in the sort of situation which these officers clearly were involved in, and their involvement has led to their termination by the Board of Directors.

I am personally pleased to see that the charges, the allegations which I raised in this House concerning these three officers have indeed been borne out, even though at the time that I raised them in all sincerity, the allegation was thrown across the House that I was stooping to mud slinging and to getting into the gutter with raising this type of issue, Mr. Speaker.

It has now, after several weeks, been shown evidently that the allegations which I made were either wholly or largely true, but certainly true to the extent where the Board of Directors has seen fit to terminate these employees. We will be asking a wide range of questions, Mr. Speaker, when the occasion next arises, because although this has cleared up part of the problem, it certainly hasn't cleared up the entire situation.

The question of ministerial responsibility - the doctrine of ministerial responsibility certainly raises the question about the desirability or the appropriateness of the Minister of Community Services continuing as the Minister responsible for A.E. McKenzie Co. Ltd. When that type of situation occurs, Mr. Speaker, under the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, the Minister should accept the responsibility, and the appropriate action on the Minister's part would seem to be to resign his responsibility.

We also, of course, will be wanting to know what further action the government will be contemplating and what action they will be taking. At the moment, of course, we have the Minister's statement simply stating that these officers have been terminated, but we, of course, do not yet have the basis for that termination beyond the statement presented here. We don't know what the Auditor's special report is going to show. It has apparently been confirmed by the Attorney-General that the Attorney-General's Department has been involved and is involved.

So I believe that it will be incumbent upon the government to further clarify what has happened here at the earliest possible opportunity. I realize there may be some difficulty with the ongoing audit which the Provincial Auditor is doing, but certainly I think the government will have to be prepared to clarify the situation as soon as possible and to move decisively on any further action which might be contemplated.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment to the resolution - the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak against the motion to amend and, in so doing, contribute to the debate as to the procedure and process. As much as possible, I would like to avoid going into the substantive issues until some later time in the debate on the resolution. But before I can do that, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to remind ourselves

about the background of the nations of Canada in its totality. We cannot see the tree unless we have a wide perspective of the forest.

When there was civil war south of the border and there was great anxiety and fear that the Americans, the revolutionaries from the 13 colonies were eyeing to expand their sphere of influence with their doctrine of manifest destiny across the border, there were some initiatives on the British occupying the Dominion, and at the time they had arrived at some basic formula or compact to establish a new nation. On the national scale, that was the BNA Act of 1867, The British North America Act. One of the considerations, shall we say, making up for the social compact is the recognition and entrenchment of the French language in the Legislature and Parliament, as well as in the processes of the courts.

But even such a nation newly created within the framework of a constitutional system that we have derived and inherited from the British, Lord Durham observed that what we have done is to enclose within the bosom of a single state basically two warring nations, the British and the English nations. Let me repeat that quote from Lord Durham: "Two warring nations enclosed within the bosom of a single state."

Basically, there were two cultures, two nations, two ways of life, and we tried to reconcile these two nations within the single framework of a federal estate, and we had to find that balance all along throughout history; how to protect the basic right of minorities and yet prevent the tyranny of the majorities in the conduct of the governing of the political systems. That is the basic paradox in all constitutional democratic systems.

We say we abide by the rule of the majority, that the majority shall have it's say; but then the majority in the pursuit of its own interests may have it's say and demolish all oppositions, and what we shall have will be the tyranny of the majority.

So it is part of the constitutional scheme of government that we also accord basic protection to minority rights. In order that the majority may not abuse their power, being the majority, we basically entrench the rights of minorities in the provision of a Constitution and, in that sense, remove the power from within the reaches of whatever government may be in power in the political system and so protect the rights of minorities. That is exactly what we have done nationally in The British North America Act by entrenching the French language in the courts and Legislatures of the nations.

Let us look at what happened to this subsystem of that great nation Canada, which is Manitoba at the time that Manitoba joined the Confederation. The same rights that were entrenched in Section 133 in relationship to Canada and Quebec, have been recognized and restated once more in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act of 1870. These are basically:

(1) The constitutional right to use either the English or the French language in the debates in the Houses of the Legislature;

(2) The constitutional right to use both the English and the French languages in the respective records and journals of those Houses;

(3) The constitutional right to use either the English or the French language in any of the pleadings or processes of the courts;

(4) The constitutional right to have the Acts of the Legislature printed and published in both the English and the French languages.

Those are the four basic constitutional language rights that were entrenched in Section 133, and repeated and entrenched in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. That is clear enough.

Now, when we entrench a right - whatever right it is, whether it's freedom of speech, religion or language - in a Constitution, what happens basically? To understand it, we have to understand what a Constitution means.

Let me quote Lord Bolingbroke on what a Constitution basically means. Lord Bolingbroke, in 1733 in his work "A Dissertation upon the Parties," defined the Constitution as follows: "By Constitution, we mean that assemblage of laws, institutions and customs derived from certain fixed principles of reason, directed to certain fixed objects of the public good that compose the general system, and according to which the community has agreed to be governed."

So that the Constitution includes laws, institutions and customs, and all those laws, institutions and customs, based on fixed principles of reason that are directed to certain fixed objects of the public good, that compose the general system, and according to which the community has agreed to be governed.

From that definition we could see that the elemental root is the agreement of the community to be governed by the provision of the Constitution as embodied in its laws, in its institutions and its customs, and that agreement, once it is sanctified by being placed in a Constitution, means that it is already beyond the reach of whatever government may be in power, unless they follow the very procedure that is prescribed in the Constitution, in changing whatever is entrenched in the Constitution.

At the time there were 52 percent French people in Manitoba and 48 percent others, but all the institutions of government, the influential positions and posts in the Legislature, in the Executive, in the Judiciary and all the possible positions of authority and power influence were in the hands of the British. But yet, they have agreed to entrench the language right in the Constitution and a constitutional government is both a grant, as well as a limitation of the powers of the Government of the Day.

That is basically what a Constitution means and all the more reason that idea of constitutional government had been confirmed when we repatriated our British-type of Constitution and removed the authority from the British House of Lords and British Parliament and placed it in our own Parliament, to change our own Constitution. But once anything is entrenched in that Constitution, even the Government in Ottawa will be powerless to change it unless the procedure that is prescribed in the very document and provision of the Constitution is followed and it will be very difficult, according to that procedure, to ever ever change anything that is entrenched in the Constitution, given the majorities required in The Constitutional Amendment Act.

If we trace the meaning of the word "constitution" in the establishment of a nation, it came from the latin word "constituere," which means to set up, to establish, to erect, to construct, to arrange, to settle, to determine.

When we wrote the Constitution we have settled, we have set up, we have established the framework for the stability of the political system, and in so doing, those who formulate the Constitution exercise two basic powers: the traditional power of gubernaculum, which is the governmental power to control the private interests for the benefit of the peaceful public order, of the general interests of the total system, as well as jurisdiction, which is a limitation of the sphere of jurisdiction of governmental power that must always be in accordance with the provision of the Constitution.

Therefore, whatever powers of government there are, will be subject to henceforth from the provision of the Constitution, until and unless the Constitution is changed, according to the very procedure that is prescribed in the constitutional document itself. But given the very definition of the Constitution, we noted with Lord Bolingbroke that it means that system, that setup, that establishment, that arrangement, according to which the community had agreed to be governed. The consent of the community is always an essential ingredient in the setting up of that establishment, in the changing of the arrangement in that establishment, in the amending of any of the provisions of that establishment, which is created by the Constitution.

The concern of the people can of course be given directly, or it can be given indirectly. If it is given directly then what we will shall have will be a direct constitutional system, comparable to the Greek Constitution of the olden days, when everybody - the populace, the people themselves - ran their own government. That is known as direct democracy. It is possible when the state is small, when the people are not as numerous as they are now at present. They rule themselves, directly, without the intervention of any delegate or representative.

And since the advancement and growth of population and the complexity of governmental activities, we have to resort to the second-best form of government, the second-best form of democracy which is representative government. That's why we elect people to Legislative Assembly; we elect people to Parliament; we elect people to Congress; but those who elect those are the populace, the people, the people whose first concern that they be governed by these representatives.

So, ultimately the authority has to be derived from the people. It can be exercised directly or it can be exercised indirectly and when we resort to referendum, what we are doing is reverting back to direct democracy by giving the ultimate power to decide to the people directly, without the intervention of the representatives of the people. Whether this is wise or not is an open question, an open debate.

The more we cultivate the habit and the more we orient people to direct exercise of power and authority, the more we diminish the credibility of established representative government and the credibility of the representatives of the people. But it does not mean that the people do not know how to govern themselves because individually they may not know, but collectively, they know the best way of governing themselves. Collectively, the people are always the ultimate repository of how best they can be governed and therefore we have stated *vox populi est vox Dei*, the voice of the people is the voice of God. It used to be under the monarch, the voice of God seems to be

directly from God to the monarch, how to run the government of the people, but since we have adopted the system of limited constitutional government, we have accepted the notion that in the ultimate analysis the people shall decide what is best for them. The only question is, shall we do it directly or shall we do it indirectly?

This is the paradox of all government, indeed. Shall constitutional government forego the good that it can do in order to prevent the evil of arbitrary power, or shall the constitutional government submit to the evil of arbitrariness to be able to secure the good end that it wants to do? That is the basic paradox in our system. The fundamental question in our constitutional government is, shall we as constitutional government forego the good that we can do in order to prevent the evil of arbitrariness in our decisions, or shall constitutional government submit to the evil of arbitrariness to be able to rule and secure the good that we want to do for the community?

The answer is possible only if there is a ruler who has divine competence; who can make no mistake; who can make no wrong. The only one who can satisfy that is the enlightened, absolute despot, the philosopher king, but there is no such person in our system who can play the role. The one who can rule competently without error or mistake has to be divine, and that person does not exist. Since we can only find rulers who are human and who are prone to error, we have to be satisfied with the second-best form of government, and the second-best form of government is a constitutional and limited form of government.

A constitution grants all the power and, within a federal system, it tells the Federal Government what power it can exercise, and it tells the Provincial Government what power is within its jurisdiction, in that system of federalism which is a division of political power between the central government with authority over all the entire territory and a limited number or set of regional or provincial or state governments with authority more or less autonomous within its own sphere of jurisdictional competence, although collectively they also rule the country within that framework. We have to find the best possible way of finding enlightened public policy in order to secure and assure the prosperity and welfare of our own country.

The basic point is that we should go on with this resolution, hear the people so that we can, through indirect consent that they have given us, we do that which we are bound to do, namely, to honour the compact and commitment in the constitutional compact when we created this nation, and entrench that right which we have agreed should be entrenched, but no more.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by a quotation from that judicare of Henry II, Rannulphus Glanville, the chief judicare of Henry II, who explained the role of the consent of the governed in the body of the English leges and laws and customs that constituted the so-called unwritten British constitution, "The English leges and customs by the authority of the kings sometimes command, sometimes forbid, sometimes take vengeance and inflict a penalty upon transgressors. Those laws, since they have been approved by the consent of those using them and confirmed by the oaths of the kings can neither be changed nor destroyed

without the consent of all those with whose counsel and concern they have been promulgated."

I say, without the consent of those who shall be affected, let us not tinker with the entrenched basic rights that have been the basis for the founding of this nation, Canada, and the entry of Manitoba into the Confederation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Tuxedo, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

The Honourable Member for Springfield.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, a couple of committee changes before the next item. I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Ellice that the name of the Minister of Community Services and Corrections be removed from the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and the Minister of Education's name be substituted therefor.

Also on the Standing Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the name of the Minister of Energy and Mines substituted for the name of the Member for The Pas.

Mr. Speaker, after that, could you please call Bill No. 3.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not necessary for the honourable member to make that motion. A simple declaration to the House is sufficient.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING Cont'd

BILL 3 - THE FARM LANDS OWNERSHIP ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, second reading of Bill No. 3 and the amendment proposed thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think in the eight years that I have had the privilege of being a member in this Chamber that I have never seen someone from the third row act as the Government House Leader, although a former Clerk of the House, perhaps one who is better skilled at conducting the affairs of the House than others. It's unusual anyway, Mr. Speaker, to see the government being run from what is often referred to as the backbenches. As someone from their side says, they are sharing the power. If they're sharing the power, I hope they share it well over the next two years, because it's a short-lived tenure.

Mr. Speaker, regarding Bill 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, it was on May 18th of this year that I had the privilege of commenting and putting some of my thoughts on record as to this particular bill. At that time, I thought that I made a number of points and made them very clearly.

Now we have a motion to further withhold the bill and to hoist the bill for six months. I fully and totally agree with that because as I have had, since May the 18th, the opportunity as many members, particularly on this side of the House, as we have hit the summer months to go out into rural Manitoba to talk to people, to talk to the farmers and the townfolk who live and derive their income, their wealth and their enjoyment from the farm communities. This is how our small communities in rural Manitoba exist, it's basically on the backs of farmers. It's a well-known fact.

In fact, on May the 18th I mentioned quite extensively that the City of Winnipeg, although it is the largest city per capita in relation to population within a province, lives by the farmer. If the farmers don't do well and crops are not a success, that Winnipeg merchants will not do well and therefore the spilloff and the spinoff will be there for all Winnipeggers.

We have had, as I have just said, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to talk to a lot of people in rural Manitoba, and even though the government has tried to diffuse the issue somewhat by bringing in the resolution on the French Language issue, we have just heard a speech from one of their members on that particular subject, that this bill is called - and has been only the last number of months - about once a week. There's no doubt that the Government of Manitoba is somewhat afraid of this bill and they should be, because any time that you restrict people in their livelihoods, you should as a government be fearing that type of legislation.

It has been often said by members on this side of the House and in the public that this bill is not in the best interests of Manitobans; therefore, it should not be passed. That is the sole reason why this side of the House has asked the government and the members of the Legislature to support a motion to withhold the calling and the passing of this bill for six months. Give the members of the government side an opportunity, and there are very few of them that have a rural background. But I noticed today, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member from Ste. Rose, is present and there are very few of them with rural backgrounds, but let them have the opportunity to get out there into the rural community, and I don't mean having the Minister of Municipal Affairs at the 50th Anniversary of the Riding Mountain National Park riding in an open-aired car with his name on the side accompanied by a colleague of his from the Cabinet saying, I was in rural Manitoba and I felt the pulse of the people. Because at Clear Lake, when you have 20,000 people who basically could and should be from rural Manitoba there, they don't have the opportunity to speak to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and tell him what is going on out in the real world, that is, the area of rural Manitoba.

So I think that the postponement of the enacting of this legislation is certainly what should take place and there have been numerous speakers, Mr. Speaker, on this particular topic and they have pointed out a number of areas that within this bill are not good for Manitobans.

The discrimination against other Canadians is a fact. It's a fact that I spoke on the last time I remarked on this bill, and I have said at that time that I have owned and rented property in Ontario. As a Manitoban, I have had the right to rent property and own property in Ontario, and I don't see why Ontario people can't own property in Manitoba. We are all Canadians and that's, in my opinion, what should come first.

We have heard a number of speeches and speakers, Mr. Speaker, comment regarding this bill. We've heard, in my opinion, two excellent speeches from this side of the House - one from the Member for Turtle Mountain talking about the corporation aspect of the bill, the fact that in his family that they have a corporate farm operation. We have also heard from the Member for Morris as to how some nine years ago he purchased farm lands from relatives who thought that the purchase of these farm lands would be their nest egg in the way of a pension, in the way of income, to supplement the rest of their lives, so they wouldn't be a charity case for government or for any other public service, and how inflation has eaten away those dollars that he paid them in good faith some nine years ago for their farm land.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the Member for Turtle Mountain, when he talked about their farm operation, the Ransom farms, and the fact that they have a corporate farm operation, it reminds me of many times in my limited knowledge as an urban member who has relatives in rural Manitoba where I see a family growing up and I see two brothers who are going to take over dad's farm. Then in due time, the two brothers can't get along all that well and they can't seem to divide up the proceeds on an even basis. Then when you mix in-laws in with the farm operation the only alternative to those people is to incorporate or divide the property up as equally as they can and separate, and separate as far as they possibly can. I've seen that in the cases of relatives of my own and people that I know in rural Manitoba.

As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with two, three or four people entering into a corporate agreement as to how they will operate farm operations. I think it makes sense. We all encourage - and you see this from the Law Society of Manitoba on a continual basis to young couples - go and make wills, take advantage of lawyers, take advantage of government subsidized Legal Aid, go and put down your assets on paper and decide amongst you, when things are in a friendlier frame of mind, as to what you want to do with what assets you have. This is the sole purpose in many cases for farmers to incorporate.

We have seen it many many times where brothers will inherit father's farm, and it'll go along for a little while. Then, as the grandchildren come onstream and as the wives who have come from other fields bicker a little bit, the only way out of it is to incorporate or split completely. Often times, when they split completely and I have seen this in a family farm operation that I'm fairly close to, they can't afford to split. The equipment they own, they couldn't split up. How do you split a tractor in half? How do you split a major combine, which nowadays costs you in the neighbourhood of \$100,000, how do you split one of them in half? It's impossible, Sir, so the only way to do it is incorporate

People don't incorporate for the simple fact that they're going to make a profit and gouge the government and their fellow citizens, they incorporate because they want things written on paper. They want it there so that both sides who are involved in the transaction know from Day One what is theirs and what is not theirs and what they can expect from the incorporation of a farm operation.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member for Morris, talk about inflation being the problem with high land costs and the reason why farms are so expensive today. He cited the example, I believe he used 1974, if my memory serves me correctly, when he bought a farm from an uncle and an aunt, and he paid them a certain figure. I'll use a certain figure rather than X because the Minister of Agriculture the last time, when he replied to my previous comments, harped on the fact that I kept using X. But I guess that's an old arithmetic term that I have inherited and prefer to use.

But the Member for Morris said that he bought this particular piece of farm land from relatives, in good faith, with the idea that he didn't get any great screaming bargain and he thought that he, at that time, paid his relatives due course for the land that he was receiving.

But in a period of nine years that land has risen from an approximate figure of \$150 an acre to almost \$1,000 an acre and in recent years, and I say recent years, in the last 24 months that land has dipped and it might be worth about \$700 an acre. But if his relatives had hung onto that land for another seven years and tried to sell it to him there was no way he could have afforded to have bought the land and to be farming the way he was today.

But on the other hand, his relatives couldn't have continued farming perhaps for another seven years. It was their selection, it was their choosing to retire and to get off the farm at that particular time, and they made a transaction in good faith. What has hurt his relatives is inflation. In the last nine years money has almost doubled and the monies they received from him today buy them half a loaf of bread instead of a full loaf of bread.

So, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the problem we have today is that inflation has been the problem with farm land prices and it hasn't been foreign ownership, it hasn't been corporate ownership, it hasn't been sons, or nephews buying lands from uncles, and aunts, and grandmothers, and grandfathers. It's inflation that has done it and you can legislate all you want against families but it won't work.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that by trying to legislate people's lives, I think that politicians have made a cardinal sin, in that people in Canada and North America in general don't want to have their lives, and their day-to-day affairs legislated by somebody in Ottawa, or on Broadway.

A MEMBER: Did you hear that, Myrna?

A MEMBER: Myrna, he was talking to you. Stay out of my bedroom.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned by me, and as I mentioned earlier on May 18th, I referred to

a number of municipalities that I was familiar with where I know people personally that own land. In checking with the municipal offices, and so on, that the amount of foreign ownership in these municipalities is very little.

I did mention back in that time that in the south-eastern part of Manitoba it rises a little bit above the average, and the norm for Manitoba is somewhere between 6 percent and 8 percent. It rises in south-eastern Manitoba above the norm. In south-eastern Manitoba we have seen an influx of people who have come, perhaps from Europe, that have come into that area and they have taken the grasslands and transpired them into farm lands. They have done an amazing job in south-eastern Manitoba in putting particular areas of that area into good, arable farm lands.

I just happened to, Mr. Speaker, be out in that area on Sunday, at my colleague, the Honourable Member for Emerson's annual picnic and golf day. And you couldn't believe it that at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when we were having our fun day of golf, that the number of fellas and gals that said - sorry we can't play the second nine with you, we have to go home and milk our cows. We work seven days a week on the farm. They run 40 head of milking cows, or 60, whatever the case may be. They never have a holiday.

Cows aren't like the government as someone said, they work seven days of the week. In fact I asked one of them - do you have to milk on Christmas day? He says - yes, we milk on Christmas Day. So they never have a holiday.

So these people, it's amazing, Mr. Speaker, it's amazing to see around St. Pierre and Grunthal the number of dairy-farm operations and talk to them at a community-type picnic where they talk about ownership. They don't talk about renting, they talk about ownership. They want to own their land; they want to own their cows; they want to be able to own their buildings; they want to own their homes. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, every one of them who works hard has excellent buildings and a lovely home, and he, and she, and in the particular case that I'm familiar with, it was a man and wife operation, a momma and poppa operation.

Some of the people from across the way will remember the North End of Winnipeg when they used to have grocery stores called - Momma and Poppa operations. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, I guess, arrived in Flin Flon far too late for the Momma and Pappa operations, and perhaps he left the Turtle Mountain area before he really realized what was happening in the agricultural community. So he's sort of what you call someone in between.

But anyway, he's having his hands full these days, Mr. Speaker, looking after housing. And what he should do is someday go out into south-eastern Manitoba, supposedly the poor man's area of farming, not where you have the great acreage that is owned by farmers west of Winnipeg, the so-called poor man's area and see the housing out there. I'll tell you what, Mr. Speaker, most of those homes would fit into River Heights alongside any home, or Tuxedo, or Charleswood, or any other area and they would fit in perfectly. And the only reason, Mr. Speaker, that these people have those homes is they worked hard and both halves of the family do the work, and as dairy farmers they work seven days a week. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon says - whose side am I on. I'm on the side of ownership. I don't want to be a tenant. He is in the business, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing is in the business of trying to put landlords in Winnipeg out of business so that he can create government housing. He wants to have everybody living in government subsidized housing. That is his specialty in this business, that is his calling to this Legislature - come and create government housing. What he knows about education for Flin Flon, or farming, is beyond me, I don't know. But I can tell him that the farmers that I was speaking to on the weekend, in south-eastern Manitoba say that they love owning their own farms. They don't want anyone to come along and tell them they can't own it.

And the other thing, and the particular example that I'm going to refer to, Mr. Speaker, is this particular young couple that were nice enough to take my 12-year-old daughter over to their home when they were milking cows on Sunday, and she was made at home at their farmstead and on the way home I was asking - do they have any kids? She says - yes, they got a 19-year-old daughter. What's she do? Oh, she's gone off to Winnipeg to work like so many girls do when they leave the farm. And she doesn't want to have to dairy farm seven days a week, including Christmas day. And she doesn't want to have to be like her Mom and have to go out and work with Dad shoulder-to-shoulder to derive the pleasures of life that they do have a seven-day-a-week basis.

In fact she was saying that recently they were putting up the hay crop and they were out haying until 2:00 in the morning, and they had their camper out with them, and they had to sleep out in the camper in order to be out in the field the following morning at 8 o'clock in the morning when it was dry enough to start haying again, and they were just about bushed. But here was a man and wife combination that were out there staying in their camper in their field some miles away from home to acquire enough feed to operate their dairy farm for the following winter. What these people are looking forward to, and they're a couple in their early 40's - their daughter has moved to the city. The probability of her coming back to the farm is likely nil. The probability of her meeting somebody and wanting to marry that particular person, and go back and work with father in the farm operation is also nil.

So what has this man who is 40 years of age got to look forward to? Another 20 to 25 and maybe 30 years of prosperous dairy farming, and then he will want to sell that farm because he has nobody to then pass it onto. He will want to pass on to his daughter perhaps some capital means, rather than land or buildings or cows. So this person will want to be able to sell this farm to the best prospective buyer. Who is the best prospective buyer?

Now if this government puts handcuffs on buyers and says that you can't come from outside of Canada; you can't come from outside of Manitoba, and you have to meet a board. Therefore, what this government is doing is they have handcuffed this guy 25 years prior to him wanting to retire as to how he will retire. As the member in front of me says, what they are doing is they are robbing and depriving this particular person of a future potential pension plan.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Agriculture could, and I'm not sure that these figures could be

obtained, but if he could find out the number of farms - and Manitoba is only a little over 100 years old - the number of farms that have been passed on to sons versus the number of farms that have been sold; if those figures could be produced, and I'm not sure that those figures could be produced, that in due time that the number of farms that are sold in the future will be greater than the farms that have been passed on to sons in the past. Because many people that have homesteaded in Manitoba in the past, and because we didn't have the technology that we have today of television and other means of communication, people stayed on the farm; but in the future, and in the past few years, we have seen many many rural people that have selected to go to other occupations, other than farming, whether it be for medical reasons or just pure selection, that they don't want to stay home on the farm. But then there are other farmers who have two and three sons that all of them want to stay farming.

You can't bring up three sons, with three families, on the same farm lands that were owned by father; they have to expand, and they have to have the right to buy. I say that people that are selling lands to them have to have the right for a fair return on those lands.

The Minister of Agriculture mentioned that I said that - and I quote from Page 2891 of Hansard, May 18th, Mr. Speaker, and I said that, "If the farm has a value of X on it, why should somebody be forced to take something less than X just because they want . . . " the young farmer from down the road to own that farm? That's when the Minister used that quotation. In his reply, he said, that I, as the Member for River Heights, was opposed to young farmers being able to buy at a fair price. I am not opposed to young farmers buying at a fair price; I am in support of existing farmers selling at a fair price. Later on at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, I said that if the Minister of Agriculture would enhance his Agricultural Credit Corporation and do something there he could perhaps help the young farmer.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago talking to the late George Hutton, and, at that time, he said that what we should do when we loan monies to young farmers is we should do it through the private lending agencies, rather than through government. The reason for that being was we could take perhaps the politics and the bureaucrats out of the system. Then if a young farmer wanted to buy some farm land he would go to his local agricultural rep and say that a particular parcel of land was available and he would like to buy it. The ag rep would give him some advice, but he's just simply a bureaucrat; he's in many cases not a farmer that owns land and so on. Then he would perhaps suggest that he go to the bank or the credit union, and if you could put the ag rep and the credit union and the bank together, saying that this particular young farmer is capable of farming, you've got two particular persons that are supporting him for farming.

But just having the government say, well, you run into Winnipeg and if you go to this certain office on a certain street, you fill out a form and, as ag rep, I'll co-sign it for you, or say that you're a nice guy, and the government will give you the money. Well, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, the government isn't protecting the rest of Manitobans well enough under such a system. What they should do is say if that young

farmer is capable of farming go to the private sector and get the money; get the money from the private sector if you're such a good young farmer. And then if the interest rates in the private sector are so high, then maybe the government should look at subsidizing interest rates, but why pick up the whole part of the loan? Why don't you just subsidize part of the interest rates and let the private sector carry it?

This particular lot, the government here today, are always saying the private sector doesn't carry their fair share. Well, I'm telling them that through agricultural loans, and so on, Mr. Speaker, there are lots of avenues for government to get young farmers involved in farming and by bringing in Bill 3, that restricts who can buy and who can sell, I think, is ridiculous, it's discrimination and it should never pass. I totally support the fact that the bill should, firstly, be withdrawn; and secondly, the bill should be hoisted so the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the few agricultural members he has on his side, can go out and talk to the real people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this motion is next before the House the honourable member will have 15 minutes remaining.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, the Honourable Member for Springfield.

COMMITTEE MEETING

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise that there will be a meeting of the Standing Committee

on Municipal Affairs tomorrow night at 7:00 p.m. in the committee room to consider the bills referred. I believe the time is the same time as is allocated to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Unless there is consent, or there is agreement, committee meetings start at 8 o'clock in the evening and there's no consent, no agreement, nor has it been asked for, nor is the Government House Leader here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, my apologies to members opposite. I thought there had been an agreement to meet at 7:00 p.m. If there hasn't been the meeting will commence at 8 o'clock and, of course, there'll be the two sittings of the House tomorrow, 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., as we would have under Speed-up. The committee meeting of Municipal Affairs will then be at 8 o'clock tomorrow evening.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).