



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. 118 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 28 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	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Robin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 28 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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your committee met on Wednesday, July 27, 1983, and heard a representation with respect of the following:

Bill No. 105 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act (2), Mr. Bob Douglas, Manitoba Farm Bureau.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 92 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill 105 - An Act to amend The Municipal Assessment Act (2),

Bill 106 - An Act to amend An Act respecting the Taxation of The Canadian Pacific Railway Company by The City of Winnipeg and to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a statement to make. For the information of members, I would like to table the text of a letter I'm sending to the heads of major provincially-funded agencies, institutions and other similar organizations.

The letter outlines the guidelines which will apply in calculating provincial grants to these agencies for the 1984-85 fiscal year.

Since the letter is relatively short, I will read a few paragraphs from it.

"The guidelines applicable to grants and assistance are consistent with the guidelines which are to be applied by the departments to their own operations. They reflect our government's view that improvement in our overall budgetary position requires a strong, sustained and broadly-based effort to contain expenditure growth within realistic limits.

"Overall, grant increases are expected to be set within the range of 0 to 5 percent, with the actual percentage to be determined primarily on the basis of a formula which takes into account all the components of agency operating expenditures. The government is also undertaking a comprehensive review of program priorities, and the results of that review will affect grant allocations as well.

"It is important to emphasize that the up to 5 percent allowance is not intended to serve as a guideline for wage settlements. Obviously, such settlements must take into account the overall grant level. We would hope they would also recognize recent efforts through settlements expressed in flat dollar amounts to provide relatively larger increases to employees in lower pay categories. While some flexibility obviously will be required to deal with a few extraordinary circumstances, the government's intention is to apply these guidelines as consistently and fairly as possible.

"There is little doubt that these guidelines will present certain agencies with difficulties, and virtually all with some pressures. However, a failure to continue to contain expenditure growth adequately over the next several years could lead to severe financial problems and large-scale program disruptions.

"It is to avoid such problems and disruptions, that we are asking for your co-operation in applying and adhering to what we regard as reasonable and essential guidelines for expenditure planning for the coming year."

I also want to advise the House that once again this year, the government will be undertaking a major round of consultations on budget policy alternatives. The consultations prior to the 1983 Budget were the most extensive ever undertaken in this province, and they were extremely successful. We want to build on that experience and to ensure that there will be even greater public input in the budget planning process than was possible last year.

I intend to initiate the consultations in the fall and, in due course, will be announcing specific timing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, this announcement is a remarkable example of how this government doesn't know where it's going and has not known where it was

going from the day that it was elected, because when they were originally elected, Sir, they were elected under the promise that they would turn the economy around. They were elected on the basis that they would restore funding, Sir; that they would turn around the alleged acute protracted restraint of the Tory years.

What this government did last year was to increase their level of expenditures at a rate of over 15 percent, by their calculations, much higher; in fact, Sir, a rate of spending increase which was over twice as much as the average of other Provincial Governments in Canada. They now belatedly are coming to realize, after incurring deficits that were in the first year almost twice as much as the deficit that they inherited, we this year are looking at a deficit in the range of, by their own estimate, \$600 million.

Sir, this comes about because this government has not had a plan as to how it was going to proceed with respect to proper careful management of the province's financial resources, because there were projects in place in this province that would have brought in the kind of tax revenues that would have allowed the government to proceed with reasonable expenditure plans.

They have, through their inept negotiations, placed the government in a position where they now have to undertake restraint of an arbitrary nature, following on the heels, I might say, Mr. Speaker, of the action taken by the Bennett Government in British Columbia. This government is now coming to realize that because of their profligate spending for their first two years, they now have to begin to place this kind of arbitrary expenditure restraint on agencies and, hopefully, Sir, as well on their own spending, but that will remain to be seen.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: What we have with this government is an example of a leaderless, rudderless government that is finding it necessary to restrain expenditures of this nature at the same time, Sir, as they are proposing to fund their propaganda out of the taxpayers' money. They want the people to begin to pay for their propaganda which they will be putting out in an attempt to re-elect themselves when they finally have the courage to call an election; at the same time, Sir, as they are proposing increased benefits to members of this Legislature.

Sir, this government doesn't deserve to be in office for its full term.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the Annual Report of the Legislative Library for the year ending 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make.

Mr. Speaker, in response to concerns raised about the effects on the beekeeping industry of the government's aerial spraying program to combat against a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis, I would like to restate to the House and to the beekeepers in the province that the government is in constant contact with industry representatives and has been made aware of the problems faced by this industry.

The Department of Agriculture will be unveiling a comprehensive compensation program which will attempt to provide fair compensation to beekeepers who experience losses due to the aerial spraying program.

In addressing this issue, let me state that I am fully aware that all avenues must be taken by the government to combat encephalitis. The health of its citizen, obviously, must take priority over all other concerns. Unfortunately, as was expected before the Aerial Spraying Program began, malathion has proven to be toxic to bees.

I have asked officials from my department to continue consultation with industry representatives to see how the government can assist them in minimizing losses due to the aerial spraying campaign.

Honeybees and leaf-cutter bees represent a combined \$15 million industry in the province.

The Government of Manitoba appreciates the importance and value of these industries.

As you know, the alfalfa leaf-cutter bees are kept to increase alfalfa seed production, whereas honeybees are kept primarily for their value in honey and beeswax production.

The Department of Agriculture is conducting an extensive monitoring program in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the impact the aerial spraying campaign has on the beekeeping industry in our province.

Ever since the Aerial Spraying Program began, my department has staffed the Emergency Information Office with personnel that are familiar with the beekeeping industry.

I urge any beekeeper with concerns or questions about the program to call the Information Centre at 944-4844 in Winnipeg or the toll-free line at 1-800-362-3305.

The government is aware that under the circumstances, protective measures pose their own unique problems. However, the government is confident that producers in each designated spray area will take those protective measures they deem feasible.

Let me take this opportunity to remind beekeepers of the extensive informational campaign now in place to keep Manitobans informed of the dangers of Western Equine Encephalitis and all aspects of the aerial spraying operation.

Beekeepers are urged to take full advantage of the advance notice of spray times and locations as it applies to their industry.

In conclusion, I wish to again reassure all beekeepers that the government is aware of the situation that confronts them and is taking immediate steps to address their concerns.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister of Agriculture for expressing those sentiments today in his brief to the beekeepers of this province.

I would like to ask him very briefly, Mr. Speaker, if he or the government had any meetings with the beekeepers before the spraying started? The bees are very important, and the honey industry is a big business in this province and one of the industries that has continued to escalate over the years that I have been in the Legislature. I only have to look at the industry in Ethelbert and, luckily, Ethelbert wasn't sprayed this particular occasion.

I also would like to, in response to the Minister's comment, ask if they're not going to compensate these beekeepers for the loss of the honey? These operations have lost a year's operation, which involves salaries, equipment, the losses are a lot more than just the bees that we see on television as a result of the spraying.

This is a very important small industry in our province, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Minister and the government have met privately with them before this spraying, and I hope that they will continue to prop up this industry and give it every encouragement, because it is one of the growing industries in our province and one that we have to devote our attention to and interest.

I recognize the fact that the spraying is very important in this province; but at the same time we must protect that honey industry in our province because we have some of the finest honey in the world in this province. Let's not destroy that industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House and the people of Manitoba on the status of the aerial spraying program to prevent a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis.

Yesterday evening, aerial spraying was conducted over the communities of Morris and Niverville, and this morning was conducted over the community of Altona. Weather permitting, aerial spraying will be conducted this evening over the communities of Gimli and the west Lake Winnipeg beaches, with Beausejour, Oakbank and Dugald scheduled as alternates.

I had earlier mentioned that every effort would be made to conduct the aerial spraying over Gimli and the beaches during the hours of 6:00 to 10:00 a.m. However, latest reports from the weather office indicate a possible weather disturbance moving in overnight, which may possibly eliminate any chance of conducting the aerial spraying over this area tomorrow morning.

As the Icelandic Festival is scheduled to be held in Gimli this weekend and an influx of several thousand people is expected, it has become even more important that this high-risk area receive the aerial spraying. Due to the unique nature of the spray pattern which would have to be conducted over this area, it can be done in a relatively short period of time. Therefore, I have instructed EMO officials to begin spraying the area no earlier than 8:30 p.m. tonight, weather permitting.

If it is not possible to conduct the aerial spraying campaign over Gimli tonight, it will be done tomorrow morning, commencing at 5:30 a.m., to allow for an

additional spray in the Beausejour, Oakbank, Dugald area, again weather permitting.

In response to the statement by the Minister of Agriculture, I can only reiterate that the government is aware and concerned over the situation which now confronts some producers in the beekeeping industry.

However, let me be very clear on this issue. There has been a health emergency declared in the province due to the possible outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis, and the aerial spraying will be conducted as scheduled if weather conditions permit.

As was mentioned earlier this week, the monitoring of viral activity has been increased throughout western Manitoba, and we expect to receive and announce the results as early as Monday, August 1st.

Should the aerial spraying program designated for the Red River Valley be completed on the weekend, I have instructed that the DC-6 aircraft used to conduct the aerial spraying be retained in Manitoba until the results from western Manitoba are available. This is merely a precautionary move and in no way reflects or suggests aerial spraying over western Manitoba is imminent.

The Emergency Information Centre, which has now been in operation for one week, has handled over 7,000 telephone calls. Again, let me state that concerns or questions about Western Equine Encephalitis are invited and should be directed to this centre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the Minister of Government Services for his announcement.

I would reiterate the concern that was expressed yesterday about the evening-time spraying in areas particularly where many are out enjoying the wonderful Manitoba climate and air these days. The Minister has indicated that a potential weather disturbance may necessitate spraying over the beaches in the evening hours. That, of course, is a concern that was raised, and the Minister said that's because of a potential for bad weather tomorrow morning.

My question would be why it wasn't done this morning then in anticipation of that, knowing that the Icelandic Festival and other celebrations are taking place out that way. We have not heard yet from the Minister, either of Health or of Government Services, whether or not there has been any incidents of Western Equine Encephalitis in horses or in humans, and that is something that obviously we would like to know about.

Also, the monitoring that keeps being referred to has not indicated that there is a high viral activity at this point in time, and we'd like to have some hard information on that when the Minister next reports.

We thank him for his continued update on the effects, or at least on the program that's being carried out by the aerial spraying endeavour, but we would like to have some other information on the other aspects of the program from time to time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement for the House, as well.

I would like to update the members of the Legislature on the status of the environmental monitoring programs to assess the effects of the emergency aerial spraying program.

As I indicated to you earlier this week, environmental monitoring will be ongoing during this program, which was put into place to combat a potential outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis. Results will be coming in on a continuing basis, and I will update the House as they become available.

These are the preliminary results to date:

In the City of Winnipeg, water in the Deacon and Hurst Reservoirs were sampled for pesticide residue. Before spraying, levels were well below the detectable level of two-tenths of one part per billion, while trace levels were found after spraying. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to note that the levels found were significantly lower than the one hundred parts per billion guideline for Canadian drinking water quality for all pesticides.

Monitoring of surface water used for drinking purposes is continuing in all communities sprayed and data will be available soon.

My department, in co-operation with other Federal and Provincial Government departments, is continuing to monitor droplet size and spray patterns and our preliminary data indicate that equipment is functioning satisfactorily and the operation is proceeding as expected.

Testing was also done on the supply of malathion which is being used for the spray program. No impurities were found in that supply.

Other testing on vegetation, native bird populations and fish is also continuing. Data on these studies are not yet available, but as I have indicated, I will be providing these to the House as soon as I receive them.

As indicated by my colleagues, monitoring of bee populations confirm a high mortality rate for bees. This high mortality rate is anticipated with malathion. However, in spite of that, malathion was chosen over Baygon because it is considered to be much less toxic to mammals, including humans.

It is also important to bear in mind that this spraying program was implemented to prevent an outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis and that its primary purpose is to prevent human cases of this disease.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we thank the Minister for his statement.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

McKenzie Seeds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds.

Yesterday, when I asked the Minister when he first had knowledge of any possible conflict-of-interest situation at McKenzie Seeds, he indicated that he had had no knowledge until I raised it in the House on June 3rd. He subsequently indicated that indeed he had had some information, Sir, and I would like to quote from yesterday's Hansard because it's important that the words of the Minister be fully on the record again. He said: "But on the Monday, May 30th, Mr. Moore volunteered a very limited amount of information saying that he had at one time an interest in the Scott National Building. That had been known and approved by the Conservative-appointed board, and that he no longer had any interest in that group.

"He secondly referred to a computer company which he said he was involved in to facilitate acquisition of computer services which the board at that time said should be acquired, that is, the computer services. But he said also, he had no longer any interest and he had made no money."

Mr. Speaker, the Minister then proceeded to tell us that "I asked my staff to prepare a report on the details that day," can the Minister advise the House why he thought it was necessary to have his staff prepare a report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can advise that my Special Assistant was with me when Mr. Moore volunteered that information. There are a number of questions that we would naturally wish to check out and verify, but I repeat, there was certainly nothing in that statement of the nature that the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain raised on Friday, June 3rd. But I thought it was prudent to have my assistant begin to check out certain information and to verify certain information.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, did the Minister not then trust Mr. Moore? Was he not prepared to accept Mr. Moore's assurance that there was no problem?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a question of trust, it's a matter of being prudent. It's a matter of common sense, a matter of being prudent in the matter.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us who it was who undertook the investigation on his behalf?

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, my Special Assistant was with me and I asked him to follow up this brief conversation we had and to investigate and prepare a report for me.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister can advise us who his Special Assistant was and can he confirm that that Special Assistant is a political appointment?

HON. L. EVANS: My Special Assistant is Mr. Randy Schulz, and as a Special Assistant he holds a very very important position in government. He is a very

competent individual and he, as indeed any Special Assistant of this government or the previous government, is in a position to obtain information much more readily than a lot of other members of a government department.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. If the Minister was satisfied that some sort of investigation was necessary, does the Minister feel that it was prudent and wise on his part to have his Special Assistant, Mr. Schulz, who is a politically-appointed person, inquire into potential problems involving his long-time friend and political associate, Mr. Moore?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think it was very appropriate to ask my Special Assistant, and indeed this obviously would have been a preliminary step and any other matters that had to be checked in with whoever, whether it be matters involving the Manitoba Development Corporation, or the Auditor, or whoever, these people would have been brought in eventually as the events unfolded, I'm sure.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House what exactly Mr. Schulz was asked to do?

HON. L. EVANS: He was asked to check out and verify some of the very few details that we received from Mr. Moore.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister advised the House that: "That report was being prepared, questions were being asked, factors were being checked out." Will the Minister advise the House what questions were being asked about whom?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are various items that had to be checked out and various obvious material that had to be looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. EVANS: Minutes of the Board of Directors' meetings . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. EVANS: . . . conversations and questions to be asked of various people, Manitoba Development Corporation, members of the board and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Had those investigations actually been undertaken? Had his Special Assistant actually made contact with Mr. Moore or other people, inquiring into the concern that the Minister had?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know exactly the detailed work of my assistant during those four days. I might add, we were in the Estimates of Community Services here for all of that week including until 11:30 p.m. the night before, the Thursday before the member asked the question. So the Special Assistant had the assignment, and he was undertaking the assignment.

Obviously he didn't speak to Mr. Moore, because Mr. Moore had taken off for a trip the day after he spoke to us on the Monday.

MR. B. RANSOM: A final supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker, can he tell us the name of any person that his Special Assistant, Mr. Schulz, spoke to in the course of his investigation which the Minister had asked him to undertake?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the Special Assistant had the assignment. Over several weeks, he has spoken to many people and has also checked Minutes of the boards of directors and so on.

Pension reform legislation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Would the Minister of Labour indicate whether the government or her department or the Pension Commission costed the implications to employers of the amendments to The Pension Benefits Act?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we costed the cost of the benefits described in the reform of The Pension Benefits Act to ourselves as employers, being one of the largest employers in this province. We thought it was appropriate to find out just in fact, how much it would cost for us to implement these, of course, through The Civil Service Superannuation Act but to make that complementary, what it would cost us.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to indicate then in terms of payroll, what percentage of payroll would the amendments cost, and would she provide us with a copy of that report?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, these deferred wages that the member is talking about would cost us on payroll, of course, an escalating amount over a series of years unless you take the whole thing as a lump sum which, of course, would not be accurate.

We had the actuary do it on the basis of 1984-85. I can make some of that information available to the member. I certainly don't have it all memorized, but I do recall that the first year was something in the order of .01 percent.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

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 whether he has received any information from the two largest German-Canadian associations in Manitoba, namely, the German Society of Winnipeg and the German-Canadian Business and Professional Men's Club, who both have now formally indicated that they are not in favour of the government's bilingual program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I have, Mr. Speaker, received copies of letters written by two organizations to Mr. Doern. The letters are instructive indeed, and I'll refer very briefly to them in my answer; indicates the kind of information or one can imply, the kind of information that they are getting from Mr. Doern.

First of all the German Society of Winnipeg says that it's a non-political organization and doesn't take political positions. "As we understand it," after listening to Mr. Doern, "this amendment will eventually also include municipal services. We are sure that 90 percent of the population will resent this." That, Sir, if told by Mr. Doern to that organization was a fraudulent misrepresentation, and as such — (Interjection) — no. I said, if it was said by Mr. Doern to that organization, was a fraudulent misrepresentation.

Indeed it was, because as the members of this House know or at least those who have taken the time to read the proposed amendment, there is no way in which there is any burden on municipalities. So if Mr. Doern told the organization that was so and they based their concern, and that's what they expressed on that, then they have been led down the garden path by someone who should be chastised for doing that to an organization which depends on the elected representatives to tell the truth. If the elected representatives don't tell the truth and they have been misled and there have been misrepresentations, then there has been a serious breakdown in the political process.

Again, Sir . . .

MR. R. DOERN: Is this an answer?

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, it is an answer.

MR. L. SHERMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry on a point of order.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask the Chair, Sir, whether it is acceptable practice in this House to engage in hypothetical answers. If hypothetical answers are going to be offered in this House, then may we assume, Sir, that hypothetical questions will from this day forward be permitted, because that's what the Attorney-General is doing, he is setting up a straw man and constructing a hypothetical answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the words used by the Honourable Attorney-General were made in a non-hypothetical manner, they would certainly be

unparliamentary. I don't think it is a very good parliamentary process or system to make such unparliamentary words in a hypothetical context as that. I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General would review his words and perhaps phrase it differently.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll phrase it differently.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like the Attorney-General to read . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a matter or privilege. The Attorney-General is putting words into my mouth. He is twisting the facts. I want him to read what he regards as an offending passage in a letter that was written by one of those organizations. I want him to read that exact statement, because I want to follow it in my letter. I don't take his word for anything.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Has the Honourable Member for Elmwood a substantive motion?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, then on a point of order, I simply say that the Attorney-General . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member take his seat? If the honourable member wishes to enter into an argument or debate, he may do so at another occasion.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling that I am not to ask or engage in anything hypothetical. I will read again, as I read when I began my answer, the actual words from the letter of this particular organization. "As we understand it, this amendment will eventually also include municipal services. We are sure that 90 percent of the population will resent this." I am sure that a very considerable percentage of the population would resent something that this Legislature does to impose an obligation on municipal services.

What I said, Sir, was that if they have been led by anyone to believe that, then they have based their opinion on a wrong assumption, because the agreement that is being proposed was specifically designed to exclude an obligation on municipalities. The agreement which is being proposed substituted the words that are in there for the preferred word in the Canadian Charter, "institutions" of government, because it was legal opinion which I had obtained that institutions of government might include municipalities, and because the word "institutions" of government might include municipalities, we deliberately chose not to use that word. So that was with respect to one of the German organizations.

The member in his question referred to two. If he doesn't like the answer, he shouldn't ask the question. Now the next letter from a German organization refers again to a meeting held with Mr. Doern where Mr. Doern gave them an explanation, and it talked about the letter . . .

MR. R. DOERN: I rise on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Member for Elmwood state his point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: If the Attorney-General is going to have 5 or 10 minutes to answer my questions, then I want 5 or 10 minutes to ask my questions.

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

The Honourable Attorney-General is to complete his question.

MR. B. RANSOM: On a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm just simply pointing out and I'll complete my answer . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you have many times admonished the House, both those who are asking questions and answering questions, that questions should be brief and answers should be brief. The question which the member asked was a question which could be answered quite briefly, and what we have is the Government House Leader engaging in debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General may complete his answer.

HON. R. PENNER: I will complete my answer in the following way, Sir: I would invite any ethnic organization which has invited Mr. Doern to give his explanation of what is being proposed, to invite me or any other member of government to give the real explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney-General whether he is familiar with the position of Serge Joyal, the Secretary of State, who has said repeatedly that he intends to encourage and finance groups of Canadians to press their governments for bilingualism at the municipal level, and he has told French Canadians from coast to coast that they are second-class citizens; even though they have federal bilingualism and even though they have provincial bilingualism, they must have municipal bilingualism. Is he familiar with those statements?

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

HON. A. MACKLING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, to ask for the opinion of a Minister of this House, to reflect or consider the opinion of someone in another institution on a matter is clearly out of order.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Following the Honourable Minister, I am asking a question as to whether the Attorney-

General is familiar with statements made by the Secretary of State in the Trudeau Cabinet, concerning the importance of municipal institutions and bilingualism in Canada? Yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. To both of the members who have spoken on a point of order, it was not a point of order. May I remind the honourable member that the purpose of question period is to seek information and not to give it to the House.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I'm going to, nor would you permit anyone to tell me that I may answer a question, yes or no. This is not the Star Chamber, even though some might like to turn it into the Star Chamber. This is a Chamber of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba and I, for one, propose to conduct myself as if that were the case.

First of all, with respect to the question, if what the Member for Elmwood purported to give or appeared to give as a quotation from Mr. Joyal, then I would ask him, in the name of decency, to table the actual quote from the actual speech to which he refers, because, to my knowledge, Mr. Joyal, the Secretary of State, has never made a speech of the kind that the member purported to give this House as if it were the words of Mr. Joyal; No. 1.

No. 2: —(Interjection) — Well, you can do it from the western concept sources but not from actual sources. No. 2: I will deal with what Mr. Joyal said on this issue in Winnipeg, speaking to the annual meeting of the Societe Franco-Manitobaine on about March 16th of this year. Mr. Joyal, in a wide-ranging speech, commenting on the discussions which were then taking place, expressed himself as desiring or hoping that any amendments would be within the Canadian Charter so that the language used would be the language similar to that used in New Brunswick and in Canada. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that that was rejected by the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm a little concerned that this is becoming a debate between two members, rather than the seeking of information as question period is supposed to be.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I have a third question. I'll simply say that I will, in fact, table the speech of Serge Joyal, in which he said that the municipal governments must become bilingual, and another speech in which he says that he's going to turn Canada into a French state. I will . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I've just told the House that I'm concerned that this matter is becoming a debate rather than the posing of a question, and the honourable member then stands up to give more information to the House. If he has a question, would he please pose it?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

Bilingualism - advertising

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has released the pamphlet and made a statement in the House on July 26th that this household mailer cost 2.8 cents per Manitoba resident, and that means that the pamphlet cost \$28,000.00. That is what he has tried to imply and he has tried to suggest.

The question is: What are the mailing costs of this pamphlet? Because my information is that it would cost \$25,000 to \$28,000 to mail it. He forgot to put that in his pamphlet, and he forgot to answer that in this House.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I have perused - I don't think I have it with me now, but I perused as early as this morning the actual question asked by the Member for Elmwood, and in Hansard it will appear - and here I'm paraphrasing rather than quoting because I don't have it with me right at the moment - that the question that was asked by the Member for Elmwood and was asked by me was: What were the production costs of the pamphlet? I gave an answer which was true then and is true now that the production costs of the pamphlet were \$28,000.00.

He now asks me a question that he did not ask me on that occasion: What were the mailing costs? I now have the answer to that question. The mailing costs were approximately \$27,000.00. — (Interjection) — The total production costs, Mr. Speaker, is the answer I gave when I was first asked that question in those terms, namely \$28,000.00. I am now asked what the mailing costs were and I've answered that question.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question. I would ask the Attorney-General what he meant to say when he was quoted in Hansard on Tuesday, July 26th, when he said the following, Page 4520: "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."

Why didn't he mention the mailing costs at that time?

HON. R. PENNER: My answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is that I meant to say exactly what I did say.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the pamphlet which has been referred to, that the government is sending out to all Manitobans, is a quote under a panel which is headed "Manitoba Is Not Becoming Bilingual." The quote is "Businesses, municipalities, non-governmental bodies, school boards and institutions are not affected in any way." On the very next panel, it says, "Provision of French Language Services will be limited to communities which have significant numbers of French speaking Manitobans (about 30 out of the 202 municipalities)."

How does one square with the other?

HON. R. PENNER: The two square with each other very well. There are, in fact, two - there's a proposed amendment which, as I . . .

A MEMBER: We haven't seen the amendments.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, you have. Why don't you read the resolution? Well you can't read perhaps, but that's your problem.

Mr. Speaker, there is a proposed amendment which has been distributed in this House as the resolution which is before the House, so let no member of the House imply that they haven't seen it. The amendment has a provision - 23.7 - which deals with the proposed services to be rendered by the Government of Manitoba. That's repeated throughout and it's clear that that is the limit of the obligation.

With respect to municipalities, there is a voluntary program that has nothing to do with the amendment . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Well, that's perfectly clear. It's perfectly clear to everybody but apparently the Member for Roblin-Russell, so I'll try to make it clear even to him that there is a fund of money of \$400,000; any municipality, where there are sufficient numbers of French speaking people who or which, as a municipality, wants to upgrade services that they're delivering in French as well as English, or to do so where they haven't done so before, may if they wish, but it is entirely up to the municipality. There is no obligation whatsoever.

Indeed, if those 30 municipalities where there are, arguably, fairly significant numbers of people who speak French as well as English, decided that they wanted to take no part in the program, which is voluntary, so be it. So the Province of Manitoba would save \$200,000.00. I would rather, as I expect will be the case after talking to a number of them, that indeed they do take advantage of the program.

MR. G. FILMON: So, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the Attorney-General, earlier, to the Member for Elmwood said that municipalities were not affected in any way, and indeed that is a statement that's repeated here, he is saying that municipalities are being offered the opportunity to have government funding to extend bilingual services.

Now, is he saying that offer is available only to 30 municipalities and that if any other municipalities ask for financial assistance, they would not be granted it?

HON. R. PENNER: The number 30 is an approximation, trying to estimate out of the 208 municipalities . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. R. PENNER: Back to the jungle. You know really, Mr. Speaker, if we can't keep the hyenas in the bushes quiet, I don't know what this Chamber is coming to.

Mr. Speaker, the program, as I say, is entirely voluntary. In order to illustrate the scope of the program, we attempted - and when I say "we" primarily, the coordinator of French Languages Services, Mr. Turenne, hired by that bunch when they were the government, has attempted for purposes of illustration to indicate where the significant numbers of French municipalities, French speaking municipalities are in order to give some indication where the program might apply.

The program, Sir, is one which will be developed over time by the Department of Municipal Affairs working

on a consensual basis. If a municipality, which has fewer rather than more, comes to the Department of Municipal Affairs and says genuinely that they want to offer services, I can say to them that the government, through the Department of Municipal Affairs, will certainly be ready to listen to any case that be made for the need to provide such services.

Robert H. Smith School - renovations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. I wonder if she could tell me what the current status is of the proposed structural renovations to the Robert H. Smith School in River Heights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Tuxedo knows . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

If the Honourable Member for Pembina wishes to listen to the answer as well as the question, he may do so.

The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I started to say a few minutes earlier, I think the Member for Tuxedo is aware that there was a special meeting held by the Public Schools Finance Board on Friday with the Winnipeg School Division over the question of the inadequate tendering procedures and the direction of the Public Schools' Finance Board to retender.

I might also indicate that the Public Schools Finance Board did offer to have the meeting earlier with the Winnipeg School Division in order to save any days possible to allow us to get under way with construction, but they did not take up on the offer.

At that meeting, the Public Schools Finance Board indicated to the Winnipeg School Division that they did think that they should still retender the project because the tendering procedures were still considered to be highly inadequate, and there was considerable evidence to show that there would have been competitive bids had a reasonable period of time been allowed.

However, they did give them another option, Mr. Speaker, that would allow them to proceed immediately and that option was that they could proceed on the existing tender but a maximum support of \$365,000 which represents the cost of underpinning estimated by Penner and Keeler, the consulting engineers for the province, that they could proceed with that bid to a maximum of \$365,000 because the bid that came in was a lone bid, there were no competitive bids and it was \$95,000 higher than the estimated cost.

So, I think that the Public Schools Finance Board has taken a reasonable position. They have questioned a non-competitive tendering process where there was information two days after the blueprints were let that another firm was interested in tendering but would not

have time in the four-day period and where there was a documented letter on the fourth day when tenders closed indicating that they wanted to bid but did not have time to get their bid in.

So, I think that the Public Schools Finance Board, as all of us want the school construction to begin, but they have other responsibilities and the two of them are, the amount of expenditure of public money and not having a 25 percent increase in costs that may not have to be borne and the way we let public works, how public works are awarded, because if we don't have the public tendering system, Mr. Speaker, we might as well just call up our friends and ask them if they want the job. Of course, we can't do that.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, leaving aside all the rationale that the Minister wants to bring to this issue, let me say that the important part of the issue that she does not bring to bear is that there are 238 students who will have no place to attend school this coming fall, because in view of the fact that the Winnipeg School Division has reorganized all the South Winnipeg schools and has allocated resources, teachers, staff and every other thing to do with the education of the students to various schools, and in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the protagonists in this whole issue, in the disagreement, are an NDP-controlled and chaired Winnipeg School Board, an NDP appointed Public Schools Finance Board and an NDP Minister of Education, will she step in to this family squabble and achieve some answer that will help us reach our purpose which is to have a place for the students to go to school this September? Will she step in and settle it?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Member for Tuxedo has provided one of the laughs of the day in suggesting that we have an NDP-controlled both Winnipeg School Division and Public Schools Finance board.

However, to get to the point that he was making about the students being in school in September, which I think is a very important point, I must say that the Winnipeg School Division, to my knowledge, has not ever promised or indicated for sure that the students would be in. They said that they hoped they would be in, and that they may have to make other arrangements, other accommodation, which they have proceeded to do.

But, I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the one place that you should not cut in is the tendering process. In order to cut six days, to save six days, in the tendering process, they dealt with the tenders in a way that was highly inappropriate. I might also say, that had they retendered right away, the second retendering process would have been almost completed. — (Interjection)

Mr. Speaker, the Public Schools Finance Board has done everything they could to both speed up the process and to make sure there were no delays caused by the Public Schools Finance Board. There were about three months of delays. The Winnipeg School Division did no structural engineering reports; the Public Schools Finance Board had to undertake that, at additional loss time; the Public Schools Finance Board offered to provide their engineering consultants which would have

saved an additional two weeks and the offer was turned down; so, they have done everything they could but there's a limit to how far they can go, Mr. Speaker, and they cannot agree with supporting inappropriate tendering procedures on a matter as important as issuing public works and expenditure of public money.

To save six days, we're going to shortcut on something as important as that and only have one bid when there were other competitive bids there that could have brought that in at a lower price?

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I would now like to table these documents which the Attorney-General requested: Two addresses by the Honourable Serge Joyal, Secretary of State; one to the Acadian Federation in which he says, it's difficult for people to accept the fact that this is a French state, and one to the Franco-Manitoban Society on March 19th in which he says in effect, that we must have the municipal level of government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The tabling of a document is a relatively simple process. It is not an excuse to make a speech.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry:

THAT an humble address be voted to Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba praying for copies of the "media plan" for the Manitoba Jobs Fund Advertising Campaign showing placement and frequency of all television, radio and newspaper advertising.

MOTION presented and carried.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If members want to hold their own private debate on something, would they please go outside and do it, not in this House when there is a motion before the House.

ORDER FOR RETURN - NO. 19

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: In accepting the Order for Return, I merely want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that much of what is asked for in the second part of the request is really contained or itemized in the first part. So the Order will be accepted as a whole, but the reply to the

Order will deal with all of the elements but not necessarily in the order given.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for the return of the following information:

1. The total cost of the advertising campaign for the Manitoba Jobs Fund, including:

(a) the cost of television time;
(b) the cost of radio time;
(c) the cost of newspaper or other print advertisements;

(d) the cost of producing the television commercials;
(e) the cost of producing the radio commercials;
(f) the cost of producing newspaper or other print advertisements;

(g) the cost of producing any supplemental material, such as brochures; and

(h) the dates on which the television, radio and magazine advertising commenced and will terminate.

2. The names of all firms or agencies producing material for the campaign and showing for each:

(a) what they produced;
(b) the total fees or commissions received by each firm or agency; and

(c) the total expenses charged by each firm or agency.

3. The television stations on which the commercials ran and the amount paid to each station.

4. The radio stations on which the commercials ran and the amount paid to each station.

5. The newspapers or other publications in which advertisements were placed, the number of times ads were placed in each and the amounts paid therefore.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Accepted, Mr. Speaker, subject only to the qualification I gave earlier when I mentioned the relationship between the first request and the second.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House Leader indicate the next item of business?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on the resolution dealing with aboriginal rights as it appears on Page 12 of the Order Paper, standing adjourned in the name of the Member for Emerson.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable First Minister, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to speak at this time, but I believe the Member for

Turtle Mountain is prepared to speak on it. — (Interjection) — Oh, anybody, for that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to allow this matter to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am greatly honoured to take part in this historical motion. It is indeed an important occasion to debate the constitutional amendment respecting the aboriginal people of this country, namely, the Inuit, the Metis and the Indian.

It is certainly fitting that the first amendment to our Constitution is dealing with the first citizens of this country, and also establishing a process whereby the aboriginal people and the governments can start defining and entrenching their rights. Far too long, the aboriginal people have not been participants and have been held in human bondage by governments. I did mention in this House before that it was only recently that the Indian people were given the right to involve themselves in the democratic process.

Far too long, governments have developed policies of integration and assimilation. This has been done through various means and through various institutions. The two that are well known are the religious and also the educational institutions. As a matter of fact, I did attend a school, a number of residential schools, including Brandon and also in Birtle. The policy of the government at that time was to isolate children from their parents and put them in an environment conducive to where values of the dominant society can be taught. As a matter of fact, aboriginal children were strapped for speaking their own language.

One of the well-known integration policies of the Federal Government is the 1969 White Policy Paper. This policy paper was totally rejected by the Indian people across this nation, because it would have extinguished their rights and also severed the special relationship between the Indian people and the Federal Government. These policies will not work and will never work, although there is indication that the Federal Government is still continuing this policy. I am glad that this Pawley Government has broken with such irresponsible policies.

Far too long the governments have dictated the lives of the aboriginal people. The aboriginal people have been subjected to the welfare system and that system has destroyed and has created chaos in many of the communities. I have brought attention to this Chamber before, some of the social, economic, and physical conditions that plague many of the communities. As long as that system persists, the aboriginal people will continue to experience a dismal future.

Far too long, governments have ignored or have not wholeheartedly attempted to address the promises made to the Indian people. The rights and the claims of the Metis people also have to be addressed. Governments have been ignorant and have not been sensitive to the rights of the aboriginal people. Certain legislations and policies have had the effect of extinguishing or else limiting the treaty rights. Certain court decisions have not upheld the constitution, some of the treaty and aboriginal rights.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this government is addressing the outstanding treaty land entitlement and to bring it to a satisfactory conclusion for everyone concerned. After all, justice serves the public interest. The aboriginal people, the Indian, the Inuit and the Metis are hopeful that this forum, the future constitutional conferences will provide whereby their rights will be entrenched.

Although past experience with governments has not been great, the aboriginal people are proceeding to meet this important challenge and to establish a rightful and a unique place in the Canadian society. Mr. Speaker, the aboriginal people have existed here - what we call as Canada today - they have existed here prior to the European settlement, prior to European application of law.

The aboriginal people have existed as distinct nations and have exercised self-governing powers over their territory and over their religious, cultural, social, economic and political life. The aboriginal people have also exercised control over natural resources. Although treaties and modern agreements have affected the rights of the aboriginal nations to some extent, such treaties and agreements cannot be construed as constituting a general extinguishment of aboriginal rights.

The Metis, children of the fur trade, played a major role in the development of this province and the development of this country. They developed an unique cultural identity. As a matter of fact, the Metis people are recognized as a distinct group of people in Manitoba, under The Manitoba Act of 1870. They were provided with a substantial amount of land, however provisions for the land was exercised in such a manner that the Metis were completely dispossessed.

Certainly this is one of the issues that has to be addressed. The Metis people are seeking preservation and development of their community and their rights to be entrenched in the Canadian constitution. The aboriginal people are seeking a unique place in the Canadian mosaic. We do, as aboriginal people, have a rich heritage. We need to preserve, enhance and protect our culture, customs, beliefs, traditions and language. We have to co-exist together.

One of the main fundamental rights the aboriginal people seek is the right to make their own decisions. This issue of self-government is a paramount priority among the Indian and his people. It is a complex issue. It is complex in that we have to start defining the responsibilities, the jurisdictions, the sharing of powers, etc. It is not an easy task.

Presently the Federal Government has complete control over many of the reserves. I can quote some of the examples in The Indian Act with respect to membership, where they have absolute control, in terms of by-laws. These are subject to approval by the Minister, by Governor-in-Council, so they do have a lot of influence in making reserves to be progressive.

And also with the Provincial Government, if I may quote from the Manitoba Metis Rights Position Paper, and it was adopted by the Metis Rights Assembly in Winnipeg on March 11, 1983. I quote from the paragraphs contained in that document: "North of the province's main agricultural belt, there are over 50 larger Metis communities and more than 200 very small settlements. Under the administration of the Provincial Department of Northern Affairs, at present these

communities do not even possess normal municipal governing powers. Their elected councils have no power to set taxes or by-laws, to sign contracts, or act, in any way, as legally responsible bodies. Decisions and actions are subject to the veto power of the Minister of Northern Affairs. The government today still possesses colonial attitudes towards Metis communities."

So those are some of the issues that we have to deal with in terms of trying to undefine, sort of start redefining some of the responsibilities that rightfully belong to those communities.

One of the other priority areas of the aboriginal people is to acquire a land base in order to survive as a nation. The aboriginal people must also acquire an economic base, so that they may, as a community be self-reliant. The aboriginal people also have to start defining some of the hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering rights.

Although the constitutional exercise will not immediately provide the needs of the community, such as housing, health services, water supply, sanitation, etc., we do have to start addressing and start defining the responsibilities of governments. We as aboriginal people have never been formally recognized as a founding race of this country. We as aboriginal people want to be involved in the guiding of Canada's future. This constitutional exercise is a nation-building exercise. Together we can build a great nation.

In my previous remarks, I mentioned many injustices and many issues that plague many of our aboriginal communities. We have a very important and vital task ahead, a task that requires commitment, dedication, that ensures a survival of a first nation. It is much more than a secretarial amendment. We have to set aside our differences. We have to be imaginative. We have to be open-minded and approach this exercise with good will. I realize that we cannot turn the clock back, but we can start a new process that will address many of the issues and the problems that confront our communities. It is certainly a great challenge, an historical occasion. In the future, we may be able to say to our children that we stood up to that challenge together.

Some of the provinces have already passed this resolution in their Legislatures. The House of Commons unanimously endorsed this resolution this June, but I am somewhat perturbed and also dismayed that the Senate has blocked this constitutional amendment respecting the aboriginal people as reported on July the 7th by the Globe and Mail. It is these kinds of actions that have left the aboriginal people with distrust, with suspicion and resentments of governments.

I hope this constitutional exercise will bring tolerance and understanding and forward friendship. I urge all members of this Legislature to endorse this resolution unanimously. When the aboriginal people succeed, the rest of the Canadian society succeeds.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Will the honourable member permit a question for clarification? Earlier in his remarks, the honourable member referred to his school days, and I believe he made reference to attending a school in

Birtle. Could the member indicate whether that was a federally-funded public school, a provincially-funded public school, or whether it was a private school financed by a religious organization?

MR. E. HARPER: Yes, I believe it is a federally-funded school provided to sort of a religious organization. I attended school there. They were trying to make a farmer out of me, but didn't succeed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the words of the Member for Rupertsland, and I know that the Member for Rupertsland speaks with great sincerity about the past and about the future. I know that there have been injustices in the past, and we are pleased to see that work is ongoing now to try and correct some of those injustices even though, as the member says, you obviously cannot roll back time. The member also looks forward to the future, and used the words "with imagination" and that we should be open-minded about the future. I certainly agree with the member in his general addressing of the subject; of what's really a broader subject than the amendment which is before us.

I don't intend to deal with that broader subject, Mr. Speaker. I would like to deal with the amendment that is before us. While we certainly intend to support this resolution, we have some questions and some concerns. I note that the Member for Rupertsland raised the question of the Senate; that the Senate had blocked the passage of this, and the Member for Rupertsland, I believe, used the words that that had left some mistrust and bitterness in the minds and hearts of the Native people. The First Minister himself called "Shame" from his seat when reference was made to that.

Mr. Speaker, some of the concerns that the Senate has, I believe, are entirely legitimate, and I have some of those concerns. The reason I have them, Mr. Speaker, is that in his presentation when the First Minister introduced this resolution, if one refers to Page 3958 of Hansard, he will find that there are exactly seven lines that actually deal with this constitutional amendment. The rest of what the First Minister had to say deals with the broader issue of aboriginal rights and self-government and land entitlements and such, but what we have before us is a proposed constitutional amendment. The First Minister didn't tell us what that constitutional amendment means. That, as I understand it — (Interjection) --- well, Mr. Speaker, let me read what the First Minister said about the amendment.

He says it straightforward. I will place some questions on the record and, hopefully, someone could answer them. What the First Minister said, and I quote, "The resolution now before us basically declares that aboriginal and Treaty rights are guaranteed equally to males and females. It further states that the rights and the freedoms guaranteed in the Charter do not take away from rights acquired by way of land claim settlements. It calls for at least two more Constitutional Conferences on aboriginal rights before 1987."

Sir, the actual changes which are before us; for instance, the first part of the proclamation would say that Paragraph 25(b) of The Constitution Act 1982 is repealed and the following substituted therefor: (b) any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired. The change in that provision is, Sir, that the original section said that the guarantee in this Charter of certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal, treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada including (b) any rights or freedoms that may be acquired by the aboriginal peoples of Canada by way of land claims settlement.

So what that did was deal with things that might happen in the future. What the amendment says is any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired, so what that does is move from the future into the present and the past.

I know that the First Minister made reference in his general speech to the James Bay Agreement, for instance. Now, that raises questions as to what this section really means. Does that include, for instance, the Northern Flood Agreement in Manitoba? Is the Northern Flood Agreement in Manitoba now going to be part of the Constitution of Canada? Because, Sir, on first blush that, at least to me, appears to be a land claims agreement, and according to this amendment it says "any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements."

So if the First Minister is speaking about the James Bay Agreement, is he also speaking about the Northern Flood Agreement? Is he speaking about the Forebay Agreement with respect to Grand Rapids? Is that now part of the Constitution of Canada? If so, then what this resolution will do is without any debate as to the substance of what we were including in the Constitution suddenly included. If that's what the section means, but perhaps, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that's not what the section means.

But I don't know and the First Minister hasn't addressed it, and I believe that is the sort of concern that the Senate was raising; that here we are being asked to accept an amendment to the Constitution without knowing what it means. I would like to know what that section means. Perhaps, the First Minister would be able to tell us that either in committee, if the resolution is going to committee. I notice by the way that the First Minister, when he addressed this resolution, said that it would be going to committee; that it would be referred to the Standing Committee along with Section 23 amendments, but the resolution on the Order Paper makes no reference to the aboriginal rights amendment in calling for a committee to meet. So perhaps we'll still see a committee; perhaps we won't with respect to this.

So I would like to see that question addressed because I don't think that we should without an understanding of it be entrenching, for instance, the Northern Flood Agreement into the Constitution of Canada. And does it also mean, Mr. Speaker, that if Manitoba, an Indian Band and the Federal Government now make a land claims settlement, that automatically becomes part of the Constitution, or are those settlements going to have to come before this Legislature, and six or seven other Legislatures, and

the Parliament, and Senate of Canada in order to become part of the Constitution? Because if it doesn't, it seems to me an unusual procedure that something can become part of the Constitution without having gone through the process for amending the Constitution which is set out in The Constitution Act.

So perhaps the First Minister could examine those questions and try and provide us with some answers.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, in Section 35 of The Constitution Act, they are now proposing to add Subsection 3 which reads: For greater certainty in Subsection 1 treaty rights includes rights that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may be so acquired.

So, once again, the same questions are attached that they will now automatically become part of treaty rights and automatically then be entrenched in the Constitution. So the whole process of amending the Constitution which is set out in the act would seem to be set aside in order that these amendments could be made.

Mr. Speaker, I also have some questions, and I know that the Senate had some questions, about the amendment - and this is a further subsection to Section 35, Subsection 4, which reads: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the aboriginal and treaty rights referred to in Subsection 1 are guaranteed equally to male and female persons." Now what does that mean, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I understand that when the informational meetings were held in Virden and Brandon, for instance, that there was an Indian woman who appeared before the committee in Brandon and asked the Attorney-General, what does that mean? And the Attorney-General said, I don't know.

Now, if that really is the case, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is it proper to be asking this House to accept a constitutional amendment without an explanation of what it means?

Now, I can ask some questions about that issue: Will an Indian woman marrying a non-Indian man, will that man now acquire the same rights as a non-Indian woman marrying an Indian man? Because it's my understanding - perhaps the Member for Rupertsland can nod assent if I'm correct - that a non-Indian woman marrying an Indian man assumes treaty status. She in fact will become a treaty Indian and their children will be treaty Indians. Is that a correct understanding?

He indicates there may be some confusion there, but there are certainly rights that go to a non-Indian woman marrying an Indian man. Now does this section mean that the reverse is also going to apply? There is not a word about that here. The First Minister didn't address that when he asked us to accept this, and I know from having the privilege of attending the Constitutional Conference in Ottawa that a lot of the Native people themselves expressed concern at this issue. I feel that this section was adopted at that Constitutional Conference over some pretty strong objections being expressed by some of the Native people. To some extent they may almost have been embarrassed into accepting this by being put in the position of, how could you possibly be against having the same rights for women as you had for men.

I seriously question whether their arguments were carefully examined, and that everyone understood the arguments, and then believed that this was the proper

amendment to make. Certainly on the surface it appears like a reasonable amendment to make but we don't know what it means.

What will it actually mean to Indian women who are going to marry non-Indian men, or who already have? What does it do for Indian women who have already lost their standing as treaty Indians? Is it somehow going to allow them some redress?

I understand there are situations on reserves in Ontario, where Indian women married non-Indian men and lost their treaty rights, and subsequently were divorced from their husbands, and wanted to go back to the reserves as Indian people, and they were denied that right by the band.

Now, is this constitutional amendment going to restore rights to those Indian women which, by anybody's standard, would have been judged to have been unjustly treated? We have no answer to that question, and I would hope that the First Minister, or someone on that side of the House is going to be able to answer these questions.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the specific concerns I have. I would wish to offer to the government some more general concerns as well, and that is that in their haste - perhaps haste isn't the right word but I'll use it anyway - in their haste to try and correct what is perceived as past injustices to the Native people of Manitoba, this government has taken some positions which they are unable to explain, and I have asked questions, in the House, for explanations; I have asked questions of the Attorney-General, in his Estimates, and the Attorney-General hasn't been able to answer those questions.

I have asked pertaining to statements made in news releases, for instance, here's one dated January 21, 1983, where the news release says - "The Manitoba Government recognizes the aspirations of the Indian people to achieve self-determination, and will support the evolutionary process of Indian self-government within the Canadian Constitution." We don't know what that means.

The government talks about self-determination, and self-government, it perhaps raises expectations among the Indian people as to what they are going to get. The government seems to be moving with undue haste to entrench statements in the constitution for which there is no common understanding. Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is the way to go.

I accept that the government has identified a number of issues that have to be dealt with. The question of aboriginal rights, and the possibility of self-government, or what rights the Indians have to self-government, what nationhood really means. But we already have moved to entrench aboriginal rights for Metis people, for instance, in the Constitution, and I don't think anybody knows what aboriginal rights are as they pertain to Metis people. So that simply moves the whole issue into the courts. What we do is sit around a table and come to an agreement on a statement for which everybody likes the wording and apply their own meaning to it, and they want to rush off and entrench it in the Constitution, and then it'll be in the hands of the courts to decide what it really means. Well, I don't think that's the proper way to proceed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I think that if the people who have actually sat down and discussed these issues, if they don't have a common

understanding of what it means then you can be sure that a decade, or five decades, or ten decades later that it's going to be interpreted in a much different way than those people sitting around the table thought it would be.

So there is a strong obligation on the government, however much they may feel that it's necessary to settle these issues; however long the perceived injustices have been going on; then it is necessary to take the time to try and work out an understanding of these issues before they become entrenched in the Constitution. Otherwise we're simply going to end up with courts determining what these sections mean.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are the specific questions we have about this constitutional amendment that is before us plus some expression of general concern and caution. I trust that someone on the other side of the House is going to provide some answers to these questions that we have. I do not wish to have this position being interpreted in any way anti Native people in terms of rights that they have or might have. I simply want to know what it is that we're being asked to pass.

I might say it's too little if it's interpreted in a very narrow sense; it might be too much if it's interpreted in a very broad sense. But I'm not sure that the government is even going to be able to answer this because I don't recall at the constitutional discussions that there really was consensus around that table as to what it meant. So unless the consensus was reached in the back rooms when the actual wording was worked out then I think we might have some difficulty.

But in the future should there be court challenges based upon these constitutional amendments, it might prove very useful, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have heard from the First Minister of the Government of Manitoba as to what exactly he thought those constitutional amendments meant. The courts at some future time might be able to go back and say - well in 1983 Premier Pawley said that no, this amendment certainly wasn't intended to apply to the Northern Flood Agreement, or yes, it was intended to apply to the Northern Flood Agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, we'll look forward with interest to hearing some answers from the opposition. I don't expect extended debate on this resolution providing we are able to have some satisfactory answers to those questions.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: If no further members wish to speak on this, the resolution will stand in the name of the Member for Emerson.

The Acting House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you call the motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, found at the bottom of Page 12 on the Order Paper dealing with the referral motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sorry I didn't understand here, the sound system . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: It's the motion by the Attorney-General found at the bottom of Page 12, dealing with a proposed resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and it goes on. Please call that motion. It stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE:
OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General and the amendment proposed thereto, standing in the name of the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I stand to speak in favour of the proposed motion as amended by the Member for Fort Garry.

The motion as proposed originally, went:

"WHEREAS the Government of the Province of Manitoba has proposed a resolution to amend Section 23 of The Manitoba Act which amendment concerns the translation of the statutes of Manitoba or some of them and the question of government services in the French as well as the English language; and

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

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee . . ." - and as amended - "sit during recess after prorogation and report to the next Session of the Legislature."

Mr. Speaker, that is just common sense. I can't imagine why this government is in such a rush to get this particular amendment through the House. Why are they in such a rush? Is the idea that the quicker they get rid of it, the quicker it'll go away? That's not going to happen, Mr. Speaker.

Why is the government attempting to rush this resolution in such a hurry? Yesterday the Acting Government House Leader indicated that he would not allow - the government is not going to allow further adjournments on the debate of this particular issue. Mr. Speaker, we had two speakers on Tuesday and we had four speakers yesterday, so who is trying to hold up the resolution? We have been speaking on it in an orderly fashion and with the business of the House, which we have to pay attention to . . .

A MEMBER: How about last week, Gerrie?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the natterings from across the floor; they are always looking at last week. I'm looking at today, and this is what we are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly . . .

A MEMBER: Vic should look ahead.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to deal with the speech of the Attorney-General on some of the points that he made when he spoke on this resolution.

On Page 4491 in Friday's Hansard, July 22nd, he said, "I would like to make an appeal to the opposition. I realize that they have a number of fairly firm opinions on a number of questions. I know that substantively

one of the main issues has to do with the question of entrenchment and that will be debated as it should and I hope, as I said, at a high level. I know with respect to process they want to make sure, as we do, that the people of Manitoba are heard and we're providing the mechanism. But I would like to say this to them. If, in fact, this motion itself becomes a matter of extended debate - I say take all the time you want but I'm just making an appeal - becomes a matter of extended debate and is adjourned and stood and stood, then what we will be doing is effectively denying the many people who now, when the issue has been debated in public, are ready to go and want to be heard and that I would hope that we don't find that what, in fact, happens is that this process resolution which is a resolution to refer to a committee for the people to be heard, becomes a way of delaying the matter. That would be the worst thing that could happen. I say that earnestly and with great appeal to the members of the opposition. Say what you have to say with respect to what you think the process should be, but let's not so delay the referral to a committee that, in fact, those people who have been involved in the debate, and those who would like to be involved in the debate, are denied their democratic opportunity to come before the committee."

Mr. Speaker, I say what's the rush? We have been speaking on this. We really do feel that this should be going to an intersessional committee. We would like to hold hearings and, as has been suggested, not just MLAs but MPs as well - a joint parliamentary committee. This is a sensible suggestion. Why not have a joint parliamentary committee? Why not involve the members of parliament as well as members of this Legislature on both sides of the House? Why can't we go all over this province? Give every Manitoban time to understand what this government is proposing.

But most important, hear what the people of our province have to say. Hear their concerns, hear their fears because they have genuine fears, Mr. Speaker. They don't believe they're being told the whole story, and they are not. Hear their suggestions, Mr. Speaker. Since when has this government that prides itself on consultation - they'll consult on anything - since when have they become afraid to listen and talk to the people of this province, or is it only on this issue? They'll consult on Shoal Lake over our water supply. When it's in immediate danger, they'll consult and consult and consult. They'll consult on the Crow. They'll consult on almost anything but the most important issue that is facing Manitobans today and in the future. This is not something that when put in, is going to easily be erased, if ever, if anyone should so want. Give the people a chance.

I've heard the Attorney-General speak of tyranny of the majority. Is that what they fear? I really find that a hard thing to understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the Attorney-General, I believe in this House, told the Member for St. Norbert that he had a poll where 70 percent were in favour. So what is there to fear if this is the case? Politicians have never had to fear the voters in this province. Very rarely are you treated discriminately, discourteously at the door.

Even in November, 1981, as the Member for Springfield says - and that's going to be fleeting for him - but people, when you go to the door, they smile,

they say thank you, and then maybe they'll vote against you. — (Interjection) — Sure, maybe they'll vote against you, but essentially they're nice people. Manitobans are nice people. — (Interjection) — I'm having a little problem with my own member here. They rarely bite. I want to say that I've never really been insulted at the door. I think most people in this province welcome politicians. They'll vote against you - don't worry about that - in a flash, and I don't think this government that is in place now is going to have to worry about that because they are doing everything possible to make the voters of this province want to vote against them. All we are asking is for this government to swallow its pride a bit and give Manitobans a chance to express themselves.

We all need a rest from this Session. Why not hold hearings in the fall? - the summer is not a time for most Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, we have had a nice long mild winter, and now we're having a great summer. At least, other Manitobans are having a great summer, but in here, we're not. We should be out listening to the people, hearing our constituents, seeing our families and not delaying, as the member from the back who always is speaking out of turn . . .

A MEMBER: The member that was.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, the member that was. But I wish to say that Manitobans . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, there is one member in this House that probably has the biggest mouth of all. I won't name him, because he'll know who he is, and it yaps and yaps away, and after the next election no one in this House will ever have to listen to him again, I'm sure of that. Let him yap, it doesn't bother me a bit. You're No. 1, buster.

A MEMBER: He'll be out looking for a job again.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: As one of the members said — (Interjection) — yes, I won't repeat it then. You're right.

We all need a rest from this Session. The Attorney-General has stated that only 5 percent of Manitobans are away in the summer. Don't believe it. They might only be away, 5 percent of them, but they're coming and going constantly. They don't want to be bothered with this type of thing. We have such a short summer. Why don't we give them a break and why don't we give ourselves a break and put this into an intersessional committee that we can go in hearings starting in the fall? But as I say that, Mr. Speaker, don't make the mistake that our resolve is weakening, because that isn't the case, but what is the rush? I have to keep repeating it.

MR. A. ANSTETT: You wanted Speed-up.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield is nattering about Speed-up. We asked for Speed-up. I am not talking about Speed-up, I am talking about a resolution that is fundamental, the most important resolution that we're going to deal with.

They're lumping it in with every other bill. This is not seat belt legislation. This is not seat belt legislation which can be repealed if needed. It is not the farm ownership legislation which can be repealed if needed. This is something that once it's done it won't be changed.

When are you going to get the idea? When are you going to start listening to the people of Manitoba who are begging to be heard on this issue, but you're going blindly along not listening to anyone but possibly the Attorney-General and the mouth on the other side?

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to this Legislature, and certainly for anyone to suggest that I can't speak, I would say the Member for Springfield has put as much in Hansard and probably more than most members of this House ever would, and certainly nothing that is worth hearing and listening to again.

What I would like to say about the meetings that the Attorney-General held - when the Attorney-General spoke about the meetings on Page 4489 of Hansard - the Member for Lakeside dealt largely with process and said in terms that he hoped that the matter would not be dealt with in, and I use his terms, "indecent haste." I simply want to point out that as part of the process we have already held four public meetings. The attendance of all these meetings indicates a high degree of interest. The fact that indeed the public has already found an opportunity - at least some significant numbers of the public - to begin to make their views known.

Mr. Speaker, the four public meetings were held, two in one day, one in Dauphin and one in Brandon; one at 11:00 a.m.; one at 7:30 p.m. in Brandon; one in Thompson at 7:30 p.m. on the 13th of July; and then the one in Winnipeg that was held. These were meetings, Mr. Speaker, they certainly were not hearings. All the meetings in the rural areas, the two meetings in the rural areas, certainly were heavily attended and people spoke very strongly against the proposed amendments, but they didn't have very much time. They only had a couple of hours. In fact, at one meeting, it was indicated they would have five minutes each, or maybe it wasn't even five minutes each, and then they had to leave for the next.

Mr. Speaker, I was at the Winnipeg meeting. I saw the meeting; I heard the presentations that were made. There was one person who stood up and called himself a former New Democratic organizer, indicated the meeting was stacked. Mr. Speaker, I don't know that was so, I only listened to what he said. The government would only know that sort of thing but, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that it was an indication, even in the summer, that Manitobans will come out to a meeting, but they need time to understand.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General went on to say, "It hasn't always been the case in these public meetings that those attending have addressed some of the questions of the terminology used. I hope that when the public comes to the standing committee to make its views known, that although, of course, it's wide open and people can say what they wish, that there will be some significant attempts to deal with apprehended problems of terminology. One of the main criticisms that has been levelled at the bill is that some of the language with respect to services may be too wide and that it might be open to the court, given the width of the language since the court of course cannot - and

the proposed amendment - do more than reject the government plan. Nevertheless, on a wider interpretation, they might create some pressure for wider services than might have been intended. So I hope the committee stage in this particular way, the members of the public coming - or some of them - will be dealing with particulars as well as principles."

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Legislature, I have seen the resolution; it's in Hansard, but somehow the government hasn't seen fit to putting the proposed amendments into its new brochure. They haven't seen fit to putting the proposed amendments in there. They didn't put it into the handout that they were giving out at the public meetings that were held. Certainly, it's a large enough edition that I would think that in all of this, with the pictures of the Legislature, the Premier, a picture of the Attorney-General and a map, that possibly they could have had the wording in there, but it wasn't. I don't know how people are supposed to get the terminology correct if they rarely have ever seen it.

Now something that was going to go, a brochure that was going to go into every household, I think would have been a wonderful opportunity to let Manitobans see exactly what was in the amendment. I can't imagine why this government is not putting the proposed amendment into the brochure, the Proclamation amending the Constitution of Canada. I don't intend to read it all, Mr. Speaker; it's in Hansard, but it is a puzzlement to me and certainly a puzzlement to anyone who is trying to find out exactly what is happening, not just depending on what is in this pamphlet, what the Attorney-General is saying to them. They would like to read it for themselves.

Oh sure, and I know, members can say, well sure, they can phone in; they can get the resolution. Certainly, they can, but when this was going into every household, what a wonderful opportunity to have every Manitoban be able to read exactly what is proposed to go into the Constitution. I can't believe that the government would find anything so offensive in it. Certainly, they are talking in the agreement; there's the "Facts": Manitoba is not becoming bilingual; Nothing is being forced on the people; Saving your tax dollars; A personal message. Everything is in this pamphlet except the one thing that is really essential for people to read themselves. Did they feel that the people of Manitoba can't understand? Certainly, they can understand, but it's not in there and it's not in the big brochure.

This is the most important issue that Manitobans will have to face. I think the people in our province have a right to know exactly what the government is proposing, and intersessional committee hearings held in the fall would give them this opportunity. Mr. Speaker, that's what we are speaking to, the amendment that we hold intersessional committee hearings. Have them start in the fall; let a joint committee go out and hear the people. There is growing frustration among the people in Manitoba. You get phone calls, you meet them in the street, and they're saying, what can we do. What is happening?

This government didn't have a mandate. They didn't have a mandate; they didn't go to the polls in November, '81, or October, '81, and on this particular issue. They are trying to ram it through just as quickly as they can, thinking, boy, out of sight; out of mind. That is not

what is going to happen. Mr. Speaker, what is the rush? I ask it again and again. We don't need to be going this quickly on an issue like this.

What is happening to our province? People are losing faith with their elected officials at every level. That is why they are asking for more and more referendums. They shouldn't need referendums, Mr. Speaker, but when politicians don't listen to their constituents, they will demand to say one way or another. If we don't listen to what they're saying and if we don't represent what they are feeling, then this is what they want is referendum.

Today it's not like a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, when you've got television, you've got all the electronic media, the newspapers. You have got everything. People are right on top of the news. You can't slip these things through. You can get it here; you can send it somewhere else, but they'll know about it, and they want to be heard. What is so strange about that?

I can't imagine that the Member for St. James, the Minister of Natural Resources, has been talking to his constituents about this issue, because I can't imagine that he would want - surely he would want, of all people, to know what his constituents are saying. St. James has always been a community that is interested in what's happening. Their school division is as one. We are interested in what happens in our area. Yet, that is not the impression that's coming across from the people. What is the government doing?

When I was elected to this Legislature, and I said it time and time again, said it before I ever thought of running for any political office: A politician does not have a conscience of his own. His conscience is what the people think. If you don't believe that and if you don't follow that, you are not going to be in government very long. That's the secret to success of most successful politicians is they listen to their constituents.

Now the members opposite are making a big mistake on this if they are closing their eyes and just listening to the Attorney-General, because he's leading them down the garden path if he's telling them that 70 percent of the people are in favour of this. Let's hear it then. Let's hear what 70 percent. Let's go out in the constituencies with a hearing. That is fair to all. Let's hear. Let the people hear; let them understand. But no, this government doesn't even put the amendment; they don't even put the words of the constitutional amendment in their pamphlet for people to see. I find that very hard to believe.

Mr. Speaker, I was talking about referendums. It started in Hamiota; next in Brandon, they're proposing a referendum; and now the Winnipeg City Council Executive Policy Committee will be looking at this issue. It was proposed last night. Mr. Speaker, when you have a situation where you've got people from all walks of life saying, just listen to us, just hear us; but then you have, as I heard on the radio, the Minister of Government Services saying that even if there is a referendum, it won't matter, we are carrying on, no matter what. I think this is what's making the people have so much despair about this particular issue because they don't in many cases, some of them don't understand it, others understand it only too well. I think that it's incumbent on this government to slow down a bit and just listen.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 4490 the Attorney-General went on to say: "And I want to say too with respect to the

process, that as a government we will be listening very carefully to the suggestions for changes. We are - I've made this known to the House - presently engaged in discussions with the constituencies most directly affected, the Civil Service, throughout the public sector, Crowns, government agencies, quasi-judicial administrative departments, because in the terms raised by Gary Doer of the MGEA, there are legitimate concerns about the wording."

Mr. Speaker, in a letter to Honourable Howard Pawley on July 12th, I will just read the last paragraph. It says: "The Manitoba Government Employees Association is clearly an interested party in the current debate as the proposed changes have direct implications for our membership. Our suggestions are made at this time based on our initial review of the proposed amendments which have been in our possession for barely one week." Now, Mr. Speaker, that was on July 12th. They've had it for barely one week, so this is just about a month.

"We are, of course, prepared to continue discussions with the Attorney-General, Government Counsel, individual MLAs, party caucuses and yourself in order to ensure that the rights of all Manitobans are protected in a fair and equitable way." Well, Mr. Speaker, these are the people that are directly affected and they've just had it in their possession for a month, or less than a month. So how is it that you call it not rushing something when everyone needs the time?

I'm just looking at a Winnipeg Free Press on July 13th, it was speaking about the press release of the Manitoba Government Employees Association, and they went on to say: "Meanwhile spokesmen for three other unions representing 4,550 employees at Manitoba Hydro, and Manitoba Telephone, said they have had no communication from the government about how the amendment would affect their members." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is July 13th. At least the MGEA had had some, they'd had something for about a week.

Charlie Washington, business manager of Local 2034 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers representing about 2,000 Hydro field workers said: "I've seen nothing at all on it, only what we get in the media." He went on to say, "It would likely be discussed at a board meeting next week."

Maggie Hadfield, a national representative with the Communication Workers of Canada, which has 1,800 Manitoba Telephone employee members, said they requested information on the proposed amendment from the government, but so far have only received a handout the government is distributing at public meetings. Well, that I suppose would be this handout --- (Interjection) --- July the 13th is the date on that - that was handed out at the public meetings, I would imagine, which again does not have the whole amendment on it.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Two weeks ago.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, now, the Member for Springfield is indicating that two weeks sounds like a great amount of time to discuss something as important as this issue. That's the kind of attitude that we get from the opposition and especially from that member who is so flip in his attitude to what our concerns are. Only his concerns count. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a

feeling that the voters in Springfield will change their mind if they haven't changed it already, and he'll be rushed out the door. He won't have to worry about coming in here.

Mr. Speaker, she said they would require further information before they could make any recommendations. Now, that's on July 13th. A spokesman for Local 998 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CUPE, representing 750 Hydro clerical and technical workers said they too were waiting for more information about the proposed package before assessing its impact on its membership.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Have they got it yet?

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield wants to know if they've got it. Well, he's on the government side, he ought to know. Why would he be asking me?

Mr. Speaker, meanwhile, Opposition Leader Sterling Lyon used the MGEA's concerns as an opportunity to renew his efforts, to convince the government to hold public hearings after the current Legislature Session ends and the next one begins. Mr. Speaker, that is what this amendment is about; that is what we're talking about. We are talking to the amendment, everyone of us that speaks on this, but they won't listen and they don't seem to care. The people will tell them, but it's going to be cold comfort if they have to lose an election on this issue. The people will not have been heard. Mr. Lyon went on to say, wouldn't it be reasonable and prudent to hold intersessional meetings? - Lyon asked during question period. Mr. Speaker, that is what it's all about.

The Union of Manitoba Municipalities sent out a news release from President Dave Harms, and the first paragraph is - a very significant majority of the members of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and also a very large percentage of the citizens of this province oppose the amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act as presented by the Government of Manitoba. It is not that we oppose French Language Services when it is needed or requested, but we feel that the application of such a service should be entirely up to the Provincial Government to administer and should not be entrenched in the Constitution and left to the decision of the courts of law in Canada to enforce.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that what he's talking about is no one is against extending the French Language Services where needed; that our government has been doing it, this government has been doing it, other governments have done it in the past.

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

Mr. Speaker, the press release went on to say - it talked about the costs to the taxpayer, and they indicate that whether there are costs to the taxpayer, or paid by the Federal Government or the Provincial Government - this is one thing about the Union of Manitoba Municipalities - they know that it all comes out of the same pocket. It doesn't matter if it's the

feds or the province or the city or the municipalities; it's all out of the taxpayers' pockets, and nobody knows that better than the people themselves. The government is fooling themselves if they think they can say, oh, the feds are paying for it. Who are the feds? It's us. We're the ones that pay the bills in the long haul, and the people will pay and pay and pay under this government.

He went on to say in the press release, "For \$4 per person, we are not prepared to give concessions that could plague us for all time to come in costs and legal wranglings." Time and time again, it's the courts. People want this sort of thing left in the hands of the Legislatures where you can come up with solutions that make common sense to the people, as needed. That's all we're asking for.

Mr. Speaker, they went on in the next paragraph to say, "It is one of the most dangerous steps any government has contemplated under existing conditions and could leave a never-healing scar on the citizens of Manitoba, regardless of their ethnic background and nationality."

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

That's what the news release said of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. This isn't the opposition speaking; this is someone who represents the people too. These are the same people. Mr. Speaker, this is a divisive issue in our province. We were moving along, putting in the very services that they are talking about now, and this is what's happened in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General went on to speak about the reasons that they couldn't hold it in December and he referred to our leadership race. It's very important to them - "to them" meaning the opposition - and for the future of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, let us worry about our leadership. We have priorities on this side of the House and, believe me, the province comes before a party. That's why we're elected; that's why we're here. Don't let you worry about our leadership. We'll take care of that ourselves. That's a non-issue in this debate.

In the "Fact" sheet, which I have already mentioned, and then we have an ad where the Premier of the province is telling the people that the sheet's coming out and be sure to read it. Now the Free Press happened to do a little article on that all for nothing: "Government to print flyer on bilingualism." They could have saved themselves a lot of bucks by just using this. People can read; they don't look out for the ads.

Mr. Speaker, in "The Facts about French Language Services," the brochure the government handed out, the last statement under "Facts" says, "It is a good agreement for all the people of Manitoba and Canada." But the people don't believe this; that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. Peter Warren was right, Mr. Speaker: "Why the NDP are losers" in the Winnipeg Sun. He said, "Pastor Pawley's parade is in one heap of a mess

over seat belts, helmets, abortion, government life insurance, land ownership, language rights, the wage tax - anything that goes bump in the night."

Mr. Speaker, I'll close by saying that if the government opposition would only slow down, take a second look, give us all a chance to listen, to hear what the people of Manitoba are trying desperately to tell us, and support the motion as amended.

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

MR. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't planned on entering the debate on this procedural motion because I view it strictly as a procedural motion; but after hearing several members on the other side repeat the remarks of their deputy leader, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I begin to think that they view this as something more than a procedural motion, almost like Custer's last stand. I'm beginning to think that what we're seeing here is a filibuster by the opposition on a procedural motion that asks that the people of Manitoba be heard on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I have chosen to speak for just a few minutes on this motion. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what the point of the remarks from members opposite really is. I don't really understand why they're demonstrating this kind of opposition to passing this bill. I don't understand why they choose to attempt to debate, at least peripherally, the merits of the proposed constitutional amendment under a procedural motion. I don't understand why they don't want the people of Manitoba to be heard now, and I don't understand that for one simple reason. Every member opposite and every member on this side have agreed they want the public to be heard. Absolutely. I don't think there's a member in this House who does not want the public to be heard on this issue. So what's at issue? Why the delay? Why the filibuster? Why the refusal to hear the public by members opposite on a procedural question?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's fairly clear. The opposition has made it clear, and the Member for Fort Garry made it clear in moving a motion on Monday last, and that motion calls for intersessional hearings. What's the difference? Well, let's look at what the real difference is that the opposition's talking about. Certainly, we could finish the current Legislative Session, prorogue the House, immediately go into hearings two weeks from now, or however long it takes to deal with the legislative program, hold those legislative hearings, and by the 1st of September or the 15th of September, be back into the Third Session of the 32nd Legislature at the completion of those hearings. We've had travelling committees, we've had committees that have sat only here in the Legislature.

Usually one week is more than enough. In this case being a very important constitutional amendment it might take more than that, holding regular hearings every day to hear all of the people who want to be heard. No question about that. I certainly will want to make sure that everyone who wants to be heard is fully heard by the committee, that every opportunity is given.

But, Mr. Speaker, what's the difference? Very simply, the difference as seen by members opposition has to be for some other reason because there's no end in

sight to this current Session, no end in sight at all. In fact, some would say that, in fact I've heard it said by members opposite, we could well be here 'till September — (Interjection) — October I now hear, will anybody give me November? I've got November and I've got December already.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if those predictions are true, the cat's out of the bag. What the members opposite want to do is postpone the intersessional hearings 'till after December 31st so that this constitutional amendment can't receive approval by the deadline date in Ottawa. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's what they want to do then what they're really attempting here today is, by a procedural debate about a procedural referral motion, they're attempting to delay, and thereby prevent the passage of this constitutional amendment by the Parliament of Canada before December 31st.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why would they want to do that? Well, only Brian Mulroney can answer that question for sure but I'd like to at least offer one possible interpretation. I say only Brian Mulroney can answer that because only he is privy to the statements and suggestions and recommendations. I suppose he hasn't quite got the firm command of the party yet to start issuing orders, but I'm sure the message has come down to the Manitoba Progressive Conservative MLAs from the leader. It will hurt the federal Tory Party if you people take a stand opposed to this constitutional amendment, so how do they fight this proposed constitutional amendment, which for some reason some of these members opposite seem to have great difficulty with?

They say, we'll fight it on a procedural question. We'll fight it on the concept of whether or not the hearings should be sessional or intersessional. We'll fight as to whether or not we want the House technically prorogued before we hold the hearings, or if we extend the session by a month, or two, or three, hold it during the Session. We'll make that procedural question the issue. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a farce, that's a farce.

Members opposite initially tried to make the issue the whole question of French Language Services. Some members in this House, and in the public will not forget the statement made by the Leader of the Official Opposition the day the Attorney-General tabled the agreement, on a Friday late in May. That statement was a vitriolic statement opposed to the agreement in principle. It didn't talk about the problem of entrenchment only, talked about the whole gamut.

Then later members opposite began to get nervous that the whole prospect of their Tory party success in the next federal election would be down the pipe, up the flue, whatever term you want to use. They would be totally devastated. Then they started to talk only about entrenchment, entrenchment's the issue. We're not opposed to French Language Services, suddenly the memos of what they did when they were government showing that they had actually encouraged it. I praised them for it, they did very well after the Forest decision in implementing some of the recommendations that were made but when they were faced with really having to do the job and support a long-term commitment to provide French Language Services, they began to back away, or at least their leader did. I would be the first to say that I know that on that issue he does not speak for everyone on that side. I know there are many on

that side who are much more enlightened on this question. But, Mr. Speaker, they've chosen a strategy and I think it's a much — (Interjection) — does the member have a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Certainly.

MR. H. GRAHAM: When the honourable member says - the previous government when they were in power began to back away - can he give any indication at what time, and by what action they backed away from their commitment?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, either the honourable member misunderstood me or my statement wasn't clear enough. I praised the previous government for having gone as far as they did. I said that they are now backing away from making a permanent commitment in the form of this amendment. — (Interjection) — That was very clearly what I intended to say, and I believe very clearly what I said.

Now, the political problem members opposite have, is that they don't want to do damage both to their party provincially but more seriously federally, by opposing the agreement. They also want to stage a battle on the question of entrenchment, and strictly on that question, and at the same time try to build a charade of supporting the expansion of French Language Services across the province.

But, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash. The people of Manitoba want to be heard on this issue. The people of Manitoba don't care whether they're heard in the month of August - when they're heard in the month of August whether the House is in Session or the House is prorogued. The people of Manitoba want to be heard in sufficient time for this issue to be addressed by the Government of Canada in Ottawa, and any filibuster or stonewalling by members opposite that attempts to prevent that will not be well received. I believe members opposite know that, and if they don't I think their contacts with their constituents will soon make them realize the people of Manitoba want this issue addressed, want the public heard, and want the issue resolved.

I'm not suggesting for a minute that everybody is on one side or on the other but certainly the people of Manitoba are entitled to a hearing. I urge members opposite to give them an opportunity to be heard in sufficient time for this amendment to go on to the Government of Canada.

One other minor observation, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to limit myself to perhaps 10 minutes, and that leaves me just a couple of minutes.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite have also fallen into another trap. I ask them to seriously consider the nature of that trap that they've set for themselves. Members opposite didn't want to exempt the bilingual French Language Services resolution from the whole Speed-up process. Members

opposite wanted to deal with the question of French Language Services, and the amendment of Section 23, on the same basis as we deal with all other legislation until they moved the amendment to treat it interessionally.

But the fact of the matter is - members opposite knew from statements from the Attorney-General, and the Premier, right from Day One that the government was not prepared to consider intersessional hearings; that we were fully prepared to have public hearings during the current Session regardless of how long that took.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at that logically. That means that members opposite, knowing who won the last election, know that there's more votes on this side, than on that side, and that their amendment proposing intersessional hearings is going to be defeated. From that they also know and they were able to deduce this before the amendment was moved because the Attorney-General announced these hearings the very first week of July, he announced there would be public hearings of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. Members opposite could easily then deduce that they would be held during the current Session before prorogation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they then have put themselves in the unenviable position of supporting Speed-up, but then being faced with hearing the public during the Speed-up regime, well, now maybe I'm beginning to understand why they want to filibuster and why they're opposing this resolution. They realize they made a mistake a week ago, and now they want to delay it, and hope, somehow beyond hope, that the government will be forced to hold intersessional hearings.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the opposition put themselves in that position. We want to hold hearings, we want to hear the public. All I can say to the opposition is the fact that Speed-up occurs will not prevent everybody who wants to be heard from being heard. The fact that Speed-up is in progress will not prevent this Session from lasting as long as is absolutely necessary for all the business of the House to be conducted.

I won't accede to the suggestion from some members opposite that may be November or December; I certainly hope it won't. But, Mr. Speaker, this government won't be stamped not on French Language Services and not on any of the other issues before the House. So the suggestion that is obviously flowing from members opposite that a filibuster is somehow going to be tactically successful is a suggestion that is based on foolishness and on a true misreading on the intent of this government.

We believe in what we're doing; we believe the people must be heard; and we will not allow the process of Speed-up to prevent the people of Manitoba from being heard. This Session will last until the legislative program and the constitutional amendment have all been properly and fairly considered by the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the opposition to reconsider the filibuster they've launched this week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention to filibuster. I am standing in my place because

it is my right to stand in my place and to speak my mind. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the honourable members would have the courtesy to allow me to speak my mind without the interruptions that they feel might cause me not to speak my mind.

I rise to speak on this referral of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act to the committee, or better named "The Act that will divide the Province and promote Bigotry." I will be supporting the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and I hope I will not be political to the point and just discuss the issue. I don't believe that it is a political issue, it is an issue that concerns the rights of some people of the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Again, I would ask the courtesy of being allowed to speak my mind and to be heard.

I will not be citing a lot of statistics or legal terminology, Mr. Speaker. Legal terminology is for lawyers and the judiciary; statistics are to justify losses. I will be speaking of the consequences of this amendment. I know it's like spitting into the wind, Mr. Speaker, it comes back into your face.

I believe that the Honourable Member for Springfield had a point that we will carry on - and it's not going to be a matter of us filibustering - until this goes to committee so that the people of the Province of Manitoba are heard. I know that they have the numbers to do this and I know that it will happen. I am going to speak of the consequences of this happening, Mr. Speaker.

Let me give you a little bit of a background of which I hope will enable you to understand my position, and the position I have taken in opposing the referral of this amendment to committee, and the enshrining of it in the Constitution. Forgive me, if I don't use the correct terminology, but if I'm able to make myself understood and my feelings accepted by all of the members of the House, I feel I would have accomplished something.

I feel that everybody has to speak their own mind and speak from the heart, not be influenced by one group, a political group or another, but to speak your own mind. I want you to respect me for speaking my mind, as I respect you for speaking yours.

My very very early background is in the north end of the City of Winnipeg, and it was close to the old St. John's Technical High School. Most of the kids that I associated with went to St. Joseph's School. It was a Roman Catholic school up on St. Johns, I believe, in the North End. Most of the kids were of backgrounds of German, Jewish, Ukrainian, French, and Polish backgrounds. There could have been some other types of backgrounds but I never bothered to ask, it just didn't seem to be that important. Some of the kids went off to war because it was just around that time, Mr. Speaker, and some of them never returned. I don't know in what language they died, but they were all Canadians.

More than 40 years ago, my family settled in St. Boniface, and I became aware at that time, at a very early age, of the conflict of the French language rights. I have supported those French language rights because they were rights, and I have formed many close attachments with many of the people in St. Boniface, particularly of French background. I support The Official Languages Act; I support the French culture and the

culture of all ethnic backgrounds. I support the French language being taught in schools, for the French-only schools, for the immersion schools, and for any other school that will teach French. I believe it's great for the people of the Province of Manitoba, considering that this is a bilingual country by the rights that were granted many many years ago, and I will support those rights.

I studied the French language, Mr. Speaker, with great difficulty. I'm not a great student of languages, but I spent many hours studying the French language because I enjoy the French language. It's a beautiful language. It sounds good; it's got many interesting aspects about it. I want the people to know that this person, this member, who represents an area in St. Boniface called Niakwa, is trying to prove that all people in the Province of Manitoba have a friendly feeling towards the Francophones and I don't want anything to happen to disturb that friendly feeling. I want a closer association with the Francophones, but this amendment seems to be taking us further and further apart. I worked very very hard to understand the French language; I'm still not capable of being able to converse in it too well. I don't consider myself to be bilingual but almost, Mr. Speaker. Part of the reason for it was that I just really wanted to prove to people that other than Francophones can accept and be part of the French culture.

I want to take this opportunity of saying thank you to the Francophones for allowing me to share in the French culture, it's a beautiful culture. But to get right down to the facts, Mr. Speaker - I would just make one remark, when I was studying French I had a neighbour, and thank goodness that neighbour has moved away because they were very very critical of myself studying French and my support of the French culture, because they thought I was trying to take away a job from a Francophone by being able to speak French. That was not my intention. The only reason I mentioned it is that I'll never be able to - at this point anyway - be able to speak French well enough to take away a job from a Francophone, where French is the language that's required.

I have a great fear of the Francophone being discriminated against, Mr. Speaker, whereas I believe that this proposed amendment by entrenching in the Constitution, is not to the best interests of the Francophone and orderly acceptance of French language rights is more beneficial, rather than passing this amendment without the due consideration that is required. I recognize the Francophone has waited for over 100 years for what is considered an injustice - a little longer ain't going to hurt. It's like chicken soup, Mr. Speaker, it ain't going to hurt.

I realize the Francophone has gone through many many trying years, particularly in the studying of French in the schools, where they had to look over their shoulders for when the inspector came around and hide their French books inside of English books and write their exams on Saturdays rather than during the week, because they were afraid of what the inspectors would do and it was a real fear because there was discrimination in those days. That discrimination has passed, it's no longer in existence. It has evolved into a friendly association of the Francophone and the Anglophone in the province, but I think that this amendment is going to change it back to where it was before and I don't want to see that happen, Mr. Speaker.

I condemn the NDP Government and I condemn the federal Liberal Government for this amendment because I believe it will lead to additional bigotry and prejudice; whereas these rights would have come in due course - not at the whim of any government - but as a legal right under our statutes. I do not condemn the Societe Franco-Manitobaine or the French community for negotiating an agreement to this amendment because it is their right to negotiate for what they believe to be the best interests of the French community in Manitoba.

I know the Anglophone community in Quebec is interested in the passing of this amendment, but as a Canadian, born and raised in Manitoba, particularly in St. Boniface, my interests are towards the people of Manitoba first and foremost, and Canada second - Manitoba first, but Canada second. I am a Manitoban and I hope that I can put them all together and support both of those types of government.

Again I would ask for the courtesy of being allowed to speak without interruption and actually if there's any questions that want to be asked at the end, I'd be quite happy to answer any of those questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, I sincerely believe this amendment enshrined in the Constitution is not to the best interests of the Francophone. The letters which I have received, the phone calls which I have received, the letters to the editors that I have read in the paper, have indicated a dissatisfaction to the amendment. I have been through the discrimination bit and I guess that I'm fair game, even though I am somewhat protected by existing legislation. I'm endeavouring with all my heart to save the embarrassment and the prejudice against the French community and ultimately to other ethnic groups, so that their culture will be supported on a somewhat equal base. The numbers of these groups should not have any bearing as to the support they receive from the government, as the percentage of Francophones in Manitoba should have no bearing on the support the government gives to that group. Therefore I appeal to the government to slow down, Mr. Speaker, and to reconsider.

Have they realized what they've done? You have turned a majority of Manitobans against the Francophone and ultimately against the government. It is too important an issue to be political and you have turned the French community against all those who will not support this amendment. It isn't only a one-way street, it's a two-way street.

Have you seen the cartoon in the French language newspaper, La Liberté? La Liberté, I believe to be the voice of the French community in St. Boniface, in Manitoba, I believe to be the largest French language newspaper in the province; wherein all of the Progressive Conservatives and the Member for Elmwood are depicted as Ku Klux Klan and it also shows the burning of the Societe Franco-Manitobaine building, and it shows the burning of a Canadian flag by Mr. Lyon, and it also shows the Union Jack on Mr. Lyon's headpiece - I'm not sure of the significance, Mr. Speaker, I'm just relating what I see in the La Liberté, le vendredi, le premier juillet, 1983. I don't know how to say it in French, so I'll just say it in English. And it's big sign, friendly Manitobans for Wasps only and no more French. I guess that with this - and there's one fellow holding a hangman's noose there. There's an awful lot in this picture.

I'm sure that the French community doesn't quite agree with it but they're stuck with it because they are part of the French community and this is associated with the French community. I guess it infers that the Progressive Conservative Party - because it's got PC initials all over the place - is responsible for burning the SFM building and the burning of the Canadian flag. There's a lot more to it than I quite understand, Mr. Speaker, but I see the prejudice all evolving out of this picture and I know that's what this amendment has done. It has brought out this prejudice that was latent. I'm not sure whether it's a good thing just to keep it in the background or whether prejudice or anything should come out in the open so you can fight it, but I am doing what I believe to be right. I am fighting what this amendment has caused.

I don't think I really want to get into that much more concerning this cartoon that appeared in *La Liberté*, because this cartoon is not supporting a government, or it's not supporting the New Democrats. It appears that this cartoon is against everything because, Mr. Speaker, it says Mr. Doern on one of the characters and it's got NPD, which is the New Democratic Party in French, the initials. So I guess they're taking a crack at just about everybody, and that's what this amendment has caused. They just have a real bad feeling towards everybody, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment will not promote unity; but on the contrary, it will promote bigotry and prejudice, and it is not to the best interests of Manitobans. It will turn the Anglophone against the Francophone. It has turned the Francophone against the Anglophone. Mr. Speaker, believe me, I have spoken to many Francophones. It has turned the Francophone against the Francophone, and that breaks my heart, Mr. Speaker, to have an inner conflict where one family fights against another family of the same background.

The damage has not already been done, Mr. Speaker; it can be corrected. It can be corrected by withdrawing the amendment. We've got to go slow for the sake of all the people who do not know what bigotry and prejudice mean. There are all kinds of Manitobans who do not know what bigotry and prejudice mean, but we are going to teach them, Mr. Speaker, by bringing in this amendment; not because of the amendment, exactly, but because it'll bring people out who will show what bigotry and prejudice is, and I don't want that to happen. I've been through it, Mr. Speaker. Let's not teach them things that it took our forefathers many years to overcome.

I just want to cite one point of when I was with the Royal Canadian Navy Volunteer Reserve many years ago. You know, there was prejudice in those days, and there still is, Mr. Speaker. It has lessened, but it's not because people of my background and other ethnic backgrounds have gone out and said, we want this, we demand this; it will come. It will come by all of the rights that the coloured person went through in the United States and brought them up to the level at which they are now. They are not at the level that I would like to see them at, and there is still much prejudice in the United States, but it is being overcome not by ramming legislation down people's throats.

Mr. Speaker, accept this as from my heart, that I do not believe that this amendment is to the best interest of the people that I think so highly of, that I have been

raised with and live with today. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the government withdraw the amendment and don't allow all of these people to come in and make . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: It's your amendment. It's your amendment, Mr. Kovnats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm talking about amendment to Bill No. 23, Mr. Speaker, not the amendment of presenting it into committee. I know it's my amendment and I will be supporting that amendment, because it'll be to the best interests of the people who I have the greatest respect for. Some of my best friends are Jews and some of my best friends are Francophones, and I don't want to see anybody hurt.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the amendment, to the referral motion as presented by the Member for Fort Garry, I will endeavour as closely as I can to leave aside the principle of the proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, which there will be plenty of opportunity to debate at a later time. I will, Mr. Speaker, as much as I can, dwell on the process, the timing and the whole procedure that we are going through in attempting to have members debate, discuss and provide an opportunity for public input to this very very important issue that faces Manitobans today.

Mr. Speaker, I begin by asking the government, as I support this amendment that would cause the referral to go not to a committee of this Legislature, but to an intersessional committee, I ask the government: What's the rush? Why are we driving through this proposed amendment in this Session? Why are we acting so quickly and in such haste, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the vast majority of Manitobans are unavailable or unable to participate in any sort of public process?

There are holidays that are occurring, and I, as an employer, and I, as an employee, know that 80 percent of Manitobans take their holidays at some point in the two-month period of July and August. Why? Because children are in school throughout the rest of the year and Manitobans plan their holidays to take advantage of the warm weather, the good surroundings and the opportunities that avail us in the summertime. There are teachers, there are students, there are all sorts who are away today from the normal processes of what goes on in this Legislature, in our society in Manitoba, and because they deserve a holiday, because they work hard throughout the year, they're not concerned for what we are doing here today. That's unfortunate, but the whole process of the Legislative Session has brought that situation upon us.

We had the Session start unusually late this year. After a brief period before Christmas, it was well into the end of February before we were called to come back into Session in this Legislature. We have spoken against that. We have told members opposite how we

feel that was an improper ordering of the business of this House and we have left that on the record, but it bears repeating. Committees were not called. We have the anomalous situation that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources has still not completed all of the various items of business before it. Manitoba Hydro has not had all of its annual report and deliberations before committee completed. And where are we? We're in the last week of July and that still hasn't been finished.

This whole process of getting and ordering the business of the House should have been completed much more speedily, much more readily. We have already told members opposite how we feel that their maladministration of the order of business of this House has caused us to be in these situations. Reluctantly, however, we've concluded that the Government House Leader, although he has very poorly ordered the business, is probably the best of the alternatives that are available on that side of the House.

The Acting Government House Leader has done far worse. He's disordered the process of business in this House and disrupted people whenever he's taken over, and there doesn't appear to be anybody who has an alternative. So we're faced with that, we have to live by it, and we have to endure it, unfortunately. However, we are put in that situation by that government by its choosing in the manner in which it's ordered the business of the House.

The other point that I want to dwell on and I want to cover in a major way is the fact that when this amendment or proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act was brought forward a while ago - I imagine that we're now probably six weeks from the time it was brought forward - again, it was late in the Session even at that time. But when it was brought forward the Attorney-General said that it was firm, that because this was not merely an agreement or an amendment that could be acted upon unilaterally by the Provincial Government; that in fact he had other partners in this whole issue and those other partners were the Government of Canada and the Societe Franco-Manitobaine. Because he had those two partners and it was a tripartite agreement, he could not tolerate any amendments to this resolution, this proposed change to The Manitoba Act.

Well, that has changed obviously because in recent times the Attorney-General has said that there may be an opportunity to amend this. He has acknowledged, after some criticism by significant groups of people within the province, such as the Manitoba Government Employees Association, such as other ethnic community groups, such as the opposition and others, that perhaps there ought to be a consideration given to some amendments, some changes in the whole proposal.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a significant other party involved in this whole potential agreement and that significant other party has not been given sufficient opportunity to make their views known, that is, the people of Manitoba who all of us represent. They, in my view, and the Member for Kirkfield Park dwelt at some length on the few government informational meetings, those ones that were held four times in the past two weeks at various different locations in the province, which gave virtually no opportunity for public feedback. There was an opportunity for the government

to state its position, to try and clarify the case, to try and argue its position and to fuse any concerns that were raised, but the major opportunity for public input was not provided.

So the Attorney-General has indicated that now it will be referred to a Standing Committee of this Legislature, but as I say, late on in the business of the House, at the end of what will probably be the longest Session in our history, when people are on holidays, when people are out of touch with the normal process of business of the Government of Manitoba, then he is going to give some opportunity for public input. Well, we are concerned because we don't think that's good enough, that that's sufficient and are we being alarmist about it, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so, I don't think so.

Because, firstly, we have the evidence of the fact that more than half of the rural municipalities of this province have already passed amendments saying that they are opposed to this proposal being put forth by the Provincial Government. We have had the situation occur that many of the major centres of population in Manitoba are seriously considering referenda which would put this question on the ballot at the municipal elections coming forth this fall in Manitoba, throughout Manitoba: Hamiota, Brandon, Winnipeg. We may find that more than three-quarters of the population of this province says we want to be heard on this issue. We want an opportunity to say whether or not we agree with this proposal and yet this government wants to trample on those desires, just sweep them under the carpet and say, no, our mind is made up, we don't care to hear from you, we are prepared to go ahead because we know what's best for Manitoba regardless of your desires, needs and concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we are not alarmists in this. This represents a fundamental change to the individual rights of Manitobans - a fundamental change . . .

A MEMBER: That's nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: The problem is that there's being proposed a fundamental change to the rights and responsibilities of Manitobans without the ability to define it in legal terms or in hard factual terms. What are those rights to be? How will they be interpreted and how will they be carried out in the future? We're not saying this alone. The MGEA has already said it to the government. They're concerned that the way the whole agreement is defined, it has loopholes. What's the central office? What's a head office? Where and how are we going to have to deliver those services that we currently are . . .

A MEMBER: Why don't you talk about the process, Gary?

MR. G. FILMON: I am talking about the process. The process that's currently structured does not allow us to find out the answers to those questions, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are arguing that the process has to be expanded to an intersessional committee that will allow the answers to those questions to be brought out.

Mr. Speaker, read the brochure. If you need to be persuaded about the contradictory kinds of information that had been put out, I just gave the Attorney-General one contradiction from one paragraph to another today. One paragraph of the brochure says, "Businesses, municipalities, non-governmental bodies, etc., etc., are not affected in any way." Municipalities are not affected in any way.

Moving over to the next panel of it, it says, "Provision of French Language Services will be limited to communities which have significant numbers (about 30 out of the 202 municipalities)." Municipalities will be affected, Mr. Speaker. That's the problem, is that there's contradictory information, there is an unclear wording in every aspect of what has been put forward on this proposed resolution. We need time, Mr. Speaker, we need time.

There are half-truths; there are contradictions. You know, the Attorney-General has said and the Premier has said in response to the Member for Elmwood - what they call sort of a crude assessment of public opinion - based on the information that he gave, it wasn't a factual representation of what people really believed because it didn't have attached to it the proposed agreement. Yet they are sending out information, they are publishing ads, suggesting that they are putting out all sorts of information, brochures, there's another tabloid that's been put out. None of it has the proposed agreement in it, so we're dealing in partial information, half-truths and the reason — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Turtle Mountain asks, why not? The reason, I can only speculate, is because they don't know what are the long-term legal ramifications of the proposed agreement. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we have all sorts of information being put forward that is contradictory. We have legal opinions, you know. The leader on our side, or the Leader of the Opposition has suggested many times that the legal advice given by Mr. Twaddle is in conflict with what the government is doing. So the Attorney-General responds well, the legal advice of Mr. Gibson does follow what we're doing.

Lawyers can't agree. The lawyer for the rural municipalities is suggesting that as the law currently sits, municipalities will definitely be unaffected by it in terms of the implementation of French Language Services because it has been so ruled by the Supreme Court that municipalities are outside of that law that is contained in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act . . .

A MEMBER: When was that ruled by the Supreme Court?

MR. G. FILMON: The Supreme Court in the Forest case. But this legislation may bring the municipalities into that net, may indeed.

HON. R. PENNER: No way.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, the Attorney-General says, no way. That's part of the problem; that is why we need

the process to be expanded, to be allowed for additional feedback, for additional discussion. That's why we need it, Mr. Speaker. Part of the problem is that the courts are proposed to be used as a basis of decision as to how far and to what is considered reasonable, will those French Language Services be extended.

Well, the Attorney-General argues it will be within defined parameters; but those defined parameters are not sufficiently defined to satisfy the MGEA; not sufficiently defined to satisfy the UMM; not sufficiently defined to satisfy many lawyers who are constitutional experts in this province. So if it's a good agreement, Mr. Speaker, if it's a good idea for Manitoba, it will withstand, I suggest to you and to members opposite, the test of public scrutiny. It will.

An intercessional committee will give that opportunity to people. There appears to be at first glance a good deal of misunderstanding, and we are proving it by every speech that's given in this House; but the Attorney-General gets up and in one day what he says seems to conflict, and I say "seems to conflict" with what he said the last time he spoke on the issue.

The folder that he has prepared seems to have contradictory information in it . . .

HON. R. PENNER: Not at all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Not seems to, it does.

MR. G. FILMON: People are saying it's a bad agreement, Mr. Speaker; that it has poor wording; that it is open to all sorts of misinterpretations. I agree. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite are saying, well, don't worry about it; we are going to put it into this committee of this Legislature and we'll get it through, and it will be over with. They say though, why are we so concerned about it?

The Member for Radisson has been saying, why is it such a big deal? Why is it so important to Manitoba's future? Prove it. Well, I tell you why, Mr. Speaker, because we are proposing to entrench something in the Constitution of Canada for all time and future; something which it will be next to impossible to change if it proves to have been a bad agreement; if it proves to have been poorly worded, as many have suggested; if it proves to have been an unfortunate error on the part of this government.

It is not like The Farm Lands Ownership Act. It is not like that act which we, when we're in government the next time around at the end of this term, can change that piece of legislation. It is not like The Legislative Assembly Act or like The Payment of Wages Act or like The Elections Finances Act which are bad, bad legislation, but we can change those when we're in office at the end of this term. We will change those, because they are terrible legislation for the future.

But this, Mr. Speaker, is entrenched for all-time future. If it's a bad agreement; if it's been poorly legislated; if it's been poorly worded because this Attorney-General does not have the experience, then, Mr. Speaker, Manitobans will suffer; not this government, not these people, but all future generations of Manitobans will suffer. That's why it has to be now. That's why it has to be dealt with.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. If there are other members wishing to enter the debate, if they will only be patient, they will have the same opportunity as the present member who has the floor.

The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That, Mr. Speaker, is why I suggest that we should take as much time as is necessary. If anything, we should err on the side of caution. Surely, if it's a good deal, a good agreement for Manitobans, it will stand the test of time, scrutiny and debate at an intersessional committee hearing.

Now is not that time after it has been rammed through in the dog days of the Session at a time when people will not have had sufficient opportunity to give the response that it deserves. The public will not be involved to the extent that all of us desire that they will be. The public will not have had that opportunity because of the very circumstances under which it is being put through at this time.

So, as I say, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General started out in this whole process by saying there shall be no changes. We are parties to the agreement, a tripartite agreement, and we unilaterally cannot bring changes to it. Therefore, he said, when he first brought it out, he cannot consider any proposed amendments. Now he has suggested that he will consider amendments. He hasn't circulated them to us. We have no idea what they may be, but he has suggested that he will consider some amendments.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Right.

MR. G. FILMON: Right. The Member for Dauphin, the Minister for Government Services, says, right. He is happy about that because he's in trouble in Dauphin. People don't like this to be rammed down their throats, and they are very unhappy with this. They're unhappy about it, and they will be even more unhappy about it if it's rammed through in this Session, I can assure the Member for Dauphin. Now he has taken a third step after saying that they might . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There are 30 people waiting to talk and you are obstructing them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: And now after saying that he might consider amendments, the Attorney-General has taken the third step. He has suggested now that rather than just the informational meetings which didn't offer an opportunity for public input, he will now send it to a committee of the Legislature, which will sit and will offer an opportunity for public input; again, a better idea than what was proposed initially, but not good enough because there are many thousands of Manitobans who would be disenfranchised, who would not be enabled to come to that committee because of the very timing, the very rush.

So take it one step further. That's all we are asking, Mr. Speaker. Take it one little step further and let that committee sit intersessionally. That's all we're asking,

Mr. Speaker. You know, they're in such a rush that this program, the folders have all been done just virtually overnight. Let's get the publicity out; they are in trouble; people are opposed. The ground swell of opposition is out there, and they're running scared. They are panicking, so they come up with all this. They don't even have time to review an ad. They don't even have the name of the Premier right in the ad, they're in such a hurry to get this out.

Let's get this \$100,000 spent; let's put all these people at ease about what we're doing. Let's convince them with hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars that we are going to do the right thing. That isn't enough; that is not the calm, rational, reasoned approach. That's the approach of a government running scared, and that is indeed what this situation is. The government is terrified, absolutely terrified. So to prop up their image, they're spending all the money on advertising to try and overcome the weight of reason, the responsible approach that people who are concerned about this legislation are taking. They're just glossing it all over with half-page ads, with some snake oil salesman, they're trying to tell Manitobans that it's a good deal. Well, it's not good enough. What we need is the intersessional committee. What we need is the opportunity for all Manitobans to have their say in this whole matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that with the volatility of this argument, with the volatility of this issue, that they themselves must realize that they have to seek some method of taking this along a further, small, reasoned step, to allow Manitobans to have their say, and that small, reasoned step is the intersessional committee. Let them explain their position, Mr. Speaker.

At this point in time they're fighting a losing battle but the members opposite are - many of them - skilled politicians, many of them skilled reasoned debaters. Many of them are people who can, indeed, present an argument to the satisfaction of many of the people who listen to them. So why are they concerned to have this go to an intersessional committee? What is the rush? That's all I ask. Why not take every possible effort? Why not be criticized, Mr. Speaker, for being a little overly cautious and entrenching something that will remain in the Constitution of Canada, that will govern the affairs and the lives of Manitobans for all time in future? Why not take a little time to ensure that you're right in what you're doing? What's the rush? That's all I'm asking. Be sure, be sure.

Manitobans have to know and understand what you're doing before you pass it, not after, because after it's too late, Mr. Speaker. There are many questions as to whether or not this a good agreement. We had a frank and quiet discussion with a group that met with the New Democratic caucus, the group who represent English language rights in Quebec — (Interjection) — and the Alliance, that's right, and they had some interesting things to say. They were concerned with the perception of the issue, not the agreement. They conceded, as lawyers, they might disagree with the agreement, that maybe it wasn't as well-worded as it ought to be. They conceded that.

So, let us have an intersessional committee, at which there will be plenty of opportunity without the rush, without the pressure of time and those suggestions may indeed be made. Those suggestions may indeed

be made. Mr. Dewar has suggested that you need to attend to this; that you need to improve it; many others have suggested it.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to speak with some of the ethnic groups who have come out in favour of this and I'll tell you that their perception of this whole issue is incorrect, because they are stating that they are in favour of protection of minority rights - and we are all in favour of protection of minority rights. However, what they didn't understand was that this is not protection of minority rights. This is an expansion of rights in a manner that was never contemplated, that was never announced or campaigned on by this government when they were running in 1981. This is an extension of rights into an area that it was never contemplated before in The Manitoba Act, and they didn't understand that because this government didn't tell them that. They told them a partial series of truths on the area, a little bit about it, but they didn't give them an opportunity to understand the issue and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that's the whole problem. That's the whole problem. Everything is going to be open to the courts and this government doesn't understand.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Premier, in speaking to the Cruise missile demonstration on the weekend, said he believed that the Federal Government should pay attention to the people, should take an opportunity to listen to where the people stand on such an important issue as nuclear disarmament and the testing of the Cruise issue, but he is unwilling to provide sufficient opportunity for the people of Manitoba to be heard on this issue.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the proposed amendment to the referral motion, the proposed amendment which would see this go to an intersessional

committee, at which the people of Manitoba could be heard, at which there will be ample opportunity for debate. All I leave with the members opposite is, listen to the people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have some committee changes for the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders. Would you please replace the Member for St. Johns for the Member for Radisson; and the Member for Inkster for the Member for Logan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I wish to speak to the motion, Mr. Speaker, however I would be happy to speak to it after the dinner hour, if you wish that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Just a brief announcement with respect to the house business, Mr. Speaker. By leave it's been agreed that the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders will meet this evening at 8 o'clock but the House will meet at 8 o'clock as well. It will meet at the same time as the House, by leave and agreement.

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