



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. 157A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 10 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 10 January, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wish to advise members of the House of the position taken by Manitoba at a recent meeting of the Provincial Ministers of Health to discuss the proposed Canada Health Act.

Manitoba is taking the position that while we can accept and support the principles of the new Canada Health Act that the major deficiency with the act is the fact that it does not include any reference to a return to a true federal/provincial partnership in health care financing. This government has taken the position that the Federal Government should be reviewing the existing arrangement with regard to funding of health care and, in fact, there should be a return to the 50-50 cost-sharing principles with more flexibility in determining programs to be cost-shared, as well as taking into account regional disparities.

The second major concern we have with the proposed Canada Health Act relates to the significant discretionary authority given to the Federal Government to act unilaterally to impose its policy views on provinces. This refers specifically to the sweeping powers given to the National Minister of Health and the Cabinet of the Federal Government in determining sanctions should they decide that terms and conditions are not being met. The regulations, which we expect to see for the first time today, may help explain federal plans and may clear up some of our immediate concerns, but regulations can be changed unilaterally. We feel there should be a better mechanism to resolve federal-provincial disagreements which might arise in this area - a mechanism which does not make Ottawa the sole judge whether or not provincial health policies and programs are appropriate.

We believe that the key to preserving our national medicare system is a real co-operative partnership between the Federal Government and the provinces. That was one of the main conclusions in Mr. Justice Hall's report a few years ago, and it is spelled out in the preamble to The Canada Health Act as well.

That means that the Federal Government and the provinces should work together to develop and improve national policies in the health care field and it also means, we believe, that both orders of government should share fairly in the costs of providing high-quality health care for Canadians.

Those are the main messages I will be giving to Madam Begin when I meet with her later on today.

I will report to the House tomorrow on that meeting and I am also attaching a copy of my press release distributed at the Interprovincial Conference of Ministers of Health in Toronto yesterday. I will provide enough copies for all the members of the House.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus, I want to thank the Minister for his statement. I wish to advise him that to a certain degree it anticipates questions that I was hoping to put to him yesterday and today and may be able to pursue in question period with him anyway with respect to this government's position vis-a-vis the new Canada Health Act.

I'm extremely concerned that this government until now has not spoken up about the shortcomings of The Canada Health Act. I'm glad to see the Minister has taken a firm and definitive position with respect to some of the shortcomings in this act and has laid them out in fairly clear terms for all of us in his statement this afternoon.

However, Mr. Speaker, our concern on this side and the concern of a great many Manitobans and a great many Canadians, I would suggest, is that The Canada Health Act misses by a country mile, by a country mile, the target of what is actually wrong, what is actually assailing and troubling the Canadian health care system today. It is not simply a question of funding. I know the difficulties the Minister is having with funding. It's not simply a question of funding. It is a question of anticipation. It is a question of evaluation and assessment of areas in the system that need to be modernized, that need to be reformed and refined, that will require a great deal of political co-operation, but also require a great deal of leadership. If the leadership isn't going to come from the National Minister then the Provincial Ministers have to goad and conjole and force that National Minister into it.

There are corrections, improvements, refinements that can be made in the universal health care system that can take the pressure off some of the funding, short falls, and some of the difficulties that we face today. The National Minister has not addressed any of those problems in The Canada Health Act, she simply pursued her own pathological interest in getting at extra billing and user fees - not unimportant problems, Mr. Speaker, but by no means major problems in the system. I would hope that the Minister for Manitoba will spend some time in educating the Federal Minister into what is wrong with the system today and what is needed in order to put it on track and make sure the money goes around properly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the report of the Provincial Auditor to the

Legislative Assembly for the fiscal year ended March, 1983. Copies had been sent to members earlier and I trust that members have read the excellent report.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have seven students from the St. Johns Cathedral Boys School under the direction of Mr. Anderson. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable First Minister.

There are also 25 students of Grade 6 standing from the Linwood School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Breckman. The school is in the location of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Morrisseau - Northern Affairs

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs and ask him if he can indicate to the House the current status of the Acting Deputy Minister, John Morrisseau, of the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no additional information to what is provided by the honourable member.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, according to a recent Free Press, it indicated that the Provincial Auditor was carrying out an examination, investigation, to see if there is any conflict of interest. I direct a question to the Minister with respect to the Auditor's review. Will the Minister consider suspending the Acting Deputy Minister while this review is taking place in view of the fact that there could be a conflict of interest and in view of the fact that the Deputy Minister is responsible for the handling of large sums of money in that department?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, no, I have not considered that. I understand that the Auditor is reviewing that matter, but I fully expect that the allegation, the insinuations that have been made, and again made by the Member for Swan River by implication in his statement will not be substantiated in any way, shape or form. I have indicated on many occasions that I have every confidence that the performance of Mr. Morrisseau's functions are not inhibited in any way by the allegations that have been made.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister can confirm that Mr. Morrisseau's annual salary is now approximately \$60,000.00? According to the Public Accounts tabled as of March 31, 1983, it indicated that Morrisseau had received some \$35,000 up to that period. Can he know confirm that an Order-in-Council was signed by the Premier, Mr. Pawley, back on July 27, 1983, indicating that Mr. Morrisseau was elevated to the Acting Deputy Minister position at a salary of approximately \$60,000.00? I wonder if the Minister would confirm that.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm those dates. I would certainly accept the member's information if he is so indicating.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if he would bring that information back to the House to confirm those figures, and I would direct another supplementary question to him.

A Free Press article date June 10, 1983 indicated "Morrisseau gets year to pay debt," a debt of some \$8,000 that he borrowed from the Manitoba Metis Federation. I would like to ask the Minister what is the current . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: A point of order. Mr. Speaker, I won't confirm the comments made by some in the House that this is scandalous or muckraking, but I would draw your attention, Sir, to Citation 358 and also to Citation 357, both the old rules from the 4th edition and the new rules in Beauchesne. 357(e) forbids inquiries as to whether or not statements made in a newspaper are true; 358 suggests that questions should not inquire as to whether statements made in a newspaper are correct. The member also, under a later citation, Sir, which I will provide if you wish, is required to ascertain the truth of statements in newspapers before he brings them to the House.

I make that comment, Sir, not in any way reflecting on our colleagues of the Fifth Estate, but rather reflecting on the obligations that members have when they bring statements to this House.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point. My understanding of the situation is that the comments or articles that my colleague from Swan River was referring to from newspapers essentially were gleaned in the first instance from the activity of our Provincial Auditor. I can only prevail upon my colleague - if you find the objection has some validity to the Government House Leader's remarks as having any validity - and I don't accept for a moment. I do believe in the concerns as expressed by our Provincial Auditor and those are directly the comments that have raised the concern of the Member for Swan River. I think his questions are perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Attorney-General to the same point.

HON. R. PENNER: To the same point of order, the question that was asked originally was in order and was not objected to, either by the Government House Leader or anybody else on this side, namely whether there was anything concerning the status of the Deputy Minister and the follow-up question, with respect to an inquiry by the Provincial Auditor as to whether or not there was a conflict of interest, completed the matter in terms of what would be in order. But then the Member for Swan River went far astray and raised the question which . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: . . . led the Government House Leader to raise the point and certainly his citations, Sir, make the point abundantly clear. The Opposition House Leader will have to learn in the fullness of time that his fulsome rhetoric is not enough to deal with points of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank those members for that information that they've given. If the honourable member will complete his question I will then judge whether or not it is order.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the MMF is primarily funded by government grants for both the province and the Federal Government, can the Minister of Northern Affairs confirm that Mr. Morrisseau owes the MMF some \$8,000.00?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to hide on this issue. I'm reluctant to answer this kind of question because I don't think it's in the public — (Interjection) — I don't think that personal information, entirely personal information should be of such concern to the Member for Swan River. I understand his motives for asking the question. I will answer this question to ease the urge in his mind to know the answer, that the amount the member was referring to with respect to the MMF has been paid to the MMF, was paid to the MMF some time ago.

The issue of the personal bankruptcy of an individual is of no concern to me and I'm not sure that it should be of concern to him. The functions that Mr. Morrisseau is performing have been performed well and if the Member for Swan River would investigate, would talk to some of the people in northern Manitoba about the activities of the Deputy Minister, about his competence and his ability to deal with the issues he has to deal with, he wouldn't be asking this kind of sleazy question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly why I'm raising these questions because the people of

Northern Manitoba are concerned about the activities of the . . .

I would ask another supplementary question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. On the CEDF Report of March 31, 1982, report of assistance granted or to be granted for the year ended March 31, 1982, and on there is listed one John Morrisseau, bank guarantee fee, for one year for \$8,000.00. I wonder if the Minister could indicate the current status of that assistance.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that specific question as notice and provide the member with the information as soon as possible.

MR. D. GOURLAY: One further question. I wonder if the Minister of Northern Affairs could indicate the current action that his department or staff is taking with respect to lease holdings by one John Morrisseau, who is the Acting Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs. I understand those leases are in arrears at the present time. What action is his department taking to recover the funds that are owing the department?

HON. J. STORIE: Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe those are questions that tend to get into the personal side. My understanding is that in any business bankruptcy that the issue of back taxes is dealt with when the assets of that particular business are disposed of. My understanding is - and I can get this confirmed for the honourable member - that back taxes will be covered by the assets that are available in that bankruptcy case.

Civil Service Commission - hirings

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. In view of the fact that the financially insolvent Acting Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs was appointed by a politically appointed commission or was selected by a politically appointed committee of the Civil Service Commission - and this was criticized previously by the Member for Charleswood - will his government now cease the practice of having the senior government positions filled by politically appointed committees of the Civil Service Commission?

A MEMBER: How did you ever choose that Deputy Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. Order please, order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the Leader of the Opposition that it has been much more the practice of this government than certainly the previous government, and probably any previous government prior to the previous one, to appoint Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers through Civil Service Commission recommendation and advice. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, there is apparently some dismay across the way. We will check one for one and one for one, their record in respect to

appropriate appointments of senior Ministers and the lead that this government has undertaken in order to ensure that there is fair and measured appointment.

Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable indeed that - and I want to say this very precisely and very clearly to the Leader of the Opposition - that I find it very unfortunate that a Deputy Minister who is unable to be in this Chamber to defend himself - I have spent time with the Minister of Northern Affairs touring the northern parts of this province and he is a man well recognized and well looked up to as an Acting Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs - should be attacked on personal matters that he is resolving, that rather than dealing with the performance of the individual, a performance that has been well regarded by the client groups that he is dealing with in Northern Manitoba. I think that Mr. Morrisseau need not take any back seat insofar as the actual performance, the actual performance of his duties and responsibilities. If honourable members want to continue to muckrake, they're entitled to do so but unfortunately it will not accomplish that which they are attempting to achieve.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that those who were on the committee that selected Mr. Morrisseau for the position consisted of Mr. Decter, himself a politically-appointed Clerk of the Executive Council; Mr. McBryde, former NDP Minister, who was then the Deputy Minister; Ms. Jolson, a politically-appointed person herself. In view of the fact that these are the people who made that selection will they continue to be used in the selection of senior civil servants for this government in future?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the eyes and in the mind of honourable members across the way anyone that is not a three generation Conservative is a political individual.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to know whether or not the question of financial stability of the individual was a question that was considered when the review was being made?

Manitoba Hydro rate increase

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was anticipating a Ministerial Statement on this subject matter but none was forthcoming.

Can the Minister of Energy and Mines confirm that Manitoba Hydro rates are about to rise? I heard some such report on the radio coming in this morning.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that but first I'd like to deal with the feigned puzzlement of the House Leader about the fact that I don't have a statement in this respect.

The House Leader's been getting up time after time, after time and saying that members of the government are providing unnecessary policy statements to the Legislature because it isn't new policy.

Mr. Speaker, the hydro rate freeze was removed last year. That means that from now on the hydro rate increases will, in fact, be made by hydro as is normally done and as was done before the hydro rate freeze was put into effect. The Hydro rate increases will be, in fact, announced the way they have always been announced to insure that they can get into the Hydrogram.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House Leader for the Conservative Party to take a look at the facts. In 1977 the hydro rates were announced through a press release and in the Hydrogram. In 1978 they were announced in a news release and in the Hydrogram. And in 1979 prior to the rate freeze they were announced in a news release and the Hydrogram. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm following the normal practice and I would hope that the House Leader would have appreciated that, the House Leader for the Conservative Party, because he's been telling us that we should follow these normal practices. He can't have it both ways - on the one hand get up one day and criticize this, and then on the next day get up and say that aren't doing that.

You can recall, Mr. Speaker, that he has been on his feet on this issue more than anyone else. Certainly I'd be pleased to deal with the issue as a question. The hydro rates will, in fact, be going up by 7.9 percent across the board this year effective April 1st.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't comment on the editorializing of the Honourable Minister.

Mr. Speaker, my further question is, at the same time that this government is sending our directives to hospitals and to all other government institutions of maintaining their budgets to 3 percent increases, they are now raising hydro rates by close to 8 percent. My question is, what is the actual dollar amount that this will generate for Manitoba Hydro?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, if the 7.9 percent increase wasn't provided hydro would run a loss of \$26.2 million. That means the 7.9 percent rate increase will allow hydro to break even in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the result of a process whereby hydro has cut its expenditures, trimmed its expenditures. It has to both contain its expenditures and deal with refinancing. Interest rates for refinancing are in the order of 11.5 percent to 12 percent. So this is why the rate increase is in the order of 7.9 percent.

I must point out that the Hydro rates in Manitoba will be the lowest in North America, will continue to be the lowest in North America. And that even with this increase, Mr. Speaker, and I think people should be appreciative of this, you know, especially the knockers on the other side, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: Sit down, Sterling.

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . that the average increase over a five year period for Manitoba Hydro users is in the order of 2.3 percent on an annual basis. This compares with increases of 8 percent, 7.7 percent, or 9.7 percent in other provinces, Mr. Speaker. So on an annual basis we are operating at about one-fifth the level in terms of rate increases as other provinces in

the country. We have had the lowest level of rate increases in Canada over the last five years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines on a point of order.

HON. W. PARASIUK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There's a little, round, red-headed fellow in the back who hasn't learned his manners yet, Mr. Speaker. He just called me a liar from his seat. I'd appreciate if he would get up and call me a liar and give me the reasons because, Mr. Speaker, that type of behaviour we thought was passed when he left the front benches and went to the back benches. We thought that we'd have a new approach from the Conservative Party. If, in fact, the Conservative Party can't be controlled by the present Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Speaker to deal with the real Leader of the Opposition who is still commenting in the sleazy way that he did before which, Mr. Speaker, is unbecoming of the Legislature and unbecoming of parliamentarians.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I cannot hear everything that every member shouts from his chair. If the honourable member wishes to stand up and speak on the record, I will so make a judge of that whether it is parliamentary or otherwise.

Creamery plants - closure

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture. It has been brought to my attention by my colleague from Minnedosa and, as well, from the individuals who operate the creamery at Minnedosa, their concerns that a change in the dairy policy could force closure of some of the creamery plants in the province as well as force some of the cream shippers or producers out of business. Will the Minister of Agriculture assure those people who are now producing cream and shipping it and getting an income from that, as well as the creameries, that they won't be forced out of business because of lack of quota or available markets for their product?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I was advised of this situation just recently by a letter that was issued to creameries by the Manitoba Milk Marketing Board. I have asked the Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council to investigate this situation to see exactly what the import of those policies are dealing with new producers.

I am concerned as well that the area of cream production in which we require butter supplies in the

province and in Western Canada should not be curtailed.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if he will assure those people who are shipping cream and those people who are receiving it and processing it that they will not be forced to close their operations and lose a portion of their livelihood because of lack of quota or available markets to sell that product to?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I thought I answered the question. I wish to reiterate to the honourable member that this policy was not a policy instituted by my department or this government, it was a policy instituted by the producer-elected Milk Producers Marketing Board. I'm having this matter investigated because I have concerns about it as well.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, it could be a possibility because of lack of quota, total dairy quota, production quota for the Province of Manitoba. Will the Minister of Agriculture, if he will not assure those producers that their livelihoods will be protected by him, as the Minister of Agriculture and supposed to be responsible for Agriculture, will he go to the national agency or government to provide sufficient quota so that Manitoba's dairy industry can grow and expand and produce an income to the farmers, not shrink as everything else has done under his direction as the Minister of Agriculture?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate any suggestions that the honourable member may have. However, in the milk industry, as the honourable member should be aware of, that there are grave surpluses of milk products, of powdered milk and skim milk powder, all over this world. In fact, if he looks south of the border, Mr. Speaker, to the United States, they have implemented a multi-hundred million dollar program to reduce the supply of milk powder and product off the market because they are burgeoning with huge surpluses in the milk industry; and it is a concern not only to this province but to our nation as a whole that we do not overproduce in an area that supply is managed.

Bilingual agreement - Union of Manitoba Municipalities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask him whether he met with representatives of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister confirm that he had a recent meeting with representatives of the UMM?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, did the organization and their representatives reiterate and re-emphasize their continuing opposition to the government's proposals on official bilingualism, the same organization that passed 125 resolutions against the government measure, the same organization that presented dozens of briefs at the public hearings, passed a resolution at their recent convention, did they express to the Minister, as their president was quoted today, in continuing that opposition? Have they conveyed their continuing opposition to the government's proposal and their continuing concerns in regard to municipalities?

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, Mr. Speaker, they did not. In fact, just the opposite was the case. The representatives of the UMM indicated a willingness to hear our new proposal, to examine it closely, and said after doing so they would then be making a statement. I am not aware, although the member may be that that statement has now been made, but certainly they indicated that this was a very new proposal and that they did want to examine it before they made any comments. I respect their wish to take their time, get legal advice and do a full evaluation of the proposal, rather than commenting abruptly and without due consideration as some are wont to do.

Deputy Speaker's position

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Government House Leader. I've had some concerned phone calls in the last few days, some of them rather irate. It appears that my position in this particular seat has led some of my constituents to believe that I may be on this side of the House due to some affiliation or affinity or sympathy with either the official opposition or the unofficial opposition. Can the Government House Leader confirm that my position here has nothing to do with any affinity or sympathy for the opposition or the unofficial opposition?

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, clearly it's an indication of concern, and I appreciate the nature of that concern. Unfortunately, the camera angle in this Chamber is such that associations can be drawn which are not only grossly incorrect, but can be misleading. Mr. Speaker, it is an established precedent in this House that the seat assigned to the Deputy Speaker is one near yours, Sir, and the only reason the Honourable Deputy Speaker is in the seat he is in because he has that additional responsibility as a House officer. No one on this side, Sir, in any way feels that he is not a full and distinguished and participating member of our caucus in good standing in every respect.

McKenzie Seeds

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Employment Services and Income Security. In view of the great public concern about past events and current events at the Crown corporation A.E. McKenzie Seeds and Company, and in view of the public's right to know, can the Minister advise the House why he resigned as Minister responsible for that corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, clearly the rules with regard to questions relate only to areas for which a Minister has administrative responsibility. The responsibility . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I notice the Opposition House Leader is not one of those cackling because he is aware of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for McKenzie Seeds is vested in the Minister of Finance and the question is only appropriately addressed to him. The rules are clear that Ministers cannot be asked questions with regard to previous responsibilities and that Ministers holding a portfolio are responsible for the actions of previous assignees to that responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Member for Turtle Mountain wish to speak to the point of order?

MR. B. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker, I'll direct my question to the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, a question for the First Minister is, can the First Minister confirm that the present Member for Brandon East and the Minister responsible for Income Security for two years answered questions in this House and in committee with respect to A.E. McKenzie, when he was not charged with the responsibility for that company?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, I couldn't confirm that length of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East indeed, during a period of time, acted as Minister responsible for McKenzie Seeds, refinanced the operations of McKenzie Seeds - which is something that honourable members across the way did not deem fit to do - and indeed, during the tenure of the ministry of the Minister of Employment and Income Security, was able to take important steps, in order to ensure that there was an appropriate Provincial Auditor's Report, in order to ensure that there be an investigation of matters pertaining to McKenzie Seeds - matters in fact that developed a long long time ago and developed prior to the time of the responsibility being assumed by the Minister of Employment and Income Security.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister advise the House

whether or not the Member for Brandon East resigned to avoid having to answer questions with respect to McKenzie Seeds, or whether the First Minister removed those responsibilities from him to prevent him from being able to answer questions?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly confide to the House as to why the Minister for Employment sought and I gladly accepted his transfer of responsibilities.

The Minister responsible for Employment and Income Security has done an excellent over the years pertaining to statistical analysis. During the time we were in opposition he counted very very well, to the embarrassment of honourable members across the way, the statistical declines that took place under the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba. And Mr. Speaker, the assumption of these additional responsibilities - honourable members won't like this because it will be rubbing them the wrong way - but the Minister responsible for Employment and Income Security will again, in the assumption of responsibilities pertaining to the Bureau of Statistics, be able to count the additional numbers of employment in this province, the additional numbers of population in this province, will be able to assume the major areas of responsibility in regard to the Bureau of Statistics, a field in which the honourable member - I need not remind honourable members across the way, they may deny it - has very particular expertise, has done an excellent job in the past, I'm sure will do an excellent job in the future of demonstrating his ability in that respect to, I'm sure, the embarrassment of honourable members across the way.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the First Minister. Since the Member for Brandon East was not legally responsible for McKenzie Seeds, but for two years, nevertheless, acted as in the First Minister's words, "the de facto Minister for McKenzie Seeds," and during that period of time there were unprecedented examples of conflict of interest and mismanagement in that Crown corporation, will the First Minister now give the House the absolute total assurance that the Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Employment Services and Income Security, has absolutely no more responsibility, no more input into the management of McKenzie Seeds?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot provide that assurance nor will I provide that assurance. The Minister responsible for Employment is a member of the ERIC Committee of Cabinet, a committee of Cabinet that is responsible for overall economic financial management pertaining to the economy of the Province of Manitoba. Part of the responsibility of the Ministers on that committee is to have an overall review in respect to the Crown corporations of the Province of Manitoba. The Minister of Employment will certainly have input into the future operations of McKenzie Seeds. It would indeed be regrettable if he did not have so, Mr. Speaker.

Provincial Auditor's Report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Finance Minister. The Provincial Auditor recently issued a report on the operations of the Provincial Government that was without qualification. In view of that fact, I have two questions I'd like to ask. No. 1, whether that ever occurred under the previous Conservative Government, and No. 2, to what the Finance Minister attributes this positive report from the Auditor?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. No, the Auditor was not able to certify the books without an unqualified statement. He, in fact, wasn't able to do that during the entire term of the previous administration. He indicated he had been including a qualification in the report that until appropriate accountability systems which include satisfactory standards of financial and administrative controls at the legislative and management levels are established and functioning effectively, his office was not in a position to carry out the kind of an analytical audit which would normally be expected.

For the past year he has finally been able to provide that certificate. That group, as I indicated yesterday, of sterling business people and incompetents, couldn't even get the Provincial Auditor to certify the province's books in an unqualified fashion.

Canada Health Act

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. Given the problems assailing the Canadian universal health care system today, and given the fact that in the opinion of a good many Canadians, Sir, the proposed new Canada Health Act fails dismally to address the basic fundamental problems, can the Minister advise the House what his position was, what Manitoba's position was, when the Federal Minister indicated that she would not meet collectively with the Provincial Health Ministers on this subject, but preferred to travel across the country and meet with them all individually - presumably so as not to have to face any kind of cohesive criticism?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I was somewhat disappointed when I realized on my trip to Toronto that we would not be able to meet collectively with the Minister of Health, although I do think that we should have had both meetings, but I think there could be an advantage to meet individually with each province. I would not condemn her for doing so, but I was disappointed she wasn't available to meet all my colleagues, the Ministers of Health of the different provinces.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister believes that there is some advantage to meeting individually with the individual provinces, does that imply, in the

Minister's opinion, that the individual provinces are united and cohesive in terms of what they think needs to be done and that a common argument will be put province by province to the national Minister?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker. It's quite difficult when you have the Ministers representing the provinces and the territories that everybody would agree on all issues. I think that you have in certain areas an agreement. I think that we led the movement to try to get the Federal Government to act responsibly and discuss the question when we're looking at Medicare because we do think that financing is one of the important things. I can't see where we can bring in an act and refuse to talk about the financing of health care of the people of Canada and especially some of the requests that are in this act that we want to clarify.

Manitoba has always been ready - we're ready to pay our share of it, and we'd like to go back to the 50/50 percent with some flexibility. I think some flexibility, not necessarily that we take the same approach in every province. I would think that I am not in the majority when I'm talking about going back to 50/50 although all the provinces agree that we should look at the financing. We have in the past requested, because the Federal Minister was always saying, well, that's not my problem, that's the Minister of Finance. We've requested on a number of occasions that we should meet with all the Ministers of Health and the Ministers of Finance, federally and provincially. So far we haven't been too successful.

In other areas there are some provinces, a few of them, who on a question of principle are against this business of no extra billing or no utilization rates. There are not too many of them but some are very very strongly opposed to that. Some of them were intending to bring utilization fees solely because they could find no other way of providing the care for the people in their provinces although they didn't like it. There are definitely some in Manitoba; as a principle we feel that we do not want to see two different levels of care. We do not want people to have to pay utilization fees or extra billing although in a number of occasions I did state that extra billing, although we did not agree in principle with extra billing, that it wasn't a major concern at this time in Manitoba.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a correction to Hansard of Thursday, December 22, 1983, on Pages 1306, 1307, 1313 and 1314 the words "Madam Chairperson" are attributed to me. I never used such words; they don't exist in the English language.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Duly noted.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker would you please call the resolution standing in the name of the Attorney-General and the amendment which is currently standing in the name of the Member for Roblin-Russell?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Government House, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell has 35 minutes remaining.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped that the First Minister would stay in his place today because basically all my remarks and my address on this extremely subject matter are related to questions I would like to ask of the First Minister and questions I would like to get some answers for at a very early date as we deal with this extremely important and complex matter that has plaguing this House and plaguing the province and our people since last June.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable First Minister in Hansard as of June 17, 1983, advised this House unilaterally that he would in fact answer all questions that were raised on this particular subject matter. Mr. Speaker, he went on and he also mentioned the fact of this so-called agreement that we are wrestling with and dealing with although nobody that I know of on our bench has seen this agreement. We don't know who was there although the Attorney-General, the former Government House Leader, did put into the record some of the names of the bureaucracy that attended this meeting. We, in the opposition, and the people of this province are still waiting for some official facts and some indication of the sequence of events that took place that brought about this resolution coming before us in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if one follows the long history of this resolution and the changes, the misinformation, the half-truths, the quarter-truths, the government's mishandling of this issue, they're mumbling and fumbling the ball continually, this I think this could be classed a proverbial nightmare. I dare say, I have never seen anything in my life in this Legislature that even compares to the way this thing has been handled by what they call themselves a government of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we've been told that the proposed changes to Section 23 is a means to unity and harmony in our province. We have been told that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in conflict of that statement I find that this province has never been divided for maybe 50, 75 years the way that it is divided today on this issue.

We've been told, Mr. Speaker, that these proposed changes to Manitoba's Constitution must be changed

to restore minority rights. The Attorney-General has told us that a poll, a government poll has been taken on this subject matter, Mr. Speaker, and some 70 percent of the people in this province support their proposed language proposal. A government poll. That's what I say, in supporting the comments of my colleague, balderdash, Mr. Speaker.

The plebiscites, in fact, reveal the extreme opposite. We also told, Mr. Speaker, that no signed agreements have been put on the table, and I don't think they have, between the Government of Canada, the SFM, Bilodeau and this government on this issue. Nothing in black and white, nothing tangible, nothing that we can read. Something that was done in a back room some day, although the Attorney-General says, the door wasn't closed when they met. I believe he said it didn't take place behind closed doors. He said that was not the history of this event. Well, if it wasn't, Mr. Speaker, why aren't we getting more information? Why aren't we getting some more facts and figures as to where this consensus came from and as to why the government picked this route and why they went this way?

Mr. Speaker, I did hear the other day that these so-called documents that were put together in this famous meeting, they can't be released under The Freedom of Information Act because it might harm the federal-provincial relations between this government and the Government of Canada.

But, anyway, Mr. Speaker, the former House Leader, the Attorney-General, in his presentation to this House, when he introduced this motion, did assure us that we can request and ask for information and comment on this resolution. He went on even to say, Mr. Speaker, on Page 377 i, he said: It's not possible for us to take an agreement that involves four or five parties unilaterally and start playing textually around with the agreement, and playing around textually with the agreement. He said it's not possible at this stage because the case in the Supreme Court merely stands adjourned. It's not possible for us to take an agreement that involves four or five parties and unilaterally start playing around textually with the agreement. Mr. Speaker, that again is another mis-statement and misjudgment and maybe that is the reason why the Attorney-General was demoted on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct, as I said earlier in my comments, a number of questions to the First Minister on this issue and see if we can get to the root or the reason that the government was forced into this position that they are, and see if we can't find some way to resolve this problem and leave the people of this province satisfied that at least we tried to settle the issue as best we could.

I'm going to ask the First Minister if I could, why did he alleviate the Attorney-General from his position as Government House Leader, and Minister responsible for piloting these proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act through the Legislature?

That's a fair question that the First Minister, I think, can answer, because I think it's extremely important for us to recognize that this man who was the author, who was there at that meeting behind, he said it wasn't closed doors, has now gone down the drain. He has been removed of any responsibilities or duties that he had to pilot this resolution through this House. I would think that would be a good question for the First Minister

to answer, and I think the people of this province deserve some answers. Why was he removed, the Attorney-General, the chief law officer of this province, in this our court of highest report? This is the highest court of the land, in the province, this Legislature, and the Attorney-General has been shorn of his duties, had his jacket removed as the man responsible for piloting this and now is sitting on the side line, Mr. Speaker, looking on.

A MEMBER: And it's his own creation, Wally.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Right. I would ask the First Minister, if he didn't make the decision, was it the Cabinet? Was it a Cabinet decision to demote the Attorney-General as the Minister responsible for piloting this resolution through the House, or maybe, was it a caucus decision? Was it a caucus decision to remove the Attorney-General from the responsibilities of piloting this resolution through the House?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if maybe we took a look at the Cabinet room or the caucus room of our friends opposite, there likely would be a lot of political blood on the wall of both those rooms over this issue. The anguish, the anxieties and the infighting that has gone on since June 17th on this issue is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. So, either the First Minister has taken the initiative himself or it's been done by the Cabinet or the caucus, they have removed the Honourable Attorney-General from his responsibility. He, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, although we don't have the documents, he was the chief author of these amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. Now he's long gone. He's been removed from the responsibility.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to ask this of the First Minister, is it possible, as well, that the Societe Franco-Manitoban or Bilodeau or maybe even the Government of Canada asked the Premier to take the Attorney-General aside and demote him as the Government House Leader and relieve him from his position as the Minister responsible for piloting these amendments through the House?

A MEMBER: I think the Governor-General did it.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Maybe. Mr. Speaker, I think the Manitoba public, I think the official opposition, I think the citizens all across Canada, deserve the answers to those questions as to why or how or who removed the Attorney-General from his responsibilities and duties as the Minister of the government in charge of piloting this famous resolution through this House.

I also would like to ask the First Minister, if I could, Mr. Speaker, in fact, he was at that famous meeting, was the First Minister there when he said, it wasn't behind closed doors? Was he maybe peeking over somebody's shoulder? The Attorney-General read into the record yesterday the names of some of the people who were there and maybe in omission forgot the First Minister of this province was looking over his shoulder and was in fact there. I'd like to know, was he there? He's the First Minister of this province.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if there were any documents signed? Did the former Government House Leader, the

Minister responsible for piloting this amendment through, did he sign anything on behalf of the people of this province or the government, or did the First Minister sign anything in that original agreement, or did anybody sign it? Those are questions that people are grappling for and asking for all across this province, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister and some of the legal fraternity, is that so-called agreement valid now that the man over there, the former Minister in charge of this, piloting it through the House, the Attorney-General, he was the one who signed it, or did he sign it? Or, if he did sign it, is it valid now that he's been removed from the arena completely and now has nothing to say and has no input into it at all?

A MEMBER: I don't think there was ever an agreement, Wally. We've been hoodwinked.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well, that's what the people of this province - where do they get their consensus? Where do we get a consensus on these issues unless we get some answers to these questions, Mr. Speaker?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the First Minister, was the Attorney-General incompetent in his handling of this matter. Was he wrong in the way that he handled it? Did he make a whole bunch of errors in his handling of this issue? Did he misunderstand the people? Did he misunderstand the consensus that is needed? Did he forget about the fact that they didn't have a mandate to bring in this kind of resolution before this House? I wonder are those the reasons that he was removed from this portfolio, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General certainly must have some understanding of what the position is all about because the Premier was an Attorney-General in the Schreyer Government in those days. He certainly has full knowledge of the portfolio. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to ask the First Minister, is this Attorney-General now the laughing stock of Attorneys-General all across this country as a result of his demotion, as a result of his fumbling and mumbling and handling this issue. Will he now, when he goes to attend these Attorneys-General' Conferences across this country, have to sneak in through the back door because of his demotion on this issue?

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that he is the chief law officer of this province. I doubt very much if he'd want to go in the front door because of the fact that he's been demoted - demoted, the chief law officer of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the First Minister, how does this new degraded image of this Attorney-General that is now being sent out to the salt-mines, how does that fit in literally with the judicial system in our province? What do the courts, what does the legal fraternity in this province think of this Attorney-General now that he's been sent out to pasture and literally sent down to the salt mines to try and get out of the way from those that are pushing this issue?

Mr. Speaker, I dare say it will have an effect on the judicial system in this province because he has lost the credibility and he has lost the support of his colleagues opposite and has been pushed to one side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat reluctant because I know that when the Member for Roblin-Russell begins to wax eloquent we might by point of order disrupt his remarks. However, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we might consider disrupting his remarks in view of our relevance rule, particularly as it relates to amendments. The relevance rule certainly applies to bills and resolutions, but the requirement with regard to amendments is that debate be strictly relevant.

I would point out to you, Sir, that debate both last evening from the honourable member and so far this afternoon has dealt: (1) with the original resolution; (2) with the Minister responsible for the resolution, but has no time dealt with the actual amendment that I moved last week.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to deal in any expeditious fashion which our rules are designed to accommodate with the amendment before us, I think that rule, Sir, should be enforced.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, last night we heard from none other than the Attorney-General, or the former Attorney-General, speaking to the same resolution. What did we hear from him, Mr. Speaker? We heard a general description of the Conservative Party as being knockers, as being this and everything else, certainly not very germane to the resolution that he, Sir, was partially responsible for authoring and bringing into this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, there is also a general rule in this Chamber that having embarked in a certain pattern, in a certain course with respect to the debates in this Chamber, that then the rules apply equally to both sides of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The members will surely be aware that it has been a practice that members have had a good deal of latitude discussing both bills and amendments thereto.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell will bear in mind, I am sure, the remarks of the Honourable Government House Leader.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I understand the problem that you face and I understand the problem of members opposite when we're dealing with a proposed amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. I've referred to it many times in my address already. That's the subject matter. Do I have to stand up every two seconds and say that that's what we're talking about? My gosh, Mr. Speaker, we've been talking on this matter since last June.

Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the problems of the demotion of the No. 1 law officer in this province because of what he stood for and what he has done and what he has said in this House about these proposed amendments to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister can tell me and tell the people of this province, before the

debate goes any further, and answer these questions so that we can tell the people back home where this government intends to go on this issue now, because I look at these watered-down amendments that the new House Leader has proposed before it.

They are not acceptable to the people that I am talking to, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can the Premier with a clear conscience, in full respect of the oath of office that he has taken as the Premier of our great province, explain to me and explain to the opposition and the people across the province any reason or reasons why I should support this watered-down amendment that is now before me.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can the Premier with a clear conscience tell the people of this province what has changed in this proposed amendment that we're dealing with now. What's different? What's so new about this? The only thing that is new is that the Attorney-General has bit the dust. He's been sent to the salt mines. He's lost his responsibility; otherwise it's about the same ballpark.

Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting thing since we last met on this issue, he's demoted the Attorney-General, the Cabinet Minister, this new member that's only been in his seat a very short time. He's demoted him and he's introduced a new Minister to deal with this subject matter, Mr. Speaker, a person I understand that has little or no legal experience in constitutional matters. The former member who was leading this through the House I dare say had a fair knowledge of constitutional law in this province and would have maybe guided us to the best of his ability much better I think than this new Minister.

Can I ask the First Minister, does he have a vote of confidence from the people and his own party on these changes that he has made on his front bench of demoting the Attorney-General? I'm asking the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he's asking for a vote of confidence on this issue from the official opposition, from people all across this province? And day after day we see here he has very blatantly and glaringly shown that he doesn't have any confidence at all in his Attorney-General, yet he's asking us to stand up and support this proposed watered-down amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act. The First Minister has lost confidence and his government has lost confidence in the Attorney-General who was guiding this thing through the House.

Is there any reason why, when he can't vouch for the Attorney-General who was in charge of this in the House, and he has taken the duties from him, he's lost confidence in him, why shouldn't I lose confidence in this government, in this First Minister, for the same reason? Why shouldn't the people lose confidence in this government for the same reason that he lost confidence in the Attorney-General for, Mr. Speaker?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will the First Minister acknowledge and agree that the New Democratic Party, and his government, and his caucus - they don't have a mandate for the citizens of this great province to proceed with these proposed amendments to Section 23 of the Manitoba Act. That's a serious charge that I'm levelling at the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I'd like him some day to stand up and tell me, or tell the opposition, tell the people of this province where he got the mandate to proceed, where he got the

consensus to proceed with this resolution? That's a serious allegation I'm making, challenging the First Minister. Am I right, or am I wrong Mr. First Minister?

A MEMBER: You're right, Wally.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Are the people of this province right or are they wrong?

A MEMBER: They're right.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Do you have a mandate? Did you get a mandate? Did you get a consensus, Mr. Speaker?

A MEMBER: No, no, no.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I ask you a very very serious question. Should we proceed any further on this disastrous course that you and your government are trying to foist on this province after all the things that have happened. But the crowning one that really concerns me as I stand here today is the demotion of the First Chief Law Officer of this province on this issue. He has been demoted, he has been literally sent to the salt mines on this issue. That scares me, Mr. Speaker. If he couldn't hack it what about the people of this province? And yet they're going to pursue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Premier, my constituents are telling me to tell you to stop right now, cut it off. My constituents are telling me to tell you, Mr. Premier, that you have no mandate to proceed any further on this issue. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are asking me to tell the First Minister of this province that neither he, nor his government, have yet gained a consensus from the people of this province on this issue, have never gained a consensus. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are asking me to ask the First Minister of this province, does he have caucus support? Are the whips going to be off on this issue? Never, it's not possible, Mr. Speaker. We know how divided they are over there. It's only that because the whips are on that they're not breaking away, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister to give me any one just reason why we should proceed any further on this disastrous course that we're taking. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, the ball's in his court, the ball's in your court over there.

I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the First Minister has taken time to read my leader's speech that he put in the record yesterday. An excellent oration and spelled it out, Mr. Speaker, exactly how it was and laid out the problems that we have with this matter that is before us loud and clear, Mr. Speaker. I dare say that the First Minister maybe hasn't read it.

I wonder then, Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister, can he provide me, or the official opposition, the Government of Canada, the Franco-Manitoban Society, and Mr. Bilodeau with a just reason or reasons why we in the opposition should back off in this issue.

A MEMBER: Never!

MR. W. McKENZIE: Can you give us any reason why we should back off? Mr. Speaker, I've listened to the

members opposite day after day after day on this subject matter and I'm still waiting for one member over there. Any one that can stand up and give me a reason why we in the opposition should support this mumbo jumbo jungle, and I mean jungle, of government mismanagement, new watered-down versions of amendments, changes of Ministers, divisions among the peoples of this province that have prevailed since June 17th, 1983 when the Attorney-General brought this resolution before this House.

Mr. Speaker, what about Bilodeau? I wonder if the First Minister has talked to Bilodeau lately. You know, I hear in the halls that Bilodeau says there's no deadlines, there's no January 15th deadline. He says there is no such a thing, it's a joke, this deadline business. And they've been leading us down the garden path that there was, in fact, deadlines, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, if he will be kind enough to go and talk to Bilodeau.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, while I'm pleased that the honourable member is speaking finally on the amendment I wish to make sure the record is clear. I at no time acknowledged nor deferred in any way to a January 15th deadline as the honourable member alleged. I have said this government wants a Made-in-Manitoba solution and submits to no person's deadline, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That was not a point of order. It may have been a matter of clarification.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, that is interesting. The December 1st deadline's gone. The December 15th deadline which we were told, now that's gone down the drain. The December 31st deadline has now gone down the drain. Now the January 15th one is gone down the drain. Now can you wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we're alarmed over here? Why the people of this province are concerned, anxiety that I've never seen in my lifetime before? There is another classic example of the bumbling handling of this issue - the dates.

I just asked the First Minister in my comments, will he go and see Bilodeau and talk? Why were these dates put forth in the first place, Mr. Speaker? Now they say they don't mean anything.

Mr. Premier, let's talk about justice on this issue. Let's talk about honesty, political honesty. Let's talk about political sincerity. Let's talk about political trust to the people of this province, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about political integrity, Mr. Speaker.

Let's review my leader's comments that were put into the record here yesterday with a fine tooth comb. That was an excellent speech, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about the mandate. Let's talk - what does a mandate mean, what is a mandate in a political arena? Let's talk about it on this issue? Why not let the people of the province know that we know what a mandate means and what it's all about in a political arena.

Let's talk about political consensus and what it means because up to now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite

have absolutely refused to talk about those extremely important things. Mr. Premier, may I ask you one question? Would you dare call an election on this issue, which you and your caucus and your Cabinet have hoisted on the people of this province? No, sir. There's no way they'd go to the people on it. No way would they go to the people. They'd be creamed at the polls and they know it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind the honourable member that he should address his remarks to the Chair and not directly to another member. The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'd get more attention if I addressed you, Mr. Speaker, than members opposite. I'm not getting much attention over there. They're just looking down all the time, but they're not listening very hard at what I say.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the First Minister again if he will stand in his place and tell the people of this province, let's now call an election on this issue. It's an extremely important issue, I agree, extremely important. Would he dare? No, no he wouldn't, Mr. Speaker, and you wouldn't advise him to because of the way they've handled this issue. They'd be creamed at the polls. They're the laughing stock of the province now and they've got an Attorney-General that's the laughing stock of all of the Attorneys-General across this country on this issue, who has been demoted. He would likely lose his seat for sure the way that he's handled this issue and, of course, he wouldn't get much support from his members opposite.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, to ask the First Minister, would you and your caucus admit that you've been wrong in this issue, that you went the wrong route, that you handled it in a terrible manner? Would you admit that? Would you admit that you don't have a mandate? Would you admit that you never got a consensus and still don't have it today? Would you admit that the Attorney-General went down the drain on this issue - lost his integrity, lost his credibility, lost his respect - the first time it's happened since I've been in this Legislature, to see an Attorney-General defrocked over a political issue, had moved to the side on this issue, pushed to the background, who now no longer has much to say about this issue, Mr. Speaker?

Those are questions, Mr. Speaker, and I dare say there are other people that are going to fall out in this issue before it's over.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the First Minister and his caucus and his Cabinet before I close, have they got a Christian conscience? Have they got a political conscience - any of them, any one of them? Have they got a political understanding of what this issue is all about and what it's doing to the people in this province - the finest people in the world - tearing them apart?

Can I ask the Cabinet Ministers, the front benchers, Mr. Speaker, if they have read their Oath of Office lately on this issue?

Can I ask the First Minister if he'll withdraw the resolution, reinstate the Attorney-General to the status that he enjoyed in this province and the status that he enjoyed in this House?

Let's get back to Square One and deal with some matters in this province that are more important at this time than this: the economic development of our province, the problems that the unemployed have, the problems that the farm community are having, the problems with the health delivery system in this province.

I leave it with the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. The matter is urgent. It's extremely important and I'm waiting with bated breath to hear the First Minister of this province rise in his place and tell me answers - at least some answers - to the number of questions that I have raised today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think the fundamental question that has to be answered and put is, who is really running the government? Who is running the province? Who is making the decisions in regard to the language issue? Is it the Premier, the Attorney-General, or now the new boy on the streets, the Minister of Municipal Affairs?

One would assume that the main decisions in regard to this legislation is being made by the Ministers, but when one observes what is going on in our province, it appears that none of these people are, in fact, making the fundamental decisions. I must say that I have heard, on a number of occasions, people make this remark and it has certainly gone through my mind on more than one occasion, that here we have legislation and the government seems to be responding to Roger Bilodeau whenever he says or does something, or George Forest whenever he says or does something.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite clear that the government is not, in fact, in control and that the government is not, in fact, responding to the wishes of the people of our province. We all know that the Prime Minister himself and his notorious sub-Lieutenant, Serge Joyal, have had a lot of influence in the affairs of this province and we all know, of course, that the SFM has a lot to say in regard to what the government will do and what the government has done so far.

It's quite clear, when we look at the latest proposals of the government put forward by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that they are following the line and the logic of George Forest, because Mr. Forest made his point, I think very effectively, in terms of the public hearings. He even made a point during the plebiscites and he has made this point on a number of occasions - that if the government is prepared to say that English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, then everything else follows. He doesn't need and he doesn't require and he never asked for all those specifics that were laid out originally in the original proposal, because if he has that one sentence, that French is an official language of the Province of Manitoba, then he has it all. So they have taken Mr. Forest's advice. They have taken it and they are following the Forest line. Because George Forest is a person who, I think, has a better grasp of political realities than many members who are in the administration and he is prepared to wait. He knows if he has that sentence, that over time all the

replacements that come into the Civil Service, starting with secretaries and so on and moving up higher and higher through the administration, that in a period of time all the new people who come in will be bilingual, and as the older unilingual people are phased out and retired that eventually you will have a Civil Service that is bilingual.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyles: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the same point of order I raised earlier with respect to debate on the amendment. I certainly appreciate the interest demonstrated by the Member for Elmwood. He's making references, though, to things he might hypothecate. He might hypothecate to occur under Bill 115, which has not yet been introduced for second reading, but the amendments before this House are very clear, very definite, as to their form and intent. In fact, any suggestion of services from and the specific hiring of persons to provide those services is contained neither in that resolution in its amended form, nor in the amendment that's been proposed, and the bill which will provide services is not at this time before the House. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the rule which requires that debate on an amendment be strictly relevant, be enforced.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden, to the same point.

MR. H. GRAHAM: To the same point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker. I just want to point out to you that it is now 3:30 in the afternoon, that the Romper Room program is on the air in the morning, and if he wants to talk Romper Room politics let him talk it on the show that is on the air in the morning and leave the business of the House to members of the Assembly who know how to handle it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood, to the same point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I am talking specifically about that line, I'm talking about the key part of the resolution which is "As English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." I am referring to the fact that Mr. Forest was the person who put that proposition to the government, surely that is in line. I also wish to say that I hope the House Leader isn't going to interrupt all the members that speak in an attempt to stop them from speaking their mind, in an attempt to detract from their remarks. He has made a number of interruptions, which I think are not helping the business of the House.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood clearly demonstrated the point I was attempting to make. He said, and the quote he used from the text of the resolution with regard to the item he was debating was a quote from the text of the

resolution and was not a quote from the text of the amendment. That exactly was my point; it is the amendment under debate. The statement in the amendment is substantially different from the statement the member just quoted.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to remind all members once again that under Rule 30 of our own rules of this House speeches shall be direct to the question under consideration or to a motion or amendment that the member speaking intends to move or to a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My point is that the government has brought in the old Penner, Pawley and Pierre proposals, recycled them, repainted them, repackaged them, but how different are they, really? What improvements have been made? What progress is there now, going back to June of 1983? You know, a new Minister and a new vocabulary doesn't mean that there has been any change.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if you examine the approach of the government and all these new amendments and compare it to what went on before you're basically back to Square One. It is people like Georges Forest who make the government jump and respond. It's people like Roger Bilodeau, who keeps threatening to take the Government of Manitoba to court, that makes the government tremble. It's people like Leo Robert, who is able to have a series of meetings and is taken as the key person in the Province of Manitoba, that has to be satisfied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the fact that these are the people who are calling the shots, who are being listened to, who are being given every opportunity to bend the government ear, it's quite clear who is being listened to.

Mr. Speaker, when the government was elected in 1981, they ran on a slogan of "We listen." Now it becomes clear that what they forgot to do was spell out to whom they listened. They didn't give us the complete line. The line should have been "We listen to the following: Roger Bilodeau, Georges Forest, Leo Robert, Pierre Trudeau and Serge Joyal."

So when the public of Manitoba expresses itself over and over again, comes to the Minister, comes to the government, writes to the Premier, phones to the Premier, sends petitions to the Premier, comes into the gallery of this Legislative Assembly, new advertisements are starting to appear in the Free Press, Mr. Speaker, and I understand there are going to be more of them from different individuals and different organizations, people who are not satisfied with what the government has done and who are going to continue to oppose these recycled and repackaged amendments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know what the Minister says. He says that these are entirely new proposals. That is a statement that he made last week on CBC television. It, in fact, was in response to a question that I put to him. We weren't in the same building, but a crew taped a comment and a question from me, and he responded, and he said, well, these are entirely new proposals. Well, Mr. Speaker, I said to him the other day that if, in fact, they are entirely new proposals that it would

be not unreasonable to consider holding new public hearings.

You know, you can't have it both ways. You can't say these are entirely new and then say you can't have hearings. I mean, do one or the other. If they are entirely new, hold new public hearings on your proposed resolution; otherwise, don't refer to them as entirely new. So, you know, take your pick. Those are your alternatives, but don't attempt to do something that is contradictory.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister also said that this was a compromise. He's compromising; he's prepared to make adjustments. With what? With whom? I mean, what is this adjustment with? I mean a compromise going off in a direction where nobody will follow you and then saying, well I'm only prepared to go half way now, is not a compromise. It is still a move in the wrong direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister, I know he's happy to be in the front bench. I know he has taken a difficult assignment. I know that he's experiencing a short-lived popularity. I know that he is delighted to have his moment in the sun and I wish him well in that regard but, Mr. Speaker, when the people of this province realize that this Minister is simply giving us more of the same; is simply recycling the same old proposals; his popularity is going to be short lived.

He has friends now in the government benches, but when people examine what he is doing and look at the record, it's going to be one of the shortest-lived careers in political history and it wouldn't surprise me that in a very short time indeed that he's going to be without friends. He won't have a single friend on the government side. He'll probably be known at that time as Little Orphan Andy, the person who's looking for a friend, the person who had a lot of fair-weather friends but now is short indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put a very serious question to the Minister and I hope he's going to listen to this question while he's attempting to have a conversation. That is this. If this bill and this resolution are both introduced in this Legislature at roughly the same time and in the event that this resolution were to carry in this House and the bill were to carry by the government majority by invoking closure and then the resolution is forwarded to Ottawa, does this mean that the bill, in fact, is entrenched in the Constitution?

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the question. I think that's a question that we must have answered in this particular debate because it says in the resolution, the proposed resolution, that the section that the law of Manitoba enforce at the time the section comes into force shall not be extinguished or restricted by or pursuant to any act of the Legislature of Manitoba.

So, I want to say to the Minister this point, that if the bill becomes an act while the resolution has been sent on to Ottawa, is it not the case that we then have that legislation in effect and that because it's in effect it means that no future Legislature can adjust or amend that legislation because it will be legislation of the time? It will be legislation that is in effect and everything from that point backwards can't be touched. Well, I think we have to have that assurance. I think that's a crucial point.

Because if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I think that if the government were able to get the resolution

passed and if the government were able or could, in fact, get the bill through by closure or any other device, then that bill should be held deliberately. That bill should either not be introduced this session or it should not be proclaimed until a later point in time because otherwise what we are doing in effect is we're taking the Penner proposals and we're entrenching all of them just as was proposed before.

So there is then a deception on the part of the government, deliberate or accidental, that the notion that they would be separating out the services and putting them into a bill, and that bill could then in fact be amended or changed or altered by succeeding Legislatures may not be the case. So I think we need some assurance on that particular point and I would ask the House Leader and the Premier or the Attorney-General to make comment during this debate on that particular legal point.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to see how the debate has in fact developed and evolved and how people have taken each other's positions and reversed themselves. For example, the government has made the point over and over again for six months that it's because of the remote possibility that the Supreme Court would rule one way that we would get legal chaos that we have to go to court. Now they say, well look, it's only a remote possibility, only a remote possibility that this new proposal means that there would be an extension of French language services and an extension of French language rights. It's only a remote possibility, what are you worried about? So, whom do you believe?

For six months the Attorney-General has been telling us because of a remote possibility we have to do this, and now the Minister of Municipal Affairs is saying, well, because it's only a remote possibility, let's proceed, what are you afraid of?

Well there's no consistency there, Mr. Speaker, in terms of what the government is warning us about. Then the Minister in his speech when he introduced the latest government language proposal - you know there was a very amusing column written by George Stephenson in the Winnipeg Sun a week or so ago, it was sort of what's going to happen in 1984. In his column he referred to the fact that the 45th Minister in charge of the bilingual proposals would be the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. He would be bringing in those new revisions and those new amendments. I look forward to that because they'll probably be a lot better than what we've had to date.

The Minister, when he brought in the latest revisions, in his introductory remarks, he talked about the tactics of misinformation and the playing to the gallery of emotion. He said "that some individuals in responsible positions have gone to great length and have been irresponsible and played on that fear."

Mr. Speaker, who are the merchants of fear in this Legislature? Is it the government side or is it the opposition side? Who has been telling us from Day One and raised the spectre of legal chaos in the province, people running around in a rampage breaking the law if we don't go along with these particular proposals? What do you call that? Is that hope and faith and trust, or is that fear that is being played upon? Who has been telling us from Day One, raising these objections in the public hearings, continually harping on this about the country breaking up?

Now the Attorney-General is the one who is always telling us that the country would be breaking up. Now the new Minister, I think he said the other day on television, that that wasn't one of his concerns. He had some expression, if I can find it in my notes, that this was not one of his particular concerns. Well, I wish they'd get together. I wish that there would be a caucus or a Cabinet meeting in which both people would be on the same wave length because we have heard from the beginning a very serious concern and I think all of us in this House and in this province have to think about that, the sort of thing that Alliance Quebec came running over here and waving the flag on and warning us that if we didn't do this, the country would break up. If we didn't support the government proposals, Canada itself was in danger of breaking up and separatism would rear its ugly head and Quebec would go its separate way.

Who is always raising the spectre of the costs of translation and saying that this is something that must be avoided at all costs? Who is always saying that if you oppose this you are a bigot? Who is creating bigots? Who is naming people as bigots? Who is threatening people with being called a bigot? Who is trying to silence people by the use of the term bigot? Who has used the word "bigot" more in the history of this province than ever before? — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I could even pick a person out of the back bench who's leading in the use of that term, but I'll decline for the moment. Who is saying, of course, that if we don't do this, then history will judge us harshly and therefore, for all of these reasons, you have to support the government proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the government should be very cautious about saying that it's the opposition or the people who don't support them, who are in fact the merchants of fear, because I think that some of the leadership has, in fact, used that tactic once too often.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I am very disappointed in the fact that the government continues to ignore some of the real evidence that has in fact been produced in the past six months in this province in regard to what the public thinks of this particular proposal. We had 225,000 people vote on this particular matter.

You know, the government produces a study - that big fat report that they commissioned - and it would be very interesting in fact, Mr. Speaker, to know what the cost of that was. I discussed that survey with somebody who knows something about polling and surveys, and so on, and a guesstimate - only a guesstimate on what it cost - would be \$50,000 and up. It would be very interesting for the government to reveal how much, in terms of taxpayers' dollars, they spent on that particular survey.

I'm also informed that telephone surveys are practically useless and so when you take a survey of 600 calls, the Attorney-General was telling us for God knows how long about 70 percent were in favour and when you look at what that is, it boils down to one line in the report, in which it said that some people in Manitoba are not opposed to the extension of some services, which is not an unreasonable position. But the government tried to make the case that 70 percent of the public was in fact in favour of their position. Well

what a study or a survey is supposed to do is to indicate what will happen in reality. You're supposed to take a sampling, so that therefore you can prove or demonstrate what the public at large thinks and, Mr. Speaker, how wrong could they be? How wrong could they be? When we finally got the real evidence and the facts were produced, they were produced on October 26th, when 225,000 people voted on this question and 175,000 of them said that they don't want any part of the government's proposals.

Mr. Speaker, 76.5 percent in Winnipeg, 79 percent outside of Winnipeg. If you average it out, it comes out to about 78 percent of the public and in spite of that, immediately when that figure was produced, immediately when the people spoke after weeks and weeks of discussion and debate and a campaign mounted by the Provincial Government, the Federal Government and all sorts of new organizations, etc., no sooner was that result produced when the Attorney-General got up and said the very next morning, within hours of the result, we reject this and we're proceeding and we don't give a damn what the people of Manitoba think.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to a lot of people and some of those people, of course, felt that the proposals were no good and voted that way. But when the government then, within a few hours, the very next morning said we're going to proceed, then they really hit the ceiling. I mean there were some people who were willing to give their opinion and see what happened, but when they found out that the government wouldn't listen to what they said, they were sorely disillusioned with this particular administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister is going to have a hard time. He's going to have a hard time trying to sell this proposition in this Assembly. He's going to have a harder time trying to sell this to the people that he is supposed to represent, the municipal people. You know in his own constituency as a Minister are the municipal men and what do they think of this? Their president, Allen Beachell was on radio today saying that he's rejecting these proposals. The municipal people produced 123 or 125 resolutions all across the province and they were opposed to the government plan. They then produced dozens of briefs. They supported a plebiscite or a referendum. They also then more recently passed a resolution at their own convention and now their president came out today.

So that shows to me quite clearly where the third level of government stands on this issue. We know where the feds are, they are in favour of it; and we know where this administration is, it's in favour of it. That's not to be confused, Mr. Speaker, with the New Democratic Party because I don't know whether the government could win a majority on that question within the party, and the municipal people are dead against, and the people of Manitoba are dead against, so that's the line-up.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister in bringing forth this wording, talking about "As English and French are the official languages of Manitoba," that's rewriting history. That is a revision of history; it is not reflecting accurately the history of this province. The word "as" means since and it means because, and it certainly is a revision and an attempt to rewrite history to include that in the resolution, 23.1. That's not a symbolic and a declaratory

statement. That is supposedly a statement of fact and history that would be looked upon and interpreted by the judges of the Supreme Court.

So, Mr. Speaker, I simply say in conclusion that the Minister has simply recycled the original proposals and is now attempting to sell them to the Legislature and to the public at large, and he will fail on both counts. He will not succeed in selling them to the Legislature, and he will not succeed in selling them to the people of Manitoba.

What he has to consider carefully is the fact that his government has a majority and can at some point vote down the opposition and can at some point invoke closure to force the Legislature into submission. He has to consider that very carefully, not only him, because he is only one person, it's the government as a whole that has to consider that very carefully. It's the judicious use and exercise of power that is the question here. The fact that they can ram this down the throats of the MLAs is not to be construed as having the acceptance or support of the people of this province.

So I say to the members of the government that they had better be very careful indeed on this particular proposal. My advice is very clear: withdraw the resolution. Scrap the resolution. Let the matter proceed to the Supreme Court. As Roosevelt would say: "You have nothing to fear but fear itself."

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is if the government thinks that the campaign is over and that by settling the matter now they are going to stop losing blood and stop losing political support and stop losing members of their own party, they have another thing coming, because there is another round of opposition that is starting to bubble and the ad that you saw that went into last Saturday's Free Press, I'm told there are more ads coming, individuals putting ads in, other organizations putting ads in and that right now if those petitions were collected now, they would be in the 5,000 to 10,000 range. When this campaign is over and these coupons start rolling in and so on, there could be 15,000 or 20,000.

Mr. Speaker, that is in a sense a direct reflection of what the public thinks. It's not these polls. It's not whether or not the government has a majority, it's whether or not the public of Manitoba in its wisdom feels that this legislation is warranted and is good for the province. It's been said over and over again by thousands of people, by 175,000 citizens, in particular, that they are against the government proposals and they want the government to withdraw the legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I can't support this resolution, and I think that I accurately reflect what the people in my constituency believe. Mr. Speaker, I would challenge each member to get up and say whether he or she believes that they are accurately reflecting their people and whether they are prepared to go back to their people and sell this program to them and get them to change their particular opinions.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not a new resolution as the Minister claims, it's the old Penner, Pawley, Pierre proposals recycled.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A **STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McKenzie, Mercier, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Lecuyer, Mackling, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohan, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 21; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HANSARD CORRECTION

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction on Page 5421 of Hansard, January 9th, after the words, in the second column, "Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order". Then my comments, the fourth line - that the municipalities and school divisions being "included", the word should be "excluded."

A MEMBER: But that's not what you said.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Oh, yes I did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I thank the honourable member for that explanation.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on a point of order to point out that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has not spoken on this. He moved adjournment of debate and we had a vote on that but he does not wish to speak at this particular time. I would like to speak to the motion before us. That is the point of order that I raise, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does anyone else wish to speak to the same point of order?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I certainly have always understood that a motion for adjournment when moved is an indication that the member is claiming the next right to speak in the debate, that that is the

understanding under which that motion is moved. The fact that the motion is negated by a vote of the House does not change the fact that the member who rose and moved that motion was the next member recognized in the debate. Mr. Speaker, that member has spoken by moving the motion for adjournment and having had that motion turned down must either speak or lose his turn to speak.

Mr. Speaker, the obligation to speak after moving that can only be removed by a member asking to have at a subsequent sitting the matter stand and then the floor being yielded to another member and allowing the debate to stand in that person's name. That is only granted by leave, Mr. Speaker, it's a question put. The principle is that recognition to speak in a debate, once given, requires the member either to move the motion for adjournment or to speak. He cannot, having been recognized, waive that recognition.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, it's been long well recognized in this Chamber that the House can do whatever it wishes as far as the rules . . . this House decided not to recognize the motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside which removes all stigma attached to that motion. The Member for Lakeside has been refused by this Assembly to move an adjournment. That removes any further obligation that the Member for Lakeside may have at this particular time in debate and I would suggest that the argument put forward by the Honourable Government House Leader is specious at best.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other member wish to speak to the same point?

I recognize the Honourable Member for Lakeside who rose to speak in the debate. If the honourable member does not wish to continue now he will lose his opportunity to debate on this question.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, with great reluctance I challenge that ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged. The question before the House is, shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Those in favour, please say aye. Those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A **STANDING VOTE** was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyler, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Lecuyer, Mackling, Pawley, Penner, Phillips,

Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

NAYS

Banman, Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 21.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, while it isn't of course the beginning of a new Session, regrettably it's a continuation of one that many of us would have liked to have put well behind us, in the back pages of history. Perhaps at some point in time, a revisionist of history could just expunge it from the records of the Journals of this House because I truly believe it's not one Session that we particularly take a great deal of joy in or sense of accomplishment in; or indeed more importantly that the people of Manitoba take a great deal of satisfaction from in terms of the productivity of their elected members.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, it is the start of a new year and I do offer you my congratulations in carrying on your stewardship of this Chamber. Congratulations to those new Ministers who find themselves in the executive branch of government although this government and this party, the government of today always has trouble in recognizing the responsibilities that are attached to that distinction between being a party member, being an MLA of this Chamber and being a member of Executive Council.

Of course, I extend to my leader congratulations for assuming the chair that he now occupies and for having started this debate on this tortured amendment to Section 23 the other day in such a significant and worthy style.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that before the Government House Leader jumps to his feet too often during the course of my remarks, that I will be speaking to the amendment that is before us bearing in mind that the words of the former Government House Leader, the Attorney-General of this province, still ring in the Chamber where he took a good deal of his time to lecture my new Leader on his responsibilities to that office, castigated the entire Conservative Party in terms of their position on this and many other economic matters, or you name it, the fact that we introduced such important matters of concern as health and other matters during the short few days that we have come back from the recess into the carrying on of this Session.

So I would hope that you would understand, Mr. Speaker, that all my comments are germane to the amendment before us. They all stem from the reason why we're here, namely this government's wilful effort to hoist onto the people of Manitoba something which in very large numbers the people of Manitoba have shown in a way that is somewhat unique of course because the capability of having that opportunity of expressing themselves by means of a plebiscite or

referendum was not theirs to be had at the municipal level, until this government in their wisdom gave them that choice just a few years ago, because on another issue they were only too happy to hear the voice of the people speak on an issue even though on that particular issue the decisions that were called upon to be influenced had to be made in Washington or in Moscow or perhaps around the table in Geneva, having to do with the very worrisome problem of nuclear arms build-up.

But on that issue of course, this government was prepared to listen to the people and they asked this Legislative Assembly to amend The Municipal Act to allow for plebiscites and referendums which we did and then of course found themselves a short few months later when the people chose to exercise that right, to voice their opinion on something that is germane to Manitoba, something that can be done by the elected officials in this Chamber, something that we have a handle on, then of course, Mr. Speaker, that voice of the people was not to be listened to; was not to be taken into consideration; was in fact to be shrugged off as a meaningless exercise.

A MEMBER: Are you listening Howard?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to the question before us in four particular categories.

Mr. Speaker, having had all the time that one always wants to take to carefully prepare a structured speech, I want you to know that that is what I am doing. I want to break down the issue on subheadings if you like; (a) crass politics; (b) poor arithmetic; (c) bad political judgment and (d) and perhaps most important of all - is the unbelievable — (Interjection) — yes, as somebody else has coined the phrase the "unbelievatable", incompetent management that this government has exhibited in handling this very important, this very sensitive matter.

A MEMBER: But Harry, you can't expect anymore from the red . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let's speak about the first item, the matter of politics. I use the word crass politics because, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the motivation that brings us to discuss this amendment at this time is politics. They were told, I suspect mostly by the then Government House Leader, now Attorney General that if they moved in this direction, they could and would forever and a day secure the support of a particular ethnic minority group in Manitoba namely the French vote.

Mr. Speaker, I can have no other explanation for the difficulties and the problems that they've heaped upon themselves other than that explanation. Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General indicated and suggested to members on this side that the Conservative Party lacked the will, lacked the political will to move in this direction with respect to language rights.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party was in office for eight years, from 1969-77. What particular political will did they show during those eight years with respect to this question?

A MEMBER: Absolutely none.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this government and particularly this government knowing its tenuous hold onto office said to themselves early on that this was an area where they could secure forever, for generations perhaps, a particular voting block that would help sustain them in office.

Mr. Speaker, I say those remarks because as a somewhat seasoned politician I believe them to be true.

We come to section (b) of my comments. Bad arithmetic. Poor mathematics if you like. Mr. Speaker, have none of their back-room advisors told them that if we are talking about 6 percent of the vote, they had most of the vote to begin with? We know that. We are practical politicians on this side of the House. We know that by and large since the demise of the Liberal Party in Manitoba that went down in 1969 under the leadership of one Bob Bend - I had a passing interest in that particular election. But since the demise of the Liberal Party in Manitoba - and I say this with genuine regret - a substantial and significant portion of the French vote has gone to the New Democrats.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I say bad arithmetic or poor mathematics on the part of honourable members opposite, that's what I'm talking about. They were prepared to go through this torturous path to secure what? To secure something they, by and large, already had. Mr. Speaker, let me hastily point out that are of course exceptions to that general statement, as there always are when one generalizes. We have and continue to have and will have in the future significant support from the French community.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to speak more personally, it's always been one of my extremely satisfying moments in political life that on election day my constituency of Lakeside, which sometimes goes past unnoticed as not having a significant French vote, I want to tell you, Sir, that my constituency ranks among the highest in terms of French vote, taking in the communities of Elie, St. Eustache, St. Laurent, St. Ambrose, St. Francois Xavier, and it's been my good fortune and the Conservative Party's good fortune to garner upwards to 67, 68 percent of that vote.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not take lightly for one moment the question of being concerned about the French-Canadian vote, the Manitoban vote of people of French ancestry because it affects me very personally. I am very proud of that support and I have every intention of retaining that support, and I am satisfied that nothing I am doing today in this Chamber or have been doing in this Chamber in the past months on this issue is in any significant way going to take that vote away from me.

But, Mr. Speaker, coming back to the general view of matters, conceding as I am prepared to concede, that a significant portion of that vote transferred to the New Democrats during the Schreyer years and basically still enjoys the attention and this government enjoys the support to some significant extent of that part of our Manitoba community.

But, Mr. Speaker, that doesn't excuse these so-called politicians from not understanding and not being able to do simple and basic arithmetic. I don't know whether that's a reflection on our educational system, Mr. Speaker, or what it is, but it's there.

Bad political judgment and, Mr. Speaker, this is where perhaps honourable members fell down most badly, and I want to go into that for a little while, because again they were misled and particularly members of the NDP caucus and most Cabinet members were misled and they were misled, Mr. Speaker, why? They were misled, Mr. Speaker, because of the action taken by my former leader, Sterling Lyon, and the Conservative administration that he then formed in the years 1977 to 1981 when the Forest case went against us or went against the province in terms of the 1890 language bill that was arbitrarily passed in that year. It was finally struck out by the Supreme Court.

What was the reaction of the then Conservative administration? The reaction was immediate. The reaction was one of total acceptance of the Supreme Court's decision. The reaction was one of recognition that basic French rights, French language rights, had in fact been arbitrarily taken away in 1890 and I, Sir, was proud to be part of a government that saw to the restoration of those rights. Those rights were restored by this Legislature in an unanimous fashion, without any of the current upheaval, without any of the current emotions that are stirred, without any of the rancor that has gone through the Province of Manitoba. It was done by a responsible government, Mr. Speaker, and done posthaste.

The Supreme Court decision came down in late '79 and the first earliest opportune moment that this Legislature could act upon, it acted upon in rectifying the mistake, the error, the arbitrary action that was taken by a similar administration, although of a different political persuasion I remind you, Mr. Speaker. It was a Liberal Party that passed the 1890 legislation taking away Francophone rights in Manitoba and I am proud to say - and I would like La Liberté to report this accurately - that it was the Conservative administration that restored the original constitutional Francophone rights in Manitoba. That took place in this Chamber and that took place, Mr. Speaker, in a civil, but more importantly in a unanimous fashion in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, we then took it one step further. We weren't prepared simply, the dog in the manger attitude . . .

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable member opposite and I accept his admonition that I restrict any interruptions to those that are absolutely essential, which he made at the beginning of his remarks, but I don't think he'd want it on the record that Bill 2, 1980, passed unanimously in this House, because I think he knows from the Journals and having been in the House at that time that two members who presently occupy seats on this side voted against that bill on second reading.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I accept that correction from the Government House Leader, but surely in lieu of what we have been through since May and June on this issue that when you get a 57-member House, and our politics were as polarized then I remind you in terms of the make-up of this House as they are today, that when out of a 57-member House 55 members vote for

an issue I could be excused the licence of using and applying the word "unanimous" to describe that kind of situation. However, being correct on the issue I accept that correction, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the honourable member not to interrupt me again unless it is of substance, because I do wish to make these comments with some continuity and with some attempt to pull together the reasons why we're here under the circumstances that have brought us here, Mr. Speaker.

Coming back to the question of bad political judgment, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to honourable members opposite that they were told, when they were finally informed of the negotiations that the elitist view in that group were carrying on with Monsieur Bilodeau, with representatives of the Canadian Government, with representatives of the Franco-Manitoban Society, they were told by and large that, hey, this is not going to present any political problem for us. After all, that arch enemy of Francophone rights, so described from time to time, Sterling Lyon and those rednecked Conservatives had just a short year before, 1980, passed a bill that this Minister now prides himself in copying in terms of the title. He gets some particular enjoyment out of using the precise title of the bill that was passed by a Conservative administration in 1980 to restore fully and to reflect the Supreme Court decision of 1979.

Mr. Speaker, they were told, and I ask honourable members opposite, particularly members of the back bench, if that is not hitting pretty close to the mark? They were told, they didn't perceive that this was going to be the major political issue confronting them today, the issue on which this government will fall when next they go to the people. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I have to be right because I do credit some honourable members opposite there with some political acumen. Surely they could not have gone into this with their eyes wide open, knowing that this was going to happen, and coming to the conclusion eight months ago around the caucus table, around the Cabinet table, yes, we know we are going to be into the longest record-breaking Session of the history of Manitoba. We are going to rile up everyone from Argyle to Sprague, to Thompson, to Portage, to Brandon. We are going to have 400 or 500 briefs coming at us from all directions. We are going to lose defectors from our party, like the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and we're going to send on vacation to Poland other members who aren't too sure about how they want to vote on this issue. They didn't know all of that, Mr. Speaker, seven or eight months ago.

Mr. Speaker, through bad political judgment they stumbled and fell into this because they believed, and here's the bad political judgment, I'm not up to the incompetent, "unbelievable" incompetency, of this government yet. I'm now just talking about bad political judgment because they couldn't understand the difference between what was done in 1980 in the recognition and at the time was there and most Manitobans were prepared to restore original Francophone rights as guaranteed to them in the Constitution of The Manitoba Act in 1870. That's what we were doing, Mr. Speaker, in 1880; that's what the people of Manitoba accepted. Not necessarily all of them, Mr. Speaker. Don't let me for one moment leave

you with the impression that when that action was taken by the Sterling Lyon administration in 1880 that there was universal support for that. — (Interjection) — 1980, I have trouble with these little details from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you and I want to assure honourable members opposite that there were certainly within our supporters and within people of Manitoba generally some people who felt then and believe now that Manitoba should be unilingual and it should be English unilingual, and that took offence to Monsieur Forest in expending particularly the public tax money that he was given to spend on it on fighting the parking ticket case in the Supreme Court. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied and I continue to be satisfied, and the Conservative Party continues to be satisfied that they do not represent a majority opinion in Manitoba, certainly do not represent the opinion of the Conservative Party in Manitoba.

Our subsequent action in the speedy, competent way in which that bill was processed through this Chamber in 1980 demonstrated our political will with respect to acknowledging, with respect to re-entrenching, if you like, the 1870 language rights that were granted to the French-speaking community of Manitoba at the time this province was incorporated.

The difficulty, the bad political judgment, that honourable members opposite fell into was they couldn't define the difference between that action and that gut political feeling on the part of the Conservative Party and the part of my leader at that time and the part of the Cabinet at that time that the action that we were taking was imminently in large measure acceptable to people of Manitoba, people of all ethnic backgrounds, and truly constituted a majority and truly constituted a consensus in Manitoba that belatedly, perhaps 90 years or 93 years belatedly, there were many in this province that recognized that those fundamental francophone rights had indeed been trampled on, had indeed been arbitrarily taken away from them by an action of this Chamber.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservative administration in 1980 restored those rights, people accepted them and people understood it. When the Attorney-General in company with whoever then felt that that situation that I just finished describing would have the same acceptance and would have the same speedy expedient attention paid to it in this Chamber, that for the proposal that he and relatively few people in the Province of Manitoba and Canada arrived at that there was no difference between the two, that's what I call bad political judgment. Because, of course, what we are now confronted with and what we are now confronted with today in the amendment before us in respect to Section 23 is an extension of rights that were not there, Mr. Speaker, in 1870.

So, Mr. Speaker, the word "restoration," first of all, has been perhaps the word that has been abused most often in the course of this debate wilfully by members of the government, carelessly by other often well-meaning persons that have from time to time shown some support for the measures that the government has tried to put forward. But some of these people have been members of other ethnic communities that have come before us in committees and pleaded and lent support to the proposal that was then before us, which of course is not the proposal now before us.

In the overheated emotions that were being whipped up, and are still there, there was all of a sudden an element of fear developing in the Province of Manitoba that suggested that, well, if the French communities rights are being taken away - again a wrongly-used term - then our rights can be taken away. Of course, that's wrong, too, because nowhere in the 1870 Charter that incorporated Manitoba do we spell out rights for other than the English and the French languages under Section 23 and how they're to be used in the official conduct of business in this province.

But you managed to frighten a great deal of people into all of a sudden believing that somehow or other if that proposal wasn't supported then the very programs, Mr. Speaker, introduced again by a Progressive Conservative administration involving other languages, immersion languages in Ukrainian, in German, in Jewish or any other group that could put together the numbers and where the community will was there to provide them with that somehow those programs would be jeopardized. Mr. Speaker, my leader did such an excellent job in pointing that out. The mere fact that we are now, in this resolution before us, having to make special mention of those rights indicates the fact that there was indeed, and is indeed, a danger to those other rights by implication.

It wasn't necessary, Mr. Speaker, to have any comment about other languages in the original 1870 charter that developed and produced the constitution that we are working with today. It wasn't necessary to say that if in a community of strong population counts of Ukrainian background that they could have immersion courses in that language in their schools, or of any other language. But now all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to pass an amendment to ask Canada to pass, to amend our Constitution saying that what was done so easily and so readily before, can now be done, it will now be okay, you can carry on doing it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then that people were genuinely, and I say this sincerely, misled into believing some of the propaganda emanating from the government benches? Mr. Speaker, I call it bad political judgment because I honestly do not believe that any political party would wilfully cease on this issue as an issue that they want to be remembered by.

Mr. Speaker, it was nowhere to be seen in their election material. Mr. Speaker, we are very familiar with their election material. It's become a bit of a Bible to us in this Chamber. We often quote from it. We like to look at Howard Pawley's picture. But Mr. Speaker, nowhere in any of the election material that was put out by honourable members opposite when they were seeking office did it indicate that their burning priority, their political will as expressed by the Attorney-General was to move boldly forward in this direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I could only come to the conclusion that indeed it was unbelievably bad political judgement that has brought them to the present situation. They could not understand the difference between what was done with such ease, and such expediency, by the Progressive Conservative administration with respect to language rights and the restoration of language rights. Why then would it not be just as easy to do what they are trying to do? They couldn't understand the difference between their proposals. That's how it

was sold to them. That's how it was sold to their back bench that this was not going to be a burning issue. I honestly appeal to honourable members opposite if there's any one of them that can stand up, could have stood up, will stand up today, back in March, or back in April of last year and say that this was going to be the consequence of the action that they were being encouraged to take by the Attorney-General. I simply cannot believe that.

Mr. Speaker, you come to the final heading, the unbelievably incompetent way this matter has been handled. You know once having embarked on this course it was then made so much more torturous, and so much more unacceptable, in the manner and way in which this government handled the matter.

Mr. Speaker, read my leader's speech again who took us through that long history of when we first started on this matter. Mr. Speaker, it all demonstrates that this government really doesn't know what they are doing, is seeking any possible means to extricate themselves from the mess they're in and belies totally any serious consideration on the part of anybody, certainly anybody observing them day to day in this Chamber, as we did throughout the long hot summer, any ideologically committed will to a particular course of action.

They have fallen into this mess and they are now trying to climb up that slippery slope to get themselves out of it and they keep getting themselves deeper, Mr. Speaker. Changing ministerial responsibility is not going to help them, Mr. Speaker. Avoiding the petitions of so many thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands, of Manitobans is not going to help them, Mr. Speaker. What they have accomplished, Mr. Speaker, is having reintroduced into Manitoba a degree of, I want to choose my words carefully, but there surely is a heightened degree of separation between the language groups. In some instances I suppose it could be called the amount of bitterness that has been evoked in the course of the debate.

All of that, Mr. Speaker, despite the attempts of the honourable members opposite to castigate the Conservative Party, or my former leader, or anybody else, or any reeve, Reeve Harms who is the leader of the municipalities in Manitoba, despite the fact of trying to push blame on anybody else but themselves. It will not wash, Mr. Speaker, because in more calm times, when people have the time to sit back and think about it, several important things will be remembered:

(a) That it was a Conservative administration under Sterling Lyon that restored those rights, those French language rights, that were arbitrarily taken away in 1890. Nothing can change that record. That is a historic that is a fact of this House and that is something that my francophone community will certainly long remember, Mr. Speaker.

(b) This may be a little bit more difficult because the records are a little more blurred, or the memories can get a little more jaded and faded on this question, but the matters with which we exhibited our political will, I use that term because the Attorney-General kept throwing it back at us last night. Our political will, Mr. Speaker, with respect to acknowledging the rightful place of French language rights in this province was demonstrated in a number of policy initiatives undertaken when we were last the administration,

undertaken by the then Attorney-General, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, undertaken in setting up the French Secretariat, began commencing immediately with the translation of bills, as difficult and as onerous a job as that was.

But, Mr. Speaker, lest there be any comfort in the minds of any members opposite that the Conservative Party will fare badly in history with respect to this debate they are mistaken. If there are politicians that are making that judgment, they're exhibiting more bad political judgment, and if they persist in this course, Mr. Speaker, they will continue to reap in growing numbers loss of support from the general public. Mr. Speaker, that's getting harder and harder to do. Now, losing 20 percent is maybe not all that tough to do; losing another 20 percent gets a little harder. But they are getting very close to where they're starting to lose that last 10 or 12 percent, which is very hard to do, I'm prepared to acknowledge, and what are they left with? Back to that bad arithmetic that I mentioned in Item 2 of my speech, where they have trouble counting.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put this on the record. The Manitobans, the Franco-Manitobans of this province will come to their senses and not forgive this government for the way they had crassly used them in this political business and on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The time being very close to 5:30, if it's the will of the Chamber to call it 5:30, I am prepared to proceed with my remarks at 8:00.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., I'm leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.

The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs will have 40 minutes remaining.