



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. 173 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 1 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNESSE, 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

Wednesday, 1 February, 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 Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Home Orderly Service - funding

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health and I would ask him, of the \$20.4 million for home care assistance in the 1983-84 Estimates of the Department of Health, how much of that money is being expended on the services of the Home Orderly Service?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, of course I do not have that information with me at this time. I'll endeavour to get the information and give it to the House, but it seems to me that this is something that should be discussed during the Estimates review.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, while the Minister is researching the answer to that question, I wonder if he would seek out some additional information on that subject and provide it to the House.

Further questions on that subject would relate to the number of clients that the Home Orderly Service has and serves and the comparative figures for spending on Home Orderly Services and for the number of clients in previous years, dating back two or three years to the turn of the decade. If the Minister would provide that information it would be helpful, and if he would provide it well before his Estimates it would be helpful, in light of the criticisms swirling around the Home Orderly Services at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could also ask the Minister whether he can confirm the statement by the director of the office of Continuing Care - his office of Continuing

Care that - "There have been complaints of inadequate service," where Home Orderly Services is concerned.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's an easy one, Mr. Speaker, there's complaints in anything it seems in the Department of Health these days. Of course, I'll have a statement. On the previous question I should say that I will endeavour to get the information, but I certainly won't make a commitment at this time that I will have it long before the Estimates. The Estimates have to be prepared and all this information will be had at this time.

I might say that as far as the orderly services are concerned, we've had the policy announced. I think that we're looking at the possibility of taking over the delivery of that service at the department and that was announced awhile ago; but for the time being, for this year anyway, we're going to ask for tenders and we've asked some of the groups affected, especially the physically handicapped people to meet with us, to sit with us and to try to work on the terms of reference that we should have for this tender, and that should be going out fairly soon. This is not an obligation that these tenders will not only be offered to the one firm; anybody and everybody is free to apply and present the tenders.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister or perhaps his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, advise the House what happened to the investigation into Home Orderly Services that was conducted, ostensibly completed and ostensibly satisfied that government within the past two years, an investigation arising out of wild and extreme accusations, I might say, that were delivered against that service and against this government when it was in office by the Minister of Mines and Energy?

What happened to that report which seemed within the past two years to satisfy the government, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, first of all there was an investigation and it was found that there was extra billing, if I might call it, in other words billing that shouldn't be done. That was corrected. The operator had to return some money to the government. There has been a new system that we help set up with him and that is being done now. I would want to say that I'm not suggesting that it was a criminal intent, but nevertheless the bookkeeping left an awful lot to be desired. That has been rectified.

Now the situation, I think we can improve the situation. It's not going to be easy, it's not going to guarantee that if the government takes it over there won't be any complaints, but we're certainly looking at it. We've improved a lot of the complaints. We've remedied and we've addressed some of the complaints. For instance, we're looking at better training for some of these

orderlies, but the situation is being looked at now, as I said. We'll ask for tenders and there will be terms of reference, and that will be worked on with the group, as I mentioned.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy in his capacity as a member of the Executive Council.

In view of the fact that he represents a constituency which contains a leading spokesman for the League for the Physically Handicapped . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Minister of Health on a point of order.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there is no question. He can speak after if he is in order, but I think he is out of order if he tries to answer it. Mr. Speaker, the situation is that you cannot ask if the Minister wants to answer it. Well, I don't think that you can ask a Minister on a responsibility that is not under his own department.

MR. SPEAKER: I will first hear the question.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, then, perhaps I can direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy in his capacity as backup Minister of Health.

In view of the fact, Sir, that one of the leading spokesmen for the physically disabled in this province lives in his constituency and has been in ongoing contact over the years both with him and with me on this problem relative to Home Orderly Services, I would like to ask the Minister whether he has received, in recent weeks or even months, direct complaints from that spokesman or from the League for the Physically Handicapped with respect to the Home Orderly Service?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is not proper to be addressed to another Minister on a matter which is not within his responsibility.

Order please.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I will redirect my question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker.

Has the Minister of Health been approached in recent weeks or months by his colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, with respect to specific complaints and grievances emanating from a relatively significant spokesman for the physically handicapped, who lives in the constituency of the Minister of Mines and Energy, about shortcomings of the Home Orderly Service?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been approached repeatedly by the Minister. I have been trying to duck him lately.

I believe that his intervention is probably responsible for the Treasury Board allowing the department to ask for tenders only for one year instead of three and accepting in principle that we should take over the service as soon as possible. I think that the responsibility

for that or the credit or blame or anything should go to the Minister.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Can the Minister explain, why he would get those complaints from his colleague, from one Mrs. Theresa Ducharme and others in view of the extreme interest expressed by the Minister of Mines and Energy when he was in opposition about that service and his pledge to do something about it? Why would the Minister be getting those complaints today two years later?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I can explain . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . this, that the Minister in his capacity as an MLA representing certain people that made representation to me on a number of occasions and has helped certainly as a member of the Treasury Board also at one time in formulating the policy that we're adopting now.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Would the Minister concur, Mr. Speaker, with the observation that with that kind of help, with those kinds of friends, he doesn't need any enemies?

It's been two years since the Minister of Mines and Energy raised accusations about that service, stayed and manipulated a press conference to try and embarrass the Government of the Day, and the reports from spokesmen such as Mrs. Ducharme are, that nothing has been done and she hasn't even received responses from the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would the Minister concur that perhaps he should be spared from that kind of assistance and help, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order. The question as posed seeks an opinion from the Treasury Bench, not for information. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that the Member for Fort Garry is trying to somehow ask me questions and is prevented to, so by parliamentary rules as a result he's breaking the rules in asking questions of the Minister of Health. I must say in that point of order that his attempts are futile because, Mr. Speaker, I as a member of the opposition found no co-operation from the then Minister of Health who is now the Member for Fort Garry on this issue. I found tremendous co-operation from the present Minister of Health on this issue . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. W. PARASIUK: We believe we can resolve the matter that was left to fester for four years by that uncaring government. We are a government that cares. We take time to clean up the mess that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There was no point of order, I had already ruled the question out of order.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, then would the Minister of Mines and Energy if he cares to take the question, accept the observation from this side of the House and from spokesmen for the League of the Physically Handicapped, from clients for the Home Orderly Services and for particular constituents of his that he has done nothing? And there has not been any action taken?

Attorney-General - defamation settlement

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Could the Minister of Finance confirm that he and the government have agreed to settle another threatened law suit against the Attorney-General and have agreed to pay former Judge Baryluk the sum of \$55,000, Mr. Speaker? Can the Minister explain the reasons for the settlement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any lawsuit against the Attorney-General. Certainly there was a settlement arranged with Judge Baryluk, as the member knows, with unification of the courts; and as Judge Baryluk himself indicated there is a surplus of judges in the Provincial Judges Court at the present time and there was an arrangement with respect to his retirement. That's something that I could take as notice with respect to the specific details of the settlement.

Retirement age - judges

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance both in his capacity as Minister of Finance and as Acting Attorney-General. In view, Mr. Speaker, of the fact that civil servants have the right to work past age 65, what is the policy with respect to judges? Will they be allowed to work past 65 as long as they are able?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That item is currently under review, but clearly even for judges there has to be work.

Land Titles Office - fee schedule

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Minister. Could the Minister justify the almost 52 percent increase in the Land Titles Office fees for the purchaser of an average-priced home? Could he justify that increase in view of the fact that the Land Titles Office has for years - its revenue has exceeded its and in

view of the 3 percent guideline that the Minister has issued with respect to increases in grants?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, on that particular item, there was an increase on tariffs that hadn't been increased since 1976 and those increases don't keep up, as I understand it, with inflation between 1976 and 1984, but I can get a full report on the particulars of the increases for the honourable member.

MR. G. MERCIER: One final question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not acknowledge that the Land Titles Office fee schedule is a percentage of the value of the transaction that is involved, so that as the prices have increased since 1976, the revenue has increased to the Land Titles Office because they've been taking a percentage of a higher price over those years?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: A number of those fees are based on the value of property which I would say, since 1976 in some instances, certainly has not kept up with inflation. A lot of our properties have not kept up with inflation since then. Mr. Speaker, there's also a whole range of charges there that do not relate to the value of the item being purchased or sold or the value of the mortgage. There's a whole host of fixed costs as well that have nothing to do with the value of the item.

Workers Compensation Board - firing and hiring

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board which is now advertising for a French-speaking employee. I would like to ask the Minister whether he approves of this hiring or whether he himself specifically approved the hiring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Workers Compensation Board did not request nor require the approval of the Minister to fill in the vacant position in the Rehabilitation Department.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that presently the Workers Compensation Board has the capacity to provide services to the people of Manitoba in eight different languages; and in the Rehabilitation Department there was no one with the capacity to deal with the injured workers, who are in the process of being rehabilitated, in the French language, and there are a number of rehabilitation officers in that department.

The time was decided, I suppose, by the Workers Compensation Board that when they were filling the position, that it would be appropriate to fill in one of those positions as one of three, I understand, that are being filled with someone with bilingual capacity.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to then direct a question to the First Minister and ask him, since apparently the position was the result of a single letter by a French-speaking Manitoban, can we take this as

an indication of the government's will to react to public pressure?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with the question under discussion, and in fact we have constantly heard in this debate from members of the opposition that while they were in government they were providing such services . . .

MR. H. ENNS: How can you do it without entrenching it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, we have also provided some of these services. The two issues are not related, and the fact that one request or one particular claimant might have triggered the response of the Workers Compensation Board at the time, is not based simply on one request. One request might, at this time, trigger it while they are filling positions that are currently vacant.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister and ask him whether a Manitoban, if a request comes into the government by a single person who spoke Ukrainian or German or Polish, would they then get a similar response from the government? In other words, would a hiring be made upon that sort of demand? Is that a sufficient demand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Perhaps I could try to rephrase it and ask the First Minister whether the government has a policy of hiring staff in response to a demand by one or more people who speak Ukrainian, German, Polish, Icelandic, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member ought to recall in fact a similar question that was posed to the Minister, then responsible for the Civil Service, that outlined that there were a number of applicants for public servant positions that had been hired that could speak German, Cree, Ukrainian, etc., depending upon the particular use and need in given circumstances. Of course, Mr. Speaker, what decent government would not want to ensure that there would be communication with those who are unable to speak English?

Civil Service Commission - hirings

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the First Minister whether civil servants are now being encouraged to hire bilingual staff, French-English bilingual staff, in anticipation of the passage of either the resolution and/or Bill 115?

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister responsible for highlighting through the present French language proposals through this House. In view of the questions and answers just given in this Chamber, and in view of the common sense just displayed by the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board who is having no difficulty in providing French services in an important area of service to Manitobans, why is the legislation before us? Why is this constitutional proposal before us?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the only conclusion I can come to from the question asked by the Opposition House Leader is that he completely missed the point of the answers provided by the Minister of the Environment. If the member doesn't understand why the package is before us, perhaps he has eight months of filibuster speeches he should reread.

Red River Health District - inquiry at Morris

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: I would like to pose a question to the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the Minister of Health could indicate whether or not he has ordered an inquiry into the administration of the Red River Health District.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, no, I haven't ordered an inquiry, but as requested by the members of the board, I have agreed that there would be an investigation of some kind as I say, at their request, after meeting with them and some of the elected members of the Town of Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, on their behalf, I thank the Minister for consenting to that request.

I wonder if the Minister could indicate who will be conducting that investigation, and as to whether that person will come from within MHSC or not. Could he also indicate that submissions of people making representation to that investigation, whether they will be treated in total confidence and more so whether those submissions can be given outside of the local hospital?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it would be fair to mention the name of this person now for the simple reason that, as far as I know, the person has not been approached as yet, therefore, has not said whether he would be willing or not to do this work, but I can assure you that it won't be anybody from the Manitoba Health Services Commission or from the board of that hospital.

As far as the information given, they certainly intend to discuss with them, or at least my Deputy Minister if I can't possibly do it, and one of the points that we have discussed is that the information would be given in confidence. Outside of the hospital that might be difficult because then they would know who is going outside of the hospital and it might be that people will be suspected, but we will find a way to either call in every single employee at one time or other during the course of the day in the hospital, or during the course of the investigation, to see if they have anything to give. It would be my intention to make sure that this is being kept confidential unless, of course, there is some - and I certainly don't expect this - but if there was criminal action or something that names would have to be named and the informant would have to be so informed.

MR. C. MANNES: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given that there will be no specific names mentioned in the final report, will that final report be made available to interested citizens of Morris, Emerson, St. Jean and other valley towns? And, furthermore, when will that report be completed?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that there is no witch hunting, certainly no intention of witch hunting, and the situation is that at the request of the board and after meeting with different concerned citizens and elected representatives, we agreed to go in that direction. As far as I am concerned, it will be very low key; I am not going to necessarily start a battle then that won't help anybody.

Now, if for some reason or other there is something wrong, something that could not be condoned with, then that's a different story. But, as of now, there is no decision has been made as to, should it be made public or not. Right now, it is at the request of the board of the hospital. It'll be returned to the board of the hospital. Now, as I say, you have to remember that the boards are responsible for the hospital. If there's any danger of patients suffering or the standard of care being reduced, well, then it's a different matter.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Could the Minister indicate how many positions within the Manitoba Telephone System have been identified as bilingual positions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if there are any, but I'll certainly attempt to find out for my friend, the Member for Pembina.

Autopac classifications

MR. D. ORCHARD: I look forward to that information. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Autopac, Mr. Speaker. On Friday of last week I posed

certain questions to the Minister regarding the position, the policy of Autopac in view of people finding themselves underinsured and what the company policy would be, and the Minister in his answer indicated he didn't know from whence my question stemmed.

I'd like to quote from a pamphlet sent by Autopac to all drivers in Manitoba renewing their insurance. Mr. Speaker, in this pamphlet it says, "If the insurance use or territory is different from the use or territory previously declared by you, then you are invalidating your Autopac coverage. If you have an accident, Autopac can and will refuse to pay your claim." My question today to the Minister is, will he assure the drivers of Manitoba who find themselves inadvertently underinsured, that this veiled threat by Autopac will not be carried forward as a matter of standard policy of the corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know where the Member for Pembina has been for the last number of years. That particular policy has been in effect for a good number of years. I indicated last week when that question was raised, I made it very clear that if the person registering the vehicle was consciously falsifying information, then Autopac will deny benefits, but where the error was made in error, certainly, Autopac has been quite lenient. I'm not aware of any case that has been brought to my attention over the past year-and-a-half where benefits have been denied.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary to the Minister, in view of the fact that it is Autopac's stated policy that if you have an accident Autopac can and will refuse to pay your claim, would the Minister consider issuing a directive from the Minister's office requiring Autopac to comply with legislated requirements in Ontario where they simply require payment of the additional premium and do not deny the claim, would the Minister consider issuing that directive to Autopac?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I'm very surprised to hear that sort of suggestion from a former Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation. It's quite evident that if all you had to do - I'm certainly not aware that is the case in Ontario - was to make up the difference in the premiums, that the system would open itself to wide-open abuse, and it would be unworkable.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I might point out to Minister that I've never been responsible for Autopac . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and I would ask the Minister if he will personally determine whether there has been deliberate misrepresentation of insurance coverage or will he leave that up to the Autopac insurance claims adjusters to make that arbitrary decision?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Certainly, if there is a case where a person has his/her benefits denied allegedly

because of an error in insuring, then if that matter is brought to my attention, I will undertake to review it.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate to this Assembly and to the employees of the Department of Agriculture as to how many of the positions within the Department of Agriculture will have to be bilingual or will be bilingual with the implementation of their proposed legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there's going to be any change, and for the benefit of the honourable member, I believe that we have within the department now somewhere in the neighbourhood of 60 people who are bilingual and are in positions within the department.

MR. H. ENNS: All without legislation, all without entrenchment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . we're providing this service . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . Amazing grace.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to hear that. Could the Minister now to this Assembly and to the people of Manitoba confirm that what he and his government are doing to expand the services aren't necessary to do what a government can do by policy and has been carried out for a long time? Would he now come to his senses, Mr. Speaker, and back off from what they're trying to force through this Assembly on to the people of Manitoba and continue to implement it as it has been done in the past?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Does the honourable member have a question rather than a statement?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, clearly what the honourable member is indicating in this House and the people of Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I'm still waiting for the honourable member to pose his question rather than posing an argument.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation and responsible for the Motor Vehicle Branch. Will the Minister confirm that the Manitoba drivers' licences will continue to be

issued in both French and English as they have in the last few years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, obviously there will be no change, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Highways indicate to me what requirements, if any, of bilingual staff have been requested of his department should this legislation pass?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it takes a bilingual person to make up a bilingual registration and licence. Certainly, there has been no requirements made.

MR. R. BANMAN: That's an unbelievable answer.

Wildlife report

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . when the Minister's department released the Five-Year Report on the status of Wildlife populations in the province, the Minister had indicated that perhaps the effect of hunting by Treaty Indians was overestimated and the effect of poaching was underestimated. Has the Minister had any studies undertaken to prove out that position that he was taking?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there are ongoing studies in monitoring of big game and wildlife in Manitoba, and I want to put on the record that I assume that the opposition will be wondering about a bilingual program for ducks next.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Minister is so sensitive about this issue. I simply asked him a straightforward question whether he had any studies undertaken that would assess the effects of poaching on big-game populations in Manitoba? Could the Minister give me an answer to that question, please?

HON. A. MACKLING: I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that there are ongoing monitoring programs. We are involved in studies of the big game and upland game and bird populations, and that's an ongoing concern. We spend far too much time here with the bells ringing for me to really get to work on some of those questions.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister advise the House whether or not his department has specifically funded a study looking into the effects of poaching upon big-game populations in Manitoba?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, there are various studies that go on. There are studies that are part of the — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: You know, the Honourable Member for Pembina says try the truth. The Honourable Member for Pembina has never exemplified that in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . Mr. Speaker, the department does fund programs of various kinds including research through the Natural Resources Institute, and certainly we are very concerned to get as much information as we can. Some of those studies have been made and we certainly have the benefit of looking at them and weighing the influence of poaching and weighing the depredation by other means as well.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister give us a specific answer then to this specific question. Did the department fund a study through the Natural Resources Institute undertaken by a graduate student to look into the effects of poaching upon big-game populations in the province?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we have funded a number of studies and I know that included in that funding there are one or more of such that the honourable member refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Will the Minister agree to table a copy then of that report that deals with that subject?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement. I believe those studies that are commissioned by department may be for the department only. I will have to consider that. Certainly I have seen some of those studies and in some respects I think that they are internal working documents. I will have to question that with my department.

Moratorium on adoption

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, last week I was asked a question by the Member for St. Norbert about the impact of the moratorium on Native adoptions, and I undertook to bring him back specific figures.

At the time the moratorium was put in place in March of '82, there were 74 Native children listed with the Adoptions Registry. Since that time, 24 more Native children have been added for a total of 98; 74 of these children have been placed with Native families, leaving 24. These are mainly older or handicapped and are somewhat harder to place. Previously, they would have been placed in the United States. The Director of Child Welfare is now ready to recommend rules for the placement of Native children within the province.

Protocols are being developed in concert with the recommendations from Judge Kimelman in his Interim Report and in discussion with Native and traditional child care agencies and it's expected that as these are adopted that all Native children requiring placement will find location.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer. I would ask her of the 74 that she says have been placed with Native families, have they been adopted? How many of those 74 have actually been adopted?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, they have what we call permanent placement, so that is the equivalent of adoption, yes.

Flyer Industries Limited

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister in charge of MDC Flyer Industries.

It has been reported, Mr. Speaker, that 11 people were laid off for 10 days and 63 indefinitely, and 5 permanently, can the Minister advise the House when these workers will be recalled to Flyer Industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason for the most recent short-term layoffs, and their plan to be short-term layoffs, is the lack of supplies that are being received from a supplier in the United States that is in the unfortunate position of having strike action that is causing the lack of supplies - parts for the production of the buses - and as a result there has to be a short-term layoff of staff.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AND SUB-AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you call the resolution. I believe, on Page 2 of the Order Paper currently standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Government House Leader, and the sub-amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday when I began my address to the sub-amendment moved by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I began by commending the Government House Leader for his decision to remove the closure motion from the heads of the members of the opposition. Albeit as I said, it was a day too late and it was still coupled with a veiled threat to reimpose it, but nevertheless, better late than never. — (Interjection) — The Government House Leader says it wasn't a veiled threat, he meant every word of it. So that's fine, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of conditions that don't go too far towards encouraging good feelings between both sides of the House. But as I say, nevertheless whatever he did I suggest that it was better for him to remove the threat of closure, whether it be permanently or temporarily, and allow continued debate on the constitutional resolution and the amendments thereto.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the topic of closure which is what has brought about so much of the rancor and acrimony and divisiveness of the last few days, I think that we should examine the whole application, the use that it was put to last week and the threat of it happening again on this constitutional resolution. When it was brought last week, to close debate on second reading of Bill 115, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House were certainly outraged and indeed, I think there's no question the public was as well.

In fact, at committee just yesterday and listening to the presentations on Bill 115, both in the morning and again in the evening, speakers mentioned the fact that they had not even been interested or really aware of the ramifications of this whole French language proposal until they became aware of the fact that the government was going to be imposing closure on the matter and that seemed like such a major step, such a draconian measure to take on anything, they felt that they better get interested and become aware of the consequences and the considerations that were resulting in closure being brought on this House on a substantive matter, for the first time in 54 years.

Two speakers referred to it, Mr. Speaker, and as I say, they indicated that they had hardly been aware of the issue prior to the closure motion being brought and that so alarmed them and so awakened their senses to it that they felt they ought to become aware of just what was going on. Having become aware, they then proceeded to examine the issue, to find out what was at stake, what was involved and they too became

concerned, alarmed, if not outraged, Mr. Speaker, because they became aware of the fact that what we were dealing with was an issue that would readjust or reapportion fundamental rights for all Manitobans, both today and in the future.

They said that they felt they had to come and make their views known because they had all of a sudden had their concerns awakened and their awareness told them that this was indeed a major step and one that should be of concern to all Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, that's surprising, that when we talk about closure having been imposed on this issue, it's surprising in light of the fact that on Friday the Premier made a statement during question period in which he said that this was 58th on a list of 61 priorities, in his view, for his government to deal with at the present time. Just so that I'm not accused of putting words in his mouth, I'll read exactly what he said on Page 5777 of Hansard: "Hon. H. Pawley: Mr. Speaker, what would be more irresponsible but to go to the people on what would be about No. 58 in 61 issues of importance to the people of Manitoba?" No. 58, by way of range of priority and importance, that's what the Premier said about it, Mr. Speaker.

How is it possible that a matter of so little import to this government, to this Premier. 58 out of 61, invokes closure on this House, on the debate in this House? How is it possible, Mr. Speaker? How is it possible when — (Interjection) — sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services says that's a different issue. Closure was invoked on second reading of Bill 115 and closure was invoked on the constitutional resolution. Mr. Speaker, he now agrees with me. That's the issue he says is 58th out of 61 on his list of priorities. — (Interjection) — The French language issue. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services is having difficulty understanding so I guess I have to go back to the beginning.

The question that brought about the Premier's answer was a question asking him whether or not he'd go to the public on an election based on the French language issue and his response was that why would he go to the public on that issue when it is of so little importance that it's 58th out of 61.

We've established now that we've brought closure on an issue that has very little concern for the government in terms of priority. You have to say to yourself, how is it then that this issue has caused such tremendous concern, confrontation and conflict even within the New Democratic Government? Let's face it, Mr. Speaker, this issue that's 58th in priority for this government has caused a member of its caucus to break ranks and leave the caucus and sit over on this side, the Member for Elmwood - 58 out of 61 - and they have a member leave caucus over it.

Some of the most prominent members of their party have not only broken ranks with the party and left the party but they had to take the measure of kicking out one of the most prominent members of their party over this issue. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to acknowledge on the record the hilarity with which that statement was greeted because the Premier obviously feels that Mr. Schulz is not one of their most prominent members despite the fact that he, Mr. Schulz, is the brother-in-law of the former Premier, Mr. Schreyer, was the special advisor to the former NDP Premier,

Mr. Schreyer, was the architect of many of their policies that they carried forward in the '70s. He articulated more so than many of their members their philosophies; he was on the provincial executive and they kicked him out over this issue, this issue that's 58th out of 61 in their order of priority of importance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: This issue that's of so little importance to the government has resulted in the longest Session in our history in this Legislature. It has spanned three years because it began in December of 1982, so we're now into 1984, all because of this issue; and yet it's of so little importance to this government, 58 out of 61.

The debate consumed a space of nine months, both in the Legislature and in committee hearings and so on; it has been the longest in terms of sitting days in the history of any Session of the Manitoba Legislature, yet it's of so little importance it's 58 out of 61 on their priorities and they had to bring closure for the first time in 54 years to this Legislature on this item. Mr. Speaker, one has to ask the question, what will they do on a really important issue? What measure will they bring in on something that's really important to this government? What will they do on No. 57 or 56?

MR. L. SHERMAN: They convulsed the province on No. 58.

MR. G. FILMON: It's unbelievable. Why have they imposed closure, firstly, on the bill and now on the constitutional resolution? Well, the rationale that is being given by various members in various speeches, the Member for Thompson said it just yesterday, I believe, was that there has been enough talk on this; there have been enough speeches given. He used the figure, as did the Premier, as did the Minister of Municipal Affairs, there have been over 100 speeches on this issue. Not so, Mr. Speaker, not on this constitutional resolution and the amendments thereto. There have not been anywhere near 100 speeches.

This is an entirely different proposition to what was before this House last spring and throughout the summer, and everybody has said so, including the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he brought in his vastly changed proposal, his entirely new approach to it. He said, Mr. Speaker, that this was an entirely different proposition.

So we are not talking about the same issue today. They are not bringing closure on the same matter today, and the speeches that they are referring to are not those that were given on the constitutional resolution or the amendments thereto. Those 100 speeches, Mr. Speaker, were to do with things like the debate over referral to committee when members opposite, for weeks and weeks and weeks, refused to allow this matter to go to committee; had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into having this matter go to a committee at which public hearings could be held. They had to do . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: They had to do, Mr. Speaker, with whether or not this government would submit to public hearings at which the public could be heard on this issue. They had to do with this silly and now apparently dishonest timetable that we were being told about - December 31, 1983 - absolute deadline, nothing beyond it, and so on. Mr. Speaker, that is what the 100 speeches were about; it was not about this constitutional resolution and the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is saying that I am giving the same information in the speech. The reason I am giving in it is because his members persist in giving us false information here in the House. Just as recently as yesterday, the Member for Thompson tried to say that there has been over 100 speeches on the constitutional resolution and the amendment thereto. That is not true, Mr. Speaker, and that's the point that is before us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, since the new year we have been dealing with a vastly different proposal, in the very words of the Minister of Municipal Affairs who introduced it to this House, it's an entirely different proposal, substantial changes now split into two parts: the amended constitutional resolution and Bill 115 which lays out proposals for French language services in the public service of Manitoba. He has called this a watered-down proposal.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I never have; I never said watered down.

MR. G. FILMON: He hasn't, okay. Well, there are others, Mr. Speaker, who have called it a watered-down proposal.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The SFM, the Societe franco-manitobaine.

MR. G. FILMON: The Societe franco-manitobaine has suggested that it is a very watered-down proposal, Mr. Speaker; that it has been altered; that it has been changed substantially.

So let's take a look for the record, Mr. Speaker, for the Member for Thompson, at what has occurred on this particular resolution and the amendments.

MR. D. SCOTT: Gary, we want to hear what you think, not the Member for Thompson.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, whenever the Member for Inkster is finished, I will be happy to proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at what debate has actually occurred since the new year on the proposal that is before us.

On the bill, 115, in second reading, we had one speech on this side. One speech on second reading of the bill. I was the one who made that speech. Beyond that, we moved a motion for a six-month hoist on the bill.

HON. A. ANSTETT: No, no. You rang the bells for four days.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: And we had seven or eight speakers on the six-month hoist. Mr. Speaker, after that, after seven or eight speakers on the six-month hoist - bang, on came the closure motion. One speech on second reading, seven or eight speeches on the hoist motion and bang! - closure comes on the bill.

Now what's their hidden agenda, Mr. Speaker? What timetable are we working on today? We have eliminated the deadline of December 31, 1983. What is the hidden agenda, what timetable, or whose deadline are we working towards today? Is it the annual meeting of the NDP Party to be held here in about two weeks? Is that the deadline? Is that what we want to get rid of this for? Because, Mr. Speaker, we are being told that the government is determined to push this through on their timetable and their deadlines.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look - that was the bill. Now let's take a look at the constitutional resolution and the amendments. We have had four speakers on this side on the main constitutional resolution; we have had 19 on the amendment proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs; we have had eight, I believe, on the sub-amendment of my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry; and that's what we have had at this point in time on the constitutional matter.

We have had a total of something like 30 or 31 speeches, and that has triggered closure, closure, Mr. Speaker, on a constitutional resolution, an amendment to our Constitution that will be there likely for all time in future. Thirty speeches on our side was too much for this government to endure and caused them to bring about a threat of closure and the attempt at closure and that, despite the fact that we have not had any position taken by members opposite on the sub-amendment of the Member for Fort Garry. We have not had them put on the record where they stand.

All we have on the record, Mr. Speaker, is speeches outside this House by the Minister of Municipal Affairs who has said it's a major reversal. I am pleased with it, he said. That's what he said, and nobody on that side has said anything else about the matter. So you have to wonder why we are outraged. I don't think you have to wonder at all, Mr. Speaker. We are outraged because they haven't even taken a position on our sub-amendment and yet they are invoking closure. I think it's a terrible situation.

HON. A. ANSTETT: The Attorney-General took a position on it last Wednesday.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, if the Attorney-General took a position on it, Mr. Speaker, then I would like to have somebody over there explain it because the Attorney-General sure obfuscated where he stood on that matter and he spoke a lot around it, but he sure didn't tell us whether or not they are prepared to support it.

HON. A. ANSTETT: He said we were opposed to it.

A MEMBER: Read Hansard.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, now we get it from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, they are opposed to it. Well, I would like to know what the substance of their argument is on the matter because I believe that we have provided them with a viable alternative that should be considered by members on that side rather than the imposition of closure - rather than the imposition of closure.

I think it's an unbelievable response from an unbelievable government that they should prefer to bring in this draconian measure of closure rather than have debate take place on a viable, reasonable sub-amendment of ours and this being done by a government that prides itself in upholding civil liberties. Prides itself . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . Prides itself in upholding civil liberties and that brings out a cry of delight from the Member for Inkster, Mr. Speaker.

All of the freedoms which they say they cherish in Manitoba including freedom of speech - freedom of speech that's what they say they believe in - that's one of the civil liberties and they're willing to snuff it out, Mr. Speaker, by closure on a constitutional resolution and amendments. It's unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, never again will Manitobans believe their pious and deceitful utterings, they go on. They start with, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." You know all of those things that they promised in here, that they could do for Manitobans that they aren't doing right now and that they'll never do because these promises were false, could never be lived up to and won't be lived up to, Mr. Speaker.

Well, he started with that and now they're trampling on democratic rights and freedoms of all Manitobans when they bring closure in on this constitutional resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the wolf is out of sheep's clothing right now. The wolf has shed his sheep's clothing. We know what they really believe in when it comes to civil liberties, individual rights and freedoms. Now we know what they believe in; and of course the ultimate irony is that it should come from this Government House Leader, this Government House Leader who has said over and over again how much he wants to protect the democratic freedoms and principles of this Legislature, the traditions of this House. This Government House Leader who refused to accept Speed-up because he believed that that was a form a closure, the long hours that it forced us to go into, that the relaxation of the rules lead to sloppiness and forced passage of legislation under duress. So he couldn't accept that, Mr. Speaker, because his own beliefs in democratic freedoms and principles of parliamentary democracy wouldn't allow him to accept Speed-up, but he can impose closure after 30 speeches - he can impose closure - after nine speeches on Bill 115 he can impose closure. — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: It's because of 14 hours of bell ringing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: It's just because of your stubbornness.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I can't believe it. I can't believe it. Mr. Speaker, even last evening in committee he goes onto say that if people aren't there despite the fact that two or three of them had been there several times before, he's cut off the public representations on the bill. Well, I ask this Government House Leader, does the end justify the means?

What's happened to the democracy of the people, by the people, for the people? What's happened to that, Mr. Speaker? I ask this Government House Leader. His answer, closure. Closure from a Premier, Mr. Speaker, whose always lecturing us on his commitment to democracy, to our freedoms.

You know, on Sunday I had the great pleasure of being in the constituency of the Premier, the Constituency of Selkirk. He and I attended together a very very pleasant function in his constituency. Both of us were asked to address, Mr. Speaker, a group of young students at the Lord Selkirk Regional Secondary School for their Youth Parliament. Mr. Speaker, as I've seen him do often before he went into a great deal of hand-wringing and mustering up all the full effect of his mock outrage and concern for the protection of individual democratic rights and freedoms as he told people about the words of a woman that he had met in Chile in 1978 when he visited there, admonishing him at that time to never take liberty, freedom or democracy for granted.

She told him at that time, in 1978, that her people had taken their liberty, their freedom and their democratic rights for granted and all of a sudden they woke up one morning and they'd lost them. She said to him, and those were his words to those young people in Selkirk, never take democracy for granted. Our parliamentary system here in Canada is so fragile and we all have to be absolutely sure that we're always protecting it, Mr. Speaker, and I wondered how he could square that view with closure, closure that he and his government were bringing in on a constitutional amendment.

A MEMBER: You preached on Sunday, and on Monday you violated it.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, let's leave aside the second reading of a major substantive bill and the closure that was brought on that but this is a constitutional amendment now that we are bringing closure on. It's to be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada, not likely ever to be able to be changed again, redefining language rights and possibly disrupting the fragile balance and the bargain that was made in 1870, 114 years ago, and restored in good faith in 1980. Now we're dealing with the establishment of new rights, Mr. Speaker. How could this Premier who says publicly how much he supports freedoms and parliamentary democracy - if he truly believes what he said on Sunday - how could he bring in this closure motion? Does the end justify the means, I ask you?

You know on constitutional matters, Mr. Speaker, most organizations have very special provisions for bringing about a change in the Constitution. Some,

including the New Democratic Party, if you want to bring in a change to their Constitution as I understand it, you have to have a two-thirds majority vote to bring in a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of their own party.

Other organizations take the precaution of requiring you to bring in a proposal for constitutional amendment at one annual meeting, for presentation and voting on it at the next annual meeting. So they give you a tremendous safeguard. An entire year for sober second thought and consideration, Mr. Speaker. Those are strong provisions that are put in normally for constitutional amendments.

Do you know that in Bill 115 that's before us, it requires a two-thirds majority of this Assembly to replace the ombudsman? Two-thirds of the majority of this Assembly just to replace the ombudsman, but you can bring in a constitutional amendment with just a bare majority and it may well be a bare majority. I suggest to you that at very best there's going to be a five-vote spread when this comes, it's getting better and better.

Mr. Speaker, you can bring that in under closure - with a five-vote spread you can bring in a constitutional amendment. That's the way they want to do it.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Trudeau spent 13 years arriving at consensus before he got his Constitution through - 13 years - and everyone, I think, appreciates how strongly he was committed to his Constitution, how strongly he was committed to bringing that in to Canada, to patriating the Constitution, and he waited patiently, and probably impatiently, for 13 years. This government says, without consensus, without a mandate, under the pressure of closure they are going to put through an amendment to the Constitution. That is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know what madness has overtaken the government to bring in this kind of measure, Mr. Speaker. What pressures are we under that the opposition, the Legislature and the people of Manitoba can be dealt with so contemptuously on this issue? Mr. Speaker, how are they so sure that they're right now?

A MEMBER: They weren't right last June.

MR. G. FILMON: After so many twists and turns in the road, after so many different proposals, how can they be sure that this is the right proposal when it still doesn't bear any consensus, when it still doesn't bear the stamp of approval or approbation by the people of Manitoba? How can they be so sure, so sure that they bring it in under closure, Mr. Speaker?

When we began with it last spring it was a very untidy and ill-prepared package. Look at it now. Is it any better? I don't know, Mr. Speaker. Let's take a look at some of the provisions that are still before us and let's see whether or not there's anything there that raises any red flags still in people's minds when we're dealing with this new proposal.

For instance, 23.1, the matter that's been proposed to be removed by the amendment we're dealing with, Mr. Speaker. As it stands here, 23.1 says: "As English and French are the official languages of Manitoba, the freedom to use either official language enjoyed under the law of Manitoba, in force at the time this section

comes into force, shall not be extinguished or restricted by or pursuant to any act of the Legislature of Manitoba." The law of Manitoba in force at the time this section comes into force, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I think very definitely one ought to ask what that means and what could possibly be affected by that.

A MEMBER: They haven't asked that simple question yet.

MR. G. FILMON: This government apparently hasn't asked that. Fortunately the Member for St. Norbert did ask that and in a legal opinion from the Legislative Counsel, Mr. Tallin, which I was required to table after I referred to it in a speech a couple of weeks ago, we have here his best advice on what could be covered by that phrase in Section 23.1.

Do you know what he says, Mr. Speaker? I quote: "As I mentioned above, the law in force in Manitoba at any time includes both common law and statutory law. In the term "statutory law" I am including laws made in accordance with statutes. For example, regulations and orders made under statutes."

He goes on to say that there are all sorts of rights and privileges under common law to use whatever language you wish, etc. He goes on to say that of course, in addition there are a number of statutes where specific rights relating to the use of English and French language are set out; and he says perhaps the best known provision dealing with language and contained in Section 79 of The Public Schools Act, the language of teaching. However, there are a number of other provisions in the statutes which specifically provide for the use of either the English or the French language. For example, Section 10 of The Builders Liens Act; Section 10, Name of Corporation, Employment Standards Act; subsection 5(1), Records of Employees - hours, wages, etc.

He says: "I haven't had an opportunity to go through all of the statutes to see where else there may be references to the use of English or the French language. However, I am sure that all the above provisions would probably be considered as included in "freedom to use" in the proposed 23.1 of The Manitoba Act."

Then he goes further to say: "For instance, you would have the right to use a French name for registration under The Business Names Registration Act; also certain rights to use language flow because of the circumstances of the statute. For example, The Vital Statistics Act is a bilingual act; therefore a person making a return or a report under the act would be entitled to use either English or French in complying with the act. I am certain that these are not all the areas which could be found, but merely offer these as illustrations of what rights and privileges might be included in the meaning of the expression, freedom to use other official languages."

Mr. Speaker, even our Legislative Counsel, the learned man that he is, experienced in the statutes, knowledgeable about all of the things that we have in law in Manitoba today, has no idea the extent to which this might be applied. Mr. Speaker, it may well be 20, 40 or 50 different statutes that contain reference to French in any way, shape or form, either within the

statutes or within the regulations appended thereto and all of those become entrenched as a result of this provision. Now that, I don't believe, is what they intended. I don't believe that that's what they intended.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs asks if I'm sure. I would like to know if he can assure me that this will not be entrenched by what he says, because various legal interpretations that we have say that it may well mean that any reference to French anywhere in our statutes up to this point in time will entrench it; and that, Mr. Speaker, goes well beyond anything that we had in mind or that they had in mind or I believe that the people of Manitoba had in mind when they started dealing with this kind of constitutional amendment. I say, Mr. Speaker, when you don't know then you can't afford to accept it. You can't afford to entrench it, above all, in the Constitution of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's a shameful situation that perhaps scores of these references in statutes, acts and regulations now put us in a position of inviting litigation, of challenging to say that there are rights there that are going to be entrenched that can't be changed for all time in future because of this untidy draftsmanship in this proposal that's still before us.

He asks what else might there be. What other things do we see in this proposal that's before us that we're concerned about. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have concerns as well about, for instance, Section 23.9(2). It's a reference to multicultural heritage and I quote: "This section shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Manitobans." I think I understand what they were intending but because this is Sub (2) of Section 23.9, when the reference is to this section, I believe that it may be interpreted that it's only Section 23.9 that's to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Manitobans. But I believe that what the government intended was that all of Section 23 was to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the multicultural heritage of Manitobans.

If that's the case, then he's got another problem in draftsmanship that should be corrected and changed prior to this thing going to be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada. I don't think that he has the answer to that, Mr. Speaker, and yet we're dealing with it under closure and we're going to get rid of it. Bang! It's going to be out of our way and dealt with because this government has some hidden agenda, some timetable that they won't let Manitobans know about.

Mr. Speaker, it's open to question and other people have referred to it, what is the term "Manitobans" and does it have legal status? Is that the kind of thing that you put in a Constitution because if so, does it in some way relate to Ontarians or Saskatchewanians or all of those? Those are not normally legal terms that are used in constitutions, Mr. Speaker, but this government wants to make legal terms out of them. I suggest to you that a lot of this draftsmanship has been done in a manner that is sloppy and that is going to bring us into all sorts of problems.

So what can our answer be? Our answer is, back off at this point in time, Mr. Speaker. There's no justification for pressing on until you fix this up because it's not right.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this proposal, because of all of the weaknesses that have been identified by various

speakers on this side, by various speakers before the committee throughout the summer months - and for Bill 115 - what this resolution needs is more debate, more discussion, maybe many amendments, I don't know, but it certainly doesn't need closure and that's what we're faced with. That's the only answer the government has given us.

You know the Member for Charleswood said it yesterday. He said, yes, you've obviously made many changes. I think he called it a 170 degree turn in the proposal. It's watered down substantially and as he said, you're getting closer but you haven't got it right yet.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, many government members have spoken about consensus, of the need for consensus when we're dealing with the constitutional amendment. The Government House Leader in introducing this has suggested that it does have consensual agreement from the major parties that he has consulted. One of them that he likes to refer to as having consented to this proposal now is the Manitoba Government Employees Association. He has suggested that they agree with this proposal as it exists today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's leave aside what Mr. Doer, the President of the MGEA, said at the committee about Bill 115 and let's see whether or not he agrees consensually to this proposal for the constitutional amendment. Let's see what he says and I quote: "However, the Manitoba Government Employees Association submits that the wording in this section could be improved by the government in a manner consistent with their stated intent by the following: 23.1. WHEREAS English and French are the official languages of Manitoba as provided for in Section 23 and 23.2 to 23.9 inclusive, the freedom to use either official language enjoyed under . . ." etc.

So that's a different clause than we have before us in 23.1; that from a group that he says agrees with the government proposal. They do not agree with the government proposal, Mr. Speaker. They do not agree with the proposal. They're telling you that they want it changed and you're not allowing any opportunity for further amendment or change because you're imposing closure. One of the major groups that you believe ought to be consenting to this proposal does not agree with what you're doing.

Here's a further part of the presentation that was made by the President of the MGEA to show how you well they agree with what the government is doing. Here's what they said further: "Although there is still a great deal of misunderstanding among many of our members with respect to the meaning and intent of the government's fourth and latest proposal on this whole issue . . ." Mark they say, fourth and latest proposal. Fourth indicating that they are acknowledging that this government has twisted and turned and flipped and flopped four different times on it and, Mr. Speaker, even today he still refers to it as the latest proposal because obviously Mr. Doer is expecting more changes, expecting more changes. He doesn't call it a final proposal, he calls it a latest proposal, Mr. Speaker. Fourth and latest proposal.

They go on to say: "a large number of the Manitoba Government Employees Association's concerns relating not only to the wording used in the original May 17, 1983 proposal, but also to later government proposals on expanded and entrenched French language services have been satisfied in two ways, namely by the decision to limit those provisions which ought to be entrenched in the Constitution."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources has said, let's have some integrity. I have read word for word from Mr. Doer's proposal to the committee. I don't know what the Minister heard when he was in committee, but this is what was said and I checked the presentation and I am reading it word for word to make sure that all members know and understand that the MGEA did not support in total the proposal. They supported certain aspects of it which is what I was going on to say but they certainly didn't approve of the constitutional amendment as it exists today and they still have their reservations which I'll get to later about other aspects of the proposal.

So for a government that is striving for consensus, Mr. Speaker, they have not achieved very much consensus even from those sectors of society that they rely on and want to encourage to approve of their proposals. Even the MGEA is not sold on this latest proposal yet, Mr. Speaker.

So, who else talked about consensus? Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs himself talked about consensus and he said on page 5376 on the 5th of January in Hansard: "Mr Speaker, what I find rather amazing is that the position of the members opposite has not changed even though they claim to have been listening and to have heard. It is the position of members on this side that has changed in response to those messages.

"I believe the government has listened well and is prepared to respond in a fashion that provides a consensus for the 1980s and for the future. I believe that it is a credit to all Manitobans that this consensus is not only possible but real." Well, Mr. Speaker, where's the real consensus when the MGEA says that the proposal is still not right? Where's the consensus when we have hundreds, if not thousands, of Manitobans gathering together to oppose what the government is doing, sending in slips of paper to Grassroots saying they're not in favour, that they want the government to stop, 20,000 to 30,000, as I understand it, sending in their slips to Grassroots saying they're not in favour. Where's the consensus?

Well, let's talk about that group that was here last Thursday evening, that was here to meet with the Premier. Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not come out and meet with the group. He realized they were out there and that they had a purpose and a message and he stayed in his office and met with four of them, I believe, at their request; but he did not go out to have any discussion with the people out there who were chanting for the Premier to come out, who were telling the government not to invoke closure, not to proceed.

Do you know what happened as a result of that, Mr. Speaker? Here's what happened, and I quote from a newspaper article by Arlene Billinkoff of yesterday and it says: "Even the protest demonstration of 800 people failed to alter that view, as Howard Pawley admitted from the security of his office, 'I believe the public consensus does exist out there.'" Where, Mr. Speaker, where, Mr. Premier, does that public consensus exist out there? Certainly those people who were there, those 800 people were not there to tell you they agreed with what you were doing. They were out there to tell you they disagreed with what they were doing, Mr. Premier, and I don't understand how you can refer . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how the Premier can call that a consensus, 800 people there telling him they disagreed with what they're doing and he says, "There's a consensus out there." Indeed there was and the consensus was that the government was wrong. They were proceeding in a wrong-headed way; they didn't want closure and they didn't want this proposal. That's the consensus.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The first time Steve has ever worn a beard was Monday night.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources had something to say about consensus. He said on Page 5400 of Friday, January 6th of Hansard: "There is an opportunity now for the Leader of the Opposition to demonstrate under his leadership, a concern to leave the past behind; there is an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to demonstrate that under his leadership an official opposition party will do what an official opposition party is capable of, and that is advancing in a constructive way suggestions, ideas, proposals to ensure that the decisions that are made are a consensual decision which will receive the endorsement and the approval of all the people of Manitoba." Well, Mr. Speaker, we took up his challenge and we offered him an alternative. It is called an amendment by the Member for Fort Garry, that it gives him the opportunity to remove Section 23.1, to have his validation of statutes that he wants and the rest of the statements and to go on with what is and would be a consensual agreement of the people of Manitoba. There is no question in my mind that that is there and they have the opportunity.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: So what was his response to that opportunity to achieve consensus? Do you know what his response was - closure, closure. They didn't even debate it. They put up one speaker on their side and didn't debate it and didn't even give us a position on the amendment; they imposed closure. That was his idea of consensus. That was his idea of discussion of amendment, of achieving some agreement amongst the various parties of this House; that was his response to it - closure - so that's how empty their words are when they speak of the need for consensus and the desire for consensus. That's how empty their words are, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: It worked. It worked, you backed off.

A MEMBER: Oh, it worked. Oh, yes, you got the message through, Al, anyway.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Are members ready to proceed? Is the Honourable Member for Charleswood ready to proceed?

HON. S. LYON: I'm always ready to proceed, Mr. Speaker. Are you?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: Are you going to leave now?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the government and the members opposite — (Interjection) — To the Minister of Cultural Affairs, do you have a leader over there? We haven't seen one yet and when you find him, ask him to stand up so we can recognize him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: We can have him speak to us from the security of his office, I'm sure.

Mr. Speaker, how can they say, in view of what they just heard in the public hearings within the last few days, the legitimate faults that are being found not only with Bill 115, the holes as was said yesterday, riddled with holes like Swiss cheese, the bill and even the constitutional proposal, the holes that are being picked in it by speakers day after day after day, that they have found a consensus and that the consensus is this final proposal that they have put before us? That's nonsense. We have made them a proposal that has more approval, that has more hope of being approved than anything that they've got before us right now.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that what we have put forward would be approved by the MGEA, would probably be approved by the vast majority of Manitobans . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Probably by the SFM.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . would probably be approved by the Grassroots people and I think that it should be approved by the members opposite. The amendment that we are currently dealing with has a greater opportunity for consensus than anything they have put before us to this point in time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What do the constituents of Springfield think of it?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: This sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, allows for the validation of statutes that this government has said that they're concerned about. It avoids the prospect of legal chaos, and it doesn't tamper with the rights that are given under Section 23. We agree and they agree, Mr. Speaker, that those are all admirable objectives and this sub-amendment deals with it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that this whole issue, the whole French language proposal, is such a terribly divisive, disruptive, and emotional issue, it's tearing the people apart and it's bringing out the worst in many people. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a viable alternative that this government can deal with and can support.

I'll tell you what people are thinking about it, calm, rational, reasoned people are saying this about it, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — This is a quote from a newscast by Bob Beaton on CJOB on January 30th, just two days ago, "The utter failure of the government, the opposition, or the public to reach any common ground on the proposed constitutional amendment in French language services legislation indicates this issue is almost beyond any amicable solution. The entire issue, though, seems almost beyond salvation."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this sub-amendment that we have before the government can provide a consensus, and I believe, can be approved of by almost all the people of Manitoba today, if this government will only recognize it as a viable alternative and as a way to proceed to accomplish almost all its purposes. But this, Mr. Speaker, isn't the kind of consensus that they seem to be talking about. Their idea of consensus, Mr. Speaker, is simply to go along with their will and nothing more, that's their idea of consensus. The government wonders why all the misapprehension, all of the mistrust, all of the ill will has been created over this issue.

Well, all we have to do to look at what's causing the public's misapprehension on this issue at what happened at the airport last week. The incredible situation of somebody issuing an edict that the boxes that contain English-language-only newspapers have to be in both French and English, the incredible, preposterous situation that occurs because legislative imperatives are there and we have bureaucrats who are going to make sure that those legislated imperatives are carried out come hell or high water. The sheer lunacy of that kind of thing is what totally discredits the kinds of things that were done at the federal level and can in all probability occur unless this government deals in some sensible way with the issue before them.

You know, what may have been legitimate reasonable intentions to begin with in the first place are being totally discredited because of what happens when these things are put in legislation that claims to outline and delineate language rights. As long as those language rights are going to be expressed by poorly drafted constitutional amendments, fuzzily-worded imperatives contained in statutes, Mr. Speaker, we'll be just inviting all sorts of litigation, constant challenges, and the public is going to have a heyday, and we're going to have continuing streams of incidents like the newspaper boxes.

Even Lloyd Axworthy, the Federal Minister of Transport, who I don't think is probably a friend to everybody in this Chamber, who isn't universally — (Interjection) — accepted or acknowledged as a

paragon of legislative virtue, even he said, enough is enough and stepped in and said no, no, a thousands times no, you don't need to have — (Interjection) — those boxes in French and English.

Now, here's someone who obviously is a strong supporter of the federal Liberal official languages policy, Lloyd Axworthy, and even he had to say enough is enough and let's not have anymore of this nonsense. So, is it any wonder why this government cannot achieve consensus on this when the public outcry on their proposal has been so great because of all of the, as I say, the fuzzy wording and the poor draftsmanship and all of those problems that we have to deal with on this proposal, the fourth or the fifth or whatever number it is in a long litany of failures, on their part?

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have complained about our opposition saying that really we've merely been frustrating the process, we've been filibustering, but look at the results since last summer. We fought and we fought and we fought and we dragged them kicking and screaming into public hearings, and what happened? They were told in no uncertain terms about the failure of the draftsmanship of their proposal in the beginning and how wrong it would have been and how disastrous it would have been to Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

Even Friday at committee, Gary Doer, the President of the MGEA, referred back to those early proposals and said the ambiguous terminology such as head or central office, administrative body, significant demand have been deleted. He complimented the government on that and he referred to other major changes that were an improvement. Well, those improvements would not have been made, Mr. Speaker, had we allowed this government to force through its proposal the way they wanted to last spring. Those improvements could not have been made, not whatsoever.

Then we had the December 15th proposal, Mr. Speaker, by this same Government House Leader. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In your case, Al, we saved the public from a very unpleasant experience.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

A MEMBER: It's the Honourable Member for Redneck again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that was the first proposal that, thank heavens, they were stopped from putting through. Thank heavens! The public acknowledges it, and the MGEA acknowledges it, and almost everybody who has anything to do with this issue acknowledges that it would have been a disaster and a wise thing that we opposed it.

Then, there was the proposal of the new Government House Leader on December 15th. You know that one

that split Section 23.1 into two parts. The first part that he declared as a simple declaratory statement declaring English and French the official languages, and the second part saying that this section didn't apply to municipalities, school divisions, or school districts. All of the lawyers and advisors, including their own, told them by implication that everything else was included as a result of the way they drafted it over the Cabinet table by their amateur lawyers, Mr. Speaker, and that would have been a disaster; and again they were told by their lawyers, by MGEA, by their union friends, by SFM, by everybody that that would have been a disaster because they wouldn't have accomplished their purpose and, by implication, they would have included all other institutions, Crown corporations and everything else - disaster No. 2 - because we opposed it, Mr. Speaker. Are we to be blamed for that?

Mr. Speaker, it's about time that members opposite realized that the opposition is doing their job. They are opposing proposals that are wrong, that are harmful, that are open to litigation, to misinterpretation, and that will be a disaster for the province if they are not corrected. So, as it was said earlier, you have gone a long way, you have improved it, but you haven't finished improving it. There is more to be done. That is our position, Mr. Speaker.

If the government believes that it's still right, even with this fourth proposal, this latest proposal, let's take a look at all of the information that has been brought forward up until this point, at both Bill 115 and the constitutional resolution as amended and sub-amended and so on, let's take a look at just whether or not there is anything there that can be corrected, and I already spoke about the poor wording of 23(1) and 23(9) and some of the problems of draftsmanship they have got there.

Let's talk about the relationship between Bill 115 and the constitutional resolution, having had the opportunity to hear from others because the government didn't believe us when we objected to the manner in which they were going to be dealing with it. It has become evident that they did not intend to have the situation prevail that is in Bill 115, whereby if Bill 115 is proclaimed before the constitutional resolution, then they would entrench Bill 115. Now they have said that they don't want to do that. They have said that they don't want to do that, Mr. Speaker, and yet that was only under questioning, and it was only after it was brought to their attention.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I said it on January 3rd at a press conference, I said it in the speech, and I confirmed it to a question. Now that's deliberate misrepresentation. Tell the truth. It's on the record.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the problem is, as Mr. Green has indicated, that the Supreme Court or any court are not going to accept his assurances. They are going to accept what is in the bill.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to have to further amend either the constitutional

proposal or Bill 115 to ensure that there is no possibility that Bill 115 will be proclaimed before the constitutional amendment. That has to be done and he hasn't told us how he is going to do it; whether or not he is going to do it by virtue of an amendment to Bill 115 or an amendment to the constitutional resolution. So we still haven't dealt with the matter, Mr. Speaker.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Tuesday the 17th of January, Page 5589. Now start telling the truth.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: Where is the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Clause-by-clause in committee.

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

May I assure all members that they will have an equal opportunity to make their remarks in debate if they are just patient.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the government pushed Bill 115 through under closure, pushed it through without the opportunity for assurance to be given other than verbally by the Minister that something was going to be done to correct that anomaly. It is very possible that that anomaly should be corrected by an amendment to the Constitution, maybe it's better to be in Bill 115, but we haven't seen a proposal of the amendment or the clause . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: When would you normally expect . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Government House Leader wanted to assure us, I would think he would be anxious to send over a copy of the proposed amendment to stop any concern, or perhaps even at committee, because it was raised at committee on several occasions and he could have laid everything to rest by having here in his hand, in his hot little hand, an amendment that would have made everybody feel less nervous about his intentions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the wisdom of our strong opposition to the manner in which this government has been proceeding on so many different fronts with this issue and with all of the problems that are inherent with it, the wisdom is now becoming evident because we see that there is continuing need to change their proposal and to change the forum and the manner in which they are dealing with this whole French language issue.

Where are we at now, Mr. Speaker? We have the sub-amendment before us, moved by the Member for Fort Garry, a good sub-amendment, a valid proposal that deserves the attention; that was welcomed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, welcomed by him; that

was urged upon us by the Minister of Natural Resources who said, "When are you going to come up with a positive suggestion, an alternative?" We came up with it and it's here before us.

Mr. Speaker, we have done this to try and make the best of a bad effort by this government. They have said all along that the reason we are dealing with this whole French language issue at all is because of their fear or their concern that all of the laws of Manitoba could be declared invalid by an adverse decision in the Supreme Court on Bilodeau. That's what was the whole premise behind this. Not that they are invalid, as was implied by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that they are invalid today, which is not the case, Mr. Speaker, but that was his implication in response to a question by the Member for Elmwood in question period a week or so ago that if they did not do this that the laws of Manitoba today are invalid. That's not true. But, Mr. Speaker, they could be declared invalid by an adverse decision in the Supreme Court on Bilodeau.

Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding on this proposal to ensure that those laws cannot be declared invalid by virtue of this constitutional amendment despite the legal opinion of their own legal counsel, Mr. Twaddle, who said, "They had an excellent chance of success on Bilodeau in the Supreme Court." Yet they said - what did the Attorney-General say? He said that he was heading off that possibility. He felt that, as the Attorney-General, he couldn't take that risk; that what would result from the adverse decision of Bilodeau and the Supreme Court would be, in effect, legal chaos. That's what the Attorney-General said and that's what has brought us to this whole situation we're in today.

Mr. Speaker, we have said to the government that we can show them a way to avoid that risk, to allow for the validation of statutes to remain in place, but to remove 23.1. We could avoid all of the debate and discussion that's going on, on this constitutional amendment and still achieve their major purpose of validation of statutes and we have given them the very real opportunity to accomplish that.

What we are avoiding, Mr. Speaker, is all of the debate and discussion of the possible effect of 23.1 of conferring additional rights on French-speaking Manitobans; avoiding the prospect by removing 23.1; avoiding the prospect of expanding French language rights in Manitoba, and yet still confirming the validity of our English-only statutes and avoiding the legal chaos.

So, Mr. Speaker, we want the government now to come clean when it discusses this sub-amendment that's before it. We want the government to come clean and let the public of Manitoba know because if it supports this amendment, the removal of 23.1, it will have accomplished its purpose of avoiding legal chaos in Manitoba. It will have confirmed the validity of the English-only statutes.

Mr. Speaker, if they don't approve the amendment, then what they're acknowledging to us is that it really wasn't their only purpose; that really they wanted to confer additional rights on French-speaking Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, they are doing it in two different ways, the way they've split the proposal. Not only are they doing it through the rewording of 23.1 but they've also got the bill and that confers additional rights by statute. That defines and confers additional rights by statute.

It's providing services in head offices of government departments, Crown Corporations, the courts, etc., but they're also raising the possibility of entrenching a further conference of rights by the use of the term "official languages" for one thing as applied to English and French; and by the point that I raised earlier, by the entrenchment of all statutes to date, the reference to French in all statutes of Manitoba to date, wherever they occur, The Public Schools Act, The Business Names Registrations Act, The Labour Relations Act - wherever it might occur - if French occurs in regulations or statute, it is entrenched today and that, Sir, is an additional conference of rights by way of entrenchment that doesn't exist to date. So they're going about it in several different ways and the government has to come clean.

By their decision on this amendment, they will have to come clean if they merely want to validate the statutes and avoid legal chaos, then agree with the amendment and vote for it and you've accomplished that purpose and you've got what you want, then you can still deal separately with Bill 115, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we want to know whether or not there is a hidden agenda on the part of members opposite? Is there any secret deal here that causes them to have to put through 23.1 and cause this further entrenchment of additional statutes and the possibility of an expanded definition of French language rights? Is that somewhere in the mix that it has to be part of the package? We'd like to know that, Mr. Speaker, because there's no other reason why they would not support the amendment. I can't find any other reason.

I think that finally it will be clear as to where they stand because if they don't support this amendment then they haven't been open and honest and clear with the people of Manitoba because they have said that the reason they were into this whole hassle is merely for the validation of statutes and not to entrench additional French language rights in the Constitution.

That's what the Attorney-General argued just the other day was their first choice. I'll just repeat what he said and I quote: "I want to say this for the record. I have the drafts that I'll be glad to table with the Order for Returns even though it wasn't asked. I have the records, the draft that was first proposed was to the members of the SFM for discussion. It was one which dealt, Mr. Ransom," referring to the Member for Turtle Mountain, "with validation only." So their first draft, he said, of this whole proposal, the Attorney-General said that on Page 5749 of Hansard Wednesday the 25th of January, their first draft was merely to deal with the validation of statutes.

A MEMBER: Right. Let's get honest now.

MR. G. FILMON: "That was the draft I presented. I wasn't born yesterday, in terms of looking at a possible solution. I was the Attorney-General for the Province of Manitoba. You start with what you consider to be, in the first instance, the easiest thing to deal with, the most direct solution. But of course it was a simplistic approach." And what he goes on to say was that the SFM turned it down because they didn't want merely validation of statutes, they wanted additional rights entrenched.

A MEMBER: It's in Hansard.

MR. G. FILMON: It's in Hansard. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's in there.

I want to know if the SFM turned this down last spring would they turn it down today? Would they turn it down today?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, I suggest that maybe having seen the serious public opposition that we've gone through, this tearing of the social fabric that we've talked about, this bitter acrimonious division that's occurred because of this proposal, maybe they would accept merely the entrenchment of the validation of statutes, Mr. Speaker, and a bill which is before this House which does grant them additional rights in terms of French-language services.

I don't know, but I say to you that that's an option that should be considered. If you truly want to arrive at consensus, I suggest to you that you look very seriously at that option. I think that the government, Mr. Speaker, has a responsibility to consider that option. We didn't put it forth lightly. It has merit and it answers the government's own concerns.

If they vote for the amendment, Mr. Speaker, if they vote for this amendment they will have accomplished their own stated concerns for the validation of statutes. They will have eliminated the hassle that might occur as a result of trying to entrench some additional statements that might confer expanded French language rights. They will have eliminated all the acrimony, divisiveness and chaos that has occurred in this province as a result of their flip-flopping and different proposals on this.

Mr. Speaker, I say to them, for heaven's sake, let's not proceed by way of closure. Let's approve this amendment, accomplish the validation of statutes and you can then be left to deal with the French language services on a separate matter by way of statute and you can let Manitobans begin to start working together again. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He has urged the government to support the sub-amendment and given an indication that that would appear to make the package much more acceptable if that amendment were approved. I'm wondering if he can advise this House if he and his colleagues would be prepared to support the amended resolution as it would be amended with that sub-amendment? Could he answer that question please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: We have said before that we are prepared to accept the amended resolution if he accepts the amendment of the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a number of points that I would like to deal with pertaining to some of the remarks that we have heard across the way. I hope, Mr. Speaker, to have some opportunity to recount and to review — (Interjection) — some of the positions that we have put forth on this side, to deal with some of the misrepresentations that have been made by some honourable members across the way and by some others, and attempt rather to provide for a rational forum by which there can be a proper consensus developed, an attempt on the part of honourable members across the way to inflame public passion, to spread unjustified fears.

Mr. Speaker, part and parcel of that, I must say, is an advertisement unfortunately that appears in today's press that contains within it the spreading of a false fear based upon a misinformation. I notice that two honourable members in this Chamber will be addressing that forum.

It's described as a grand rally against official bilingualism; the Pawley Government is attempting to force official bilingualism through the Manitoba Legislature; this may be your last chance to protest against closure, entrenchment, and the extension of French language services.

Note again, to protest against the entrenchment and extension of French language services. Mr. Speaker, what indeed was the purpose of the bill that was introduced in this Chamber? The purpose of that bill was to provide for French language services by way of a statute of this Chamber, not to entrench French language services, but indeed, to follow some of the suggestions that we had heard because, Mr. Speaker, unlike the allegations of honourable members across the way, we have been a listening government, we have been prepared to listen to the responses and the concerns of Manitobans.

We are prepared and we have filed a bill in this House to provide for French language services in a reasonable manner in the Province of Manitoba, but not to entrench French language services, as indeed, is the misrepresentation that is focused by the group in question, Grassroots, of which, of course, Mr. Conrad Kelly, and others that are involved with the Canadian Intelligence Association have been very active in respect to support by Mr. Gostick in Ontario and supported apparently - and certainly honourable members across the way have yet to disassociate themselves from the activity and participation of the Canadian Intelligence Association - they have yet to get up in their place and say we disassociate ourselves from what Mr. Conrad Kelly and his associates did in respect to the collecting

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood on a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a point of order. I believe that the First Minister is either deliberately or not in full knowledge of the situation, that he has not given recognition to the fact that Grant

Russell, the leader of the Grassroots movement has, I think, publicly disassociated himself from Mr. Kelly and said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: . . . that he is not a member of that group and so if the First — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . Mr. Speaker, my point is that the First Minister is misleading the House, and he is making a false statement because the leader of that organization has, in fact, indicated that Conrad Kelly is not a member and there is no association between Mr. Kelly or that organization and the Grassroots movement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The honourable member might have had an explanation, he does not have a point of order.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I now know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . Mr. Russell and his associates in the company of Mr. Kelly, carried petitions into the Lieutenant-Governor's office, the representative of Her Majesty in the Province of Manitoba, and then, Mr. Speaker, what is rather interesting, rather than leaving those petitions, removed those petitions on their departure from the Lieutenant-Governor's office.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned what Mr. Russell has to say, but I haven't heard the Honourable Member for Elmwood disassociate himself, I haven't heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition disassociate himself, I haven't heard the former - or maybe the present Leader of the Opposition would be better to describe the situation, because he's calling the shots - disassociate himself. Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . then honourable members across the way want to talk about the advancement of fear, dissension, divisiveness in the province, Mr. Speaker, that's what they want to discuss.

Mr. Speaker, I have also in front of me . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I have also in front of me a paper, December, 1983, a publication of the Filipino paper in the City of Winnipeg, because the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said there is a hidden agenda. Mr. Speaker, what is the hidden agenda of honourable members across the way, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition?

I was impressed by some comments that the Leader of the Opposition made to the ethnic communities, in

particular, the Filipino community. Now it states December, 1983, so I'm sure whether it's prior or subsequent, Mr. Speaker, and I want to read from that publication some words from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

"Gary Filmon stresses that Manitoba will follow the two provinces by giving a major role to the minorities in the government. I'm strongly supporting the policy of Mr. Brian Mulroney to make the party receptive to the ethnic minorities. On French language accord, Gary Filmon rejected the package presented by the New Democratic Party Government, not as a personal determination, but by the caucus." Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . the implication is clear. The Leader of the Opposition ensures that he keeps a distance personally from the position of his own caucus in respect to this issue. Mr. Speaker, honourable members on this side of the Chamber have risen in their place — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say on a point of order that the Premier is making a statement there and referring to a quotation and obviously he has difficulty understanding that a caucus decision is an even stronger decision than a personal decision because it carries the weight of the party. That's the point I was making.

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

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I'm saying, and no matter how hard the Leader of the Opposition protests, the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to place his distance when he speaks to ethnic communities that really he is bound by a caucus determination, that he does not clearly and forcibly stand for his position on his own personal conviction.

Honourable members on this side of the Chamber will say the same thing, whether it be in Melita, whether it be in Arborg, whether it be in Thompson, whether it be in Winnipeg, whether it's to the ethnic communities or the Francophone communities, our determination is that of the government of this province. We stand foursquare behind the resolution and the bill that is before this Chamber because what we are talking about is the freedom to use a language, the freedom to ensure that language right is not stripped away by future governments, such as the government that we have in the Province of Quebec that has stripped away the rights of Anglophone people in the Province of Quebec.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek says, nuts. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, if he would visit Quebec would indeed know how freedom has been stripped away from certain Anglophone people in the Province of Quebec to utilize their English language. Is it such a tremendous

requirement that we should, by way of a constitutional amendment that we are discussing in this Chamber, declare to all Manitobans that English and French are the official languages. That is a fact. The freedom to use either official language enjoyed under the law of Manitoba in force at the time this section comes into force should not be extinguished or restricted. In what way do we remove freedoms by guaranteeing that freedoms will not be extinguished or eliminated?

Mr. Speaker, I always thought, and I think the vast majority of Manitobans conclude that the freedom given to one individual, one group indeed increases the freedom of all. Freedom is indivisible; freedom enriches; freedom enhances. On this side of the Chamber we do not intend to take a narrow, cynical, selfish point of view that we must indeed ensure that freedoms be restricted and extinguished. That is not the democratic way; that is not the way by which we stand proudly in this Chamber in support of freedom, freedom for Manitobans. Not glibly, as expressed by honourable members across the way, by their constant filibustering, by their constant bell ringing, by their attempts, continued efforts to obstruct, that they don't really believe in freedom. They believe rather, Mr. Speaker, in legislation that would restrict or extinguish freedom in the future for Manitobans.

We're not just talking of Manitobans of today. We're talking about the children and children's children of Manitobans in years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to talk a little bit about the question of bell ringing and the question of process in this Chamber and a little bit about closure. Under our Constitution and under the principle of responsible government developed in England, when an election results and a majority in the Legislature for a political party, that political party forms the government. It is able to govern because it is assured of a majority in the House on matters of government business. The House has a right to question the government in respect to its measures. This Chamber provides a proving ground for the testing of ideas, to the challenging of ideas by the elected representatives of the people of the province or jurisdiction.

This House is indeed a forum for political parties to present their principles and their policies to the Chamber and it's an opportunity as well for members to participate, not in misinforming, not in misrepresenting but informing accurately and honestly, Manitobans and people within their jurisdiction. Under this kind of system, Mr. Speaker, a government must anticipate, a government has an obligation to anticipate the questions and the criticisms that would be raised in the Legislature.

It must be prepared, Mr. Speaker, and we accept this responsibility and we have made no secret of this, we accept the responsibility to answer publicly for our actions in this Chamber and the positions that we take in this Chamber and we're prepared to address those concerns with Manitobans; but the opposition on this particular matter has had eight months to use these opportunities. In addition, we asked the opposition to sit down with the government just before Christmas. The House Leader and myself met with the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party and the Leader of the Opposition to ascertain whether it would not be possible to arrive at a bi-partisan approach, to see if

it was possible that we could work out a co-operative approach to this difficult issue.

Mr. Speaker, we offered to the Leader of the Opposition, we proposed to the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party an offer of involvement, of consultation and compromise. Have those offers of involvement and participation been accepted by the members of the opposition? No, Speaker, those offers were rejected and they've been responded to by way of obstruction, constant obstruction and filibustering and attempts, not to attempt to co-operate in a provincial-wide approach that would be accommodating, would be reasonable; but rather we have been responded to by obstruction, by the attempt to filibuster and unfortunately, the more serious expediency and opportunism from the word go on the part of honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, it's entirely unprecedented to even suggest that the majority in this House have chosen an opportunity to present their views and entrusted to do so by the electorate and having formed a government in offering proposals for question, for debate and review, cannot then proceed after eight months, after over 100 speeches - and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has incorrectly said it was 25 or 30 - the speeches last summer were also dealing with the matter of referral, a resolution.

Mr. Speaker, what we now must anticipate and expect within any democratic society after that kind of debate, after that opportunity of review, is that members of this House had the opportunity to arrive at a conclusion, to be able to make a decision in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the very principle of responsible government would be destroyed if this Legislature was permitted to prevent a vote on government business. There can indeed be no government that can assume accountability for its actions if after debate, if after questioning, if after public hearings, Mr. Speaker, and after review, cannot then ensure that at long last a decision is arrived at.

Mr. Speaker, this government is prepared to accept responsibility and prepared to address the concerns of Manitobans and is prepared to present, not false fact, but accurate information to Manitobans. We're prepared to accept that responsibility. We will be accountable to the electorate and we're prepared to be accountable to the electorate because we believe in the principle, we believe in the rightness and the decency of what we are doing; and we reject the pleas on the part of honourable members across the way that for reasons of expediency or opportunism we should run with tails between our legs.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the step of New Democrats, that was not the step of J.S. Woodsworth when he opposed the deportation of the Japanese from the west coast. It was not the step of Tommy Douglas and David Lewis when they opposed, even though it was unpopular to do so, the imposition of The War Measures Act in Quebec. It was the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation that spoke out on behalf of the mistreatment of Germans, the unfair treatment of Germans in the 1940s, even though it was unpopular to do so because there are principles. Once and awhile there are principles that must be recognized.

There again tell the electorate. Mr. Speaker, forget principle, forget honesty, forget conviction. Think only

of opportunism, that is what the Member for Arthur is doing. My response to the Member for Arthur is that this party, this philosophy, New Democratic Party philosophy, the philosophy of social democracy, is not built on sand like your part indeed may be built upon, but it's built on a foundation of rock. That's the difference.

Mr. Speaker, between 1977 . . .

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

A MEMBER: Gotcha eh?

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

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, between 1977 and 1981 we then sat in the benches where honourable members now sit. I recall many pieces of legislation that were introduced by honourable members across the way and I remember that we opposed much of that legislation. We questioned that legislation, we debated that legislation, we opposed their changes to the Family Law legislation in 1977.

A MEMBER: They didn't have a mandate for that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we also opposed their dismantling of rent control in the Province of Manitoba. We fought hard in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: Filmon did that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: We debated on second reading. We participated in the public hearings. You will recall we also debated in third reading, but we allowed eventually the Government of the Day to make a decision. We accepted the fact that the Government of the Day was a government and they had the right to ensure that a decision could be made so in fact they could be accountable for their decisions.

Mr. Speaker, as it turns out not only was that principled but it was wise because although we attempted to prevent honourable members from making the mistake, for instance, of dismantling rent control by way of legislation that the Honourable Member for Tuxedo was responsible for, for the final period of the Lyon administration. Maybe it was a good thing we allowed honourable members to bring that legislation to a vote and to make a decision, because the electorate in November 1981 held them responsible for the passage of that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that is democracy. That is the essence of the democracy, the basis of democracy. I could mention many other actions of that day but now we have an opposition that's willing to allow the bells to ring forever and ever for one sole purpose and let there be no mistaking this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of preventing the government from doing its business. That is the purpose of the bell ringing, to prevent the democratic essence of government from functioning, to prevent the government from carrying out its business of government.

Mr. Speaker, I respected, indeed, the words of the Honourable Member for Springfield, and I think he has done a — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, let me tell the honourable members across the way, the reports that I have, including one from a gentleman that listened to the honourable member Sunday and expressed his disappointment that he had been misinformed earlier, the Honourable Member for Springfield did a very very good job of explaining this legislation to the people that were involved.

Members are elected to this Chamber not to act as robots, not to simply wet the finger, lift the finger to the winds and sense whether the winds are blowing east or west, or north or south. No, Mr. Speaker, voters are intelligent, principled groups; especially Manitobans are a principled group of people. Manitobans are caring and concerned people and they do not want - in fact, they would reject, Mr. Speaker - and this is why they will reject honourable members across the way because they want individuals with backbone and with courage, not individuals that serve only as robots in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, when a candidate appears for office the voters determine not only if that particular candidate follows in some instances a party line, but the vast majority of voters want to know whether that candidate, if elected, will use the best of their talents, their abilities; whether that individual will be principled and not opportunistic; whether that individual will be prepared to use wisdom and not foolishness; whether that individual will be able to stand up to the pressure of the momentary moment for the long-term interests of his constituents and his provincial community; that is what voters are looking for. They are not looking for straw men and straw women. They are looking for people of principle, representatives of principle and honesty and decency.

Mr. Speaker, now what is the assumption of honourable members across the way? The assumption of honourable members across the way is that they have the divine right. I thought we had moved away from divine right several centuries ago, but I forgot that it does really trace back through Conservative thinking and Conservative ideology through the centuries, that they have the divine right to continue to assume that in the final analysis they are the ones that must insist that it be their legislation or no legislation that is passed on this particular matter in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if the assumptions of honourable members across the way are indeed true, then what's the point of elections? What is the point of elections? That is really the question that honourable members must pose to themselves. Mr. Speaker, if a government, upon election, can be frustrated from performing its mandate because of bell ringing and is permitted to be able to prevent a government from arriving at decisions because of bell ringing, constant day in and day out and week after week, then what's the point of government; what's the point of elections?

Mr. Speaker, what is the fundamental purpose of our Legislature? To override the absence or existence of any one rule or customary procedure; not to permit the overruling of customary procedure but to allow members to perform their duty in an orderly manner, to be able to arrive at decisions in an orderly manner after there has been the fullest of debate and review.

And there can be none who would think reasonably, that would suggest that there has not been - well, since I have been elected, including the Autopac debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to here for a moment to pay tribute. I want to pay tribute here to the leaders of the Conservative Party during the Autopac debate. They got up in their seats one by one, each and every one of them spoke, then they moved a hoist motion but they stayed in the Chamber. They debated in the Chamber and they allowed the Government of the Day to bring the matter to a vote.

Mr. Speaker, although honourable members and those that are here still from that day will remember that honourable members, those of us that were here in 1970 will . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's interesting but honourable members across the way in 1970 and '71, when we go back to Hansard, were screaming then that the government had no mandate. They said that all we had promised was to reduce automobile insurance premiums, that we had no mandate to bring in a compulsory, universal one-agency automobile insurance system. Mr. Speaker, we heard that echo over and over again in this Chamber from honourable members across the way. I don't fault the honourable members from that day for trying to make that case in this Chamber. But what is important, Mr. Speaker, they allowed democracy to work; they allowed a vote to take place.

They allowed members to establish the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation despite, Mr. Speaker, we had 10,000 people out demonstrating and despite the opposition, despite the scores of resolutions that I remember, as the Minister responsible at that time, that I received from municipalities opposing the establishment of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

And, Mr. Speaker, just by way of reference, the Reeve from Elton wasn't aware that, in fact, I had been the Minister responsible for Autopac, and previous Ministers of Municipal Affairs have been involved in so-called contentious matters that aroused the anger and concern of some municipalities. Certainly, the Autopac legislation in 1970 aroused the opposition of some good scores of municipalities in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility, each and every one of us, to ensure that the fundamental purpose of this House is not trampled upon by way of undemocratic process in this Chamber. We have seen an opposition that is willing to permit bells to ring for no other purpose, and let there be no mistake, for no other purpose but to blockade this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, if responsible government is to remain the basis of our constitutional system — (Interjection) — we must be allowed to arrive at a decision on government business. — (Interjection) — Well, the member says talk about the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I understand fully their uneasiness in respect to these items.

I must say that, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect if some of the former leaders of the Conservative Party, I'm

thinking of people such as Duff Roblin, were in this Chamber, they would echo the words that I have just uttered in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — They would with all modesty, Mr. Speaker, attempt to remind honourable members of the democratic essence of arriving at decisions, and honourable members of the Government of the Day assuming responsibility for those decisions. Then, at the end of the mandate, Mr. Speaker, accepting accountability from the electorate.

We're prepared to accept accountability from the electorate. The question is: are honourable members across the way prepared to accept accountability for their actions, for their conduct, Mr. Speaker? Are they prepared to? We're prepared to accept accountability for our actions.

Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting the other evening with four gentlemen from Grassroots: Mr. Bill Hutton, Reeve Heeneey, Mr. Russell and Mr. Bend. I was impressed by the fact that two of those gentlemen agreed that they had a fuller understanding and a better understanding from having the opportunity to discuss this matter with us. Mr. Hutton, for example, acknowledged that he, except for one particular word, "official," he had no problem with respect what we are doing in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Reeve from Elton Municipality expressed some surprise at some of the information that was rendered to him, because he was working on so much on the basis of information and assumption that was based upon the debate of last summer. Mr. Speaker, it's not a surprise because honourable members across the way have taken no position. They've rehashed last May and June and July and August. They've done everything, Mr. Speaker, but discuss the items specifically before at any length.

A MEMBER: Well, why don't you make the amendment then?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what is important at this time is the fact that we move on to ensure a decision is made. I'm convinced that Manitobans want to have this issue behind them. I make no apology for this, Mr. Speaker. Honourable members across the way seem to think that this is the most important issue in the province. No jobs, jobs for our youth, job opportunities, economic opportunities, the educational standards in our schools and our universities, health opportunities, Mr. Speaker; those are the kind of areas that the people of the Province of Manitoba want us to be debating in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

They don't want a further eight months of debate on this particular item, they want this government and the members of the opposition to discuss jobs, the economy, health care, education, human rights, freedoms, Mr. Speaker. That's what honourable members want, but all that we can hear from honourable members across the way is no, let's not have a vote, oh no, never, never. don't have a vote, pull the bill, don't make a decision, so we can proceed down to the Supreme Court. We can end up with a decision

possibly from the Supreme Court. We end back in this Chamber again next year debating this issue all over again, increasing the divisiveness in this province, increasing the opportunity for honourable members to create fear in the province, for honourable members to be again expedient on this issue in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, subsequent to a Supreme Court decision to have another two, three, four month debate in this Chamber.

Is that what honourable members want, Mr. Speaker, that we allow this matter to proceed to the Supreme Court of Canada, accept the fact that it is possible we would end up again debating this matter next year, 1985, again in this Chamber? Is that what honourable members would like? Is that what honourable members are asking for when honourable members are saying deal with the issue?

What honourable members are saying, Mr. Speaker, is deal with this issue by letting it go to the Supreme Court of Canada, allowing the Prime Minister of this country, through his appointed representatives in the Supreme Court of Canada, impose an Ottawa decision on Manitoba. We say no way, the decision must be a made-in-Manitoba solution, not a made-in-Ottawa solution.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members can if they wish attach a label to themselves made-in-Ottawa, or Pass-the-Buck-to-Ottawa, or pass the responsibility for dealing with this matter with the members of the Supreme Court of Canada appointed by the Prime Minister in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, that is the easy route, yes. Then you say, well, we don't like what the Supreme Court imposed upon us, but it wasn't our doings, it was the doings of the Supreme Court of Canada in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, do you know what I call that? That is unmitigated cowardliness and expediency.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the courage as Manitobans to ensure that this matter is dealt with within Manitoba by the elected representatives of Manitobans and not have a decision imposed upon us from Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I can't understand honourable members across the way. They never like anything that comes out of Ottawa, and I share with them much of their concerns in respect to that. They don't like anything the Prime Minister does; they don't like any of the appointments of the Prime Minister, and I share much of that, but what I find is rather inconsistent, they say let Mr. Prime Minister and his appointed members of the Supreme Court of Canada make this decision for us. That's what they're saying. We want to embrace Prime Minister Trudeau and work with Prime Minister Trudeau's appointments to arrive at a decision from Manitoba rather than Manitobans arrive at a decision for themselves.

A MEMBER: Admit what you're doing is wrong.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the time for dilly-dallying on this issue I think has been thoroughly debated. I don't think anyone can question that for a moment.

Mr. Speaker, it's my view that we have presented a reasonable and a principled consensus, a consensus that's going to resolve this issue once and for all; not

like their approach in 1980 when they passed Bill 2 that didn't effectively deal with this problem at all. Rather than deal with the matter that is before us, and ensured in 1980 that this matter be dealt with properly, they passed Bill 2 in this Chamber with the support of honourable members on this side, including the Member for Elmwood at that time. But one of the reasons that we have problems today is because they didn't have the initiative and the courage; in fact they hid, rather than ensure that things were done properly in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, as I have indicated, I don't claim, unlike honourable members across the way, to be a constitutional lawyer. I depend upon the advice of constitutional lawyers and I wish indeed that I had taken the opportunity to have acquainted myself with the views of some constitutional lawyers because I suspect in 1980 they would have advised me that what the Government of the Day was doing was incorrect. I wonder what advice honourable members across the way had in 1980 that they didn't ensure that this job was done properly, so it wouldn't bounce back into this Chamber four years hence. I wonder what sort of information and advice that honourable members across the way had.

Secondly, the vast majority of Manitobans want this government and the opposition, as I have indicated, to put this issue behind us now so we can deal with the more important matters. It's only the Conservatives and, yes, there are some, but I think a minority of Manitobans that want this issue to continue to go on and on and on.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, what indeed we want is to ensure that the costs of translation are reduced. What honourable members across the way did was not provide for the most cost-efficient way of dealing with translation but one of the most cost-expensive ways of dealing with translation of statutes. What we are doing here was to reduce the costs of translation, to reduce that burden upon Manitobans of translation. Why do honourable members across the way not ensure, not want - and it's true - they presented an amendment recently. They've just recently indicated they want to validate the statutes, which was a new position, but two weeks old, out of eight months. But, Mr. Speaker, why would honourable members from Day One have said let's validate, let's ensure that the statutes of this province are validated. Why would they not?

So, Mr. Speaker, in summation, this is a matter that must be dealt with, must be resolved by this Chamber in Manitoba by the elected representatives of Manitobans, must not be resolved by way of a decision imposed upon the Province of Manitoba, the people of the Province of Manitoba by the appointees of the Federal Government and the Supreme Court of Canada.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, Parliament indeed, which is the essence of the democratic process, must be in a position to finally make a decision and not be held hostage - as indeed the Leader of the Opposition is being held hostage - to his own caucus. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to be hostage to his own caucus, fine, let it be, but this side will not be held hostage in this Chamber.

A MEMBER: Have a free vote.

A MEMBER: It wouldn't create any problems on this side.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you think it would create any problems on this side, you're sadly out to lunch.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the resolution must be resolved by way of circumstances of 1984 and not 1870. The resolution must be based upon the circumstances and events of the year 1984, and that's why the bill that accompanies the resolution in this Chamber recognizing that an 1870 resolution of this matter would simply deal with the courts, the Legislature and the statutes rather than dealing with services to people, enhancing the opportunity for people to receive services.

Last Sunday I had the opportunity to meet in this very building with approximately 300 leaders of ethnic communities that came to visit this building and I talked with them. I was pleased with the understanding expressed by the leaders of the ethnic communities that I spoke to. It wasn't just one or two but it was many many that said to me, stick with your battle on the French language service issue. We're disappointed in the approach that the opposition is taking. We cannot understand, they said, by ensuring freedom for one group is not considered to be the extension of freedom for all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, if it's the French today, who will it be tomorrow? Why do we need to all be fitted into some melting pot? Why do we have to fit into some melting pot, one culture, one language? Manitoba is a rich mosaic. We will not allow . . .

HON. S. LYON: The smell of gas is on your hands; you'll never wash it away.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . a rich mosaic of Manitobans, different ethnic backgrounds, different colours, different religions. A flower garden is much more beautiful for the different flowers that make up that flower garden, that contribute to the overall beauty of that flower garden and that's the richness of Manitobans, that we can enhance this province. We enhance this province because we have people from different backgrounds. My own children descend from English, Irish, French, Polish and Austrian. That is the beauty of Manitobans - tolerance, understanding and trust, not selfish cynicism, not hate, not fear, but tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you. This government is not for a moment going to attempt to prop itself up on a foundation, that as I mentioned earlier, one of sand. The foundation of any government must be to ensure equity amongst its citizens; it must be one to encourage tolerance and understanding; it must be one to respect minority groups and the very important fact that minority groups deserve protection in our society, they deserve protection against the Keegstras in our society.

Mr. Speaker, isn't it unfortunate in the Province of Alberta that for ten years we had a school teacher in a little community in Alberta that spread hate against one of our groups, one of our nationalities, the Jewish people in the Province of Alberta, that spread lies and

distrust that even to this day there is a scar in Eckville, Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, that individual became the mayor of his community, because apparently the people of Eckville weren't upset by what he was saying. No, I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that it may very well have been that despite what he was saying the people of Alberta felt that it wasn't really all that important. They elected him as mayor - the head official in Eckville, Alberta.

MR. R. DOERN: What time is closure?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I will not despite the uneasiness of the Honourable Member for Elmwood because I'm talking about Keegstra in Alberta close my remarks. If the Honourable Member for Elmwood doesn't want to hear me talk about Keegstra, then he can leave this Chamber until I'm finished.

Mr. Speaker, that's what I'm asking for is tolerance, understanding, love, the respect for the historical reality of Manitoba, reasonableness in the way we approach this matter in a legal way, in order to ensure that we do not end up as indeed was the result in 1980 with this matter coming back before this Chamber next year or the year afterwards, that this time we get it done right so future Manitobans don't have to be burdened with this issue, whether it be '85, '86, '87 or '88 or '94, but we ensure that this matter is done legally and properly according to the advice of constitutional lawyers - that the advise that we follow is the advise of the constitutional lawyers and not those who think that they are constitutional lawyers and are not.

Mr. Speaker, why is it so difficult once we wash aside expediency, opportunism and fear? I acknowledge when it comes to the Constitution I don't claim, as your former leader does and some others, that I know all that there is to know about the Constitution, but I am prepared to listen to the Kerr Twaddles and the Dale Gibsons. Maybe you're not prepared to - I acknowledge that I don't know as much as Kerr Twaddle and Dale Gibson and some of the other constitutional advisors. I am prepared to follow their advice because I have the responsibility of ensuring that that which I do is done in the interests of Manitobans. I'm not going to accept legal advice from a John Doe when we have respected constitutional lawyers that give us legal advice like Kerr Twaddle and Dale Gibson in this province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in addition there's another area of misinformation that I would like to rectify on the record because we've heard it frequently and it has been repeated on numerous occasions. It has been said by the former leader - maybe present leader because I think he's still calling the shots, it's pretty clear - that we were dragged kicking and screaming into public hearings and the present Member for Tuxedo, the present Leader of the Opposition, has made the same sort of suggestion in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, just so we can get the facts straight once and for all and hopefully this will bury this misconception once and for all, I want to read into the record my comments of Monday, June 27, 1983 - Page 3957.

"In addition" . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: I know honourable members don't like to have the truth recorded in Hansard in order to betray the falsehoods that have been tossed about this province by honourable members here. "In addition" . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. L. SHERMAN: Howard, you were up when I went out. Still trying to make the same point, eh, Howard?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my problem is I have to keep trying to make the same point because I sense that those that have ears across the way have ears that don't hear. That's a problem. I think part of the problem is they don't generally remain silent long enough so they can hear with their own ears.

Mr. Speaker, "In addition, the Attorney-General, in due course, acting in his capacity as Government House Leader, will introduce a motion to refer the subject matter of the resolutions to one of the Standing Committees of the Legislature to provide a more formal opportunity for presentations from the public. The referral will require the committee to report back prior to the conclusion of debate on the resolutions."

I want to read it again for honourable members because some of the honourable members across the way were not listening. They were not listening, they preferred not to listen. "In addition, the Attorney-General in due course, acting in his capacity as Government House Leader, will introduce a motion to refer the subject matter of the resolution to one of the Standing Committees of the Legislature to provide a more formal opportunity for presentations from the public. The referral will require the committee to report back to prior to the conclusion of debate on the resolution."

The date was — (Interjection) — yes, it wasn't August the 15th or 14th; it wasn't in July. It was June 27, 1983.

A MEMBER: What a liar!

HON. H. PAWLEY: June 27th and, Mr. Speaker, when members across the way urge the Leader of the Opposition to tell the truth, this is an example that I would ask with all due modesty to the Leader of the Opposition and especially the former Leader of the Opposition who was much more colourful in his remarks on this, to get the true facts, to deal with the facts, deal with the reality - June 27, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, we dealt with this matter from June 27th to August 18th.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Over and over and over.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker, the same speeches . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there was bell ringing then, there was filibuster, there was repetition day after day, week after week, and then these individuals and their newspeak, their Orwellian type of utilization of trying to remake history, saying, well, the government had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into the public hearings.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the Honourable First Minister permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the Honourable First Minister permit a question?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Would the Honourable First Minister not agree that his remarks on the 17th of June were, on Page 3770, he said, "It is a matter that cannot be dealt with effectively by public hearings"?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it appears that I was right on June 17th, but let honourable members who try to say that we were dragged, kicking and screaming, throughout June and July and August, know that their facts are incorrect, that a motion was raised in this Chamber within days by the Attorney-General to refer this matter to a committee of this House for public hearings, Mr. Speaker.

Then I have heard suggestions that we were not prepared to make change, Mr. Speaker. I remember within days of the Attorney-General having raised this matter in this Chamber, upon the receipt, on my part, of a letter from the Manitoba Government Employees Association, of indicating that we would be prepared to make constructive changes. That was said in June of 1983.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members like to talk about the Member for Elmwood not being in our ranks. I wonder where the Member for Provencher stands on this issue. I wonder where the Member for Lisgar stands on this issue. What about the Member for Marquette? Where does the Member for Brandon-Souris stand on this issue?

A MEMBER: They are Manitobans; they are Manitobans.

HON. R. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, they are Manitobans; they represent Manitobans just as much as honourable members across the way.

Are honourable members suggesting there are two types of Manitobans: Class A Manitoban that relates

only to the provincial scene and Class B Manitoban that relates only to the federal scene and therefore, it's irrelevant? — (Interjection) — Somebody says Dan McKenzie. I don't include Dan McKenzie in my comments. Although the Leader of the Conservative Party got up and said he carried this whole caucus with him on this matter when the vote came in the House, it was the Member for Winnipeg-St. James that lurked out into the hallway. He wasn't courageous enough to get up in the Chamber and say I disagree with my leader, but snuck out into the corridor and said I don't agree with what my leader has said. After his leader had said in the Chamber that he spoke for the unanimous, each and every member of the Conservative caucus federally, the Member for Winnipeg-St. James snuck out into the corridors and tried to disassociate himself from his leader.

A MEMBER: Winnipeg-Assiniboia.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Winnipeg-Assiniboia, I'm sorry. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I apologize, and I will be in deep trouble with the Member for Winnipeg-St. James who I hold in the highest of esteem.

Mr. Speaker, the ground has been covered many times. The House Leader has pointed out that the preparatory words are not expansionary; the House Leader has pointed out that legal opinion is that our chances of failure with the Bilodeau case are at least five times greater than they are with the legislation that we have before us. That has been pointed out to honourable members across the way. If they want to second guess legal counsel, let them go ahead and do it, but let them be accountable for second guessing of legal counsel.

Mr. Speaker, they have left an impression. They haven't come out and said municipalities, you need not worry, it's entrenched; this will not apply to municipalities or to school divisions. Have they said that once? Have they attempted to assist in easing the fears and concerns, and understandable fears and concerns of the municipalities, that this does not apply to municipalities? Have they tried?

Mr. Speaker, the debate is one that has consumed the attention of members in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, I just want to check my notes to make sure that I haven't left some point out that the honourable members across the way might not appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, just by way of conclusion, I want to read a few lines to honourable members across the way.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Just sit down, Howard, please.

A MEMBER: Listen to these words, listen to these words, Frank.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I want the honourable members across the way to listen to these words. "This resolution

is about fairness; it's about decency. It is an invitation for co-operation and understanding. It speaks to the finest qualities in the nation."

Mr. Speaker, those are not my words; they are not the words of Prime Minister Trudeau. They were the words of the Leader of the Conservative Party. And the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I understand, wants to join the ranks of Mr. Mulroney. He wants to join the ranks of the Leader of the Conservative Party that said this resolution is - in fact, they were then dealing with the resolution before the compromise, the resolution before the Honourable Member for Charleswood said had undergone a 170 degree change. The Leader of the Opposition said this, and the Federal House said this resolution is about fairness.

If the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is successful in defeating Mr. Axworthy, is he going to rise in his place in the House of Commons next year and say, yes, I played a part in this Chamber, I participated in the debate so that we could have a resolution that was fair as described by my leader? Is the Honourable Member for Fort Garry going to rise in his place next year if he's successful and say, yes, I played a part in achieving that which was decent as said by my leader in the federal House?

Is the Member for Fort Garry going to be able to say that I participated in a resolution that was an invitation for co-operation, for understanding, for the qualities, or is the Honourable Member for Fort Garry going to have to acknowledge in the House of Commons - if indeed he is successful - that he participated in filibustering, that he participated in bell ringing, that he had participated in fear mongering, that he didn't try to participate in the debate in order to remove inaccuracies and misrepresentation? What is the Honourable Member for Fort Garry - because I respect the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I believe the Honourable Member for Fort Garry to be principled; I've always felt that way about the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I have felt that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry indeed was and is a principled individual, and I ask how the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is going to respond insofar as the words spoken by his federal leader in Ottawa about fairness, about decency, but opening the way for co-operation, about the finer qualities that make up Canada as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further comments to make at this point. The Attorney-General made it very clear last Friday as to where this side of the Chamber stands in respect to the amendment itself. I don't think that requires any further clarification or comment by honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, we've presented our case, our views, on this very important matter before us, important to Manitobans, important to the history of this province and future generations within this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I'm sorry that the First Minister mislaid his notes and didn't have before him the date of closure that he was going to announce to this Chamber. I don't know whether it's going to happen tomorrow afternoon, or whether it's going to happen Friday, or whether it's going to happen Monday, but we all know, Mr. Speaker, that it's imminent.

I was also, Mr. Speaker, giving some thought - not a great deal - to attending the convention in Brandon, but having just heard the First Minister's convention speech, which he gave to us as a preview, I think it wouldn't be necessary. Because we know, Mr. Speaker, that he has to try to sell this clumsy package that he has come up with to the New Democratic Party in Brandon, and there is no way that he can go into that convention with the situation being as is. Because if he goes into Brandon under the present circumstances, he might come out of that convention as the former Leader of the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker . . .

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

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member like to submit to a question?

MR. R. DOERN: Certainly.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member like to engage in a substantial bet?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: I'll speak to you about that later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Honourable members know that wagering is contrary to the principles of Parliament.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say in all seriousness to the First Minister - he read to this Chamber the names of some of the great leaders of the New Democratic Party - I respect each and every one of them: Stanley Knowles, Tommy Douglas, David Lewis, M.J. Coldwell, J.S. Woodsworth, and if he didn't mention him, Ed Broadbent. I respect each and every one.

But I have to tell the First Minister in all seriousness that his name is never mentioned in that company - never. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the First Minister that his name is never mentioned in the company of Edward Schreyer - never. I want to tell the First Minister that in two years time his name will never be mentioned by anybody in the New Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, it'll be too embarrassing and it'll be too painful for people in the New Democratic Party to mention the name of the First Minister in the future because of what he has done to that party and what he is going to do to the New Democratic Party in this province for the next 20 or 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, he talked about closure, but he didn't mention the opinions of M.J. Coldwell and Stanley Knowles in regard to what they thought of closure. He didn't mention what they said about closure in the pipeline debate.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, like his colleagues, are shaking in their boots about the rally that is going to take place tomorrow night.

Mr. Speaker, he wants to talk about the advertisement, and I want to say to him that he read

this sentence and I don't understand what he saw as a problem with this sentence. I'd like to know what the problem is with this sentence. It said in this advertisement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, he said that the ad said - and he complained that it said - that it was possibly your last chance to protest against closure, entrenchment and the extension of French language services. Mr. Speaker, that is deadly accurate.

And notice the names of the people who are speaking at that particular rally, Mr. Speaker: Sterling Lyon; Sidney Green; Herb Schulz; D.L. Campbell, former Premier of Manitoba, a man that I have the highest regard for; Bobby Bend, the former Leader of the Liberal Party; Pat Maltman who led the plebiscite forces in the plebiscites; and Grant Russell, the Chairman of Manitoba Grassroots.

Mr. Speaker, all that the First Minister can talk about and all that his colleagues can talk about is the fact that one Manitoban, a right-winger named Conrad Kelly, collected 5,700 names. Those are not the names of right-wingers, those are the names of people spread around throughout the province. Petitions were signed by all kinds of people and those petitions were taken to the Lieutenant-Governor and to the First Minister and all he can talk about is his grave concern about the fact that the right wing is attached to Conrad Kelly and that people should leap up and repudiate Ron Gostick.

Mr. Speaker, I repudiate Ron Gostick; I have no use for Ron Gostick. I know who Ron Gostick is and I don't subscribe to any of his ideas. But if the First Minister wants us to stand up and repudiate, why doesn't he stand up and repudiate Paula Fletcher and the Communist Party? Why doesn't he stand up when Paula Fletcher came to the committee and endorsed the Manitoba Government proposals in the committee, and why didn't he stand up two weeks ago when the Communist Party endorsed the New Democratic Party?

Would you like to get up right now and repudiate Paula Fletcher and the Communist Party, because I'll sit down if you will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to lower myself to the same as the member. I have persistently and consistently repudiated communism, fascism, any form of extremism.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, that's fine, Mr. Speaker, because now we have it on record.

I made the point that Mr. Russell, who's the chairman, repudiated and said that this organization in no way reflected his organization. Conrad Kelly is not a member of Grassroots and neither are any of those other people.

Mr. Speaker, I have just repudiated Gostick and the First Minister has just repudiated Paula Fletcher and

the Communist Party, so we understand each other. Extremism and the people on the far left and the far right should not be involved in this particular . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the next point I'd like to deal with is our friend here, the House Leader, who should go out and rent himself a crowd because he's having problems in his own riding and he's having problems with his own constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the Springfield rally and the fact that the Minister of Mines worked on that poor old gentlemen, Mr. Shields. I'm told that Mr. Shields spent the afternoon listening to the Minister of Mines.

That is cruel and unusual punishment and I would hazard to say that anyone subjected to that would recant or withdraw or confess anything that they had said rather than be subjected to the personality and the arguments of the Minister of Mines.

A MEMBER: I'll buy that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when this matter is next before the House the honourable member will have 32 minutes remaining.

This House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).