



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

**DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS**

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 181A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 13 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
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 13 February, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Waiding: 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 Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the background information which I'll be providing to participants with my pre-Budget consultations.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. I'm wondering now if he's had an opportunity to review the translation of the front-page article from *Le Devoir* last Wednesday, February 8th in which the Premier is quoted, in an interview with Jean Pierre Proux, as saying that he is willing to scrap the word "official" in the constitutional amendment which is before us today and if so, Mr. Speaker, will he then be supporting the amendment that we on this side have made to that proposal and allow this matter to be dealt with?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I have asked the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in making reference to the article to indicate it was trash; that was the headline that was given to the article. Mr. Speaker, what we have indicated throughout, we are prepared at all times to discuss wording in regard to the resolution that's before us. In fact, the House Leader at least six times since early December has made opportunity to encourage such discussion with members of the opposition. On six occasions he has been rebuffed in any opportunity to discuss wording with the opposition; in fact the last time, as short a period as two weeks ago, when an attempt was made to have some discussions with the opposition in respect to concerns that they might have in regard to wording. If the Leader of the Opposition is indicating now publicly that he is interested in having some discussions re the wording of the section in mind or any other section, certainly we're prepared to discuss

alternative wording at any time. But, Mr. Speaker, on six different occasions there has been a rebuff to the House Leader on attempts to have such a discussion.

Probably of more interest this morning, Mr. Speaker, would be some comment from the Leader of the Opposition, since this is Monday of the week of the offer of a free vote in this Chamber, as to whether the Leader of the Opposition over the weekend has had any opportunity to convince his colleagues to back him up on the offer that he made this past Thursday.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that last Thursday I said that at any time the vote took place, it would be a free vote on this side of the House and that still stands. That still stands, Mr. Speaker. At any time that vote takes place it will be a free vote on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister says that this is a matter open for discussion why has he not, in debate in the House, made reference to fact that he is not committed to the word "official," that he and his government would consider changing it. Mr. Speaker, the manner in which discussions take place between the two sides of the House is in debate right here in the Legislature. The question is, we have given our position on the matter. We have put forward an amendment that would remove Section 23.1. Will he and his government be supporting that amendment so that the matter can be dealt with expediently?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing with the Leader of the Opposition - and the opposition is that they have reneged on their words - every time there's been a number of flip-flops there have been, as I've indicated, attempts on the part of the House Leader to have discussions with the opposition; those attempts have been rebuffed, the last as of two weeks ago. If the Leader of the Opposition is now indicating that they would like to have a discussion with the House Leader in respect to wording, then certainly, Mr. Speaker, we would encourage that kind of discussion, that kind of bipartisan discussion, if that is now the indication that is being provided for by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have not referred in any way to bipartisan discussions. I've asked the Premier if he's willing to drop his commitment to the term "official languages" and support our amendment. That's all I've asked him, Mr. Speaker. I want to just indicate to the Premier that commitments aren't made by shouting back and forth across the House, by bantering back and forth and heckling that goes on. Commitments are made in discussion in caucus and in positions taken by parties in caucus, Mr. Speaker. I just want to know whether or not his party has taken a position in caucus to support our amendment and remove their concern about the term "official languages."

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just so that we don't attempt to revise history, February 9, 1984, Page 5913:

"Mr. G. Filmon: With the assurance of the fact that there would be a free vote, we'd be glad to have the time to get our members in." That was Thursday. This is now 2:10, Monday afternoon. I would think there would have been more than ample opportunity to ensure that members be brought in for a vote, Mr. Speaker. So let us not try to play tricks with what was said Thursday in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to advise us as to what particular freedoms as provided for in the declaratory statement they, as an official opposition, would like to see extinguished or eliminated, then let the Leader of the Opposition spell out those particular items because what we are dealing with is a provision in the declaratory statement - the freedom to use French or English as per the existing rights. It would be indeed helpful if the Leader of the Opposition would list for us this afternoon the particular uses of French, the existing uses of French, that they as a party would like to officially see extinguished or removed.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, we on this side do not wish to extinguish or remove any freedoms. The record is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we support the existing Section 23. We have never changed from that position, Mr. Speaker. Our amendment is clear - at least it should be clear, and I think it is to most members of the House - perhaps the Premier has difficulty understanding it, but we have moved an amendment to remove Section 23.1. The Premier seems to be leaning that way by his comments to *Le Devoir*.

We are simply asking, is he now going to lead his caucus in supporting our amendment to this motion so that we can get on with it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my statements again are very very clear insofar as the position of the government. If the honourable member wants to propose some wording that would make valid sense, if he would like to indeed meet with the House Leader rather than rebuff the House Leader in order to discuss appropriate wording that would be reasonable and appropriate, fine. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to note over the weekend that his leader, the provincial leader here, has received a very clear examination on the part of his federal leader who has indicated very clearly on the record that he does not support the obstruction that is being put up by Manitoba Conservatives in the Manitoba Legislature.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the First Minister, always in the hope that as we start a new week that maybe sanity will prevail, and in the hope that we'll be able to deal with and discuss the issue before us, namely a constitutional amendment.

Would the First Minister ask his Government House Leader to set aside his motions of privilege that have us debating the length the bells can ring or the previous questions being put, and allow us to get back to dealing with the amendments and deal with issues at stake here so that we can do that, not with the editors or newspapers of Montreal? Would he not consider doing that? Let's get on with the debate on the resolution.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let the honourable members not now hide from their refusal to participate in a bipartisan discussion on the basis of motions in this Chamber. The House Leader and myself, and the House Leader on other occasions on his own, made numerous attempts - as I mentioned earlier - to ensure that there would be ample opportunity for bipartisan discussion so that there could be a consensus arrived at in this Chamber. Despite those efforts on the part of the House Leader, myself, numbering at least six occasions, some of those occasions prior to us coming into this Chamber, those attempts were rebuffed.

Mr. Speaker, I'm encouraged if there is some glimmer of hope this afternoon being offered by members across the way, that they are now prepared to initiate those kinds of bipartisan discussions. I would commend them for that if indeed they are signalling to us this afternoon that they're now prepared, not for the seventh time to rebuff, but for the first time to be prepared to discuss some bipartisan resolution of the issue before us.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions to the First Minister but I do have a matter of order to raise. It could not have escaped your notice that what in effect has taken place is, we are attempting to debate the important constitutional amendment during question period, whether it's by the questions being put forward the other day by the Member for St. Norbert asking about the effects of the various different statutes with respect to this motion, whether it is the questions that have been raised by my leader, we are debating or attempting, Sir, to debate the important constitutional resolution in question period and that's out of order.

I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to allow us or to find some way of facilitating this Chamber from getting back to debating that at its appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I agree with and share the concern of the Member for Lakeside, the Opposition House Leader. Every time that motion has been called, the opposition has walked out of this Chamber. They did the same thing for four consecutive days on the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think what's important here is that you, Sir, ruled that the obstruction and abuse of the Rules of this House which has occurred steadily over the last month and on many occasions last summer, was a matter of the privileges of this House, particularly as it related to the ringing of division bells. This House, having decided Speaker's Ruling to deal with that matter, is now dealing with that matter and if opposition members are concerned with dealing with bringing some order to this House so that debate can proceed is a matter of urgent importance, then, Sir, we should vote on that matter immediately and we will call the resolution immediately.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Before members get too far away from the original point of order that was raised, I would remind honourable members that we are on Oral Questions which is a

time when the opposition asks short and concise and to-the-point questions and the government side answers them in a short, concise manner.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: I cannot allow the remarks that the Honourable House Leader left on the record go unchallenged, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to put on the record that the only occasion we've had to debate the constitutional amendment was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The point of order has been settled and I would remind members that we are in Oral Questions.

K-Cycle Engines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Technology and concerns the current situation surrounding K-Cycle Engines, the research and industrial project located in Buffalo Industrial Park in Fort Garry. I wonder if the Minister can confirm reports of Saturday that the \$600,000 K-Cycle Engines debenture - that's \$600,000 plus some \$300,000 in accumulated interest - held by the Federal Business Development Bank is being sold to new purchasers, a Mr. Parker and a Mr. Holman. Can the Minister confirm or comment on that report, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can't confirm or deny the potential sale of Debenture with respect to the K-cycle engine.

We are naturally interested in trying to ensure that further development with regard to the K-cycle engine remain in Manitoba.

We also recognize that there is considerable value to both industry and the research community of the companies present research laboratory and facilities. We have had some difficulty in getting accurate information with respect to the present developments from the Federal Business Development Bank because they are treating the matters related to the present situation in a confidential manner because of, in their view, commercial information.

Because of that I have this morning telexed the Federal Minister responsible for the Federal Business Development Bank, the Honourable David Smith, asking him to intervene directly so that we can get more accurate information with respect to the present development so that we can work along with them to ensure that that resource and that research remain here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Fort Garry make it clear if he wishes to continue on this topic that he is asking a question which is within the administrative competence of the Provincial Government.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your concern on the subject. However, what I am asking for, Sir, and up to this point in time I'm encouraged by the response of the Minister, is an indication that the Provincial Government, particularly the economic departments of this government, are concerned that the Province of Manitoba does not lose the expertise and technology that is constituted by the effort and the money that's gone into the development of the K-cycle engine up to this point.

So my reasons for questions, Mr. Speaker, are to assure this side of the House, and Manitobans generally, that this government is not going to be caught short or caught by surprise or willingly accede to the loss of a potential for Manitoba even though that potential, agreed Sir, really exists within federal parameters. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's response by the first question and I thank him for that reply.

I would like to ask him as a supplementary question whether he does know in fact anything about current reports, news reports that the prospective buyers of K-Cycle Engines believe that they can raise a sufficient amount of money to continue and conclude development work on the K-Cycle engine, development work on that engine itself. Does he know anything of those reports or have any of his departmental advisors given him any counsel on that subject?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, the province is very concerned and staff are working and have met both with the Federal Business Development Bank and the former developers of the K-Cycle engine. Again unfortunately, because of the position that the Federal Business Development Bank has taken with respect to confidentiality, we are having difficulty getting accurate information with respect to potential offers or conditions relative to potential offers on the debenture, and that is the reason that I have, this morning, contacted the Federal Minister asking his intervention so that we can get that information to assure ourselves and to work with all interested parties, to maintain that research here in the Province of Manitoba and to continue working, as has been the case with the government, to assist in the development of that technology here in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information. One final supplementary. Would the Minister consider with his colleagues or would the Minister be in a position to advise this House that it might be viable or possible to take action such as the form of seeking an injunction to prevent other buyers from moving in on the technology developed to this point by K-Cycle Engines or to prevent the Federal Business Development Bank from moving precipitously in this case before he has concluded his inquiries?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated, we are exploring various options with respect to this situation. The question of any kind of pre-emptive court action does not at this point seem appropriate, nor have we looked into the need for it. I do appreciate his advice and that is another area we will explore.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and

that is, can the Acting Minister advise the House whether anything is being done to protect the position of the 2,100 shareholders, most of them obviously minority shareholders in K-Cycle Engines? Have those shareholders been informed of the up-to-date and current situation under discussion in the media and in this House at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the question as notice. I don't know the intricacies of the shareholdings or the probable legal rights that flow from them.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Given some statements that he made since last Friday and in his remarks that the vote that would be taken on the constitutional amendment would be both a free vote and a matter of confidence, I would ask the First Minister whether this wouldn't appear to be somewhat of a contradiction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to ask the First Minister whether he also indicated that he knows how each and every one of his caucus will vote.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I said in caucus and I have, I think, a much better idea than the Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the First Minister, given the fact that a switch of four government members on this question would mean the defeat of the government and a general election, is the First Minister and his Cabinet leaning on the other MLAs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think the question is hypothetical, but it gives me an opportunity again to reconfirm that I'm prepared to have that vote today. If the honourable member wants to find out, let's have the vote right now and we'll find out.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would attempt to repeat or rephrase my question. If the First Minister is calling a free vote, then it would seem to follow that the government would not in fact fall on that basis. However, if he is making it a matter of confidence in the government, then how can he talk about a free vote when there's tremendous pressure on each and every one of his members to support the government because of the danger of a general election and the disastrous consequences that would flow from it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what way honourable members want it. I offered a free vote; I

offered that that free vote be one in confidence in the government; now I'm receiving requests from the Member for Elmwood that it be a free vote without expressing confidence in the government, Mr. Speaker. I thought indeed for this offer of a free vote to be concrete and to be worthwhile, it would have to be a vote of confidence in the government and I was prepared to have that Thursday, Friday, again today.

Brandon University - firing of President

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct my question to the Acting Minister of Education or the First Minister. As it is now nearly three months after the firing of Dr. Perkins, former University of Brandon President, has the board of governors of that university given a reason to the government as to the reason for Dr. Perkins' dismissal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to take any questions on education as notice for my colleague, but let me say that it has been very clear that question has been answered in this House many times, that that is the responsibility of the university board of governors.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, that's exactly my point. The question never has been answered in the House. I asked if the government was aware of the reason?

I would ask then this second question specifically to the First Minister. Is it a concern to the government and to the First Minister that at the meeting of the board of governors, November 17, 1983, at which time Dr. Perkins was tried and sentenced, that he was not present and not aware that the board would be discussing the subject of his fate? Does the government support the procedures of the dismissal as practised by its politically appointed board of governors?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the board of governors meeting is concerned, the board of governors is charged with responsibility for the administration of the affairs of Brandon University. It was suggested around that time by some that the meeting indeed had been held in an illegal way. If indeed that be the case, then it is an onus upon those that feel that way to bring such allegations to a proper hearing, a proper adjudication. Since that has not been the case then I would assume, Mr. Speaker, the hearing was held in a proper way.

Mr. Speaker, what is of importance to the government is the welfare of the students and education at the University of Brandon. I think we should all keep uppermost in our minds in this House the welfare of the students at Brandon University. Are the students at Brandon University being ill-served by way of the decision of the Board of Governors of the Brandon University? If indeed that be the opinion and view and there's concrete evidence to that effect, then that would

warrant overall general policy involvement in the part of the government, Mr. Speaker. But the government is not going to become involved in hiring or dismissal or appointment decisions that have not, according to any evidence submitted in this House and certainly not according to the position of faculty and student body of the University of Brandon, caused any decline whatsoever in the quality of education at Brandon University.

MR. C. MANNES: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and it's obvious that the First Minister is trying to cover up with words the desperate state of affairs at that university.

Mr. Speaker, as no reasons have been given in support of the board of governors' statement of "gross professional misconduct in respect to Dr. Perkins' termination as President," and as outside auditors have shown no misappropriation of funds, when will the Premier tell his politically-appointed board of governors to stop their desperate search for reasons to support their hasty and unwise decision of November 17, 1983? And will he not reconsider his government's action to not hold an inquiry into the state of affairs at that university?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this profound interest and concern on the part of the Member for Morris who's reported to have indicated today that in his view not everyone is entitled to an education, is quite interesting indeed.

I think that what is best is that we leave to the Board of Governors of the Brandon University - the board that is charged with the responsibility for the operations of Brandon University - the responsibility for determining whether or not the interests of Brandon University are best conducted through the maintenance of any particular president, just as is the case with the University of Winnipeg and the University of Manitoba.

If we were interfering insofar as a hiring decision at the University of Manitoba, I can just hear echoing through my ears right now, charges of undue interference by a socialist government in the operation of the university.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would ask - I don't know if I can ask - the First Minister indicated that I had said that I was against people being educated. He said that somewhere through his last answer to my question. I'd ask him to withdraw that statement.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are media reports to that effect today of a meeting at the University of Brandon, that the member made such a statement. If that is not the case, then I am pleased to withdraw the statement if the honourable member can assure me that the media reports are incorrect, the reports of his speech at the university.

Pre-Budget consultations

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

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance. Earlier today the Minister

tabled the background information for a series of pre-Budget consultation meetings that will be taking place around the province this year. Last year the Minister held a series of meetings in Thompson and throughout the province in regard to last year's Budget. I would like to ask the Minister if he could indicate the results of the consultations last year and the extent of the meetings he plans to hold this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We felt that the results of those consultations were very good. We discussed with a variety of groups in the province, the business community, people delivering health care services, education services and the trade union groups, what could be done at a time of very difficult recession to ensure that the province would not experience the worst of those conditions.

It was generally agreed by the people who came to those meetings that the No. 1 issue at that time was job creation. As a result we implemented the Jobs Fund. We dealt with the national government with respect to national economic recovery program - and members opposite were laughing at the time about a "Wish List" that would never come true. We've indicated that a whole host of those areas of suggestions to the Federal Government have been put into effect. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of agreements that are in the proposal stage and so on, and it has made a tremendous difference to the economy of this province.

So we were very pleased with the results last year. There were some difficulties last year, including the fact that there were no background documents, which this year we have prepared ahead of time, tabled, allowed members opposite also to partake.

Mr. Speaker, there were two questions. Happy Harry and his rules of order again appear to indicate that only the opposition can ask questions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There were two questions, one dealing with the effects of last year's meetings; the second dealing with proposed meetings for this year. I can tell the honourable member that there will indeed be meetings this year in a number of towns and cities in the province including Brandon, Thompson, Winnipeg, The Pas, Flin Flon. I believe even in Altona or someplace in southern Manitoba, there will be meetings.

We have, for the first time, also included opposition MLAs in terms of the background documentation and we will welcome as well their participation in terms of pre-Budget planning. If they have any suggestions, certainly those suggestions will be welcome.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind honourable members once more that they should refer to other members by their constituency or by the position that they hold and not by any name or nickname.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I would like to ask whether the Minister

might consider holding a special Session for members of the opposition so they don't make the same kind of wildly inaccurate predictions about this year's Budget and this year's deficit as they made last year.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question was frivolous and out of order.

Children's Aid Society - regional boards

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services. Because considerable concern is being expressed about the way the Boards of the Children's Aid Society are to be elected in the six regions in Winnipeg, can the Minister tell me whether only persons chosen as nominees by her staff will be placed before the electors or will the Minister now allow nominations from the floor and allow a truly democratic election?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, nominations have been invited from all citizens and from groups in each region. They are being processed by the nomination committee that was appointed last week and from that the slates will be drawn.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would still like to ask: Are nominations going to be allowed from the floor?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that question has been answered before. The nominating committee, I would point out, are in no way staff of government; they are appointees. They have been asked to consult with the regions and with the groups who have already been submitting their names and showing their interest, to come up with a balanced recommended list for election at the membership meetings.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the many people who have inquired about this are still going to be concerned because they do want nominations from the floor.

On a second question, can the Minister assure us that because of the structural change with the Winnipeg Children's Aid Society, that federal funding will not be placed in jeopardy?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member who proposed the question to clarify what federal funding he is inquiring about.

MR. A. BROWN: I am referring to the cost sharing with the Federal Government. The Federal Government always does some cost sharing. Is this in jeopardy? In other words, is the Federal Government aware of the changes she is making and do they approve of the plan?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the honourable member would wish to rephrase his question, not to

ask whether the Federal Government is aware of something. That is not within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister made the Federal Government aware of the changes she is making within the Children's Aid Society, and has she been assured that federal cost sharing is not going to be placed in jeopardy?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, child welfare is a provincial responsibility and the funding is provincial.

Expo '86 news releases

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and I believe Heritage, Cultural or

A MEMBER: Everybody is a Minister of something.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.
The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: When the babies are finished chattering, Mr. Speaker, I think I have a question for the Minister of Cultural Affairs then.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Saskatchewan has put out news releases extensively on their plans for Expo '86 in Vancouver. I wonder, could the Minister outline the presence that Manitoba will have in Expo '86. Saskatchewan has set up a corporation to handle their exposure there in '86. Is Manitoba doing anything to be recognized at Expo in '86?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for the question. I have not seen the media release from Saskatchewan, they don't seem to send them to me. But I can comment that the government is looking at its role with respect to Expo '86. The lead with respect to the discussions relative to that is through the Department of Business Development and Tourism, but I have been in consultation with that Minister and we are presently reviewing that item and will be discussing it further in the next short while.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, has the government - they are going to be discussing it - has the government any intention of arranging a situation where Manitoba will also have some exposure at Expo '86 in Vancouver? Do they intend to or don't they?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I indicated, the government is presently discussing the potential role of the Province of Manitoba with respect to Expo '86 and, once decisions are reached, they will be announced in the usual fashion.

Viability of local trucking firms

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Oh, he is otherwise engaged. Well, I will ask the question of the Minister of Highways and Transportation then. Could the Minister of Highways and Transportation indicate whether his government is pursuing any policy directions to ensure the viability of locally based trucking firms in Manitoba serving our rural communities?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That is a good question. Certainly we are always . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I wonder if that is the same question he was going to ask the Minister of Agriculture. I can tell the honourable member that we are very concerned on this side for the viability of trucking operations in the rural areas of this province, and it is one of my major concerns in the trucking task force that is undergoing at this time, and I am confident that the recommendations that come forward will ensure the viability of local trucking firms in this province.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my left. We have a former member of this Assembly, Mr. Bud Boyce.

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

HANSARD CORRECTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may take a few seconds to make some corrections in Hansard. I quite sympathize with the Hansard writers for they have a rather difficult time when one is being heckled as strongly as I was the other night to be able to make out one's words, but on Page 5952, Thursday, February 9, 1984, about halfway down the first column, the left-hand column, the word "dispend" should read "suspend."

Just below that, a couple of lines below, the word "bearing" should read "barring." A few, about two or three inches below that in the editorial of the Winnipeg Free Press referring to it of the 30th . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, one can understand why Hansard has a difficult time with speeches when you have the constant heckling of members opposite.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if the Member for Inkster could share with us which page he is being corrected on so that we can follow in Hansard. Mr. Speaker, with all the heckling from that side of the House, I missed the page number.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Once again for the Member for Pembina's benefit - and he sits quite close but usually his mouth is going faster than his ears - it's Page 5952.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, surely the Member for Inkster could show the usual civility that is accorded to him in this House rather than referring in such terrible ways to honourable members of the House. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if he would be advised to withdraw his last very ill-considered remarks to an honourable member of this House.

MR. D. SCOTT: If I may continue. The word "impervious" should be "impetuous," Page 5952 - for the third time. Is that too fast for you? Further down the word "service" should be "serve" and, Mr. Speaker, on the right-hand column near the bottom it should be "every position that is possibly presented" not "falsely presented."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder I could have leave of the House to make a brief statement of a non-political nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday at Virden a rink from the Pembina Curling Club in Fort Garry skipped by Mike Riley and consisting also of Brian Toews, John Helston and Russ Wookey won the 1984 Manitoba Labatt Tankard Men's Curling Championship. They won it with a 5-3 victory in their finals, Sir, that capped what was apparently a brilliant four days of curling for them in which they went through the competition without a defeat and they go on now, Sir, to Victoria, B.C. next month and the Canadian Labatt Brier National Curling Championships in which they will be carrying Manitoba's colours.

I'm sure I speak for all Members of the Legislature on all sides of the House, Sir, when I offer warm

congratulations to Mike Riley and his teammates from the Pembina Curling Club on their Manitoba Provincial victory and when I extend, on behalf of everyone here, our best wishes for every success in Victoria next month.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to make a brief statement of a non-political nature.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the citizens of the town of Virden and surrounding area, I want to express to the curlers throughout Manitoba the great pleasure that they had for the past four days in Virden of hosting the Manitoba Curling Association playdowns.

They also want to extend their congratulations to the Mike Riley rink because the Mike Riley rink provided tremendous spectator interest for all of those who attended the curling in Virden. The rink was full on almost every draw. They also want, at the same time, to urge the same type of support for the community of Dauphin next year when the Tankard playdowns will be held in Dauphin.

So the people of Virden want to also congratulate the Mike Riley rink and wish them the best when they go to Victoria next month.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE (Cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. On the matter of privilege raised by the Honourable Government House Leader, the motion thereto by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that the question be now put. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when is an agreement not an agreement - and I believe when it's with the New Democratic Party, the government in power in this House. On August 12, 1983 we had an agreement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: . . . in writing signed by the former Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader. In Rule 6 it said Rules of the House apply with provision for a two-week maximum on bell ringing. No. 7 is regular sitting hours after recess except there will be no Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I am trying to hear the honourable member. If there are other members who wish to hold their own private caucus meetings, perhaps they would do so outside of the Chamber.

The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The motion that we are dealing with now and speaking on

is a motion respecting a matter of House privilege, which states, that the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House be instructed to examine the question of extended ringing of the division bells and to report back with recommendations to this House at its next Session and, that until the report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House is received and considered, a time limit of two hours on the ringing of the bells during all divisions be established as an interim measure.

This, Sir, is double closure. Not only do they not honour their agreements, we can't trust their word. Now we can't trust them when it's in writing and when it's signed. What kind of a government is it that can't come to an agreement and live by it, but wants to change the rules in midstream? This is the problem that the people of Manitoba are having with this government and, Sir, I say that this resolution, this matter of House privilege is an affront to the people of Manitoba and to the Legislature.

We have been letting the bells ring because of the motion of closure over our heads. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, on February 6th on Page 5868 when he was talking to the matter of privilege, said, "I would suggest, Sir, as well, that under Citation 80(2) related to the law of contempt of Parliament you may wish to consider Speaker Brand's decision at Westminster which said as follows: 'This House is perfectly aware that any member willfully and persistently obstructing public business without just and reasonable cause is guilty of a contempt of this House.'"

Sir, I suggest that it's this government that is guilty of contempt of this House without just and reasonable cause. What better cause could we have to oppose this government on an amendment to the Constitution than the way they have been proceeding without listening to the people, without even listening to the arguments of this side of the House, but just wanting to proceed ahead. I believe that closure and not respecting agreements, these are reason enough for contempt. I think that the Government of the Day owes the opposition an apology for the way that they have handled this issue.

The Minister has the nerve to talk about British parliamentary tradition; they know nothing about parliamentary tradition. He went on to say, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Government House Leader, that he "denies the right of government to see its legislation proceed to enactment." Sir, I say that bad legislation can be changed, constitutional amendments are there forever. We cannot change a constitutional amendment and by now the people of Manitoba, on both sides of this House, are well aware of that. We can change their bad legislation, and we will change their bad legislation, but this is one issue that cannot be dealt with the same as legislation that is ordinarily brought into this House.

What have we seen in this province since the resolution has been brought forward, and that's the new amendment that was brought in? We've had a rally at the Legislative Building, approximately 1,000 people attending; nowhere was the Premier to be seen. He met with four people, I believe he indicated, of the committee for Grassroots, but at no time did he see fit to come out and speak to the people of Manitoba who came here to listen and to try and understand

what was happening in their province. He chose to hide in his office.

This same Premier indicated that in order of importance this piece of legislation was 58 out of 61; an extraordinary statement for the Premier of this province to make when we have been spending the last how many months trying to get this issue out of our way, trying to get a sensible solution, something that we could all live with. But always this government chooses to bring in closure, they really don't want to hear anymore. They feel that they've made a turnabout of 170 degrees; they've made an important compromise and that should be it. But until we get it right, Mr. Speaker, until we get the resolution, the amendment to the Constitution right, we do not intend to stop, we intend to keep on going.

I'm sure if the people of Manitoba were asked what their priority would be on this issue it would be 61 out of 61. It's not an issue they want to be dealing with at all. I say to you, Sir, that this is one of the most divisive pieces of legislation that we will ever have to deal with in this Legislature. It's the only issue that's before us, they didn't choose to bring in anything else. This was the choice of the government.

There was a meeting held in River East, according to news reports, that the Member for River East, I believe, the Minister of Finance and the Premier attended. It was a meeting to talk about the economy. What happened at that meeting? Because this issue is so all-consuming they were forced to discuss the resolution, the French language issue as it's known in Manitoba, the Premier was forced to hold a meeting in Selkirk. He didn't bother to attend the one that was held on the Monday evening, but he held his own on the Wednesday in Selkirk. I'm sure he was among friends and former supporters, but the reports from that meeting, Sir, were that 80 percent were against the Premier and where he stood on this issue. Imagine the Premier of this province being booed in his own constituency on an issue that needn't be.

If this government would only adhere and listen to what we have been saying on behalf of the people of Manitoba, if they would support our amendment that was brought in by the Member for Fort Garry, then we wouldn't be on an issue about bell ringing; we would be able to get on with the business of the province.

I'd like to speak briefly about Grant Russell, the spokesperson for Grassroots. Grant lives in my constituency and I know him fairly well. He's a man of honour, he's a man who certainly stands up and speaks about what he thinks. He, unfortunately, is in poor health and for a man of his age it's pretty hard to take. His family and friends are worried about him, worried about his involvement. Then we have the Premier of the province standing up and taking pot shots at someone who opposes him on an issue, and in the worst possible way - I have a transcript of the press conference and the question was to Mr. Pawley.

"Do you think that the Federal Government should be telling Grant Russell of Grassroots that he should not be engaged in partisan politics."

The answer, Pawley: "I don't know what Mr. Russell's situation is with the Federal Government. The one thing that kind of surprised me is if he is well enough to be working on practically a full-time basis on Grassroots, I would have thought that he might be well enough to

be back working for the Federal Government, rather than drawing taxpayers' money on sick leave. But, outside of that, I wouldn't want to comment on their code."

Mr. Speaker, in the House on February 8th - the press conference took place on February 7th - the Premier, when asked if he didn't owe an apology to Mr. Russell, indicated, "As far as I'm concerned Mr. Russell is entitled to any views he wishes to express. He has expressed those views as part of the democratic process. My only musing was to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Russell is well enough to work on many many hours a day, as apparently he has been able to - I sense 16-17 hours a day, at the same time drawing disability cheques from the Federal Government and has been for some time - I wonder if indeed the federal job that he has is really so much more taxing that he would not be able to perform his duties at the federal level, rather than to draw disability cheques from the Federal Government."

This is from the Premier of our Province. This is the way he talks about someone who opposes him. Mr. Speaker, I've got a couple of articles from the Winnipeg Free Press and one of them says: "MLA collected pay and sick benefits." It refers to Labour Minister at the time, Mary Beth Dolin. "Dolin, who joined the Cabinet in July, received benefits from Seven Oaks School Division equal to her full salary as a teaching vice-principal from October 18, 1981 until February 19, 1982. After her accrued sick leave benefits with Seven Oaks ran out, Dolin also applied for and received until July, 1982, benefits from Great-West Life Assurance. Members of the Legislative Assembly, according to the office of the Clerk of the Assembly, began drawing their salary immediately following November 17, 1981 election."

I don't bring this matter up, of the Minister, to judge whether collecting was right or wrong. How I do bring it up is the reaction of her husband to that report. He wrote a letter to the Winnipeg Free Press and it says: "Article attacked as sleazy. It is with shock and disbelief I noted your article, 'MLA collected pay and sick benefits' Free Press, September 30th. The article calls into question the rights or morality of a person with cancer" - you might substitute that with heart disease in relation to Mr. Russell - and in brackets, "(a minor fact your reporter failed to mention). Mary Beth Dolin, unable to continue at her job, collecting earned sick leave and later salary continuance insurance, plus an MLA's salary. The person involved in this case was my wife." He was indignant and so he should have been at what was happening. But no more indignant, Sir, than I am at what the First Minister has done with Grant Russell, who was not collecting two salaries.

But how it ended, the last paragraph from Mr. Dolin in relation to his wife, is "vicious and sleazy" are two words that immediately come to mind when I think of your article - "vicious and sleazy." I wish to tell you that that accurately describes what I felt when I heard our so-called man of principle, the Premier of our province, attack Grant Russell because he dared to oppose this government. How desperate he must be that he would stoop so low.

In this business, Sir, I say to you that we all live in glass houses and when you throw that first stone, you want to be very careful where it lands. The Premier

sits in his place or in his cushy office, has his good health, collects a big salary, cars at government expense - and he has the nerve to question a man who is on disability leave and question his motives. I find it disgusting; it's revolting. I think that more than anything the people of Manitoba should speak out against this Premier who would do such a thing.

Sir, on Page 5 of the press conference, the question was asked about the mandate that the government had to go ahead with this proposal, and the question went, "So their point would be that you don't have a mandate in the strict sense for this, and they also questioned whether you should be amending the Constitution against their wishes. How would you address that concern?" And the Premier answered, "We have administrative responsibilities when we are elected as a government. We are expected to use wisdom, judgment and good sense when we are faced with legal challenges."

Sir, I ask you, could possibly an issue that has so divided our province have been caused by wisdom, judgment and good sense? If only they had some good sense, we wouldn't be in this present predicament.

Another question that was asked: "You talked to us a few minutes ago about responsibility to the electorate. The opposition is challenging you daily to go to the electorate. Why not go now?" Pawley: "For the simple reason that when we proceed to, we have a mandate to fulfill to the electorate, the vast, silent majority of Manitobans are much more concerned about other issues."

I agree they are concerned with other issues, but right now this is the only issue before them and this is the issue that concerns them. This is what the petitions are all about; this is what the ballots are all about. This is what the people coming to the Legislature, the rallies - that's what it's all about. When I'm talking to people it's almost a phenomenon. Where did you ever see people turn out at anything on 24 to 48 hours notice? They don't; they stay home normally. But this issue is bringing them out in droves and I can't understand for the life of me why this government is proceeding the way it is on this issue.

That's the reason the bells are ringing; that's the reason they keep saying to us, keep the bells ringing. If this government believes for one minute that there's a silent majority out there that wants this to end and get this down to the Parliament of Canada to be passed immediately, they have another think coming. This is not so; that is not what people want.

I'd like to give just a few examples of what people in my own constituency have been telling me. I had one that called and he's taking a petition around. I know a lot of the people in my constituency and I know what happens if you call a meeting or if you send a letter out or if you send a franking piece, you get an average amount of calls, but they're happy to hear from you and that's possibly the end of it. On this one I have never had so many calls on an issue. I would think, if I was the Member for Riel who had over 2,000 people petition her, believe me, I would be in a state of panic because it is just unheard of to have people come forward like that.

The Minister of Agriculture, with people pounding at his door, now he would like to have you believe that this came from Lakeside, it did not come from his

constituency. I doubt very much if he is calling too many public meetings because he is not interested in hearing what is happening.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I had someone say I am silly, Gerrie. Maybe so, but I want to tell you I'll be here next time and they won't. Silly as they may think I am, I am representing the people in my constituency. If they would do the same themselves they wouldn't be in this position.

Mr. Speaker, we have said time and time again that on this issue they have moved 170 degrees, or 190, and they just need to move the other 10 percent, and I believe that that is true.

We have an amendment on 23.1 to be deleted and, if they would go along with that amendment, we could get rid of this issue, everyone - almost everyone, I won't say everyone - is going to be happy but because of the way they have treated the issue there are people now out in our community who won't accept anything. What a shame that is, but it has come about because of the way this government has chosen to treat the issue.

I had another woman who called to say that she is on a fixed income and all she sees in this issue, both the bill and the rescission down the line, is more cost. This government thinks it is saving us money; not on your life. There has never been anything that this government has done. The bill alone is set up to have a structure that there is going to be all sorts of bureaucrats, all sorts of money going out. So this is going to cost, let no one think that that is going to be any different.

Another woman called. She's fourth generation in Manitoba, her husband is sixth. They consider themselves Canadians, not hyphenated Canadians. They don't want to go back necessarily to their roots, they are happy to know what they are, but they don't want to be dealing with it on a day-to-day basis and they certainly don't want to turn into second-class citizens in this province.

Another, a small businessman called and he said we should be stressing costs. He is of Polish-Ukrainian background; he speaks four languages - French does not happen to be one of them. His children, none of them speak another language, he said they chose to do the extracurricular things, sports, all the things that they preferred because it was not a necessity to speak another language. It's nice if you want it, but not a necessity. His sister who lives in Roblin, her children took Ukrainian but they took it outside of school and at her expense, not the taxpayers. He went on to mention that the Minister of Health said: "You can't get blood out of a stone," and he agreed, you can't; but there is only so much money to go around. He said housewives know that, and businessmen know that. You have priorities, and this isn't a priority as far as he is concerned.

MR. H. ENNS: No. 58 on the Premier's listing.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: You are right. He started his own business in 1973 after working in the public sector for 17 years. He went into business of his own; he has to put in four times the effort than in the '70s to make the same amount or even anywhere close just to keep

his head above water. He indicates that in 1983 he is only doing 7 percent of his business in Manitoba, recovery is not happening here, this is what is happening.

Maybe this is why we are at this issue because this government can't get anything done; they can't produce any results but advertisements for the Jobs Fund. So possibly this is the reason that this government had this on the Order Paper as the only issue.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say that Manitoba is worse than anywhere else. He went on to say that the recovery is not happening here. Why is it not happening here? Why are we not spending our energies on something other than this? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of unrest in this province and I say to you, Sir, that it is not going to go away until this government comes to its senses.

I had another fellow call, and I guess the thing that is maybe appalling me the most, and I mentioned it in another speech, is that people are giving me their ethnic backgrounds now when they talk to me. They are not phoning up and saying I am Mr. Smith or I am Mrs. Jones; I am Mr. Smith and I am Ukrainian, and I am Mrs. Jones and I am Welsh, and I am Mr. so-and-so and I am something else. That is sheer nonsense and it should not be happening in this province.

MR. H. ENNS: We used to be Canadians.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Anyway to carry on, Mr. Speaker, I had another constituent that called, and he again informed me that he was of Ukrainian background and most opposed to what the government is doing, and that he was doing most of his business in Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories. He was depending on this government starting the Limestone, and I guess possibly he even voted for the NDP because, in the Clear Choice for Manitobans, it said they were going to have the immediate, orderly development of our hydro-electric resources; coupled with ManOil, would provide the basis for sound, sensible energy strategy for Manitoba. The New Democratic Party would act to develop needed energy resources.

Well, unfortunately, Sir, there are not any needed energy resources, but we have people like this man who called me, who is in business, who was pinning his hopes on this government keeping their promise. Not anymore. Even if they started it now, that's a vote that they have lost because they will never be believed again.

Why are they going ahead with this? He just tells me "sheer nonsense," and this is happening more and more. I think that the government has thought that they had a good percentage of the Ukrainian/Polish vote. Well, I think they can expect that one to be down the tube because most people, no matter what is happening with these little groups that are coming out, the ones that are getting the grants, no matter what's happening these people are coming out now and they are saying, nothing doing; we don't intend to be third-class citizens in this province. We're first-class citizens now on a par with everyone else. That's coming out loud and clear.

These are just a few of the people that have called. I've had many many more calls and in every instance

but I would say, four, who for one reason or another are feeling that there should be French language services entrenched; two were just in the province for a couple of years and indicated that. But other than that, the overwhelming response has been against this government's position and for the position we're taking and how long can we keep the bells ringing?

Mr. Speaker, they would like us to stay out forever. In fact, what is happening now is people are saying, why don't you just stay out and let them go ahead and do it, then it would be all on their head. But of course I have to explain to them that there's just no way that that can happen.

The underlying question to it all, to the whole thing is, why? Why would the Pawley government be doing this? There must be some payback. There's not anyone that doesn't think that. They can't believe a government would allow itself to get into such trouble. There has to be a payback. Pawley must be getting something - and keep the bells ringing.

Mr. Speaker, the other morning I was listening to the CBC and I managed to get a transcript . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Finished?

A MEMBER: Absolutely.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: . . . or I managed to get a partial one. It was Alexander Pressey and he's a Professor of Psychology at the University of Manitoba. I'd like to read into the record what Professor Pressey had to say. He stated: "Manitobans are not bigots and they are not angry at Franco-Manitobans; rather, Manitobans feel betrayed. They have developed a culture in which equality and tolerance are prize virtues and they see these virtues.

"As a Manitoban, I remember when this province was a seething cauldron of racial and ethnic hostility. I remember when we called each other "bohunks" and "krauts." These are not happy memories and certainly I would not call these the good old days, but a cultural accommodation has slowly and painfully emerged over the past 50 years. This accommodation has been achieved, not through legislation, but through innumerable personal contacts between people of different racial, ethnic and religious groups.

"These contacts have fundamentally changed the character of each and every one of us. Social harmony has come about because people have agreed that all cultures, though different, are equal. They fear that the proposed legislation will give the French culture a special status and thus produce social discord. This is because Manitobans perceive the English and French languages as fundamentally different. English is a culturally neutral language. All minority groups have adopted the English language, have integrated the language into their own culture yet believe that their culture is independent of the English language.

"French, on the other hand, is perceived to be culture-bound and indeed the legislation speaks of it as the property of the people of French origin. Thus the bill selects a particular cultural group for special treatment. But there is a second and perhaps more important

reason for this winter of discontent: Manitobans see their legislators negotiating the future of the province, not with the people as a whole, but with special interest groups. They feel belittled by a democracy that disregards the will of the majority. They deplore the degrading tactics of those who argue that the legislation is intrinsically good and that therefore all opposition to it is intrinsically evil.

"The driving force behind Manitoba's outrage is not bigotry. It is opposition to a bill that the people of this province fear will destroy a stable process of cultural accommodation, and it is opposition to what seems to be a democracy gone mad."

That is the end of Professor Pressey's talk on CBC radio. Mr. Speaker, he is so right when he talks about all that is good and all the opposition that is evil. You only have to see the way the Premier has attacked one of our citizens, Grant Russell, who opposed; how he treated the Member for Elmwood, "without honour," he said, because he opposed. There is just no end of what will happen when this government continues on and they know this. Maybe that's the reason they're bringing closure because they're fighting among themselves. They're calling down the people of Manitoba. They're ignorant; they don't know any better. But the people of Manitoba know what they're doing. They know that this government is behaving in an irresponsible manner.

Our position on this issue has been clear from the start. I'll quickly move along, Mr. Speaker, because I realize our time is short. But I want to say that now we've heard of the re-emergence of Mr. Maldoof from Alliance Quebec who has sent a letter, I believe, to our leader. I lived in the east for seven years and the only time any news of the west came is if we had a blizzard. They didn't give a damn what happened in the west. They didn't know we existed. A good example was the last federal election. At 8 p.m., we turned on the radio and the election was over and not a ballot had been counted here and in B.C. they were still voting. — (Interjection) — Believe me, this has everything to do with the motion before the House. That's why . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: . . . we don't want the bells to ring. Why, all of a sudden . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Why, all of a sudden are we so important now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: Give her a chance to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has two minutes remaining.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why, all of a sudden, are we so important to the east now? It's unbelievable, because we're not. For this government to hang their hat on the unity of Canada because Manitoba chooses not to go bilingual is utter

rot. I have never heard so much poppycock - or whatever the word is - as I've heard on this issue. All of a sudden, we're important to the east. Not on your life. This will be put through and we won't get a second passing glance except they'll be able to move on to Saskatchewan, Alberta, B.C. and then their big target is Ontario. They don't give a damn about Manitoba, so don't think that they do.

I want to tell you that when I lived in the east seven years, you begged for news of the west. I'm a westerner. Not a word. So I don't want to hear any of that sort of nonsense. It doesn't matter one little bit.

I think I'd just like to end with the Member for Burrows who, in his speech on Friday, February 26th said, "Responsibility in government also means that we should not be in a hurry in doing anything that later on we cannot undo." That is exactly what we're talking about and that's why we do not want to have this over in a hurry.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. May I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 20 members of the ringette team from Finland. The visitors are under the direction of Mr. Mattern.

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

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE (Cont'd)

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

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to debate the question before the House, the motion by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that this question be now put.

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand members opposite in their enthusiasm because perhaps they don't realize what they are doing to the democratic process, because this may very well likely be the last opportunity that I have to debate this important constitutional matter and I resent that, Mr. Speaker.

After this motion is passed by the government majority, I may or may not get the opportunity to speak another 30 minutes on the day that closure is imposed by the government.

I have had an opportunity during the summer months to debate referral motions as we attempted to have the government send this matter out through a committee to hear public submissions. I did have an opportunity to speak to a motion that the bill be hoisted. I have not, as 18 other members on this side of the House, had an opportunity to debate the main motion. I have not had an opportunity, as have another half a dozen members on this side, not had an opportunity, to debate the Government House Leader's amendment. There are 11 of us on this side who have not had an opportunity to debate the Member for Fort Garry's amendment.

It is with a great deal of sadness for the democratic process that I stand here today realizing that this may

be the last opportunity I have to speak to the constitutional amendment, and I do so, Mr. Speaker, having had the privilege, in the former government, to become involved in constitutional discussions that seemed to go on almost interminably. Here we have a situation where the government is imposing closure and we look at the series of amendments. This government made a proposal last summer; the then Government House Leader, at the beginning of the committee meetings, proposed further amendments last September; the new Government House Leader proposed an amendment on December 15th; and then within a matter of a week or so proposed a further amendment, and a large number of speakers have not had an opportunity to speak to either one of these and we have closure imposed.

Mr. Speaker, I resent that because, for one thing - and surely government members must realize this - how can there be any possibility to discuss the amendments before the House, or further amendments before the House, when you have closure imposed? I intend to attempt to refer to some possibilities today and I may or may not get an opportunity to speak on the day that closure is imposed, or get an opportunity to introduce an amendment at that time. Mr. Speaker, that is not the democratic process that we believe should exist in this country. I don't believe it and I believe the government should be harshly criticized for the process that they are using.

Under the circumstances, I firmly believe that closure, motions that question be put, are arrogant and are dictatorial. Regrettably - and I say so as a former Government House Leader - bell ringing appears to be the only defense left to opposition members. I regret that very much, Mr. Speaker. I support that part of the motion that reads, "that the matter of bell ringing be referred to the Committee on the Rules of the House." It is a matter that has to be considered seriously by members on all sides of this House. It is regrettable that the opposition has to be forced into using that type of tactic.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, the imposition of closure on a constitutional amendment because I simply can't believe that closure should be used in this Legislature to pass an amendment to the Constitution. It's inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, when we've had, for example, constitutional debate on the patriation of the Constitution to Canada go on for well over 50 years in this country. Politicians of all political stripes and all governments have discussed that issue for years and years until a consensus was finally reached and was accepted by the people of Canada. Unless you have a consensus on a constitutional amendment, how can you have a Constitution for a province and a country, something under which the life in this province is governed for virtually all time, Mr. Speaker?

The process of closure on a constitutional amendment is absolutely wrong. I deplore the circumstances under which I and other members of the House have to speak to this motion; I deplore the circumstances inside this House and outside this House that the government has created. I do so, Mr. Speaker, indicating - and for the record, the Attorney-General has tabled some of the documents that demonstrate the concern that we had as a party and as a government for the rights of French-speaking people in Manitoba. He tabled the documents

in this House that showed how this government, through the offices of the Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs, the late Mr. Rene Prefontaine, a very valuable civil servant for the Province of Manitoba, how he worked with the SFM, with the French community on our behalf and with us, how we appointed the French Language Secretariat, how we were making an honest effort and how progress was being made and how there was no criticism of public turmoil and excitement caused, Mr. Speaker.

The translation of statutes, I say for the record, was not done without criticism and reaction from a number of Manitobans. That was done, Mr. Speaker, but progress was being made in a reasonable way without this turmoil. After the next election is completed and this government is thrown out of office and this side forms a government, I want to assure the French-speaking people of Manitoba that we will continue the reasonable progress that was being made and they should have no fears in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, this government has not helped French-speaking people in Manitoba by their actions; by the turmoil that is being created; by the emotions that are being created; by the resentment that is being created. For them to proceed with a constitutional amendment - with some parts of it at least - is going to make a bad situation worse, I suggest.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some criticism from the now Attorney-General in his speeches and by the First Minister that somehow criticized me and the former Leader of the Opposition for not taking any action because I received a letter from the Attorney-General back on December 17, 1982. For the record again, let me make it clear that we in the Conservative Party formed a committee; we met with the SFM in the month of January of 1983; we discussed our concerns with them. At that time, Mr. Speaker, they were put to them. They indicated they were continuing to meet with the Attorney-General and that they would provide us with further information later on as those meetings progressed. We never heard from them, so I don't feel that any criticism of us in this area is particularly necessary.

There was indeed a quote and a question from the former Leader of the Opposition on May 18, 1983. At that time, the Leader of the Opposition was asking questions of the First Minister because the Prime Minister had been in Winnipeg a day or two previously and had announced the agreement between the Provincial Government and the Federal Government and the SFM. The Leader of the Opposition at that time put clearly on the record that neither the opposition nor the people of Manitoba are aware of what is now presently in contemplation. Mr. Speaker, after receiving the letter from the Attorney-General, we heard nothing further from the Attorney-General or from the Franco-Manitoban Society.

It is interesting to note as I reviewed some of the files and the press clippings with respect to this matter that there was an article in the Free Press referring to bilingual services on January 17, 1983, but then more interestingly in an editorial - members opposite like to quote Free Press editorials these days it seems - but on April 8, 1982 they said in an editorial: "The amendment is unlikely to pass smoothly through the Manitoba Legislature if it is not well understood and

generally accepted by the Manitoba public. If its subsequent implementation produces nasty surprises for the non-French Manitoba public, serious ill will is likely to result which will not benefit the French-speaking minority."

Mr. Speaker, that was almost one year ago. The government fumbled and bungled the whole process and is responsible for the surprises that they made to the people of Manitoba. They ignored that advice back in April, 1982, primarily the Attorney-General. They had an opportunity in the summer to read in another article, an interview with Senator Duff Roblin who introduced into this Legislature and into the province a number of new French-speaking services. He said at that time: "It would have been wiser to allow the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with the case of Mr. Bilodeau in order to get the issue at rest." He went on to say that once the judicial process has begun, it should be left to follow its natural course. He thinks it was a mistake for the government to short-circuit the administration of justice.

Mostly importantly, Mr. Speaker, he said: "In the Manitoba context the language question carries a burden of 100 years of history. Therefore, it is wise to prepare public opinion, especially when constitutional changes are involved. Public opinion is particularly important in this case for two reasons: (1) it is the first effort to amend our Constitution and (2) it deals with a problem so difficult for Manitobans to agree upon." That advice was rejected.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has said in response to questions in this House that the foundation of any government must be one to encourage tolerance and understanding. That's what I'm asking for is tolerance, understanding and love. No one can disagree with that wish, but what this government has done is created the very opposite by the way in which they have handled this matter, and they must bear the burden of that responsibility. People have to understand and accept fundamental changes to constitutional change, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Kirkfield Park made a remark about the last federal election and unfortunately turning on the radio at 8 o'clock or 8:30 and finding out that the election was over before the results in Western Canada were known. The Minister of Natural Resources said, well, what's that got to do with this debate? Unfortunately, it has a great deal to do with this debate. It's part of the reason for western alienation and when you combine that with the concern in Western Canada over the implementation of The Official Languages Act, you have a mind set or you have a feeling in Western Canada that we have been alienated; we have been ignored in the institutions of this country. That's part of the feeling in Manitoba, in Western Canada, and is part of the reason for the importance of the process that must be undertaken before any fundamental constitutional change can be made. The government has done a poor job of that, Mr. Speaker, and that's part of the reason why there is such vast resentment and objection to what is being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, what of people here? They heard last week, the Federal Minister of Recreation and Sport criticize the Calgary Olympic Committee who made a presentation to an international group, but didn't do it bilingually from the City of Calgary. I'm not critical

of anybody who can speak the French language; I wish we all could. I'm sure in the City of Calgary there are very few, if any, who could do it that are on the committee. Yet, they have this criticism from the new Federal Minister of Recreation and Sport that they didn't make their presentation bilingually. That's what causes resentment and suspicion and the feelings that exist in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker. That is what this government hasn't dealt with. In their whole process they haven't taken that into consideration, Mr. Speaker, and they haven't explained their position and they haven't sold their position.

Under those circumstances, it is doubtful whether they can proceed, certainly with a part of these amendments. I keep saying "a part," Mr. Speaker, because we have no objection and I have no objection to the validation of the statutes, that part of the proposed amendment, although it was clear in the legal opinion from Mr. Twaddle that the government received last year that the government had an excellent chance of success. The chances may not be excellent now. If they are not excellent, that is the responsibility of the government, Mr. Speaker, but in view of that we, on this side, certainly I, have no objection to that portion of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me get on to speak for a moment, as again this may be the last opportunity I have to speak to the amendment. Section 23.1 of the proposed amendment states, Mr. Speaker, that "as English and French are the official languages of Manitoba." As I say, again, that is under the circumstances in Manitoba and Western Canada, a provocative statement to many people in Manitoba because of the way in which The Official Languages Act has been handled and administered by the Federal Government.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the amendment that was proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General which he brought to the Committee of Privileges and Elections which held public hearings last fall in which, on the second page, and I know he is dealing with a little bit different wording, but he uses the words, "as provided for in Section 23." The Attorney-General brought forward that proposed amendment at that time.

Mr. Twaddle, in a legal opinion of January 5, 1984, has indicated that: "It is possible for a court to reason that if the two languages are official there must be an implied right to use either in official business with government; or" - to use the same reasoning - "to give a broader interpretation to Section 23 than has been given to it to date," and goes on to discuss and use the words "remote possibility."

The question asked on this side, Mr. Speaker, is why approve a remote possibility, why approve a remote possibility of appointed judges determining the way in which a language policy in Manitoba is to be determined? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General, in the proposed amendments he had to the then wording in September, 1983, may have had a partial solution.

There are other types of solutions, Mr. Speaker. If they examine the Charter of Rights, there are words used in the Charter of Rights that refer to the quality of status of French and English. That was a possibility you could add to that type of wording, the words "as provided for in Section 23."

I say that, Mr. Speaker, knowing and putting forth the submission that the amendment of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is at the present time the preferred amendment by members on this side of the House. I am offering, Mr. Speaker, some comments on the amendment that has been proposed by the Government House Leader. The First Minister, Mr. Speaker, spoke at one time and asked the question whether there was any consistent position for members of the opposition.

On the issue of the Constitution there always has been, no matter what the section was. Our party has opposed entrenchment; we have opposed the principle that appointed judges can interpret the Constitution in a way in which they will tell the elected people how to administer any policy, Mr. Speaker. We have opposed entrenchment and that is why I express the concerns with respect to that part of the amendment by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, there is another part to Section 23.1 which we have referred to from time to time. It goes on to say, "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."

I had asked - and this has been referred to now a number of times - for an opinion from Mr. Tallin with respect to entrenchment of Bill 115 and entrenchment of any other references to the French or English language in Manitoba. Mr. Tallin, in his opinion, referred as you are probably aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to "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, regulations and orders made under statutes.

He concluded, Mr. Speaker, by saying, "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 either official languages.'"

The effect of all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that any reference to the English or French language under the wording presently proposed by the government will be entrenched forever in the Constitution. So that, for example, in The Public Schools Act introduced, I believe, by the former Premier Duff Roblin, the reference to the situation where there are 23 or more pupils who may be grouped for French language instruction, the possibility, or probability, that the numbers in the future could only be changed by virtue of a constitutional amendment. There are references in The City of Winnipeg Act in the same way, Mr. Speaker.

Most importantly, the Government House Leader cannot tell us what other references there are to the French and English language in the statutes or common law of Manitoba that would be entrenched. He cannot tell us, Mr. Speaker, what the real effect is of the wording used in this section. At the same time, they are imposing closure.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when you are taking an action of this sort, and using wording whereby every reference to English or French in the statutes and common law of Manitoba and the regulations is going to be entrenched as part of the Constitution and,

thereafter, can only be amended by amendments to the Constitution, surely members realize the difficulty in amending the Constitution by now.

We are creating a ridiculous situation, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader cannot tell us what we are entrenching; he doesn't have the information. We have asked him from time to time about it. My leader tabled this opinion in the Legislature a few days after we got it. The Member for Charleswood has referred to it on numerous occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the members opposite that they better look very seriously at the wording that they are proposing, because in introducing the bill, the Government House Leader - this will enable us to adapt to changing circumstances, etc., - I'm paraphrasing his words - that's why we're introducing a bill. At the same time, he's entrenching in the Constitution all sorts of references to matters of which we don't know how many there are, but making detailed provisions in bills like the ones we've referred to, as part of the Constitution which can only thereafter be amended by amendments to the Constitution. So, Mr. Speaker, that wording has to be looked at very carefully.

Although it may be somewhat redundant, why not look at using, rather than "under the law of Manitoba," something like "under the Constitution of Canada" and avoid this almost silly, if it weren't so serious, step of including every reference to English and French presently in the common law or statute law or regulatory law of Manitoba in the Constitution?

Mr. Speaker, the government is asking us, under closure, to adopt this provision when the government doesn't even know what is referred to and can't give us a list of what would be entrenched under that provision. What other defence is there, in reality, than to ring the bells when you're faced with that type of completely unreasonable behaviour? This is not the flexibility that the Government House Leader referred to when he introduced Bill 115 in this Legislature. It is extremely difficult for me or anyone else in this House to agree to that sort of a proposition.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of other statements that I would like to refer to, that have been offered to this Legislature by the First Minister. The First Minister, in the translation of the article in *Le Devoir* which my Leader has referred to and which the First Minister has not yet responded to satisfactorily, and in his speech that he made some days ago, said that the former government didn't do the job properly in 1980 in dealing with Bill 2 and that's why we're in this situation. Mr. Speaker, what a preposterous statement. Bill 2, which was introduced in this Legislature after the Forest decision, simply referred to and included provisions to be used in dealing with translation of statutes, including a reference to a certificate from the Clerk on what language the bill was printed in - 6, 7 sections, just dealing with the interpretation of bills passed by this House and subsequently translated, so that some reference could be made in the future to the first language in which the bill was brought into this House.

The Premier suggests Bill 2 should have settled the whole situation in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. I know that the premier has difficulty with a lot of things, but I thought that he would have never stopped that low to make that sort of a statement. Bill 2 has nothing to

do with the Bilodeau case. For the record, Mr. Bilodeau lost his case in the Manitoba Court of Appeal by a unanimous decision. That's where that case sits. The Premier is quoted as saying, "In 1980, law did not permit or allow that question to be settled in Manitoba and the result was the Bilodeau case." It had nothing to do with the Bilodeau case. Mr. Speaker, if that's any example of the understanding the Premier has of this issue, then no wonder we're in trouble. He told me in the House in response to questions, that he's following the advice of legal advisors, Mr. Speaker, although the only opinion tabled in the House was the January 5, 1984 opinion from Mr. Twaddle. I'm sure he didn't clear this statement with any of his legal advisors, because otherwise he would never have made that statement.

Mr. Speaker, the record of our party with respect to French-speaking services is clear. Immediately upon the Forest decision being rendered by the Supreme Court - and I've heard some criticism from time to time, Mr. Speaker, - that we should never have allowed that case to go to the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, again, that is a preposterous statement. If that case hadn't proceeded to the Supreme Court, there would have been other people who would have taken the same issue to the Supreme Court. But once it was on its way to the Supreme Court, it simply had to go to the Supreme Court to be decided; it had to go there to be decided to get that issue resolved. After we resolved that issue, we hired as many translators as we could; we advertised nationally; we used Federal Government people; we used Province of Quebec translators; we entered into contracts with the University of Moncton.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, and the Attorney-General might want to make an enquiry because I'm given to understand that contract is being completed and this government had some money possibly available from the Federal Government and have not requested funds in that regard, lawyers in Manitoba are wondering, because that work has been done, when will it be available in Manitoba? I just offer that as an aside to the Attorney-General and perhaps he might make an enquiry.

We were making progress, Mr. Speaker; we established a French-speaking court; we incurred the cost of translating documents in the court system for French-speaking litigants; we did publish some documents in both languages and made them available where there was a demand for them, recognizing that we had a limited availability of translators. We were making progress, Mr. Speaker. There was not the resentment; there was not the turmoil; there was the name-calling; there were not the emotions expressed that are being expressed now; there were not large gatherings called in towns and cities and villages in this province that are being called together now, Mr. Speaker. French-speaking people were being helped under that program; they were being encouraged. That is not what is happening now, Mr. Speaker.

It's simply a terrible situation, Mr. Speaker, that people find themselves in, in Manitoba, as a result of the manner in which this government has handled it. They ignored opinions and public comments by retired politicians like Premier Roblin, about the process that had to be followed. The process this government used was completely botched; it's what's resulted in this situation now. And what is the situation now, Mr.

Speaker? The government is asking that the question be put, they're going to allow - after the question is put - one further day of discussion in which a member will be allowed, if he can get recognized, to speak for 30 minutes, to speak for 30 minutes when I and others on this side have raised serious questions about the amendment presently before the House.

I hope somebody on that side now will rise and explain what happened to the Attorney-General's proposed amendment in September of 1983 which would clarify the wording significantly. Why isn't wording like the Charter of Rights used with respect to the quality of status of French and English? Why can't the Government House Leader supply us with a list of the references to French and English in the common law, in the statutory law, in the regulatory law of Manitoba that will be entrenched under the proposal of the government? Surely, Mr. Speaker, those are serious questions and reasonable questions to be put to the government.

The government is enforcing closure and how is . . . Maybe somebody on the government side could explain how this issue, how these questions are going to be rationally discussed and debated, rational amendments, discussion can take place with the government imposing closure, in one day, when speakers can only speak one time for 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite, the government persist in this course of action, it will create a precedent that . . . It won't create a precedent, I hope, because I hope it will never happen again, but it's a course of action that just defies logical common-sense thinking. It's absolutely the wrong process. That's not the way you amend a Constitution. That's not the way you, in fact, deal with any piece of legislation.

When questions like these are asked, surely there should be answers given. The Government House Leader hasn't given any. Who's going to answer those questions and who's going to explain the government position with respect to that one section? That's one section of a number of sections and we have speakers who haven't had an opportunity to speak on the main motion, or to speak on the amendment by the Government House Leader, or to speak on the sub-amendment by the Member for Fort Garry. Meanwhile, the government is forcing closure and they wonder why the people of Manitoba have concerns about the way the government is proceeding.

This is an absolutely intolerable situation for the government to be proceeding in this manner. It is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker. How on earth can we on this side support, in any way, what the government is doing when they are treating this side of the House to this type of behaviour? It's completely irrational, the government have lost their senses completely.

Mr. Speaker, as an individual member of this Legislature, I resent very much having to deal with an amendment to the Constitution of this province and this country in this way - and I don't know how, frankly, the Federal Government can be expected to deal and approve a constitutional amendment that is proposed in this manner - where reasonable questions are being asked of the government where they're imposing closure, where they're not allowing full debate on the amendment to take place. I don't see how they can even suggest that the Federal Government would support their amendment. Surely we on this side can't.

The people of Manitoba deserve answers to these questions and a clear explanation of what is being proposed. They've abandoned the process of education and discussion that former Premier Duff Roblin recommended to them on constitutional amendments. They should have taken that advice. Perhaps we wouldn't find ourselves in this kind of situation; this kind of situation where the people who are expected to benefit from the government's action, the French-speaking people of Manitoba, are being hurt by the government's action.

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

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, as the Member for St. Norbert, am disappointed at having to speak on a motion such as this which should not be before the House at this time or any other time.

It is a motion so arbitrary and so undemocratic, as this motion before us which is, in essence, double closure. The government members scream, mostly from their seats, that we are being undemocratic by ringing bells, or buzzers as the case is, and refusing to vote. What can be more undemocratic than putting double closure on a resolution so important as a constitutional amendment - double closure.

The First Minister attempts to justify the actions of his government by trying to turn the focus on the members of the opposition. He tried to blame the opposition, Mr. Speaker, for this dilemma and for the dreadful state of affairs in this province. Instead of explaining to the people why his government is so determined in their plan to change the Constitution of the province he launches into wild-eyed attacks on the opposition, blaming them.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition did not bring forward this original resolution in May or June. The opposition didn't say to the Manitoba people, here it is, here's a plan for entrenchment of the Constitution for language services in the province. Here it is, like it or not; here it is, it cannot be changed; it will not be changed, accept it and like it.

The opposition did not refuse to take the matter to public hearings and hear the views of the people. The Minister of Natural Resources and others have tried to turn the facts and twist them to leave the impression that it was the opposition that didn't want to go to the people, that we prevented public hearings.

They've attempted to leave the impression to anyone who will listen to them or read their words that it was the government who wanted the hearings in the first place. Well, Mr. Speaker, we know different from that. That sort of twisting the facts will not be swallowed by the public of Manitoba, the people know better than that.

A MEMBER: That's right. They know a lie when they hear one.

MRS. C. OLESON: They have learned through bitter experience that they cannot always believe what this government tells them.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Speaker, if this government had their way the opposition would have meekly accepted the original resolution, would have passed it and sent it along to Ottawa to the House of Commons and to the Senate before the people knew what was happening. If the opposition had allowed that to happen the people would have found out about the problems with that piece of legislation long after it was too late to do anything about it. Is that the role which is played by a responsible opposition? It is the duty of the opposition to question what the government does, to suggest changes, to inform the people of what effect legislation will have on them, just what will be the ramifications of things that are brought forward by the government.

If the opposition had not immediately pointed out to the government some of the pitfalls of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of Manitoba, we'd have been guilty of neglecting our duty as an opposition. We'd have been condemned by the people just as the NDP Government is being condemned now by the vast majority of Manitobans and we would have deserved it. We would have deserved every word of it as this government deserves every bit of condemnation that they are getting at the present time from the people of Manitoba.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, the morning that the original resolution was introduced. It does seem like a long long time ago. When the Member for Charleswood, who was Leader of the Opposition at that time, stood in his place to reply to the announcement made by the Attorney-General. Among other things the Member for Charleswood said, Mr. Speaker, he remarked that because the opposition was taking a stand against the proposed amendment we would, in all likelihood, run the risk of being called many things such as anti-French and racists, but because of the importance of the issue, of the nature of the amendment, we were willing to take that chance.

Time has borne out the accuracy of that statement, Mr. Speaker. We've been called all those things and more, but time has also proved us right about other matters also. I'd like to read to you some of the remarks made by the then Leader of the Opposition on May 20th. I'm reading from Hansard on Page 2978 at the top of the page on the left-hand side.

"Mr. Speaker, as we work, as we have - both governments have attempted to - with reason and fairness toward re-establishing the linguistic rights for 6 percent of our citizens in this province, we must be ever vigilant that we do not create a tyranny by that very minority, because that, Sir, in some ways, is what has happened with respect to the implementation of The Official Languages Act in other parts of this country. Legislation that could lead to the kinds of administrative excesses seen elsewhere must be studiously avoided in Manitoba. I suggest, Sir, that the social fabric of the province cannot and should not be made hostage to what Chief Justice Freedman referred to in his judgment in the Forest Case as, 'Intransigent assertion of abstract rights' by language zealots.

"A further point, Sir, I foresee dangers in the approach that is taken, with respect to this negotiation, because it does not appear to be a negotiation in which the Government of Manitoba, on behalf of the people, ended up with something that will be seen to be fair

in the interests of the totality of the public interest in Manitoba. And without, in any way, trying, because this is not an occasion to try to score partisan points against any government in Manitoba, because the issue is too crucial to the future of our province, I must say, as fairly as I can, that I would hope that the government would go back to Square One on this negotiation - and I'll be making a suggestion as to how this can be done - in order to ensure that it is not going far beyond what reason and fairness require to be done in this instance. We do not want to see important, and we cannot afford to see, important constitutional changes of this nature going far beyond the import of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, being made out of weakness or an inability to represent that totality of public interest and public opinion of all sections of our Manitoba community."

He went on to say, "Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion to make to the government with respect to how this agreement should be dealt with from this point forward. I believe, as in the matter of the previous Constitution Act that this government, our government, worked on for a number of years, the public has the right to see and to understand and to comment upon any agreement of this kind of substantive nature before the agreement is put into effect, and it is all the more important, after we see this agreement today, all the more important than what I mentioned the other day in questions to the First Minister.

"Mr. Speaker, we cannot have any Legislature in Manitoba inflicting on our province some form of locked-in constitutional change which the people may well reject." You will recall this was in May and the then Leader of the Opposition had stated that the people may well reject.

"Therefore, Sir, it is imperative that we have, I would suggest, a suspension of all further action on this agreement at the present time, until the agreement can be placed before a Legislative Committee authorized to sit between Sessions - that is, between the end of the 1983 Session and the beginning of the 1984-85 Session - between Sessions and to report at the next Session of the Legislature on the advisability as to whether or not the Legislature should confirm this agreement by resolution, under Section 43 of The Constitution Act.

"The instrumentality that I'm suggesting, Sir, would be this: That the government would introduce a resolution attaching this agreement as Schedule "A," the import of the resolution would be not to approve or disapprove of the agreement, but rather to refer the agreement to a Standing Committee of the House, that would then proceed intersessionally to sit and to hear representations about the agreement and then, and only then, would the committee make a recommendation, which would come back to this House, as to the advisability or otherwise of this agreement in its present form or in an amended form being proceeded with. The matter is so crucial, so important, and so capable of social divisiveness in this province, that I think any other course would be a dangerous course for the people of Manitoba to follow.

"Mr. Speaker, there is no rush for this agreement. The province can continue and the government can continue its steady and reasonable progress toward implementing Section 23, started by the previous

government and carried on ably by the present government."

Then, Mr. Speaker, the member went on to say, as I have mentioned before, that because the opposition was taking this stand that we would be running the risk of being branded as bigots and racists and time has borne out not only that statement of his, but the other statements that it would create divisiveness in the province. He predicted that the people would not like this. I think perhaps on that morning, the government should have listened and taken the advice of the Member for Charleswood. If they had, we would not be in this predicament at this time and we would not be looking at closure and forcing and cramming and ramming this sort of thing through the House at this time.

So we saw, Mr. Speaker, that the people did not approve of this action by the government. When the public hearings were held, they told the government so in no uncertain terms. Something the people said must have hit home to this group of people who claim to listen. Remember, during the election campaign, they were the people who were going to listen and be kind to the people and do everything they wanted done? They were the keepers of kindness and they were the only people in the world who listened. Well, they must have heard something at those hearings because something caused them to make changes to the original proposal.

Mr. Speaker, those hearings, as we recall, the road to those public hearings was not a smooth and straight highway. It was a hard-fought battle waged in the heat of last summer when most of us would probably prefer to have been attending country fairs or, heaven forbid, we might have even wanted to take a holiday. There are many times when the opposition had to resort to bell ringing during that long hot summer; bell ringing to prove to an uncaring government that we meant business. Finally, the government agreed to hold public hearings in eight locations in the province. — (Interjection) — I did; I must have hit a sore spot.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. C. OLESON: It seems interesting that they are so sensitive to that matter. Why were we here? I can recall being here and there being bell ringing - and I can recall them - no, no, no, we'll have a hearing and we'll have it in Winnipeg. First we were going to meetings; we were not even going to have hearings. So this sensitive government starts to wriggle and scream when they hear that they were forced into this by the opposition.

A MEMBER: Wriggling like a snake.

MRS. C. OLESON: It was interesting at some of the hearings that I was at, that they must have given their best to their people because some of the people that appeared at the hearings to support the government also mentioned and thanked the government for having had the hearings, which I found rather a twist of the facts, but that is typical of what they apparently have been telling their people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for Gladstone is quite capable of

making her remarks. I am sure that she does not need the assistance of her colleagues in making them.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: However, before we got on the road to those hearings, in the course of the problems in the summer, we had to come to an agreement which stated that the opposition was to limit bell ringing for two weeks. Two weeks, Mr. Speaker, at the government's request. Now it just shows you what sort of paranoia there was building up over there about bells, that somehow there is something wrong with bells. But we all know that fear does strange things to people and we realize that this government is afraid.

This government forgets that it is the duty of the opposition to do just what the name implies, oppose. If the opposition had approved of the resolution, we would likely have given a few supportive speeches on it. If we had approved of it, we might have given a few suggestions and then said well, fine, send this away to Ottawa and good riddance to Bilodeau and company. But, Mr. Speaker, there was no way we could agree with the resolution, and if ringing the bells for two hours or two days or two weeks or even two months is what it takes to get this government to change the resolution until it's right, then I guess that's what we will have to do. It is the duty of the opposition to oppose.

It is the only defence we have to try and make an irresponsible government responsible. It is our only defence, and we are so concerned about the effect of this resolution that we are willing to go to that extreme action to stop this government. When closure is put on, our only defence is bell ringing.

When I think about the events of the past few months and try to figure out the motives of this government, several things cross my mind. As I try to rationalize in my own mind just what could possibly be the reason for all this. Why would a government do this sort of thing to themselves? Sometimes I think, well, you know, maybe there is something I have missed, maybe they are right. So I sit down and I think about it again and I rationalize it. No, they are not right; absolutely not. We go over the facts and I review the facts with my colleagues. No, the government is not right.

Then there is the possibility that maybe they are victims of some plot to divide and conquer our province. Somebody at the hearings suggested that; other people have suggested that, too, as a possibility. I am not saying it is, but that has been suggested as a possibility.

There is another possibility that occurs to me that's probably right; that maybe they have been sold a bill of goods by one or two of their caucus members and they are too embarrassed to admit it. How far do you carry embarrassment, Mr. Speaker?

A MEMBER: Like a rat in a trap.

MRS. C. OLESON: Maybe that is the case; maybe they are embarrassed. Is it really worth all this problem to save their face?

The First Minister is quoted in an eastern newspaper as saying, and I quote, "Like all Manitobans, we have our pride." What kind of pride is he referring to, Mr. Speaker? Is it pride in Manitoba and its people, or is it pride in themselves personally, or pride in their party?

What kind of pride is it? One definition of pride which is in the Oxford dictionary, and I quote, "unduly high opinion of one's own qualities or merits." Is this the type of pride we are dealing with, the type of pride which leads the members of the NDP caucus to feel that they are the sole purveyors of knowledge and reason in this province; that no matter what they do or say is right no matter what the people think? What a shameful state of affairs we have to come to in this province if this is the case, that the people have no say in matters. Is the government telling us that it is the divine right of the Pawley Government to do anything they wish without regard for the people?

Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. They were elected; they were not anointed, and there is a great deal of difference.

One morning recently as I drove to the building, there was a gentleman from Dauphin speaking on a phone-in program on the radio. He kept referring to the Premier, for instance, as "Pastor Pawley" but that is beside the point. Most of his remarks were on the subject of majority government. He said, and of course I can't quote him exactly because it was on the radio and I, of course, didn't get a transcript of it, but he said something to the effect that just because a government has a majority doesn't mean that everything it does is right. He also started to say something about his MLA, but the words were lost to the listeners on the radio because the station cut him off. Apparently what he had to say about his MLA was not within the code of ethics of the Board of Broadcast Governors.

I found the incident rather interesting nevertheless, because the Member for Dauphin would have us believe that all is sweetness and light in Dauphin. Everyone is so taken up with this resolution that there is no opposition in Dauphin. Maybe this was the reason that the hearings were not taken to Dauphin, because everything was so sweetness and light, but I don't believe that, Mr. Speaker.

Also, the other day in Virden when I was attending the provincial playdowns, I was talking to some people from Dauphin. They didn't indicate that they were thrilled with what their member was doing. They indicated that they were anything but happy with his reaction to this resolution. They almost apologized to me that they had an NDP member for Dauphin, and I sympathize with them.

Now, the NDP Government kept insisting and keeps insisting any time that they say anything about this subject, other than to scream at the opposition, they say that the opposition has frightened the people. They tell us day after day in question period - and they make statements outside the House - that the people don't understand. If what they say is true, and I'm not conceding that it is, that maybe is reason enough to withdraw the resolution. The whole package should be withdrawn and try to reach a solution through consensus. If there is widespread misunderstanding, and I submit there is not, this is no time to bring in closure and even worse, double closure.

If this is, as the Premier has stated, No. 58 out of 61 on his list of priorities, why not drop it and stop the divisive debate? If this No. 58 out of 61 is so crucial as to cause this harsh and unusual treatment, what are we to expect next Session when the government brings in legislation? For instance, legislation that they

feel is No. 2 or even 10 on their hit parade, are they going to, every day when they come into the House to announce a new bill or to introduce a bill, are they going to introduce closure immediately on everything that is of great importance? Is this how we're to run the Legislature in the future? You come in and you introduce a bill and you slap closure motion on it and it goes through the House? — (Interjection) — They certainly would . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. C. OLESON: . . . the Member for Ste. Rose, the bells certainly would if that's the type of government you're going to run.

Now I do not believe that this is what is so commonly referred to as the "Clear Choice for Manitoba" as the now famous little bulletin remarks on its front page. I would say that these are the tactics of a government that is afraid. An immediate question which seems to flow more often these days out of this whole mess, people keep asking me and I know they ask my colleagues, why is this government doing this? They told us in December it was a new and different proposal. Why are they afraid to debate it? Why would they bring on closure and not allow careful and full debate on this different resolution? They claim it's different. The Member for Ste. Rose says we keep ringing the bells. I guess he hasn't caught on exactly why we're ringing the bells. The importance of the matter seems to have escaped him.

The closure motion now, this motion on bell ringing and the motion by the Minister of Natural Resources to limit debate is a clear indication of a weak and desperate and frightened government. Every time they rise in this Chamber to debate or to answer questions, they attack the opposition. We hear no recent speeches on the constitutional resolution and why it is so urgently necessary; we hear no attempts to justify their position. All we hear are cries of anger because the opposition dares to oppose. It seems that they really can't tell us why they negotiated so badly in the first place, and why they did not include the opposition in the original negotiations so that there could be some hope, some chance of consensus. The light has shone on them and they scream and rage and say that the opposition and the people don't understand. The people don't understand, therefore, we'll force it through with limited bell ringing, limited debate - and who cares what the people say? By their actions they tell the people that their opinion is of no value whatsoever. They do not understand, therefore their opinion is of no importance; put it through and like it.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba do understand; they understand only too well what is happening. Day by day, the First Minister proves that he doesn't understand. When the First Minister and others of his colleagues were asked how many of the statutes of Manitoba would be entrenched if the constitutional amendment passes in its present form, none of them could answer. We still haven't found out. They don't know. And what's worse in the whole thing is they don't even seem to care; they don't seem to show any concern for finding out. If they were scurrying around finding out and were saying, just a moment, in another day

or so we'll get the list complete, maybe we could live with that, but we can't live with their total disregard for the question. How can they, in all conscience, pass a resolution using double closure when they themselves don't even know or seem to care about the effect of the legislation they're forcing through?

Why on earth would the First Minister condone a motion by the Minister of Natural Resources putting the question immediately, which is another form of closure? These people scream from their seats that we're undemocratic by ringing bells. Poor little boys and girls - they're afraid of bells. Closure is an offence to democracy, an offence to the basic principles on which this province was founded.

I'm here, Mr. Speaker, to speak for and to defend the rights of the people who live in the constituency of Gladstone. The people I represent do not want this constitutional package. They expect me to do all that I can and all that the opposition can to prevent it from passing - everything, Mr. Speaker. If opposition to the package includes bell ringing, they are in favour of us ringing bells and they are not pleased to hear that the NDP Government has invoked closure in the form which they did last week. They are very unhappy to hear it and they keep phoning me and telling me that. They say to hang in there; stick with it; do not let this pass. They understand what this question is all about. As much as the government members would have us believe that the people don't understand, they understand, they're not stupid. This government is trying to tell us that 80 percent of the people of Manitoba are stupid. Well, that is a very very rotten - for lack of a better word - thing to say to the people of Manitoba.

As I said before, a question that is asked of me when people phone me about this, they say what's in it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MRS. C. OLESON: . . . for this government? They say, why are they doing this to themselves? Don't they like themselves? Don't they want to be government? Why do they proceed in a foolhardy way, when surely they can see all around them the havoc they have created?

In the midst of all this chaos that they themselves have created, they cry "foul" when the opposition resorts to bell ringing in a desperate attempt to bring the government to their senses. In the midst of massive indication by the people of this province that they do not want and like what the government is doing, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Municipal Affairs come up with a petty motion on bell ringing and slap closure on that motion before even one member on their side or ours has a chance to debate it. They make a big fuss about rule changes and bell ringing. They want to throw the attention off the issue at hand and try to discredit the opposition by changing the subject.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is all tied into one in the minds of the people of this province. The people know what this issue and this bell ringing is all about. They know, they want the bells to ring as long as it takes to get this government to withdraw the constitutional amendment and Bill 115.

The Member for Inkster says that bell ringing is thwarting democracy. How wrong he is! We are ringing

bells to keep democracy alive in Manitoba, to keep bad government from passing bad legislation against the wishes of the majority of the people of Manitoba. The Member for Inkster, in his speech in this Chamber, showed us just how afraid the government is of the effect of bell ringing. By their very screaming and introducing motions of closure, they have told us that they are scared of the effect of the bell ringing, they realize that it's not in their best interests.

There's one very easy way this government can stop all this trouble. They can stop the bells; they can stop all this nonsense and screaming about procedure. They could pull the resolution, pull the bill, dissolve the legislative Session and call an election. The people of Manitoba will soon tell you whether they want a constitutional amendment or not. The people will decide the matter very quickly if they have a chance to go to the polls and vote. You will be tested, I believe, and found wanting.

I have in my possession an editorial. Since the government is so interested in editorials - they particularly liked Free Press editorials - perhaps I could read them one from the rural areas, from the Carillon News this one is, and I quote. The heading is: "Political Disaster. Each passing day only seems to heighten the depth of the political quagmire into which the New Democratic Government is sinking. In the past days particularly it is becoming apparent just how deeply resentful many Manitobans are over the Pawley Government's apparent unrelenting resolve to push through its constitutional changes affecting the use of the French language. It must be obvious to all but the most thick-headed in government that passage of the legislation will almost certainly banish the New Democrats to the political wilderness in the next election, probably next year. It is even being suggested the hatred generated by the controversial legislation will not subside until as yet unborn generations comes of age.

"How much better that it were not so, that the government, had it shown more understanding and straight political savvy, had chosen a course vastly different from the one it's presently on. Premier Pawley, a shadowy figure these days, conspicuously absent from some of the hottest debates, should have ignored all the legal experts whose academic advice must have looked sound in theory, but whose political judgment was woefully short-sighted.

"Many Manitobans, neither rednecks nor bigots, can readily comprehend that the French language and its adherents were dealt an injustice by the Manitoba Government nearly a hundred years ago. A perception of the injustice, however, is light years removed from tacit approval of an under-the-table deal concluded last May after which a young law student agreed to drop his threat of a Supreme Court challenge of the validity of Manitoba's largely English-only laws. In effect, it was a vocal minority group that was holding the cards, that was holding the government for ransom after a fashion perfected by Quebec on Ottawa for the past 15 years.

"It may well be that a win for Roger Bilodeau in the highest court could eventually have led to an order decreeing that all Manitoba laws be translated into French. Such an awesome task might take 20 years to accomplish but at least the legal aspects of our

province's constitutional crisis would have been resolved and the energies of all would be directed to more productive aspirations. Moreover, a Supreme Court victory for Bilodeau would very probably have prevented the divisiveness and bitterness now evident among Manitobans, feelings that threaten the spirit of co-operation and linguistic tolerance that have developed over the decades as our present multi-ethnic social makeup evolved.

"For their part, many Francophones must be asking themselves whether any victory they ultimately gain from this controversy will be worth the loss of good will, whether the benefits will ever translate into greater economic clout many claim has been denied them by past language policy. In the end, the very minority group this government is trying to appease may wind up the big loser. The government, unfortunately, may eventually be held to blame by those on both sides of the volatile issue."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Talk standing up Pete, if you dare.

MRS. C. OLESON: —(Interjection) — I'm not even going to answer that one. I don't consider that even a question.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to support this closure motion, this double closure. It stifles debate and it is impossible for we, as responsible people in the opposition, to condone such an action by such a weak government on so important an issue as a constitutional amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. ENNS: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has already spoken in this debate and therefore he cannot be recognized again.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: I apologize to you, Sir, for obviously being out of order in making that motion.

I now, Sir, make a motion, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, ORDER. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside and seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the House do now adjourn. Those in favour, please say aye. Those opposed, please say nay.

In my opinion the nays have it and I declare the motion lost.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

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

A MEMBER: Now you see why you're going to be here for awhile.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking against the motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. I do not want to limit the time of bell ringing in this Legislature. I hope that what I am about to say will come out the way I prepared it.

I want to thank the members of the press who are here in great numbers to hear all of the sage wisdom that I am about to impart. I want to thank all the people in the gallery for coming out to listen to me. I do have many, many important things that must be said, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Go ahead, Abe, you tell them.

MR. A. KOVNATS: En francais. Je vous present mon discours en francais, mais je parle anglais meilleur que je parle francais et tous les députés ici ne que prend en anglais . . .

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, was the translation booth working on that last . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I don't believe that is a point of order. The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, je suis traducteur, also I am a translator and I will translate.

What I was about to say, or what I had said in French, Mr. Speaker, is I would like to present my speech in French but I speak English better than I speak French. All of the members of the Legislature will understand me if I speak in English. So, therefore, I will be speaking in English.

Where is everybody, Mr. Speaker, on such an important debate? I will be quoting Shakespeare and I will be quoting Moliere. Mr. Speaker, you will see the reference to the motion. I am one who follows the rules very very closely and I am not about to cause you any embarrassment, Mr. Speaker, by having to bring me to order because I will be speaking with everything that is relevant to this motion. If I can get out of here, I can get my teeth fixed. I will also be telling some stories, Mr. Speaker, and you will see the connection on the stories that I will be relating.

What is the New Democratic Party Government doing, Mr. Speaker? It's like bridge; I vote to double, they vote to redouble. They are putting on double closure, Mr. Speaker, they are taking away my rights in the Legislature. I have received dozens of phone calls, more so than I have ever received under any other issue. Mr. Speaker, dozens and dozens of phone calls, and they are almost completely in agreement, ring the bells. In regard to the ringing of the bells, don't let them pass this legislation which is not good for the people of the Province of Manitoba and, therefore, that is part of the reason why I am speaking against the motion inasmuch as I represent these people and they have directed me to do so.

I have received some calls, Mr. Speaker, wherein some people have mentioned to me, Abe, is there anything you can do about getting the two sides together? Mr. Speaker, it goes further than that. I would love to be able to get the two sides together so that we can reach a compromise, but the compromise that they would allow would not be acceptable to over 80 percent of the people of the Province of Manitoba. I have told this party who called me to try and reach a compromise that it was impossible, we have tried.

A MEMBER: Isn't that what Jake Epp told them?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: What would happen, Mr. Speaker, if we didn't debate the issues? Now we're talking about the parliamentary process which we have been accused of trying to do away with inasmuch as the ringing of the bells is destroying the parliamentary process, at least that's what we've been accused of, Mr. Speaker.

I am prepared to debate, stop ringing the bells, give me a chance, that's all I ask, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Who's ringing the bells?

A MEMBER: You are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I will debate, Mr. Speaker, allow me to debate. I hope the government will debate. Look at who is accusing who of filibustering. We have been accused of filibustering, swearing, accusations, innuendoes, half truths and no truths, Mr. Speaker. I've got to get back to the time when Saul Miller was in . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: . . . the Chamber, a very respected member in this Chamber representing the wrong party, but a very respected member in the Chamber. — (Interjection) — Yes, Saul. I'm sorry did I say Saul Cherniack, I meant Saul Miller. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I have some respect for Mr. Cherniack also; I can take that away, but it's Saul Miller that I'm making reference to, Mr. Speaker. He was upset and very annoyed over something that had happened and I remember him saying there, and he was sitting in his seat just down over here when I was sitting where the Clerk is sitting and we were in committee, and he got up and he was very upset and very irate and he says: "The white gloves are off." Those were his exact words, Mr. Speaker. I repeat what Mr. Miller has said: "The white gloves are off and the fighting gloves are on," Mr. Speaker. "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead."

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day when there was some discussion back and forward, I heard members of the government yelling across to the opposition, vote, vote, vote. I say debate, debate, debate. I've heard many recommendations from the government side when some of our members have stood up to speak and the commands that have come across, sit down, sit down. I throw it back at the government, Mr. Speaker. Instead of sit down - stand up, stand up and debate.

The government has made a big fuss about the free vote, the freedom to vote as the conscience dictates. Do they dare?

A MEMBER: No, they don't.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Why not give the free vote to all Manitobans? Call an election, it's that easy; call an election. What about free speech, the freedom to speak as your conscience dictates? Don't be afraid. Do you dare? You can't make it any worse for your own party and maybe you might get back some of the supporters that you've already lost. And what is the First Minister trying to prove in criticizing people like Grant Russell, Russ Doern, Herb Schulz, many others? If you don't agree with me, I'll destroy you. I will cut away your credibility. That's what he's saying, Mr. Speaker.

It reminds me of a story of the young boy at his first day at school. His mother had taken him to school and the mother was talking to the teacher and the mother was explaining to the teacher that the young boy was very high strung; and if he was going to be punished, please don't punish him as such. If he has done anything wrong, the mother said, slap the little boy next to him and maybe that will scare him into behaving.

Mr. Speaker, they can't keep slapping innocent people trying to get us to behave and to follow their rules. We will be guided by our own conscience. Why don't you slap the right people, or try to, because we won't be slapped.

We are participating in an historical event, the longest Session ever in the Manitoba Legislature, I believe. It started in 1982, continued through all of 1983 and well into 1984. We're into the second month. Historical events? Closure was invoked on Bill 115. That's an historical event, Mr. Speaker, and the amendment to the resolution and also, an historical event, limiting time of debate and calling members to the Chamber for a vote; limiting the time of debate, Mr. Speaker, an historical event. That's what I'm discussing today, calling members into the Chamber after ringing the bells for two hours, Mr. Speaker, so you see I do follow the topic.

The last motion proposed by the Minister for Natural Resources allows a great deal of latitude and I hope you will allow me that latitude because I am somewhat inexperienced and I might sway from the subject ever so slightly.

As most Manitobans, I support the extension of French language rights. I reject the entrenchment of rights and services under the guise of those rights promised in 1870, taken away in 1890 and never returned. The government of Sterling Lyon, of which I was a part, were working to that end in 1980 to restore the rights of all Francophones in the Province of Manitoba.

Does the government know themselves or have they told the people of the Province of Manitoba what is contained in The Manitoba Act of 1870? Have they explained to the people what rights are being restored, what rights have been taken away? Who took away those rights in 1890? It wasn't our party; I believe it was the Liberals. Who restored the rights in 1980? It was our party, the Conservatives, who restored those rights, so we don't have any anti-feelings against this group. We support this group.

Are we going back to the original or are we sweetening the pot to make up for an injustice? I'm just asking these questions, Mr. Speaker, because it's what all of the people of the Province of Manitoba are asking. If it's all right to correct an injustice, we better include the injustices to the Natives and the Ukrainians and the Germans and the Jews and the Japanese and the Chinese and the Mennonites and many other minority groups. Let's correct the injustices to all of them and let's not forget the women.

If we are sweetening the pot because of the many wonderful things the French pioneers contributed to the province and the establishing of the community, I for one have got to admit - got to, I must stand up and say - how much they did contribute to the community, a great contribution to the community, the starting of the St. Boniface Hospital by the Grey Nuns, great contributions, Mr. Speaker; but that's not what is at issue here. There were many contributions made by other groups, not just the French groups, and if that is the reason why we are going to extend their rights, then we've got to extend the rights of all Manitobans, all minority groups. We cannot pick on one group and forget about another.

How can we appear to be supporting one group and not another by entrenching special rights into the Constitution, to protect those rights and leave the other groups, other than the French Francophone groups, out in the cold?

I support the extension of French language rights in the school, Mr. Speaker. I have supported the equality of funding to private schools and I'm not really getting off the track. I think this all combines. I have supported the cultural development for the Francophone or any other person or group who wishes to accept that culture.

Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of being a bigot, a hate monger, a stupid Conservative, anti-French, anti-ethnic, and the most ridiculous of all, anti-Semitic. Because I don't agree with your views, please give me the courtesy of allowing me to express my views which happen to be the views of 80 percent of the people of the Province of Manitoba. I will be getting to the voting procedure very soon and the limiting of debate so that I, as the Member for Niakwa, will be expressing the views of my constituency, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, to read, write and speak French will be an asset to every Manitoban in time to come. Let it be a choice of those individuals whether they want to participate or whether they don't want to participate, but I can see the future in being able to speak, read and write French. There's no doubt in my mind at all, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not about to discourage anybody from wanting to learn and read and write French. In fact, I would encourage it, I have been through that part myself, Mr. Speaker. But let it be their choice, Mr. Speaker, let it not be entrenched into the Constitution.

The passing of this motion, and the resolution, and Bill 115 will have a reverse affect on what it was originally intended to do. It will not unify the province. It will divide the province. I reject this motion, this resolution, because I believe it is in the best interest of the Francophone in the Province of Manitoba for me to reject both the resolution and the motion and the bill, and I think it's to the best interest of the Anglophone for me to reject all of these items, also, Mr. Speaker.

Look at the damage already done, Mr. Speaker, the hate, the divisiveness. I'm not going to point a finger

and say it's all their fault or it's all our fault because it can't be anyone's fault completely. There has to be some contribution from everybody to cause as much hate and divisiveness as we have seen here, Mr. Speaker.

The La Liberté, the French-language papers, appeared at the very early part of the battle with some caricatures. It depicted the Progressive Conservative Party as Klu Klux Klanners; it showed the burning of the Societé Franco-Manitobain edifice, the building of the SFM, being burnt down; it showed the hanging of a person depicted as Louis Riel and being hung by the Progressive Conservatives. All many things which promoted disunity and lack of understanding from one to another. It showed another caricature in a later edition of a dog, it looked like a dog dressed up and it had a face similar to the previous Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Sterling Lyon, and it had a - I believe it was a Union Jack sticking out the back end of the dog. Sacrilegious to the point where it was embarrassing, Mr. Speaker, the things that have happened because of what this resolution, this Bill 115 has presented.

I would just like to bring to the attention of the honourable members something about the Jewish wedding ceremony, and I think that I have mentioned it once before, Mr. Speaker, about how during the ceremony there is the breaking of glass to depict that glass is like love, once broken it can be put all back together but never in the original; it is never back to the original. The withdrawing of this resolution, this amendment, Mr. Speaker, will put the glass back together; it will never ever be the same as the original, but it will be somewhat similar to what it was before, before we had all of this fighting and divisiveness trying to entrench the French language into the Constitution.

Why have the government taken such a hard stand, Mr. Speaker? There's been all kinds of speculation like promises have been made and deals have been made and things of that nature. I don't want to get into that, that's a thing of the past, it's of no consequence, Mr. Speaker, whether it's right or whether it's wrong. I have my feelings about it as to whether I believe them, and they have their feelings, and the Francophone have their feelings and the Anglophones have their feelings. I really don't think it's too important at this point, but the conservatives were not consulted.

I will be getting back to the two-hour time limit in just a very short time, Mr. Speaker, because I know that you're quite concerned that I've drifted away a little bit but I will be getting back to the two-hour time limit.

Why were the conservatives not consulted? I don't want to look back now and say we should have been consulted although maybe we should have. It would've been to everybody's better interest but it was not well planned, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that I can suggest that maybe if it's withdrawn we can sit down together and plan it better than what it was before. Let's not cause all of the hard feelings and the divisiveness.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to quote some of Shakespeare here and you will see how this quote from Shakespeare really has something to do with the two-hour time limit on the ringing of the bells. It's from the Life of Henry V and I guess he had anticipated the ringing of the bells even way back in those years, Mr. Speaker, because it starts off - and I remember this

from my early days and I can recite some of it by memory from the very beginning, and I will just to the point where I get stuck.

"Once more into the breach, dear friends, once more; or close the wall up with our English dead! In peace there's nothing so becomes a man as modest stillness and humility."

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I go on quoting Shakespeare, Mr. Speaker. It says: "But when the blast of war blows in our ears, then imitate the action of the tiger; stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood, disguise fair nature with hard-favoured rage."

The blasts of war has been sounded in our ears, Mr. Speaker. The blast of war is the sounding of the bells. We have declared war against the entrenchment of French-language rights into the Constitution.

A MEMBER: Well said.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The ringing of the bells is similar to the blowing of the trumpets when Joshua was attacking the walls of Jericho, and their walls are coming down, Mr. Speaker. It is similar to the ringing of the bells, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Do you like that? Am I in trouble, Mr. Speaker? I have prepared for at least an hour-and-a-half of debate because . . .

A MEMBER: Leave.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, thank you very much. I will accept leave after, Mr. Speaker, but I have prepared for such great amount of debate because I had the fear of my right to debate being taken away, and I got a little bit excited and I started putting down a lot of things because if I get the opportunity to debate, if my opportunity is not taken away, I have got such wise, wise things to impart to this group and I just hope that I do have that chance.

You do recall, Mr. Speaker, when Bill 115 was first announced and it was stood by a member on this side and criticized for ringing the bells because that bill was stood; it's a parliamentary procedure. I happen to be the member who stood the bill. I stood it for three days, Mr. Speaker, because it was a Monday, a Tuesday and a Wednesday. I had made arrangements with my constituents to discuss this bill with them on the Wednesday night. I had made arrangements with legal counsel to advise me on Bill 115.

The only thing, Mr. Speaker, that I can relate at this time is that it didn't coincide with the government's plans, but it was a normal procedure to ask to have the bill stood. If there was any other business in the House, I am sure that there wouldn't have been any discussion, it would have been allowed; but to have it rejected, which was a normal procedure, Mr. Speaker, I have explained to you the reason and I feel very very slighted that I wasn't allowed to stand the bill because I had great feeling on presenting my feelings on that bill. I had presented my feelings on that bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused of filibustering, and I know my time is rapidly running out, but I have got some other things that I must just present. We have

been accused of filibustering. What is filibustering? It is the use of extreme dilatory tactics in an attempt to delay or prevent action, especially in a Legislative Assembly. I wish to debate and present my views. I am not trying to delay or prevent action in this Assembly. We have had many many points of order brought up by the government, insignificant, picayune, no points of order, but just to filibuster, Mr. Speaker, just to waste time. I can't understand it. Why would they want to waste time? They are the ones who want to get this through and there they are filibustering, and we are the ones who are accused of filibustering.

Mr. Speaker, I really don't know whether this is parliamentary or not, but the government is trying to stick it - and that is as far as I am going to go - is trying to stick it to the Conservatives and the people of the Province of Manitoba. Do they expect me to say thank you or to enjoy it? I don't have many alternatives. One of them is ringing the bells, Mr. Speaker; that's one of my alternatives. I protest, Mr. Speaker, I protest without violence, but I protest because I have the right to speak in this Legislature and therefore I cannot protest with violence. I have that right to protest. I hope that right is not being taken away from me.

The sounds of battle are the ringing of the bells, Mr. Speaker. They don't expect us to roll over and play dead. These are the sounds of battle. I don't see the Member for Ste. Rose, but earlier he had made a remark, "Might is right, and we will ram it down your throat because might is right," is what he said. That's what he said. That's what he said, Mr. Speaker, "might is right," and I will not yield the floor to anybody who is going to get up on a false point of order. If might is right, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I must sit down if I am being called to order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services on a point of order.

Order please, order please. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member and others have been saying that I said "might is right," and because we have a majority in the House that is not what I was referring to. They were saying that because there was a plebiscite taken earlier on the first package, they were saying because 80 percent of the population say that that's the way it is right, might is right. That's what they are saying, and that's not what I said.

They have said that because there was a plebiscite where 80 percent of the people expressed an opinion, because they expressed that opinion, that means that might is right and that we should listen to that. That's what they are saying.

I would move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that he withdraw that because I never said that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister might have had a point of clarification but he did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I would hope that that 10-minute speech and tirade from the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose will not be deducted from my time and will be added on to the latter part. As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have so many pearls of wisdom here that just must be imparted. I know that I can't get into a debate, Mr. Speaker, but I trust to your judgment and I will be guided by whatever comes of it.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring another story to light here. You know, after the First World War, these pilots used to barnstorm and go around the country in these small airplanes and give rides to the local inhabitants there, so that they could enjoy riding in these airplanes. This was after the First World War, it wasn't big airplanes; these little two-winged airplanes with two-seater airplanes. This pilot wasn't doing very good at this small carnival in the small town and he was trying to drum up some business, Mr. Speaker. There was an elderly chap there - I now know what elderly is after I had received that kind of recognition by one of the local newspapers, they spelled the name wrong by the way - the pilot was trying to drum some business and it was \$1 a ride and there was this elderly chap there. The pilot says, look, if you want a ride, I'll give you a ride. He says, I'll make a deal with you. If I take you up the charge is \$1; if you don't say anything when I've got you up in the air you get a free ride, but if you say anything it'll cost you double. Anyway, the old gentleman says, fine, and up they go and he's doing loop-the-loops, inside and outside rolls and upside-down flying, and after about 15 minutes the pilot can't get this gentleman to say a word. He brings him down and he says, well, you know, you're fantastic, I gave you my best and you get a free ride because you didn't say a word. The elderly gentleman looked at him and he says, you know what? I almost said something when my wife fell out.

Mr. Speaker, these people are on a free ride and they can't be on a free ride; they've got to say something; they can't just keep sitting there; they've got to get up and debate. That's what the people of the Province of Manitoba elected them to do, Mr. Speaker. Let us debate with no restrictions of closure; let us all represent our constituents. Mr. Speaker, I look at the clock and I'm just a few minutes away from 5:30. I have more and my presentation allows me to make a final part of the presentation, so I must know how much time I have left, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has seven minutes remaining.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Seven minutes? — (Interjection) — You know I hear the Honourable Minister, the Member for Radisson, and I bite my tongue, Mr. Speaker, because I have received phone calls in the last little while complaining about the Honourable Minister from Radisson. I defended him, Mr. Speaker, I defended him, and I bite my tongue for so doing, but I could not and I would not allow what was being said about him to go unchallenged. It was that bad, Mr. Speaker, and I will not. I'll defend him for his right to do what he has

done, and I will defend him for his right to speak, Mr. Speaker.

We are changing the Constitution and you're never going to find out what I defended you against. Mr. Speaker, we are changing the Constitution. They've proposed to change the Constitution. Let's go slow; let's not put conditions on the debating of Manitoba's first constitutional amendment. You have us where you want us; you have the numbers; you can pass anything you want. But understand the consequences, gentlemen

and ladies, understand the consequences. You have stuck it up and broken it off.

I won't forget . . .

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

The time being 5:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.