



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 167B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 24 JANUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, 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	Rupert Island	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 24 January, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND
READING

BILL NO. 115 - AN ACT RESPECTING THE
OPERATION OF SECTION 23 OF
THE MANITOBA ACT

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Minister of Finance has 26 minutes remaining.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I had indicated this afternoon, during all of the speeches given to date by the opposition on this issue of Bill 115, I can recall only one reference and that was by the Member for Sturgeon Creek to Bill 115 when he discussed the issue of the ombudsman.

A MEMBER: It was a mistake.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It may well have been a mistake, and we have to get back to the history of it because what they are talking about, what the opposition is talking about, is a matter that is not before this Chamber.

A MEMBER: You should have spoken to your Leader, the Premier, then. What did he speak about?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the issue is Bill 115, French language services in this province and, as indicated, in the spring, in March of 1982, the Premier made an announcement with respect to what French language services this government was prepared to provide. The opposition never opposed it, indeed, indicated that they supported it. We then go into the matter of the amendment of the Constitution of which we gave the opposition notice in December of 1982. They chose to sit in the bush, do nothing, say nothing, until May of 1983.

A MEMBER: Not true.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It's true. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see something on the record indicating that there was any indication that that is incorrect. I would like to see some quotes on that. Certainly I haven't see them.

In June of 1983 we brought the proposals to the House, or May, and in my opinion, we were wrong in terms of saying - and it was a caucus decision . . .

A MEMBER: You were wrong then and you are wrong now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . it was a decision of all of us to choose to come here and say that we weren't going to have public hearings. We changed our position on that in June of 1983, and at the end of July of 1983 the opposition was still in here talking about the fact - and in August - that back in June we had done something that was not right. But in June we were saying as soon as these people finish talking we will take this matter to the public, we will hear people in Winnipeg, in Brandon, in Thompson, in other centres of the province. As soon as they allowed us out of here, after six weeks of the kind of kicking and screaming that they were doing now in the last few days, they finally allowed us out of here to get to those hearings. As a result of those hearings, the package that we are here in the Legislature with, is a completely different package from what we had proposed initially.

To begin with, there is not one area where we have in the constitutional amendment that is before this Chamber now, expanded French language rights in the Province of Manitoba, not one. What we have done is propose to take away the right, the possible right, the probable right of French-speaking Manitobans to insist on the translation of 4,500 statutes, and in turn have said we will translate 400 of them. That's what we've done.

We have also said to French-speaking Manitobans that we will not tolerate in this province the kind of bigotry that happened in the Province of Quebec with Bill 101, where the English-speaking minority had its rights taken away by the Government of Quebec, by the Levesque Government, the Separatists - a government and a bill, which incidentally, the Conservatives supported when they were in office. They supported Bill 101 in court. They went to court to support the position that the Quebec Government could take away English language rights from the people, the minority in Quebec. That's what they did. We have said we're not prepared to do that and we're prepared to pass an amendment to the Constitution to that effect, and I believe the bulk of Manitoba, the vast majority of Manitobans would support us on that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There is not one other . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes. The honourable member has put forward innumerable positions that they're not prepared to support. Will he put forward one position they are prepared to support?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member knows that is not a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, as a former Speaker of this Chamber, one would think that we would get a better performance than that.

Let us re-emphasize the constitutional amendment that is before this Chamber today. It takes away the probable rights of French-speaking Manitobans to the translation: of 4,000 of 4,500 statutes, that's No. 1. No. 2, it provides them with a shield with respect to their rights that are presently existing.

Mr. Speaker, we have the legal opinion of Mr. Kerr Twaddle, who happens to be a very prominent Conservative lawyer in this province, a capable lawyer, even though he's a Conservative. There are capable people in the Conservative Party, regrettably not very many of them in the Legislature, and what he says in terms of any possibility of our constitutional amendment expanding French language rights he says is a remote possibility - a remote possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from an editorial of the Free Press that I wish more members of the opposition would have read and read very carefully, the January 6th Free Press editorial entitled: "Afraid of the dark."

"Opposition Leader Gary Filmon has come up with his position on the fourth version of the Pawley Government's constitutional amendment. He is opposed to it, but his work is not done yet, for he has yet to produce . . ."

A MEMBER: What happened to the first three?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Now, that's the problem, Mr. Speaker, that member keeps talking about what happened to the first three. We are discussing here the fourth one. We are discussing what is before this Chamber and not a bunch of history. That's the problem. If those people would start talking about what's before this Chamber and not something that happened last year then we could get on with the business of this province, get on with the business of jobs and the economy and the issues that are important to the people of Manitoba.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: "He is opposed to it." I read again, "But his work is not done yet . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A further quote from that editorial. "He is opposed to it but his work is not done yet, for he has yet to produce a plausible reason for his opposition. By announcing he is against, Mr. Filmon keeps himself in the same camp with Sterling Lyon, whom he dare not contradict; with other members of his caucus whom he needs more than they need him and with all those around the province who do not actually know what the government is proposing and who do not need to know in order to find out they are against, but to make his position

plausible to a wider audience, Mr. Filmon should work out an argument that is related to what the government is proposing.

"There is a risk, Mr. Filmon says, that the proposal might be interpreted to bring about an expansion of French language rights beyond those now established. He wisely does not try to cite the proposed words which will accomplish this, nor describe the expansion he has in mind and the damage it will do to Manitoba.

"There is a risk, when Mr. Filmon gets out of bed each morning that he will fall and break his bones, but he does get up nonetheless. He does not lie there paralyzed with fear, calculating the risks and pondering the imponderables. He looks rationally at what the risks are, sorts out those things that are worth worrying about from those that are not. Judging the risks in the constitutional amendment is worth at least that much intellectual effort.

"When a frightened child fears a monster in the closet, the parent can turn on the light, open the closet and satisfy all reasonable observers that there is no monster; but the child who enjoys being scared will not say where the monster is. The parent is powerless to prove the absence of a monster who is given neither a description nor a location.

"The government has taken out of its resolution the nooks and crannies which were named earlier as the places where the monster was lurking; no matter that there was no monster. Sterling Lyon said there was one or might be one and a large number of Manitobans were inclined to believe him, so the government demolished section after section. If the child is determined to go on screaming and crying with fright there is really not much left for the parent to do except wait for him to cry himself to sleep.

"The fourth version, the one now on the agenda, preserves those freedoms to use French or English now enjoyed under law in Manitoba. Mr. Filmon is opposed to that, but he has not yet said which of the existing freedoms he wishes the Legislature to be able to take away. Would it be the freedom to use French as a language of instruction? Would it be the existing terms for French service in the municipal administration of Winnipeg? Would it be the system enacted by the Lyon Government for putting French bills through the Legislature? None of these; it is expansion of French rights that terrifies Mr. Filmon. The protection of existing freedoms, done the way this constitutional amendment does it, appears to Mr. Filmon to be an expansion of rights.

"An opposition argument that has a basis in fact and that leads logically from there to a conclusion deserves a hearing, and can require an adjustment to the government's policy. Mr. Filmon's whimperings cannot be taken seriously. He should be told firmly to be quiet and go back to sleep."

That's the problem, Mr. Speaker, they don't know what they are opposed to, but they think it feels good because they've got a referendum that said people disliked the package we had before. We come forward with a new package that they don't want to talk about; they want to talk about Package No. 1, Package No. 2, Package No. 3, but not what is here before the Legislature today. They don't have the guts to talk about what we have here, that's why they're talking about referendums; that's why they're talking about what

happened in March of 1983, May, June, that's what they're talking about.

But let's go back then, let's take a little trip down memory lane. The Member for Gladstone, she'll recall moving a motion on July 29, 1983. She said on Page 4673: "One of the members from the opposite side was shouting across the House to us, in his usual rude manner the other day, and suggested - actually he's the Member for Springfield - that perhaps we were trying to hold this up, to delay." And then she goes on: "So, in order to dispel the notion created by the Member for Springfield, I would like to propose a sub-amendment to the amendment.

"Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson

"THAT the resolution be further amended by adding after the words "next Session of the Legislature" where they appear in the proposed amendment of Mr. Sherman, the words "and in any case not later than December 31, 1983."

They knew then that there should be a time limit on this. They, in fact, although they didn't say we want a six-month hoist in July in the way that the Leader of the Opposition did now, they were asking for a six-month hoist then. We gave it to them. We went out to the people, we heard the people, we then came back. We waited for them. They were having a leadership fight. Mr. Speaker, they were having a leadership fight.

A MEMBER: Who won?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, on the first round the Member for Tuxedo won. I don't know whether this is their Transcona rules or other rules where they had, sometimes it was best two out of three.

The Member for Tuxedo won and then let's go into a little history, it's fairly recent. He indicated he'd like an early Session of the House. We then indicated back, that's pretty good with us, let's go right away, let's go right away. What did he say? He was on television, on radio, crying about the notion of us coming back into the Session before Christmas. We would have to wait until after Christmas because so many of his people were out of the country. That's what he said. So we said, fine, fine, we will wait until after Christmas. We came back after New Years and what did they do now? They refused to talk about the bill, they ring the bells. They have been ringing the bells. Fourteen hours of speaking time they have wasted by ringing the bells like a bunch of school boys.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a specific bill before this Legislature dealing with French language services which, in principle, the opposition has agreed to on a number of occasions. There may be specific items in this bill which they do not like. That is something to be discussed at committee. We're prepared to do that if they propose amendments that make some sense. We're prepared to accept amendments that improve the bill. We want to have the best possible bill for Manitobans. They know full well that any future government can change this legislation if it proves not to be perfect and it is very seldom that any legislation is perfect. We agree with that, but we think this is the best possible at this time.

Now what happens after the bell ringing, after a whole week of ringing the bells and wasting the time of the

Legislature of this province? What do they do? They get up and move another motion to have the debate moved back six months.

The Member for Charleswood, the flower child up there, was suggesting this afternoon that somehow that motion meant that we would never debate it again, but that was a motion to kill it.

Well, the Leader of your party, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of their party told us at the time that what we needed was six months to cool things off, that we would come back after six months and discuss it in a rational way. Get your facts right. I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to the Member for Charleswood, get your facts right. That's not what you told us when you moved the motion. What you want is for us to come back six months from now. I don't believe there's anybody in Manitoba, except for the Tory Caucus and maybe a few other Tories, who would seriously want us to go home now and come back six months from now, to discuss this issue again. That doesn't make any sense. We're in here now and we're going to finish it.

If they want to co-operate, if they want to talk to the principles of the bill, let them go ahead and do that, but let's not talk about all of this nonsense about package one, package two, package three. The beautiful performance we had this afternoon from the Member for Sturgeon Creek, taking his 30 minutes to quote the Webster Dictionary, reading line after line about twits and twerps. That is the level to which their debate has sunk and it's about time they started going through in principle . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I said to the House this afternoon that I hoped the words used by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek would not be a precedent for other members. I would hope the Honourable Minister of Finance will take those words to heart.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I was merely referring to what base levels the debate had sunk to on the part of the opposition. They're not talking about the French language services Bill, which is the legislation of the package proposed by our Premier in March of 1982, a package which the members of the opposition then agreed to. They're now saying, we don't want to debate it now, but we want to debate it in six months. What will have changed in six months that would make it more sensible to debate it then other than, that they can continue to spread their message of misinformation, this business of, ah, they're entrenching French and they're doing this and they're doing that.

They have shown no evidence to this House that there is any increase in French language rights in the Constitution as a result of this, excepting again for the shield I was discussing, and if they want to take away rights let them stand up and tell us which rights it is that they want to take away and it's about time they did.

A MEMBER: What rights haven't they got that I got? What haven't they got that I got?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a sad commentary. That is a very sad commentary on the level of understanding of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a proposal that is just, that is honourable in its principle. It's a proposal I think that members of the House should be prepared to accept in principle. We can then go into committee and discuss the issue clause by clause. Let's not get into the kinds of things that we saw from the Member for Charleswood this afternoon.

The Premier read out a statement made by the Member for Charleswood when he was Premier of this province when the then Premier of the province said, we shouldn't talk about this. This is our French language services but we don't want to talk about this. I don't have the exact words, but it was something like that. The Member for Charleswood insisted that that document be tabled. Rather than dealing with the substance of what our Premier said, that you people had wanted to stick this under a bushel in those days, keep us in the dark like mushrooms - people in Manitoba - you would have this policy but nobody would know about it. Nobody would know about it. What does he say in response when he gets the document? He says, oh you socialists have copied this thing a number of times, it's hard to read. That is the kind of principle that we're dealing with on that side of this House. There is no principle there in terms of their position on this issue, and it is about time that we got away from that expediency, got back to where we were - I'm sorry, I made a mistake - there was one member opposite who did give a good speech on the issue and that was the Member for Turtle Mountain who dealt with the issue.

Read his speech. I would commend that speech to you, Mr. Speaker, to all members of the opposition, because he talked about the notion of French language rights in legislation. He understood what we were doing. He had some differences, but he basically understood what was going on and he was discussing the issues rather than playing to the crowd that they have developed themselves, the crowd that has come to believe that we are entrenching increased rights into the Constitution for French-speaking Manitobans, which is a falsehood, which is a falsehood that they well know. They know that there is only a remote possibility of anything like that happening, and if they want to go through life without taking chances of remote possibilities ever, as the Free Press editorial put it so eloquently, they should just go back to sleep.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it's not without some sense and concern for history that I rise once again to speak on this issue. — (Interjection) — Well the history is, that what we're doing tonight has not been done in 54 years in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: In 54 years this has not happened in this Chamber. We have heard the admonition of the last speaker about opposite members not addressing themselves to the issue of the bill, Bill 115.

Mr. Speaker, I implore and I beseech you, did the honourable member, the Minister of Finance, spend five seconds on the bill? Five seconds on the bill?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, he did not.

MR. H. ENNS: I heard him compliment the Member for Turtle Mountain about a speech that he made a few days ago. I heard him talk about the speech that the Member for Charleswood made. I heard him spend a great deal of time with the speech that the Member for Sturgeon Creek made. But, Mr. Speaker, did he spend five minutes, five seconds in his 30-minute address on the bill?

Mr. Speaker, now that a 54-year record has been broken and closure is being imposed on this House, it was the first time the First Minister of this province, the Premier of this province stood up and spoke on this issue. Up to now he's been pussyfooting around, sending letters to all kinds of constituencies - oh, he doesn't mean French bilingualism, he doesn't mean that at all.

Now that we have closure imposed on the House we find for the first time members of the government speaking to the bill. For the last 10 days nobody from the members of the government spoke on this bill. Nobody spoke on the resolution, nobody spoke on the bill.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Your record on Hansard today will prove, that all of a sudden on this whole issue today after closure is imposed, we have government spokesmen speaking, finally, for the first time the Premier. The Premier has not entered into this debate at all. No, he's worked with his former Attorney-General who is House Leader, and then when his Attorney-General got into too much hot water because of it all, then he dumped them in favour of a new Minister. We got a new Minister of Municipal Affairs, a new Government House Leader, he's going to parrot this thing, but the Premier has not spoken on this subject until today. But what the Premier has done, he's written letters to individual constituents in Swan River saying, oh, we're not promoting the French question in Manitoba. We don't mean bilingualism really in Manitoba.

When my colleague, the Member for Roblin-Russell, asked him today in the House whether or not . . .

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

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that a member is supposed to address the Speaker, not the Member for River Heights.

Being a rather more recent member of this Assembly to the Member for Lakeside, it's my humble opinion that that's the way it's supposed to work, unless he knows otherwise. My understanding is, he is supposed to address you?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable member for her reminder that all members should address their remarks to the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: My colleague, the Member for Wolseley is of course absolutely right and I should be addressing

you, Sir, and I will address all my remarks through you, Sir, to other members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, addressing other members of the House through you, Sir, the only important speech made on this bill today - the only one - was made by my leader.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, it was. Not only that, but he evoked his special privilege to speak beyond limits and spoke for the better part of an hour and a half and spoke to the bill and, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion of that speech, my leader did not make a frivolous amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it was in concert with the remarks that were made by the Member for Charleswood before we adjourned for the supper hour. It is this government, and the inept bungling of this government, that has so poisoned the relationship on this question that we cannot deal with this issue now and that's why the sub-amendment made by my leader makes so much eminent sense.

If this government wants, by means of closure and by means of debating this till 2:00 o'clock on a cold January morning, to bring this about, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if the Francophone community of Manitoba wants this issue settled this way, they are making a bad mistake. That's not how you resolve, that's not how you move forward in trying to develop the kind of harmony, the kind of understanding, the kind of co-operation and good will that's required.

If this has to be done and it is only on the shoulders of this government, the rules that we made, à la the Supreme Court decision in 1979, the near virtue of unanimous legislation that was passed by the same name, by the same title in 1980 by a Progressive Conservative administration, and the fact that when my Attorney-General, the now Member for St. Norbert, Mr. Mercier, set up the French Secretariat, when we started to move towards meaningful provision of French services in Manitoba if you want to do that under the umbrella that this government is doing it - and I say to my friends and I have many friends of the Francophone community - if they want to do it under this umbrella, we are all making a mistake. We are making a mistake by not heeding the advice that our leader offered to this House by suggesting a cooling-off period to deliberate this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we are, as I said, setting history today. This government is choosing, on this delicate and sensitive issue of French language services, the French language question, to use the muscle of their 33 members versus our 23 members. They're prepared. They don't understand there are some issues that you don't use your absent majority for. You need to have moral persuasion. You need to have the spiritual willingness of the people of Manitoba to go along. You need the good will of the people of Manitoba to go along, and the militants and the zealots and the SFM Society are doing the Francophones such a tremendous disservice in this whole issue, that it will truly set back race relations for generations to come, if they persist in this.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, this government has an opportunity to reconsider the course of action they're on. We've been put on notice, Sir, by the House Leader

that they intend to follow the same path on the more important, much more important issue of a constitutional amendment.

The bill that we are dealing with now is a Manitoba bill. It is a bill that people with good will and good heart can change, can modify, can improve in the years to come, but the constitutional resolution that is facing us tomorrow, that the Government House Leader has said he is prepared to evoke, the same brutish strength of majority in closure that cannot be changed by this Legislature, ever. If you want that on your shoulders and if the NDP want that on their shoulders, you are going to have to live with that for generations to come, and that message had better get back to some of your SFM friends. They really have to because that is not a service done towards better co-operation between the two founding groups in this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by simply saying that it is not too late for this government to come to their senses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak, Mr. Speaker, on the hoist motion with somewhat of a feeling that today in the Province of Manitoba, we, as members of this Legislative Assembly, have been taken away the basic freedom that we have been given as a people of this nation and this province. I, Mr. Speaker, felt as a member of the Legislative Assembly, would have had a 40 minute speech to give on Bill 115, on the fact that my leader had indicated that it would be better debated some six months from now because, in fact, a six-month period would give the members of the Legislature and give the people of the Province of Manitoba an opportunity to reassess what has been forced upon them by this, the NDP Party Government in Manitoba. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, had the government voted down the hoist motion which was introduced last week, I would have again had another 40 minutes to speak on Bill 115.

Mr. Speaker, what the government has done today is struck me, as a member of the Legislative Assembly, as my colleagues, of 50 minutes of time to tell them how my constituents and the people which I represent feel about an issue and about a concern which goes to the very roots of this province. Mr. Speaker, we have had that taken from us and that, Mr. Speaker, is not a democratic society. We have, Mr. Speaker, seen the New Democratic Party strip me as a member, and my colleagues, of a right that was given to us in a free country and they will never live to forget that and the people of the Province of Manitoba will never let them forget it, and their greatest reminder will come at the next general election.

The next general election will point out to this government that they have done the wrong thing and they have imposed, against the wishes of the majority of the people of the Province of Manitoba and the minority of the members of this Assembly, what is wrong for the people of the Province of Manitoba and it is they - it is not the Premier because, Mr. Speaker, I respect the Office of the Premier and I respect all members of this Assembly - but when they disregard, Mr. Speaker, the wishes of the people of the Province

of Manitoba, then I disrespect those individuals that have been given those offices, in trust, to act in the best interests of the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I have 30 minutes of valuable time which I'm going to use. I'm not going to listen to the people who do not respect what the wishes of Manitobans want. I am not going to be bothered by the heckling which has come forward in an irresponsible way by members of the government. They have not, on this hoist motion, been able to speak and tell us one reason why we shouldn't be debating it six months from now.

I believe that the man who holds the job of Premier in this Assembly, in this province, does not have the respect or the confidence of the people of the Province of Manitoba. He does not have the mandate nor his government do not have the mandate to continue to govern. He does not have that mandate and that is why - and not in a light way - we have asked him to reconsider his position and support a hoist motion on the bill that is before us, Bill 115. That is responsible, a decision which we have taken, not lightly as a caucus, but one which took a lot of time to assess and consider.

If they think, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have support from the people of Manitoba on what we are doing, then the best way to put the question to the people of Manitoba and sort it out, once and for all, is to call a general election. That's what my constituents want. That's what the constituents from Roblin-Russell want. That's what the majority of Manitobans want because how many things has this government done that have been in the best interests of the people of the Province of Manitoba? How many things have they done that they've been complimented for? Has it been the handling of the Brandon University issue? Has it been the McKenzie Seeds issue? Has it been the payroll tax? Has it been the increase in the sales tax? Has it been the uncontrollable deficit, Mr. Speaker, the farmlands ownership? Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is, the reason that we want a hoist on Bill 115 is they have proven to the people of Manitoba in spades that what they're doing is wrong, wrong, wrong. They are not listening to what the people of Manitoba want.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the people that took the responsible position of asking or petitioning the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba to handle this issue and to ask this government to resign by petition, are taking a responsible move. We have had enough, the people of Manitoba have had enough. And today what did we see? Not the Premier but the man who holds the office of Premier say to us - he read a letter from one person who has supposedly been a Conservative who tore up their membership card. What about the members that left his party over what they're doing, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood, the Member for Brandon West, the President of their party, Mr. Speaker, and long-time workers. He doesn't need to waste our time, Mr. Speaker, talking about a few Tories that maybe tore up their membership because this has no political ties. This cuts through all political parties, Mr. Speaker.

I know that D.L. Campbell, a long-time respected member of this Legislative Assembly and a leader of this province, does not support what they're doing. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe when a government has lost their mandate to govern they should continue to hold the offices which they hold. We want the people of

Manitoba to assess in the next six months, that's why we have introduced a hoist.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do the people of Manitoba question what the government are doing? Well, let me make a short reference to what has happened at the federal level. This is along the lines of what is being proposed in Bill 115. I'll quote some of the statements in the Winnipeg Free Press, January 5th. This came from nine members of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and they say that Canada has weathered but not solved the linguistic problems they were asked to study in the 1960's. In fact they say Canada has gone through a crisis.

They go further, Mr. Speaker, to say in its preliminary report in 1965 the Commission stated Canada, without being fully conscious of the fact, was passing through the greatest crisis in its history. Who created that crisis, Mr. Speaker? The Prime Minister of Canada who was behind what the Premier of Manitoba is doing, supported by the Premier, and a part of the agreement which was initially set up by the Government of Manitoba.

I'll deal with the Federal Conservative Party because I believe, Mr. Speaker, when you look back at the vote on the bilingual question, The Official Languages Act, that a tremendous tribute should be given to people like Walter Dinsdale who voted against that because they knew it was wrong, Mr. Speaker. That doesn't make what today may be proposed, by the federal party, right. What was wrong in the 1969 vote is still wrong today because it's dividing the people of Canada and the people of this province. When are you, as the man who sits in the Premier's office, not the Premier, going to come to your senses, Mr. Speaker? When is the Member for Selkirk going to come to his senses?

Mr. Speaker, I will further quote from the Free Press article. This came from one of the Commissioners, Mrs. Lang, and this is a direct quote. "Mrs. Lang regretted the way in which it was done." That's the legislation, Mr. Speaker, which we're being asked to impose on the people of Manitoba. It was done, pointing out that the wholesale creation of bilingual positions and massive second language training programs were bureaucratic instruments that sometimes failed to respect the individual's feelings and needs, fears and aspirations.

Mr. Speaker, there is evidence here, evidence in Canada that they have divided this country, and the man who holds the Premier's office is asking us to divide a province which we all love. We didn't want to be into this debate because we had handled it properly when we were government. We had set an example that our brothers and sisters of whatever backgrounds they were, Mr. Speaker, and were given the rights and privileges that we have all enjoyed; but today I regret that I have to stand in my place and feel badly that we are pitting one neighbour against another neighbour, one member of one family against another, intermarriages against one another. That's not Manitoba; that's not the province that I love, Mr. Speaker.

Who has to wear the blame for this? The members of the New Democratic Government who have brought this issue before us, and it didn't have to be. We proved, Mr. Speaker, that it could be done through government policy, and I believe if this government, if the Member for Selkirk who is now occupying the Premier's office

had not bungled it, had not mishandled it and flared the emotions of the people of Manitoba, that we could have all supported the legislation quite handily; but they have, as has been said by the Member for Charleswood and by my leader, they have poisoned the well and they have raised the feelings and the emotions. Mr. Speaker, they have raised the emotions of the people of the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: And yes, Mr. Speaker, the member, the implant from central Canada who is now the hero of the New Democratic Party, the Member for Springfield, is saying, do I support in principle? Mr. Speaker, I support the hoist motion which was brought forward by my leader. Mr. Speaker, I support the hoist motion because at this particular point we cannot support that which has divided our province and our country. How can we stand in our place and be responsible and take a decision of that magnitude when in fact the law doesn't come into effect until 1987? How bloody ridiculous can they be, Mr. Speaker? If that is not a parliamentary word, I will withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. How stupid can they be, Mr. Speaker? How stupid can they be to force the question on an act that comes into force in 1987?

Mr. Speaker, I am debating the hoist motion, and I will continue to do so as long as I have breath in me to do so. I know my time has been restricted by some 50 minutes at this particular time, but that doesn't restrict me from walking out of this Assembly, this Chamber, and telling every New Democrat, whether it is in the member's seat for Interlake where his constituents are telling him precisely how they feel; whether it's in the member's seat for Brandon East who won't be there anyway because of other actions that he has been involved in; whether it's the Member for Dauphin because of his inability to represent his people; or whether it's the Member for Flin Flon, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is, please, in the interests of a long-time legislative system in this province, please back off for six months and let the people of Manitoba get their message through to you.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Will you support the bill then?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, why would I be asked - the Member for Springfield says, will I support the bill then? The bill doesn't come into effect till 1987. Why should I have to answer that question today? I, Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, you know, this has been the problem. This is the problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What we have just seen is a demonstration of how seriously this government takes the problem that is before us. They laugh because we, as an opposition, are dealing responsibly with it. We

put in the policies that support the French language services in this government; we brought it in. What did they do? They didn't support it; they didn't continue on it.

They are now in a position where they're in a trap. They're in a trap, Mr. Speaker, because they are trying to fool themselves. I heard the man from Selkirk, the Member for Selkirk who occupies the Premier's Office for another short term of office, stand here and try and fool himself. That, Mr. Speaker, won't wash because, I'll tell you, the people of Manitoba have caught on to the game that he is playing.

We all know that the government isn't sincere about what they are doing. They've been caught in a political trap, and they don't know how to get out of it. He has appointed a former Deputy Clerk of this Assembly as the man to pilot Bill 115 through . . .

A MEMBER: Assistant Clerk.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . I'm sorry, the Assistant Clerk. It has blown up in his face, it has blown up on the man who occupies the Premier's office, the Member for Selkirk, and it isn't going to work. It is bungled, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that the people of Manitoba don't even look at whether it's a bill we're debating or whether it's an amendment to our Constitution. What they're saying is the evidence is there, they have lost their mandate to govern.

What we want is an election, Mr. Speaker. They have lost the confidence of the people and they can't demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, that they haven't. There are 80-some percent of the people voting against.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Where do you stand on the bill?

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have dealt more with the bill, Mr. Speaker, than any member across the way. Mr. Speaker, I am debating the hoist motion. I support the hoist motion because I don't believe the people of the Province of Manitoba support what they propose in Bill 115.

I can deal with the bill. If you want me to deal with the bill, sure, I'll deal with it; but you have taken away my right to deal with the bill by closure, Mr. Speaker, you have taken away my right to deal on the bill by closure.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: You have taken away my right to deal with the bill — (Interjection) — No, you've taken it away. You've stripped me of that right. I am dealing with the hoist motion, you have stripped me of the right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If members can control their exuberance for a little while they will have the same opportunity to speak to the bill as they present member.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislative Assembly, a person, I believe, who has to

speak how I feel - and I've been doing that - I will continue to do so in the remaining time that is left for me in this speech.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking at the operations of the present government and the way in which they perform their duties as responsible elected members dealing with 115, Mr. Speaker.

Last night we saw and heard the government so carefully have the Member for Riel, I believe it is, stand and adjourn the resolution, which really is why we're back here; not the bill, but the resolution is why we're back here debating the French language resolution. They carefully had the Honourable Member for Riel adjourn the resolution so that we were forced to debate the bill, which was initially the reason why we had the bells ringing because we were here to debate the resolution, and there was no mention of a bill when it was all started, Mr. Speaker. That's the issue in plain and simple terms. We were here to debate the resolution, but the government forced debate on the bill. Now they have adjourned the resolution and have now forced closure on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the bill — (Interjection) — the hoist motion is what we're dealing with because they have taken away, they have used their NDP Government power to take away my right to speak on the bill, Mr. Speaker, they have taken that away. I am speaking on the hoist motion, the reason for it, Mr. Speaker, they're trying to fudge it.

Mr. Speaker, what they have said is the bill that we're dealing with, the hoist motion, the reason that we have to get on with it is because we have to deal with the economy. Mr. Speaker, where did the man who occupies the Premier's Office, and the Member for Selkirk, make that statement? Was it in this Assembly? Was it before the people who are elected to hear him? He went to Thompson, Mr. Speaker, and again tried to fool the people of the province.

Where did the Member for Springfield, the temporary Member for Springfield, and Minister who is supposed to be the hotshot member to pilot this thing through, where did he make his statements on how we were going to have closure in this Assembly? Well he made a brief comment last night after the Member for Riel had taken the adjournment on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, he had a press conference this morning at 10 o'clock so that he could bluff over the people of Manitoba, so that he could tell them what he thought it was all about. He went to the public, that great parliamentarian, that person who pretends to know all the rules. Oh, he was quite impressive yesterday when he rose and abused the privileges of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, he was quite impressive.

We couldn't deal with the bill then, Mr. Speaker, we had to listen to him and let him tell us all about the rules and lay the groundwork for a closure motion which would stop us from debating the issue. He thought he was hot-time stuff, he was a big shot, Mr. Speaker. Well let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's been said many times, people like him have talked their way in here and right through, Mr. Speaker, and that's the path that he is on.

I, and my colleagues, are going to work to see that that happens, Mr. Speaker, because he does not have the support of this Chamber. He, as a House Leader, has lost the respect of this Chamber; he has lost the

respect of our caucus; he has lost the respect of his constituency. And what will happen to him? He will be voted out at the next general election if the temporary man who holds the Premier's Office, the Member for Selkirk, would screw up his courage and call an election, Mr. Speaker, because he does not have the mandate to govern anymore.

I would challenge any member, any backbencher or member of his Cabinet, to stand in their place, Mr. Speaker, and tell us, tell the people of Manitoba what they have done, that they have the support of the majority of the people in Manitoba on, they cannot tell us one thing, so the people of Manitoba have lost faith in this Premier. I'm sorry, again I apologize, he is not the Premier, the Premier is the top man who governs the Province of Manitoba; he is the Member for Selkirk who occupies the Premier's Office.

I have no disrespect for the individual. It's not a personal attack, it's proven, Mr. Speaker, that he hasn't been able to muster the job. He can't handle it, and that's why I am saying the people desperately want a change; they want a change in government, they want a change in the province.

I will conclude my remarks this evening, Mr. Speaker, by again saying that it is proven the Federal Government and their imposition of a federal bilingual act has divided Canada. To this point what the NDP Party have done in Manitoba have divided Manitobans, and that tears me apart, Mr. Speaker, because I have friends in every community. I have friends of every ethnic background, and I don't feel that we should be apologetic, Mr. Speaker. We shouldn't be apologetic for standing here in our place and stopping this government from doing something that is wrong, that is not supported by the people of Manitoba; and I would expect that each one of my colleagues, as will be demonstrated later tonight, as will be former New Democratic members of his caucus, Mr. Speaker, will be standing and speaking against what he is doing.

When does a government come to life and realize that the path they are going is doing nothing but destroying the very roots and the very being of what has made this a great province? I would plead with him and I would plead with his Cabinet and his caucus members to say to the people: we have made a mistake, what we have done is wrong, we have seen what you are saying, we have finally heard. Sure we have listened through hearings that we were forced to have, but we have not only listened, but we have heard and got the message. And, not only are we going to delay the bill six months, but we are going to delay the constitutional change which is being proposed for the same six months or longer; and let us put the question to the people of Manitoba, whether it be through referendum or through a general election, let us see, let us campaign on the issue, if that is the direction we want to go.

It's not a matter of us standing stopping people from getting rights. We have demonstrated time and time again we're for more rights than they are, Mr. Speaker, because today they have taken away our rights, they have taken away our rights to speak, and that's a demonstration of what they think of our rights; they've taken them away. Why don't they demonstrate to the people of Manitoba that they're listening, that they've made a mistake and that they'll back off, Mr. Speaker,

and forget that they ever introduced such a divisive mechanism and a divisive policy into the Province of Manitoba?

With those words, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude and hope for the best interests of the future of the Province of Manitoba and the people that we all love, because they show no compassion for the wishes of the people of Manitoba. I would ask in all sincerity, in no light way, that they withdraw this issue and if, after six months of careful consideration, if they still feel as strongly about it - because the bill doesn't come into effect until 1987 - in six months then bring it forward again but don't force it upon the people of Manitoba at this particular point because it is disastrous and you will pay the political reward which you deserve from that action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, these are trying times for members of the New Democratic Party. Party members have had to swallow a great deal in the past few months. First of all, they have had to look at what the government has done in terms of its general performance and, more particularly, in regard to the language legislation which, not only does not have support within the general public, but does not have support within the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the people of Manitoba expressed their opinion in an overwhelming plebiscite which 225,000 citizens voted and 175,000 voted against the government's measures, than the Attorney-General rose at a press conference the following morning and told the people that he didn't care - these are not his words, but this was the thrust of his remarks - that he really didn't care what the results were because the government was going to press on.

Mr. Speaker, it was only a few days ago that the Minister of Health said the same thing in this Assembly. He said that he didn't care what the results of the plebiscite were, that he — (Interjection) — well, he still says that. Mr. Speaker, that is the attitude of the government, a callous disregard of the opinions of people in the general public, and a callous disregard, I think, of the views of the majority of members in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, when the government introduced this measure today, and when the House Leader attempted to make the case yesterday for an extraordinary measure, I think that a lot of people in the New Democratic Party who have allegiances going back many decades were considerably pained, because all of us who have been around since the 1950's very much recall, and are painfully aware of the use of closure. Mr. Speaker, a New Democrat is the first to recoil at the thought of closure, and for them to have to swallow that this administration had to resort to that measure, I think, is excruciatingly painful.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few quotations — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, as you know I, myself, have always opposed the Speed-up resolution, and I have always opposed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . Speed-up, particularly because when the debate goes long into the nights, particularly past 10 or 11 p.m., I think there's a tendency for it to deteriorate and members find it difficult to properly perform their duties when they are asked by the government, or coerced by the government, to stay up all hours of the night and, in this instance of madness, until 2 a.m., and then are asked to come in the next day and debate. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the 1956 pipeline debate, if I had the time I would read pages and pages of the remarks of M. J. Coldwell and Stanley Knowles in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, only today I received a couple of mailings from Stanley Knowles, his speeches, his contributions to the House, as he is now concluding his career in the House of Commons which goes back to 1942. The man with the longest record in the House of Commons - some 40-odd years, minus one term, minus the Diefenbaker term which was largely the result of the imposition of closure by the Liberals and the public reaction to this, which not only wiped out the Liberals but smashed the NDP. The Premier and I were both attending United College in 1956 and had to suffer all the Tories who came out of the woodwork suddenly sprouting blue ribbons in great jubilation in 1957 and '58 in the reaction to Diefenbaker's first narrow victory and then his massive sweep in 1958. All of us were pained.

Mr. Speaker, here are a few remarks reaching back into 1956 by M. J. Coldwell and Stanley Knowles. Mr. Coldwell said, in the debate on May 30, 1956: "Anything I can do to stop this going through, under proper parliamentary procedure, I am right in undertaking."

He said, on the next page: "I hope the people of Canada are taking some notice of it. The time has come when the people of this country should have an opportunity of exercising some judgment over what has been done in the House over the last while."

Stanley Knowles, who was the pre-eminent expert on the rules and who researched all sorts of material to speak in that famous debate, Mr. Speaker, I'm reminded of the conclusion of that debate - the conclusion - when members of the opposition rushed to the Speaker's Chair and as mild a mannered person as M.J. Coldwell and as fine a gentleman as M.J. Coldwell was, he raised his fist in the direction of the Speaker's Chair in trembling and with many others of the CCF and Conservative side, rushed the Chair to protest, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles — (Interjection) — Well, the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . was not a CCFer at that time. Mr. Speaker, Stanley Knowles, in his quotes, referred to Robert Borden who made the following remarks about the procedure that this government has invoked

- and I realize that this is another debate and another time but a lot of this applies, Mr. Speaker, to the present - Robert Borden said much earlier, "The mere existence of the rule will itself prevent the necessity of its being brought into practice at least very frequently," and Wilfred Laurier said that they are holding a terror above our heads.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Knowles again quoted Laurier who said, "There are times when you can oppose that measure with all the force at its command." This is what he said in regard to the role of the opposition when confronted with an obstinate government that is promoting, pushing and ramming legislation through Parliament that is not in the best interest of the country. I would simply give a couple more quotes in which he said - and this is now Stanley Knowles himself speaking - "The day will come," and he's quoting Laurier as well, but these are his own words now, he said, "I believe the day will come when posterity will bless the pertinacity of those of us in this House who believe that Parliament is still free and that we are not called upon to bow our necks to the tyranny of a despotic government."

Mr. Speaker, I conclude with this remark from Mr. Knowles, who said, "Closure is not a blow at the opposition of the House; it is a blow at the rights of the Canadian people." Then he said, "It is a blow that strikes at the very heart of our democratic system." Well, those are authorities that may or may not appeal to everyone but they certainly must be respected in the CCF and the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's therefore a sad day for the government's supporters to have to stomach this after stomaching the results of the plebiscite, after stomaching the Attorney-General's rejection of that and now having to put up with the new House Leader who struts arounds here and quotes the rules until he's blue in the face; and now he has put the party on the hook because of the fact that closure has been invoked.

Mr. Speaker, it was only last Wednesday that the House Leader came into my constituency to sell the Elmwood New Democratic Party on the government program. I was curious myself as to what the result of that would be, because here was the new shining star - temporary albeit, here today and gone tomorrow, Andy Who - but here he was coming into my riding to sell my people on this and there was some support in the constituency for the government position. It is a painful thing, Mr. Speaker, for the party supporters to have to choose between loyalty to the government or using their own intelligence to decide on whether this is a right measure or not.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to give you a couple of quotes that came out of that meeting. There are a few I will not quote because I think they would prove too embarrassing to the government and to the Premier in particular.

The first speaker got up and said that he came to congratulate me. Well we were off to a good start. The second speaker - remember these are party members, these are not Conservatives, these are not people who belong to no party, these are not Liberals or Progressives, these are not Social Creditors or Communists - these are members of the New Democratic Party who live in the riding of Elmwood. Another gentleman was very upset - he spoke second

- because the government, he said, was ignoring public opinion.

A woman wanted to know the costs of providing services and she was told by the House Leader, well, I don't have a dollar figure but it's about a quarter to a half of the cost of validation and the up-front cost. Wasn't it Joe Magnet or somebody like that who said it was about the equivalent of the cost of the ball players, the catcher of the Expos, Gary Carter's salary? I was waiting for the Minister to say it was less than the cost of a package of cigarettes a day but he didn't get that far. Someone admonished the Minister for excluding yours truly from caucus. He said, "Well you could exclude him on this issue but he should be in caucus on the other issues." He said, "When you're excluding him, you're excluding the Elmwood constituency."

Another lady got up and - this is maybe the worst I'm going to mention and I'm going to leave out most of her remarks - but she said, "The government smells." Now, Mr. Speaker, again I have to tell you that that was said by a member of the party. One lady disagreed with me.

Then another lady got up, and she and her husband have been in the party about 30 years, and she said that she phoned the Premier's office and she wanted to know what a definition of an Anglophone was and they gave her a definition and it was somebody who doesn't speak French or isn't of French birth; everybody else is an Anglophone. She said, "What about some of the other people? What does that make some of us, Ukrainianphones, Germanphones?" That is what she said about this sort of thing. Then she quoted the Minister of Health and she was furious with him because he said words to the effect and I think this is a right quote, "What the hell do I care about the results of the plebiscite?" She said to the Minister who was present, "Is Desjardins representing the views of the government?" and he said, "Yes, he is." — (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: The Minister of Health misunderstands me. She put that question to your seat mate and he was asked whether you were representing the government and he said, "Yes."

Mr. Speaker, I could go but those are examples. There were a few stronger words used. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, the House Leader, he had his ears filled when he left that particular meeting. Maybe he'll stand up and say some of the final words which were said to him.

Mr. Speaker, the House Leader tried to make the case at that meeting and it was a phony argument if I ever heard one. He was very clever, as Saul Miller used to say, "very cute, very cute." He tried to make the case that whatever happened from November on was his responsibility and what happened before November didn't count. I mean that's like in the old days. You know what I mean. Back in the old days there was this resolution, these guys were debating, there was a plebiscite. Remember the plebiscite, a long time ago. It's fading into history and he tried to make the case that that didn't matter because now he was in charge. He was running the government and he got

the best legal advice and he came to that meeting and it was a brand new ball game.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it may be a brand new ball game because in the last one - here's a headline from the Winnipeg Sun, July 8th, "Penner strikes out in Brandon and Dauphin." You remember the results of that ball game.

Mr. Speaker, now the new Minister comes in there, struts out before this meeting and took a shellacking, a shellacking from party members. Not from the general public, not from the Tories, from members of the Elmwood New Democratic Party. Several of them were members for 30 and 40 years. One man said, who has been a member since the 1940s - he said, "I will put up a sign in the next election but it will only have a name on it, it won't have a party." He said, "because I'm going door to door and the same people I appeal to votes for are hammering me in this regard." — (Interjection) — Well, I will talk about the bill in about two minutes, just as much as the other speakers on that side talked about the bill and just as much as the Premier talked about the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is not true, it is not true that support is growing for the government. We heard that today. The House Leader came out today and in invoking closure said that support was growing for the government position.

MR. H. ENNS: Not true, lie.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, he said that at 10 o'clock. At 11 o'clock Manitoba Grassroots held a press conference and released the results of their ballots and their petitions . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . 15,000 ballots came into date; 10,000 signed petitions to date; 25,000 signed to date. The new proposals, the spanking new proposals by the spanking new Minister brought in on January 3rd or so; the ad went in on January 7th and the ballots started to come in and the petitions started to come in and they're still rolling in, Mr. Speaker, still rolling in, 25,000 to date and when I had a campaign in July and August, 17,500 signatures and petitions came in. That was a massive display of opposition. Now it has increased 50 percent and still climbing, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal in the remaining time with some of the principles of this bill. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment said it all in an interview in *La Liberté*. He said in effect, we're going to put this legislation in place before proclamation. We're going to put in as much as we possibly can, we're going to have it so that people get accustomed to the demanding of these services, get used to it and ask for even more. Well, Mr. Speaker, think of it. Think of it. If you want to do that, if you intend to do that, if you are starting to do that now and will implement that bill in its fullest extent prior to the date of proclamation, it proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that you don't need a bill at all, that you can do it as a matter of government policy. So there's no need for this bill. There's no need for this debate. There's no need for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, then we look at the bill. Same old stuff. The right to communicate which means that a citizen

who speaks French can go into any government department, can go into one of the 260-odd boards, commissions and agencies and demand that he have the right to communicate in French. He can go all over Manitoba. Don't give me this stuff that it's only in areas where there's a heavy French-Canadian population or component. That isn't true. It is in those areas, plus it's in all these head offices, hundreds and boards and commissions and agencies plus the Crown Corporations etc. As soon as one person goes in and demands a right to speak to somebody in French the trouble will begin and when the letters go in, they'll have to come back in French.

We saw this silliness today of where the Winnipeg Sun is being told to go and change the print on the outside of their boxes in the airport. Now, Mr. Axworthy at least had the political sense today to invoke his right as a Minister and wipe that out today. It has nothing to do with the fact that one of the members of the House is running against him or that an election is imminent in terms of the next few months.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that that section has to be amended. I'm saying to the House Leader, that has to be amended. The boards and commissions and agencies shouldn't be in there. The right to communicate is one that is a thin edge of the wedge that can result in the full range of services throughout the entire Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I am concerned about is, even though school boards and R.M.'s, municipalities are mentioned - I'm concerned that they too will be pressured by the right to communicate.

Mr. Speaker, finally one of the most ominous and stupidest and most dangerous sections of this bill is the language ombudsman. I mean, just think of it. In Quebec you have the tongue troopers running around, ordering people to take down their signs; that you cannot, in the Province of Quebec, have a bilingual sign on your business or on your building. You must have a sign in French only. I don't know what's going to happen here eventually. Don't tell me that this bill is the maximum because it isn't. This bill is going to be the minimum. It's going to be the beginning of a long journey. If it goes into place, then it's going to be the bottom line, but it's not going to be the top and it's not going to be the end of the road. It's going to be the beginning of something that will fuel and grow and expand throughout our province with very detrimental effects.

So they're going to appoint a language ombudsman, aren't you? Mr. Speaker, can you imagine somebody filling that role, going around ordering people what they have to do in terms of translating things into French, providing French services, etc. You know, Mr. Speaker, about the only thing they don't have in the bill is the costume of this man. I mean, can't you see in the future, a couple of years from now, where some business man will have a sign in his window and somebody will report it to the office and then you'll hear a voice just like in the old radio thrillers saying, "This is a job for language ombudsman!" Then, like a bird or a plane or a Tarzan swinging on a vine, into the window will come language ombudsman.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what he is going to wear because at first I had it figured out he would have pink tights, or maybe orange tights, and a black cape and

a big "O" on his chest. That was my first thought, but then I listened to one of the speeches from the Conservative Party and I guess it was, in fact - no, it was in fact the speech made only a few days ago by the leader himself who was concerned about zealots.

What would happen if a zealot filled that particular position? Well, if it is a language zealot, there is a costume for him - a black outfit with a black cape and a black mask and a Spanish bullfighter's hat and a big "Z" - the mark of "zealot" carved with a sword in the sand, on the building, on the window, wherever it is, to draw attention to the fact that that person, that business, that school board, that municipality, that Crown corporation, that government agency, or that individual, was violating the spirit and the law of Bill 115.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the sort of things that we have to be concerned about and, although I make light of that particular point, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province of Quebec it's no laughing matter. When some group comes into an office, peopled by good Québécois, people who speak French in the back, in a kitchen, not in the front where they meet the public, in the back where they have a calendar in English showing how many calories, and they are told to take that calendar down, or they are told to take their sign down because the sign isn't in French only and nobody, least of all you, Mr. House Leader, can guarantee that this sort of thing won't happen here, because this is just the beginning. It is just the beginning, and nobody, Mr. Speaker, predicted this sort of insanity at the federal level, in terms of some of the things we have now; and nobody would have predicted some of these inanities in the Province of Quebec as a result.

So we don't know what is before us. We know what is in the bill - far too much - a number of areas which should be gutted, or the entire bill withdrawn; and I say that the opposition and the general public should oppose this bill with everything they have because we not only will fight for ourselves and for the province now, but we will fight for the benefit of generations to come.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the first opportunity that I have had to speak on this particular issue. I did, throughout the early part of the summer, listen to what took place in this Legislature on the provision of French language services. I also had the opportunity of going out in the country as a member of the committee and listened to the views of the people of Manitoba in Swan River, Dauphin, Ste. Rose and other areas that the meetings took place. In addition to that, I also attended a number of district meetings when I was Minister of Municipal Affairs, district meetings held by the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, at every one of those meetings I heard the subject of French services brought up, questions being raised at all of these meetings, and at every meeting the president indicated that there was no objection to the provision of French language services. They had no opposition to that; they were not opposed

to French language services, but they didn't want it entrenched in The Manitoba Act. That is what they were opposed to; that is what they were against, Mr. Speaker.

There were about 1,200 people that attended those meetings, I believe, and they made their views known and we heard, during the hearings as well, many people have supported what the government was trying to do, and there were others that did not. Mr. Speaker, it's because what we heard out in the Province of Manitoba - and I want to extend my congratulations to those who came forward and expressed their views sincerely to us - and it is they who should get the credit for the changes that we have made and not that bunch that sit over there and call themselves Loyal Opposition of Her Majesty, because I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that there ever was, in history in this province, a government that had to face the obstructions of the kind that this group have put up.

Mr. Speaker, we never heard, including the little rat from Charleswood, . . .

A MEMBER: Withdraw, withdraw, withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I really don't think those are the sort of words that we expect to hear in this House.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I should apologize, but I remember very well when the former leader, and I think the de facto leader, was calling people on this side of the House "church mice" and all kinds of other names. You know there is not much difference between a mouse and a rat, they are very closely related.

A MEMBER: What's religion Pete?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Member for Elmwood, and I recall that he had a study, sent out a survey in his constituency asking his members - they were sent to party members and I am not sure how many members they have in Elmwood - but he sent out a study asking for their views on whether they supported what the government was doing. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, he put his words and his questionnaire that he sent out in order to get the answer that he wanted. It's very easy to do that, Mr. Speaker. We've seen the opposition members do that as well.

Mr. Speaker, I believe - I stand to be corrected but I believe he got about . . .

A MEMBER: It won't be the first time.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . he may have got about 5 percent response - and the member nods agreement - so I don't have to be corrected. He received about 5 percent response and he says that was a majority in his constituency. I remind him that there's 95 percent other people there as well that did not respond to his questionnaire.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, we know what happens to people, to those who have taken the path now being

followed by the Member for Elmwood. We've seen what happened to people in the past; history has shown what happened to people.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Like Stanley Knowles and Coldwell?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I'm still not sure the reason for the position now taken by the Member for Elmwood. I'm not sure if he's still not bitter over past events that have taken place. He spoke awhile ago and he said that what was happening now was the beginning of a long journey.

A MEMBER: No wonder he's bitter, seeing you in the Cabinet and him . . . No wonder he's bitter.

HON. A. ADAM: Those are almost the same words that he said when Bill No. 2 was introduced in the House and when he spoke to it. He made those same words. It was the right way to go.

Mr. Speaker, according to this report - and I know it's in Hansard because I read it - that on the 16th of April, the member said, "Bonjour Mesdames et Messieurs." That's how he began his speech, Mr. Speaker. "Bonjour Mesdames et Messieurs. Manitoba has been officially unilingual and now I suppose, from this point on, will become officially bilingual."

A MEMBER: When did he say that?

HON. A. ADAM: On April 16, 1980. "This isn't a bill to translate some statutes. It is a bill because of the fact that we in Canada and it is because of the fact that we have a French Canadian population, we have an obligation to a bilingual country."

He said that he was not concerned about the impact of plebiscites in Quebec, Mr. Speaker. He went on to say, "The Tory legislation is a step in the right direction and as it has been said, a journey of thousand miles begins with one step, but there are many more steps that must be taken and there must also be, as we advance along the way, appreciation for the multicultural diversity of the people of Manitoba and Canada."

Mr. Speaker, those are almost exactly the same words that he said in conclusion of his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ADAM: We have listened to members opposite speak. None of them have dealt with what was before the Legislature. None of them have dealt with the fact that we were now coming forward with a complete new package, except one person on that side, and I want to give credit, as some of my colleagues have, and it's the Member for Turtle Mountain who should have been the leader of that party. While I didn't agree with all that he said, Mr. Speaker, he said it with sincerity. We didn't have to agree with him and he made sense and he was rational. We never heard one speech outside of that that made any sense and I want to extend my congratulations to the Member for Turtle Mountain.

Mr. Speaker, we listen to the ranting and raving - and I don't even want to waste time because he isn't even worth the time of day - from the Member for

Arthur who carped about closure. Can you imagine that? Anybody on that side that has the nerve to get up, the audacity, Mr. Speaker, to come up and say, "You're not giving us a chance to speak," and for four days last week, when we asked them to speak, they let the bells ring - four days, cost to the taxpayers, heavy costs to keep this operation going and the backup staff, so let them not, Mr. Speaker, come up with those arguments, a phony argument if ever there was one, for members to come up and say that they didn't have the opportunity to speak.

I recall very well - I believe it was back in 1980 - when they brought in closure on the Department of Agriculture and I remember very well in 1978 or '79 when they brought in closure for the Minister of Cultural Affairs, Mrs. Norma Price, when they brought in closure - that's just a few years ago, Mr. Speaker. Let them not come down and say, "Holy thou," because we know where they stand and they cannot come here now today and say that they had no opportunity to speak on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have been out, we have listened to the people and . . .

A MEMBER: But you didn't hear them.

HON. A. ADAM: . . . we have made some changes to our proposal. Throughout this province the message that I heard was that people did not want to have services entrenched in the Constitution, in The Manitoba Act.

Those services will not be entrenched in the Constitution, they will be brought in by a bill which can be changed, which can be amended by another government, or this government and that is the impression that I got when we went out to those hearings.

It is a reasonable proposal, a principled proposal. It's a compromise, a complete change from what we had proposed last year, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely no reason for the opposition that we have at the present time for this resolution. People in their everyday lives after this is done and gone and forgotten, people will not know the difference in their daily lives. It is unfortunate that we have those people who want to use this issue for their own political gains. It is too important an issue for that and, Mr. Speaker, I for one would rather lose my next election - (Interjection) - I hear the Member for Charleswood say you will.

He was out in the Interlake country in 1981 telling everybody that we had Neepawa, Ste. Rose in the bag. Well, he got left holding the bag. He was the one that was left holding the bag, Mr. Speaker, and he was on this side when he was saying that, and where is he now? He's not at the front bench, he's at the backbench and that's where he should be. He never was fit to be in the front row anyway. Yes, he went out in the Interlake and said, oh yes, we've got Ste. Rose in the bag. - (Interjection) -

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

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would rather lose my election on this issue because you don't measure the strength of a government on what it does for the

majority, but you measure the strength of a government on how it protects its minorities. That is how you measure the strength of a government.

When I hear people stand up and say - and the Member for Charleswood said it today - 78 percent voted against this. They voted against that other package. They didn't vote against this, they voted against something completely different. But if you look at it the other way, you can turn that around and say listen, 78 percent says that you shouldn't do that, and the Member for Charleswood says, are you saying that they're wrong? No, we're not saying they're wrong, but let's put it on the other term, let's turn that around. What he is saying is that might is right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in history it has been proven that might is not always right.

A MEMBER: You always listen to the people, Peter.

HON. A. ADAM: Well, if you have no principles and you just wanted to flow with the wind so that you can be elected, that is how you operate. You are willing to sacrifice your principles in order to try and defeat this government so that you can get elected, that's all you care about and it's obvious. Wherever the wind blows, that's where you go.

I kind of think the Member for Turtle Mountain is maybe an exception to that, but the rest of you, the rest of them, Mr. Speaker, you could put them in — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: You're a lone man there.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I think we want to be fair and reasonable, we want a compromise. This is a great country. Canada is a great country and Manitoba is not an island. We must recognize the rights and our heritage and the rights of the minorities in this province and in any province in this country.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable compromise that has come up and I want to thank again the people of Manitoba for helping us, because it's they that help us do it. Even the plebiscites, and I don't like to see a government run by plebiscite, that's not the way you run a country. You don't run a country by plebiscites. You don't run a municipality by plebiscites.

A MEMBER: What do you think an election is, Pete?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, we have elections every four or five years. That is the time for the people to make their views known, but as I said previously, I would rather lose an election on account of my principles, what I believe is right, than to win an election and sacrifice my principles like what I think is happening over there.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened in the past. We've seen what was happening back in 1980 when they were meeting with their Franco-Manitoban Society. Yes, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert I think it is. Yes, the former Attorney-General and Mrs. Price,

the Minister of Cultural Affairs met with the Franco-Manitoban Society to try and find out what services that they should provide and so on. We read all the documents, they're there. We know that they said well look we keep this under wraps because, you know, the Federal Government is coming in with a bilingual policy, and we sure don't want to be on that band wagon, we don't want to get on that band wagon. That was the reason why. Of course, we don't support what the Federal Government is doing with their bilingual language either, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Are you going to ride with that in the next election?

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened in 1980. We know what happened. When I was out on the hearings we heard numerous people and I think even the Member for Elmwood was complaining about the costs. Oh, there's going to be costs involved, it costs too much.

Well, I want to give credit to the Member for Charleswood who was former leader, maybe still is, and he said on July 12, 1983 in debating this resolution - and I want to congratulate him and give credit where credit is due - Mr. Speaker, he said, "You've never heard anyone on this side of the House talk about cost. I don't think you heard me talk about costs in 1979, 1980 when the Forest case came down. I said the rule of law was that we had to obey the Supreme Court of Canada and to engage in those translation services that were necessary to re-implement Section 23. You don't talk about costs unless you're shallow in your thinking."

A MEMBER: Who said that?

HON. A. ADAM: The Member for Charleswood.

A MEMBER: No kidding.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, that you don't understand what the country is made of. You don't talk about costs in a murder case, there's a principle involved. You pursue the case until the end. One of the jobs of state. One of the legitimate costs of state is to pursue justice and that's what we're doing. That's what we're doing, Mr. Speaker, right now. We are following the course of justice to the people of Manitoba, to the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good proposal that I am sure in the years to come the people of Manitoba will be proud that there was a New Democratic Government that had the nerve and the intestinal fortitude to stand up and be counted on this issue.

Well, when the former Leader of the Conservative Party accused people who talked about costs, that they were shallow, we heard quite a number of people raise that argument too. Now I'm not going to call them shallow because I think that, in themselves, they felt that that was a legitimate argument. It's not my intention to accuse these people of being shallow, Mr. Speaker.

I know that those people who are concerned of the unknown are concerned that things might happen that you don't perceive at this particular time. But all the

best legal advice available tells us that what they are concerned about is almost 100 percent or so remote because you can never be 100 percent sure in our system of law. But it is so remote that those concerns should be laid to rest.

Thank you very much.

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

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely difficult tonight. I normally have 40 minutes, with this closure motion I'm cut to 30 minutes. I have to speak on supporting the proposed hoist motion that was provided by my leader, I would like to speak about the bill and I would also like to speak about the closure motion which was historically imposed and it's all concise now to 30 minutes. So I have a difficult task, Mr. Speaker, to try and tell the House and the people of this province what the people in Roblin-Russell constituency think about what is going on in this House since we were called back since the recess.

Mr. Speaker, may I first of all assure the Francophone community who are up in our galleries, or any place in this province, this caucus, this party, these people that I represent in Roblin constituency, we believe in equal rights for all the people in this province because they are all equal. Mr. Speaker, may I assure my friends again, there are no majorities in this province. We are all minorities. Every group in this province are minorities. Let that be on the record, Mr. Speaker, and let it be fair and square. That's what I stand for, that's what the people in Roblin constituency stand for, that's what our caucus stands for, that's what our party stands for on this issue and will be forever.

Mr. Speaker, I have a difficult time to speak on this motion. I sat here for two weeks waiting for the Premier of this province to rise in his place and answer the 25 questions I raised about two weeks ago. What got him to his feet, Mr. Speaker? A closure motion. It takes a closure motion to get the First Minister of this province to rise and get to his feet. Did he answer any of the questions that I raised on behalf of my people, the some 35 questions? He never answered one. He never answered one question. Is that an insult to me? Is that an insult to democracy? Is that an insult to the people I represent? Is that an insult to the Franco-Manitoban Society who sit up in the galleries? That's an insult, I say, to Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. That's an insult that the First Minister rose in his place and why it took him so long I don't know because those questions have been on the record for weeks.

Mr. Speaker, what did he say? He accused us of McCarthyism. Of using McCarthy tactics. Mr. Speaker, I say, when I and the people of this opposition bench stand up and defend what 80 percent of the people in this province are doing, that's not McCarthy tactics. That is not McCarthyism. That's representing the wishes of the people. That's practising democracy. That's what's makes this country so great and that's what makes this province so great and makes its people so great, practising democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, do the members opposite ever take a look at that statute over there? Moses, with the

Ten Commandments in his hands. Do you ever take a look at what Moses said and what those commandments said when you go to bed at night or before you rise in your place in this House and misguide us and mislead us day after day after day, tell quarter-truths, tell half-truths, tell something that we can't even understand?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think they know what Moses is all about. I don't think they understand the Ten Commandments. I don't think they understand democracy. Mr. Speaker, it scares me. It scares a lot of people what's going on in this province as I speak in this Chamber tonight, Mr. Speaker.

This First Minister that we have in this province - and now I'm comparing him to those three brass monkeys, the Premier and this new House Leader and that one that got dumped, what was his name - the Attorney-General, the chief law officer of this province - those three brass NDP monkeys who hear no evil, see no evil and are afraid to speak; afraid to speak on the most important issue that this province has seen since it was accepted. There they are; those three brass NDP monkeys. They are now guiding us, well one now is dead and gone, the Attorney-General who guided this, directed this resolution through the early stages.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Premier should have told me today, and the people of this province, why did he defrock the first chief law officer of this province of this issue? Why did he dismantle him and kick him out of office? The chief law officer of this province, could he not handle it? Was he not capable, or did he go wrong? The First Minister never said a word, and that's why I compare him to those brass monkeys. We don't get those kinds of answers.

A MEMBER: Wally, be fair to the monkeys.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Well . . . but, Mr. Speaker, we are learning real quick. When you want to deal with these people over here, you bring in a closure motion; then they all want to talk. They all want to talk. I have been wanting to speak since 4 o'clock this afternoon; I am just getting on. What time is it now, Mr. Driedger? Ten o'clock. We have heard, well, already three members opposite in a space of - we heard the First Minister, we heard the Minister of Finance and we heard the honourable member that just took his seat, the Minister of Government Services. We have already heard three biggies on this issue — (Interjection) — well, two-and-a-half.

Mr. Speaker, this closure motion scares me; this government scares me - these people that are over here who treat this place as a playground, a political playground. Mr. Speaker, I just suggest to some of the members opposite some of us have been around here for a little while, such as the Member for Concordia, or the old club; there's five of us left from '66. The Member for St. Boniface is here; the Member for Charleswood. How can you possibly compare this Chamber and the conduct of the way business is carried on the way it was when we first came in here? There is no comparison. It's a nightmare in this place; it's an insult to those people who inhabited this place and guided this province through those years. If you don't believe me, my friends and my colleagues, I just ask

you, tune into Channel 9 some time at night and try to listen to what is going on. It's an absolute nightmare the way we conduct ourselves in this House.

Don't you look at Moses when you walk in the door? Don't you look at Solomon? Don't you look at the decor and the grandeur of this building? This is the highest court of the land, my friends; this is where the final decisions are made right in this room, and I suggest that we had better clean up our act and start dealing with matters the way they should be dealt with, and not in this childish manner that this government, of course, plays around with all the time.

Mr. Speaker, I understand this government had a problem. They have no leader. They are absolutely leaderless. The Attorney-General, he tried to lead the gang for a while and he got dumped. He is not even considered now in this matter anymore. So they got this new wild-eyed guy here that came in here not so long ago. He used to sit over at the desk here . . .

A MEMBER: Assistant Clerk.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Assistant Clerk - and he used to guide us. Some of us that have been around here are old enough to be his father, but he tried to tell us how to deal with it. Then all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, he became a rules expert, and people still say he drew the lines for the boundaries, in the constituency boundaries. I don't know if it was him and the Clerk and the Chief Electoral Officer, and that's fair ball. Then all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, this wild-eyed guy, he quits one day. He says, "Ah, I've got this place made." He takes leave of absence and he goes and campaigns for 18 months. He gets elected; he comes in here and now he is running the place. Now that is progress; that is.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, the problem that they have over there, this man, this House Leader can't be trusted. Nobody in our caucus trusts this House Leader that you have today, Mr. Speaker. We can't trust him.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The honourable member is reflecting on a member of this House, suggesting that a member of this House took a leave of absence and campaigned while he was still an employee of this House.

MR. W. McKENZIE: No, I didn't say that.

HON. A. MACKLING: That is what the honourable member said, and I ask him to withdraw it because that's as false as the rest of his speech.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. If I said that, I apologize to the honourable member of the House. What I said was he took leave and quit then and went out campaigning; but let's go a little farther. He sat at the desk, he worked there, he drew boundaries, he guided us; he did all of those things; he helped the Clerk. Then he resigned or quit, whatever the case was; then he went out and campaigned for

18 months and came back and was elected. Now, in that short space, he is running the province. He is bringing in a motion of closure, this man who sat over there telling us about the rules and how to guide us through this problem that we have in this extremely important time in our history, and now we don't trust him over here. We are not talking to him anymore.

Parliament, Mr. Speaker, will not work under those kinds of conditions ever. If we can't have House Leaders that are speaking; if we cannot have a House Leader that we can talk to, that will give us some sense of sensibility, some understanding and some guidance, Parliament will not work. That's the first problem we've got with that House Leader.

The second problem: He doesn't know how to run Parliament. He may know how to read the book, Mr. Speaker, but he doesn't know how to run Parliament because Parliament cannot work unless you get both sides of this House functioning. You have to have compassion; you have to have understanding; you have to have agreement; especially, Mr. Speaker, when you come in this House and there is only one issue on the table.

One issue - that's all we have on the table in this last two or three weeks, and then the honourable members say that we walk out. Sure we walk out; we can't get along with that House Leader. Is that our problem? No, that's the First Minister's problem; that's the leader of the government that is trying to bring this thing to a head and pass it through this House with the help of the opposition, and I don't see, Mr. Speaker, as a person that's been here a long time, how we are ever going to pass that with that House Leader guiding this legislation any farther.

We are on a disaster course. Sure, we will go to the hearings and we will hear the public. We have to come back in here and deal with the resolution. How, Mr. Speaker, in anybody's wildest imagination, are we going to deal with that resolution with that House Leader on the government side guiding the government in this most extremely difficult time? It won't work.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we have to watch so carefully - do you know what the next step is after closure? Dictatorship. That scares the living daylights out of me. If you are going to throw a motion of closure around in this place, in this Parliament, Mr. Speaker, and use it as a playground the way they do - and I am surprised at a lot of the legal fraternity who know this is the highest court in the land - lawyers wouldn't conduct themselves in a court house the way they conduct themselves here. No way; it wouldn't be allowed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem; we have a difficult problem, and the time on the clock moves on and on and the problem gets bigger and bigger because the people outside this Legislature, the people from the north, to the south, from the east to west across this province have not escalated from the 60 percent to 70 percent. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, about 90 percent of the people in this province are opposed, absolutely opposed, to what this House Leader is doing to our province and to our people, doing it by closure, a closure motion going against 80 percent of the people, or 85 percent of the people.

That's an insult to democracy; that's an insult to the people of this province; that's an insult to the Franco-

Manitoban Society; it's an insult to the Poles; it's an insult to the Ukrainians; it's an insult to the whole mosaic, this fantastic province of many many people from many many lands. It's tearing their hearts out; it's tearing their guts out as we wrestle and struggle with this problem every day, and we have a House Leader that we can't trust. And now I doubt if we're going to be speaking to him the way he conducted himself today, and that is a tragedy for Parliament. Parliament is the one that's going to suffer and the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, are the ones that are going to suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also concerned about the press, since this debate has been going on for months, and one only has to go and listen to the various press releases and the press stories that come out almost every day about this place, and there's hardly two that will agree. Here's one, I'll just give you an example - January 14th, Brandon Sun: "P.C. proposal could prolong French debate." Turn it over - Free Press: "Tories ready to compromise." The same day and the only one issue before this House. Mr. Speaker, what has gone wrong with the media, the Third Estate in this province, who are supposed to take this message out across this province and tell the people what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, do they not understand? Don't the people that sit up there in the Fourth Estate understand this democratic system? Don't they understand this Chamber? I wonder. — (Interjection) — It's every day. Mr. Speaker, that's another problem that we have to deal with in trying to resolve this extremely important matter that we are dealing with at this moment.

This closure motion - I call it Black Tuesday for Manitoba; I call it Black Tuesday for this mosaic of many many people from many lands, 85 percent who oppose what this government is trying to do. It must be a black black day for them. It must be a black day for the Franco-Manitoban Society who we support and will do everything we can because look at what the Lyon Government is doing to try and give them the rights that they lost, brought them all back and was promoting them on, but now there's hate, there's animosity, there's bitterness, there's mistrust.

I wonder sometimes, Mr. Speaker, if this Parliament will ever function again until we go to the people. I don't see how this Legislature will ever function again unless we go to the people and bring some new faces in here and a new government because we are bogged down to the nth degree on this issue; and if that government brings in the closure motion on the resolution, which is going to be dealt with after 2 o'clock this morning, if you have to go the closure route with that then I say we have to go to the people, there's no other solution. I think it would be an insult for me to stand in my place and even speak to a second closure motion. I think we should call the Lieutenant-Governor and ask her to issue the writs for an election, even if the Premier hasn't got the guts to do it, I think the people should do it because we're, not only destroying the rights of the people, 80 or 90 percent of them, we're destroying Parliament, we're destroying the honesty of the members across this place.

We're not talking, we're not speaking, we're tearing the heart out of the people of this province, the fabric that's so tender. We used to curl together; we used to dance together; we used to play ball together. That's gone my friend, that's gone. Who did it? That First Minister over there, that First Minister is the guy, he's the one that started it all and there we sit.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how we're going to get out of it? How are we going to get out of this impasse, because we're not going to back off. Why should we back off when we have over 80 percent of the people on our side telling us, and phoning us, and writing us day after day; McKenzie, don't come back to Roblin Constituency until you give every breath and every ounce of your strength to fight this issue to the last hour and the last minute, and I'm not going to let those people down, never. We're going to fight it right here until the bitter end and I tell you — (Interjection) — Oh, we'll ring bells, we're going to do a lot of things.

A MEMBER: Not one of you can say that.

MR. W. McKENZIE: We're going to do lots of things, my friend, because you, you new House Leader who nobody trusts on this side anymore, nobody speaks to, you carry on the way you're going, my friend, you're going to lead this province and your party and democracy into an abyss it'll never come out for decades. You're on the wrong track; you've got the wrong frame of mind. You don't understand what compassion is; you don't understand what compromise is; you don't understand what Parliament is all about. All you've got is a bunch of books.

Parliament is people, my friend. Parliament is people, and once you interfere with the rights of people you destroy Parliament, and I defy you to bring in that second closure motion on the resolution. We'll be standing in our place and demanding an election and I'll betcha you'll have the people on your back and you'll be calling an election a lot quicker than you thought you were.

Why not support the compromise that my House Leader offered you, to give it a hoist for six months and let it cool down. Why not? What's wrong with it? What was wrong with that motion? I never heard one of them that spoke today speak to my leader's compromise - a simple, easy, compromise. Let's cool it down for six months and see what the people say then; but the Premier didn't speak to it, the Minister of Finance didn't speak to it.

A MEMBER: Yes he did.

MR. W. McKENZIE: You never offered any solution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mickey Mouse stuff. Mr. Speaker, where did this problem start? Where did it start? It started here.

MR. H. ENNS: You're right Wally, and you're the first one to point that out.

MR. W. McKENZIE: It started, secondly, Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of the word, "mandate"? When you

want to do something in a Legislature or Parliament, you must have a mandate. You must have the wishes of the people. You must campaign in your election campaign and tell the people what you're going to do.

Mr. Speaker, let's go through this book, page-by-page, and see if we can find one trace of the word, "bilingualism, entrenchment." It's not there. You can search the pages inside out - and it's a big document. It's "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." Policies - the New Democratic Party; great people, NDP, great future, Manitoba and the NDP."

A MEMBER: Who signed it?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Signed by Howard Pawley.

MR. H. ENNS: Nice picture of Howard there, too.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yes. "Great people, great future," signed by Howard Pawley. There it is; there's their whole election platform.

MR. H. ENNS: Anything about bilingualism?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Bilingualism's not there.

MR. H. ENNS: Anything about entrenchment, constitutional change?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Entrenchment's not there, not mentioned.

MR. H. ENNS: It has to be, Wally, it has to be there, look at that thing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: It's not there. I've searched it, I've taken it home, Mr. Speaker, and I've read it . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . on weekends. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't sleep last night, the heat of the debate in this place and the bitterness. I went and got myself a copy of a dictionary. What's the word "mandate" mean - just for the benefit of the First Minister and members opposite. Have you looked up lately what the word mandate means? Have you looked it up? It means, Mr. Speaker, an authoritative command. Now, did you get the authoritative command from Trudeau? Did you get it from Bilodeau? Did you get it from the Manitoba Franco-Manitoban Society, but you never got it to the people. Did you tell the people that you were to do this, Mr. Speaker? Did the First Minister anywhere in this analogy of words and pictures and great wisdom for the future? Not mentioned, not mentioned. That's what scares me, Mr. Speaker. There they went across this province, toured, and says no we don't need to listen to people, we'll do it our own way.

The tragedy is, Mr. Speaker, they have gone farther, they've gone on to closure. As I said earlier, what scares the living daylights out of me, the next step after closure is dictatorship. I tell you, there's some wild-eyed characters across there when I start thinking about a

dictatorship that scares the living daylights out of me and scares the living daylights of a lot of people in this province who don't understand Parliament, as I said earlier, who treat it as a playground. Look at the way they've conducted themselves every day, banging desks and screaming and yelling. This is the highest court in the land, Mr. Speaker, this is Parliament. This is Manitoba's No. 1 court house.

Mr. Speaker, the first guy that got ruptured in this debate was the No. 1 law officer in the highest court of the land. Is that not enough reason to go to the people? Defrocked, pushed off to the side, the chief law officer of this province, the No. 1 guy, he's been dumped, he's been sent to the salt mines, he's gone. Is that not a reason to call an election? He laughs, he laughed.

Mr. Speaker, what else does it say about mandate? It says its a formal order from a superior court or official to an inferior one. Now, where's this superior court that gave you this mandate to go this route? — (Interjection)—

HON. R. PENNER: That's a mandamus, not a mandate.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I'm talking about mandate, I'm using the dictionary, the explanation. I'm not a lawyer. I can go to mandamus, it's farther in here, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing it says about a mandate, Mr. Speaker, it's an authorization to act given a representative, an authorization given to act by a representative. Who are we representing? We are representing the people of this province, these great Manitobans, one of the greatest provinces in all of Canada, Manitoba. We are standing here, Mr. Speaker, supposedly representing and standing up for the rights and wishes of the people. Where did you get this mandate to pursue this right? Where did you get the mandate to bring in closure today? Did you ask the people? No, they didn't ask the people, Mr. Speaker, they've never talked to the people. They live in dens, they live in the caucus room, they live in their little cells, they don't go out and talk to the people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, where was this resolution, Bill 115, conceived? Now, you can't blame the Attorney-General because he was dumped. He wouldn't be part and parcel of this bill, so who was it? Was it the Premier? No, it wouldn't be the Premier. It would likely be the new House Leader, this new genius, this rules expert that they've brought in. I wonder where the Premier was when this Bill 115 was - because we seldom hear anything about him, what he's doing, or he is saying. Where was he when this Bill 115 was drafted, was he there? He said he wasn't there when the resolution was cooked up. He's already told us he had no part of that earlier resolution. I'm asking him, was he there when the bill was drafted? What was the First Minister's comments today about what's going on? He called it McCarthyism because we over here, the opposition benches, standing up and fighting for the rights of 80-90 percent of these people in this province and we're called using McCarthy tactics. That's how wrong these people are, that's how wrong this New Democratic Party is on this issue, Mr. Speaker, that's why they shouldn't be allowed to govern in this province any longer. Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the early days of this resolution that was first brought in by the Attorney-General and the Government of the Day. I was very pleased with the speech that the Honourable Member for Charleswood raised the other day to see why they went from no bill then to a bill now. Where was the decision made to get rid of the Attorney-General, then go a different route and come in with a different resolution and now a bill. Why was that made, where did they go wrong, did they think they were going to mislead us as to this sort of trickery that was going on? Did they think they were going to mislead the people of Manitoba on these tactics? Did they think we would lose our courage and back off? Did they think that we maybe didn't have an understanding of this issue, Mr. Speaker? I don't know because you know they won't talk until you put closure in, then they all want to talk. I daresay there'll be two or three more rise to their places tonight.

So, Mr. Speaker, very quickly and very sad - this black day, this black Tuesday in Manitoba - I fully support the hoist motion given by my leader and will vote against this closure motion, and I will stand here as long as I can breathe and fight to defend the rights of the people that I represent . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. McKENZIE: . . . in Roblin constituency on the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. McKENZIE: I tell you, I'm told today by phone calls . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order.
The honourable member's time has expired.
Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to participate in this debate on what is known as the hoist motion that had been moved by my leader. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, I draw this to the attention of the Minister of Government Services who spoke on this hoist motion tonight, and also to the Minister of Health that back in July of 1980 when our government had introduced Bill No. 2, which was part of the process of restoring French language rights in this province, those two gentlemen opposite moved the hoist motion to try to kill Bill 2 when it was introduced here in this House in 1980.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a final appeal to the members opposite. They are making a terrible mistake.

A MEMBER: Right on.

MR. B. RANSOM: They are making a terrible mistake and I don't care about what it does to them because one of the things, of course, that I would like to see is that those people opposite are replaced as government in Manitoba. So I'm not concerned about them as individuals but, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about Manitobans. I'm talking about all Manitobans,

whether they're Francophone Manitobans or whether they are non-Francophone Manitobans. This government is making a mistake and I don't think they understand the extent of the mistake that they are making.

Mr. Speaker, we need only go back to the case that George Forest brought into the courts and that went to the Supreme Court and resulted in the law of 1890 being ruled invalid, and the law of 1870 being reinstated. That, coupled with the bill that our government introduced into this Legislature in 1980, is when the rights of French-speaking people were restored in this province, and what flowed after that would have given meaning to that.

Mr. Speaker . . .

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, our government moved to begin the implementation of French language services in many new areas to give some reason to the restored Section 23.

A MEMBER: Is that why you advertised it?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, what the Minister of Natural Resources continues to demonstrate is that he doesn't understand what is taking place, he doesn't seem to understand the people of this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, progress was being made in this province. At that time there was a considerable measure of good will with respect to the use of the French language in this province. You will recall, Sir, that attendant with the court decision that restored Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, that shortly after that we had the referendum in Quebec, and that Quebec people voted overwhelmingly against separation from Canada. That, Sir, created a considerable amount of good will across the rest of the country, and it was possible for us to move and to begin to make changes and to expand French language services in this province in a way that did not create divisiveness. It advanced the rights of the French-speaking people in this province, but it did not trample on other people's rights, it did not go against the wishes of other people in this province.

When this government came in they proceeded the same way for the first year, Mr. Speaker, and there were no problems. The public was not outraged at what they were doing; the members of the opposition were not opposed to what they were doing; the rights of French-speaking people were being expanded to virtually everyone's satisfaction in this province because it was under control, it was within the control of the government and the Legislature of this province. Then Mr. Bilodeau took his case to court to try and overthrow The Highway and Traffic Act and The Summary Convictions Act, and that's where the government went wrong. That is where the government made the mistake that when they opted to enter into negotiations with the Franco-Manitoban Society with respect to an amendment to the Constitution of Manitoba, of Canada, which could be made by the Parliament of Canada and by the Legislature of this province.

I just want to say a word in that respect, Mr. Speaker, because the members opposite, I believe, have to some extent misrepresented the speech that I made on the resolution when I acknowledged that there was a possibility of legal chaos if the Bilodeau case went forward and was upheld. I didn't say there was any likelihood of that, I didn't say that it was probable, but I acknowledged that it was possible and I said, if the government opposite felt that that was a threat and they wanted to head it off, then the way to head it off would have been to put a resolution through this House and through the Parliament of Canada validating the laws of this province. If they had that fear then that is what they should have done, then they should have proceeded to give some meaning to Section 23.

But, Mr. Speaker, they chose not to go that way. They chose not to go that way and now they have placed all Manitobans in a situation that has taken us back probably 25 years from where we were in 1981, in 1982 and as recently as May of 1983. This government should make no mistake, we are not a vocal minority fighting for some self-interest. All of the people who are opposed to what the government are doing are not some vocal minority fighting for self-interest. What we represent is the vast majority of the people in this province. Those people are not quite Anglo-Saxon Protestants, Mr. Speaker, by any means, they are not bigots, they are not racists and they are not rednecks; they are approximately 80 percent of the people of this province that cut across every ethnic group that exists in this province that are opposed to what this government is trying to do. It is wrong what they are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, if they think — (Interjection) — well, not the old package. Mr. Speaker, let's have a look then. This government doesn't believe in government by referendum - fine. That's fine, they brought in the bill that allowed it, Mr. Speaker. I think it was wrong, I think it was wrong that they should have brought that bill in, but they did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: The bill happened to allow municipalities to carry out a referendum that the members opposite didn't want to see carried out. Let's set that aside, let's look at a technical study that was done at the University of Manitoba by the Institute for Social and Economic Research. This is a study that was done in a scientific fashion, Mr. Speaker. The results of this opinion survey, I believe, are reasonably accurate. I don't know how many of the members opposite have taken the time to look at this and see some of the attitudes of people that are reflected in this study, and some of the figures that come out of this study. First of all, I suppose, is that there were only 26.2 percent of the people polled who were in favour of the question that this institute put to people as representing the government's proposal.

I should say a word about the question that they put because it wasn't a question that, I believe, was entirely representative of what the government was going to do, I believe it actually underestimated what the government was going to do because the question was - they said that no attempt was made to explain the proposal to the respondent, also the motive word

"entrenched" is replaced by the more neutral term "secure." So what people were being asked then, were they in favour of securing French-language rights? So that happens, Mr. Speaker, to cover the sort of package that the government now has before us because they're not talking about entrenchment here, they're talking about securing.

Let the members not misunderstand what the feeling is among the public. That study showed, Mr. Speaker, that there were only 26.2 percent in favour of the government's proposal. It happens, of course, that in the referendum in Winnipeg there were only 23.5 percent of the people who were in favour of the government's proposal. Very remarkable that those two figures should be that close. One a scientific study conducted by the institute at the university and the other the referendum.

Of course, the number of people opposed in the referendum were higher because they only had two choices. In the study that was done at the university, of course, they could be neutral or they could say that they didn't know so the actual numbers opposed there came to 55.9 percent, but the ones who knew that they were in favour of it were almost the same. So, Mr. Speaker, I take that to mean that the referendum was very accurate in reflecting what the vast majority of people in this province believe.

I would like to take a few minutes to go through some of the other analysis in this study and point out to the members opposite, in one last effort to convince them that what they are doing is wrong. These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker. Of those people who supported what the government was going to do, 52 percent of them believed that it was because of historical and constitutional rights. Over half of the people who supported them thought that that was part of the constitutional right.

Some people, 42 percent, thought that there were benefits of speaking more than one language, but the one that I find extremely interesting here is that only 3 percent of the people who favoured it believed that it would bring benefits to other ethnic minorities. The members opposite are very fond of talking about the people that came before the committee. I think Mr. Spalsky is one of those people who is frequently quoted, but this scientific, independent, objective study shows that, of all the people who supported it, only 3 percent thought that there would be any benefit to other ethnic minorities, only 3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, of those people who opposed the government's proposal in this study, 29 percent thought that it would be unfair to other ethnic minorities. So what you have there among the population of this province is a much greater proportion of the people who believe that what you are doing is bad for ethnic minorities, rather than being good for ethnic minorities as the government has attempted to put forward. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there are so many people in this province opposed to what the government is trying to do? If only they would understand that - of how the people in this province are thinking. 23 percent of the people who were opposed to it were opposed on the basis of cost. I don't happen to believe that that's a consideration of great magnitude, but 23 percent of the people who were opposed to it think it is important and, therefore, I have to give some recognition to that because it's part of my job to

represent what the public thinks on this issue. Mr. Speaker, the members opposite would be wise to pay more attention to what the public thinks of this issue. 18 percent of those people who were opposed to it were opposed because the issue is being forced by the government; that's what they thought. Do you know what . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is it hard to understand why 18 percent of the people feel that this is being forced on them by the government when you have such absolute patent nonsense this very day as having the Winnipeg Sun, and the Free Press, and the Globe and Mail having to put the French-language versions of the names of their newspapers on the box that they sell them in?

The Member for St. Boniface is denying that, Mr. Speaker. Well, is the Member for St. Boniface saying that the Winnipeg Sun didn't get a directive that they were supposed to do that, Mr. Speaker? That's the type of thing - I hope it's wrong, but there are many other examples, Mr. Speaker, of that same type of thing happening that makes absolutely no sense to the public of this province, and that is why 18 percent of the people feel that this is being forced down their throats by the government.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other reasons as well why Manitobans are opposed, but they are opposed and the members opposite should respect the views of the majority of people in this province, they should respect them. There are a great many people who felt that they would personally be affected by this. One might be able to argue that they are not going to be, but that doesn't change the fact that they feel that they will be affected by it. They thought that there would be an increased cost; they thought that there would be more exposure to French in daily life; 24 percent of the people thought that employment prospects would be influenced. That's a lot of people who feel, who believe, that it will be harder for the average Manitoban who is not bilingual in French and English to get a job, and in this day and age when unemployment is as high as it is, Mr. Speaker, how can the members opposite underestimate that very real fear that people have, that this will make it more difficult for them to get a job than it was before?

There were 18 percent of the people thought that there would be a need to learn French, Mr. Speaker. This is a belief that is out there among 18 percent of the population.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You see the misunderstanding, exactly it, misunderstanding?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter whether it's a misunderstanding. If the members opposite find themselves on an issue where 80 percent of the people are opposed to them and it's all misunderstanding then they had better back off, support this six-month hoist and clear up the misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, if that's what it is, and they could . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the members opposite have become so blinkered, so

narrow in their outlook that they will not understand what the public feels about this issue and how important the public views are on this issue; and I don't care whether they look at it from a political view or not, it is the wrong thing to do when it is opposed for whatever reason by such a vast majority of people in this province.

An interesting feature about this study - and it's been referred to by some of the members opposite - and this was a question that was asked, "Do you think services like those provided by the police, the courts, hospitals or Autopac should be available in French when requested?" Sixty one percent of the people answered yes and only 32 percent answered no, so it's clear to me from looking at that, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of people out there were prepared to accept an expansion of French language services in the way that our government was undertaking it and in the way that this government undertook it for the first year-and-a-half of their term. That was being accepted by the people, so clearly what they are opposed to is the manner, the fashion in which this government has undertaken to try and expand upon French language rights in this province.

They took a population that had the majority in favour of the expansion of services and turned it around to the point where any type of legislative solution to this problem is today unacceptable and that is what I find extremely disheartening and extremely sad, Mr. Speaker, because it need not have happened. It need not have happened at all and anyone who will take the time to look at this document carefully will see what has happened.

There are some other interesting things. Mr. Speaker, could you give me an indication of how much time I have left?

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the other questions that the members opposite should pay attention to was this one: "If French language rights are secured in this province, do you think many people will have to learn to speak French?" Sixty-one percent of the people answered yes. It happens to be the same percentage as were in favour of the services, but 61 percent of the people believed that if this effort to secure French language rights was made, that they would have to learn to speak French.

Gentlemen and ladies opposite should realize that in the political arena that the appearance, the understanding, the misunderstanding of an issue is every bit as important as the reality and the fact . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: You're admitting it's misunderstood.

MR. B. RANSOM: I'm not saying - I'm saying these are legitimate fears that people have; they are legitimate beliefs that people have.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: If all this is misunderstanding, if all this is illegitimate, if all this is unfounded fear, then let

this government not jam this down their throats. Let them allay the fears; let them explain away the misunderstandings then before they proceed. Let them do that, Mr. Speaker, before they bring closure into this House to try and force this upon the people of the province. They are making a terrible mistake.

There are further enlightening figures to be seen within the study, Mr. Speaker, and that has to do with the people who were bilingual, French and English, those people who were non-bilingual and those who were bilingual in English and another language; and I find it extremely interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see that of the people who were bilingual, other than French and English, that only 21.5 percent of those people were in favour of the government's proposal. That is a smaller percentage than the percentage of the overall population that was in favour of the government's proposal, so that puts the absolute lie to the myth that this proposal is only being opposed by white Anglo-Saxon protestants, red-necks, racists and bigots because, Mr. Speaker, there are fewer people who are bilingual English and some other language than French in favour of this proposal than there are in the population as a whole.

HON. A. MACKLING: Why would your federal caucus support it, Brian?

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources continues to demonstrate his lack of understanding of this issue, what his responsibility is in Manitoba to this Legislature. His responsibility is not in Parliament, it's here, where about 75-80 percent of the people that elect the members of this Legislature are opposed to what this government is doing. Why are they proceeding?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, one further figure that I would like to point out to the members opposite for their consideration and that is that of people who are bilingual French and English that there were 22.1 percent of the people bilingual French and English who are opposed to what the government is doing. That is approximately. It's a smaller percentage but it is approximately the same percentage opposed who are bilingual French and English as those on the other side of the issue who are in favour of it.

The members opposite want to represent the minority of the population overall and are opposing the views of 22.1 percent of the people who are bilingual French and English. Mr. Speaker, the point . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . that I would like to make to the members opposite - if the Minister of Natural Resources could shut up for a minute - I would like to simply point out to them, Mr. Speaker, that the point at which they have arrived at now, that they have so brought the relationships within this province to such a divisive and almost explosive point, where they should recognize the reality of their proposals now, and the reality of what the public thinks, and if the members

opposite will realize that they don't need this bill they can implement all of the services that this bill calls for without passing the bill, they don't need it.

Now in view of that, why would a government proceed the way they are? Why would they proceed against the wishes of 75 percent or 80 percent of the people of the province? Why would they bring in closure on a bill that isn't needed? I tell you, Mr. Speaker - I'll just stray from the subject of the hoist for a minute to the resolution because that's relevant to this issue as well - that the proposal in the resolution that is before the House now is so different from the proposal that they had before the House in May that if they would just realize that by moving, as the Member for Charleswood said, that other 10 degrees - they've come around 170 degrees - if they'll just go the other 10 degrees, then they will have arrived at a point where they could have a proposal that could be acceptable to the people of Manitoba and they could get that through the House.

With respect to the bill in which my Leader has proposed the hoist, Mr. Speaker, they have to admit that they do not need the bill to implement the services, they don't need the bill. What they have done, again in the words of the Member for Charleswood, is "so poison the well" that what could have been accomplished in this province nine months ago, a year ago, two years ago, cannot be accomplished today because of the actions of those members opposite. That is why they have so debased the currency, so devalued the currency, Sir, that what would have been acceptable then is not acceptable now, and that is the tragedy of what these members have done. I will give them some credit that what they attempt to do may well have been done in the interests of what they thought were the interests of Franco-Manitobans and all Manitobans. It's a tragedy, Sir, that that situation has now been reversed to where what they propose is no longer acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill 115, something which almost seems heretical in this House, judging by what I've heard this evening and in previous days from members opposite who take refuge in speaking about just about everything else except the bill and the issues which it raises, and take refuge in referring to the hoist motion, rather than to the link between that and what it is that they're asking be put aside. We're debating the whole issue because it is every part, the hoist and the second reading, which comes to a vote at the end of this evening's discussion.

I would like to make two preparatory remarks, Sir, about the process we have witnessed before dealing with some of the principles raised by the bill. We have now heard, by my count, and I checked it with the Clerk this afternoon, we have had from the opposition, since the government introduced its basic proposal in May of this year, 88 speeches, some good, some bad, some indifferent but all, every one in a variety of ways, saying no, never, no way; 88 speeches to come down to the same conclusion in one way or another - no way. That, in my view, Sir, is sheer political opportunism, a refusal to deal with the issues in the kind of a constructive way an opposition ought to deal with issues which they

say, speaking piously, has convulsed Manitoba, but they refuse to deal with the issues.

The closest thing to principle that I have heard in all of those 88 speeches, in fact let me say it, without apologizing, are the remarks of the former Opposition Leader, the Member for Charleswood, who has a position with respect to entrenchment which I think is wrong, but he persists in it and he has, although he zigzagged on whether or not we have official languages and he zigzagged on a number of issues, still there's a discernible principle, but that's about the extent of the principled opposition we have heard from those 88 interventions. But, Bill 115, which they're now asking to hoist, does not entrench; and the main brunt of their criticism throughout the long hot summer was the entrenchment of services.

In response, we do listen to the opposition, although at times they may not think so; we listen to the public, although at times they may not think so; but in response to that, not only from our opposition, but from our friends - the Manitoba Association of Rights and Liberties, for example, raised serious concerns about the entrenchment of services and the resort to courts, in a constitutional way, when they came before the committee - in response to all of these we now have Bill 115, services without entrenchment.

So what possible reason for all of the manoeuvring, for all of the gimmickry, for all of the bell ringing, for all of the evasiveness? Only one reason, political opportunism, Mr. Speaker. Not merely political opportunism, but political opportunism which regrettably, whether intended or not, feeds on and feeds bigotry. One must ask, Mr. Speaker, in this context, if they have already said, in a variety of ways, although the repetition is now getting boring - no, no way - then let me say this, we're convinced you mean no. So what's this talk about ramming something through by means of closure? You've already said no 88 times - we're prepared, of course, to sit till 2 and hear you say it four or five more times - it'll be over 90 times that you've said no. There's certainly been no shortage of opportunity for the opposition to say no, and this talk about ramming through, or showing it down your throats, or the Member for Turtle Mountain, jamming it down your throats is asinine in that context. But what a disgraceful role for an opposition to play.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, in this session - it's been a long session, sometimes one almost wants to say in the last session, but earlier in this session - the government introduced a number of difficult, complex bills, bills that were very controversial. Conflict of interest, for example, let me take two examples: The Law Enforcement Review Act. But the opposition played a useful role, they were prepared to debate these bills and they debated these bills. They raised a number of points. We didn't agree with all of those points.

The Member for Tuxedo, as he was then was, the Leader of the Opposition now, came over and spoke to me about some ways that we might resolve some of the wording problems, some of the definitional problems in one of those bills, and they'd let the bills, after a debate in the House, go to committee; and in committee they raised the issues. That's the way an opposition tries to improve legislation; that's the way an opposition avoids what they, in fact, have created by the kind of negativism that has dominated their

thinking in their approach, the convulsion they have created by playing, not the constructive role of an opposition, but the role of obstructionists.

In deference, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition - and we kid him a little bit across the House from time to time, but he is the Leader of the Opposition and we respect him in that role - he, in his opening speech, raised some issues with respect to Bill 115, but that's the last we've heard from that side about issues raised by Bill 115. This issues a principle. For example, he raised - and I'm here referring to unofficial Hansard so therefore I won't quote - he raised some question about the head of the institution with respect to the courts, and in the draft that has been distributed - it has been debated on second reading - there is reference to the Chief Justice heading that institution.

That was clearly wrong and he was right to raise it, although it had been raised with me by the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench earlier, and we're prepared to bring in an amendment that will deal with that properly, as it should be, name the Attorney-General as the respondent in any case where the court offices are not providing the services required.

So that's the way the democratic process works in a Legislature that knows what it's about and what it's doing, with an opposition which knows what its role is, an opposition that isn't afraid that they might be suspected of, in some way, supporting French language services by offering constructive contributions to the debate.

Fear has dominated a lot of their actions. Fear of being seen to identify, in any way, with the appropriate provision of French language services. Why the desire to hide their response to French language services in 1980? Why their refusal to debate the issues in this bill?

Again the Leader of the Opposition raised an issue with respect to the linkage between the bill and the resolution. The Government House Leader rose in response thereto and said, well, yes that is an issue. We'll consult with Legislative Counsel and we'll bring in an amendment which will deal with that. That's the way the process should work; that's the way it worked with several pieces of legislation in the spring, there's no reason why it shouldn't work, there's no reason why it couldn't work at this time if they wanted it to work, if there was a will to make it work.

The Leader of the Opposition said he was worried about the concept of a language ombudsman. He asked the question: "Is this ombudsman a referee, an adjudicator, an arbitrator?" The act, Sir, deals with that and if the language, in the view of the opposition, is not precise enough - I believe it is but they may be right; we learn from the opposition and we're prepared to listen to them quite frequently - if they would only stop being obstructionists and saying, no, stop taking people to task in a personal way; stop using these dictionary definitions in order to put people down; and play a constructive role, we would listen.

Mr. Speaker, apropos of that, earlier this evening and earlier this day there were two slighting references to the Government House Leader as being a former Assistant Clerk at the Table. It reeked of class prejudice, as if that role for which the Tories in this province are known the length and breadth of this country, as if the position of Clerk of the House and Assistant Clerk of the House isn't a noble position.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. R. PENNER: The heart — (Interjection) — well there they go. Their sexist remarks with respect to women, their class prejudice remarks with respect to the occupation of people, their remarks with respect to the national origin of people . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, I want the Attorney-General to know that some of my best friends are Assistant Clerks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I'm happy to say, Sir, that none of my best friends are sexists or racists or language bigots.

Mr. Speaker, continuing with the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made, the heart of Bill 115 is that part which deals with communications and services. Some questions were raised by the Leader of the Opposition albeit not very clearly, he's not always clear. But I want to say that this is precisely the kind of thing that can be examined in committee, that we worked on this side of the House, week in and week out. There wasn't a week went by that we were not meeting with the constituency most directly affected, the Manitoba Government Associations and those other unions, with the Crown corporations, and they raised the issues and we tried this version, we tried that version, trying to meet the concerns that they raised. They were playing the kind of role that the opposition should have been playing on this.

The result, Sir, has been a vastly improved section dealing with the definition of government offices, of areas where services are to be delivered, and the position now, Sir, is that the MGEA, for example, is reported through its President as saying that they find this package 90 percent acceptable, and they may have some other points to raise when this bill reaches committee. That was the kind of role that the opposition should have played, as well.

The Member for Turtle Mountain spoke, as others on that side, Sir, have spoken about their heartfelt dedication to French language services. What we pointed out was what their official pronouncements were - at least official in the sense of being in Cabinet documents - now clear, of course, not official in the sense of telling the public what they were prepared to do. But, in fact, Sir, if one measures what the present opposition, then government, did between the decision of the Supreme Court in Forest in 1979 and November 1981 - when we were elected by people who had had enough of their misgoverning - what they did in that period of time was virtually zilch, zero, nothing.

Let me take a particular example, but there are others. The present Minister of Energy and Mines, when he was the Member for Transcona sitting in opposition, raised this question of the then Minister of Highways, the Member for Pembina, with respect to motor vehicle registrations and drivers licences, and we found out that the plates of these were all ready, but they were

holding back - another fear of letting the public know they had been driven so far - but then they were holding back. You know, with respect — (Interjection) — yes, the printing plates. With respect to that incidentally - and those people who have concerns about costs, and those are appropriate concerns, Mr. Speaker - do you know that the translation costs of the motor vehicle registration form is \$80 if you contract it out - \$80 is what it costs to translate it. It costs less than \$200 to plate it and, after that, there is no additional cost because it is bilingual; that's the total cost.

With respect to doing the Highway Road Map for the whole Province of Manitoba, there is a one-time initial cost already expended of \$9,000 and after that there is no additional cost because, once the plate is there, it's just printed.

A MEMBER: Who did that; when was it done?

HON. R. PENNER: Well, the things that we are now seeing were done substantially by this government; they were begun by them in a hesitant way but not delivered. No wonder there is a feeling there is need for a piece of legislation, a bill, which sets down the obligations of government and provides some remedy, albeit in the way in which we are presenting the bill that remedy is one which, in fact, is mediative rather than punitive.

Dealing just a little bit further with services and the cost of services, and this relates to the bill which we propose, this is a question which has been raised, if not so much by some of the members opposite, certainly by the Member for Elmwood whose recurring theme it is, I would like to point out, Sir, just a couple of examples because, in fact, the process has been taking place and now it be regularized and formalized as it should be in order that those who are affected one way or another know what their rights, duties and obligations are.

I have a document from the Chief Executive Officer of Hydro, addressed to the Senior Adviser, French Language Services, pointing out, that Hydro, in his estimation, would need 40 positions - 1 percent of the total of Hydro employees - what would be needed, and they are spelled out in terms of their locations. The majority of these positions would be in our customer service area which encompasses the designated areas identified for French language services. The corporation presently has many Francophone employees working in various areas of the province, and we have been able to communicate with our customers in the French language when required to do so, and we are prepared between then and 1987 to complete the balance of the program in an orderly way which doesn't disturb anybody in their job, which doesn't disturb anybody in their position, which doesn't add anybody to the Civil Service, and which is negligible in cost, but historically, socially important in implementation.

There are other examples, Sir, which I could give and am prepared to give as required, because we took a lot of time dealing with the unions and the Crown corporations throughout the summer and obtained this material. It's pointed out, as I say, the virtually negligible costs of implementing French language services.

We found out, Mr. Speaker, in the course of doing that, that Ontario Hydro was already printing its bills

bilingually; that Bell Canada, a private corporation, was doing the same with respect to its billing; that they all found that this was a relatively easy thing to do and raised no opposition in the public.

You know, when we distributed the motor vehicle registration forms for the first time bilingually there were less than 20 phone calls from the whole province raising that as an issue and after one week, it was a forgotten issue. The vast majority of the people in this province probably don't even know that that form is in two languages and, yet, it fulfills a needed and useful purpose for those of our citizens who have the right to use their historic language.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain said, again in defence of all of the wonderful things they were doing, that therefore no need for us to do anything, that Bill 2 of 1980, the Act respecting the operation of Section 23 restored French rights in this province; and the Member for River Heights, when he introduced his amendment, the speech preceding his amendment, made the same error with respect to Bill 2, or at least a similar error, in which he assumed, apparently having not read the bill - I am now speaking about the Member for River Heights - that Bill 2 dealt with services. Of course, it didn't deal with services at all and, of course, the Member for Turtle Mountain knows that, but Bill 2 did not restore the rights that the Francophone population of this province had in 1870. It did not do that at all.

"Where the meaning of a provision of an act in one official language conflicts with, is repugnant to, or is inconsistent with the meaning of the corresponding provision of the act in the other official language, the provision in the official language in which of the bill for the act was printed when copies were first distributed takes precedence."

Well, all of those bills, Sir, which would take precedence, were in the English language only and, hence, what you had in Bill 2 was the legalization of inequality. It was the entrenchment in legislative form of legal inequality and our advice, Sir, is that this bill is invalid, that it offends the basic principles of the Constitution. So much for the restoration of rights by Bill 2; so much for their services in which, between 1979, December, and two years later less a month when they were defeated, they had done virtually nothing. They hired one person, perhaps two - one that we know of for sure, the Co-ordinator of French Language Services - and that was it. For the rest, forget it; hide it under the nearest shade tree. Don't let the public know.

Well, I want to speak for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, about something that has bothered me a great deal, and it relates to remarks which I have made about the duties of an opposition. I have said this before, I am going to say it again, and I will say it till I draw my dying breath. The hypocrisy of that notion that we convulsed the problems - the hypocrisy! Mr. Speaker, I was closely associated with the development of the legislation and the resolution from the beginning and I want to say, as the Minister for Finance said earlier today in his speech, that on the 16th or 17th of December, 1982, we sent the draft of the Accord that was tabled in the House formally in May to the Member for St. Norbert, a copy to the then Leader of the Opposition and, as I have said and will say again, we never heard a word, never a word.

That's the question I now want to ask and put on the public record: Did they take it to their caucus? Now, two possibilities, right? Either they did or they didn't. If they didn't, then that is the most irresponsible act I have ever heard of, people who purport to be leaders of their caucus, of hiding from their caucus something that was being developed by the government of the kind of significance they say it had. How irresponsible!

The other possibility, and I would like to hear from them, is that they took it to their caucus and their caucus said, like everything else that we've done with respect to French language services, let's hide on it; let's put it in the bushes; let's wait and, if the government tables it, let's go get them. Let's go get them.

Who, Mr. Speaker, convulsed this province? We brought forward this resolution; the Minister for Finance said that there was a period of three weeks in which - and I believe he was right - we thought that the best way of dealing with the issue was to have public meetings, but on June 27th - and it's in Hansard - the Premier of this province, standing in his place - (Interjection) - no, it's not, it's in Hansard - made his speech and said this will go to a committee, and the following day the Attorney-General of this province, standing in his place said, "It will go to the Committee of Privileges and Elections," so don't let there be any obfuscation about that.

Who has convulsed this province? Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain referred to a study, the Mason Study, from the University Institute; and I have the Angus Reid Study prepared for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. They both said the same thing, that 61 percent of the people of Manitoba polled in this sample, which he admits is a scientific sample, support the delivery of French language services in a limited way, which is what this bill is doing.

The figures which he has given, and which I accept, show that the 80 percent vote in the referendum, which they've harped upon and harped upon and harped upon, was based by a lot of misconceptions that people had about what the government's intentions were, but who created those misconceptions? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition which, as I pointed out, lay in the bushes on our proposal for five months and then sprang like irresponsible vultures onto the resolution, that their actions which were loaded with the kind of fears about costs and implications and speaking French and the future of their children and all the rest of it, created an atmosphere that convulsed this province. It's like the fox jumping into the hen yard and saying, "Look at the noise that bunch is creating, and why are they disturbing the night." It's that kind of action that they will be held responsible for. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, there is 90 minutes left between now and the time when the first of a series of historic votes must be taken. There is time for at least one member opposite to show that he or she can play the role of a constructive opposition and speak to the bill and speak to the debate on principle, on second reading, so when it goes to committee, we will have the guidance, not only of the input we've had

from the MGEA, from CUPE and from the other unions, but we will have the guidance of some of the inspired thinkers on that side.

Now members on my side may think that I'm being a bit ironic when I suggest that there may be an inspired thinker on that side. I understand their problem. There's been nothing we've heard to reveal that but I've lived my life on hope, Mr. Speaker - hope springs eternal in the breast of Roland Penner, they say - and I hope that one day in this House an inspired speech will be delivered by a member. I hope that one day in this House on this issue there will be a principle speech delivered by a member opposite. I live in that hope. The Member for St. Boniface says it's a foolish hope but he's more experienced in this House than I am. We are approximately the same age, he has slightly more grey hair, but more experience in this House. Perhaps he's right in being pessimistic about that possibility. He will shortly address the House and he can speak for himself.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the opposition. There is time yet - not much - time to stand up and address the issues raised in the bill. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid that some of the people who are ringing the phones off your wall are going to say, "It looks as if you're almost supporting that; don't support it. After all, we have the government by the throat and that is the main thing. Never mind the good of the province, never mind historic and constitutional obligations. Win the next election at any cost." Sir, that is something that ought to be rejected by any right thinking person and I do.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have now supposedly heard a principled speech from the biggest disaster that has ever set upon this province. This is a man and a government who talk about the pursuit of justice. Let me just talk about justice for a minute

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . justice for a minute, Mr. Speaker, under this Attorney-General. In the last few weeks we have seen, and he has admitted in this House, it doesn't matter whether you are pro life or pro abortion or what your stand is on that issue, we have seen over the past few months in this province a man who stood up in this Chamber and said that the Director of Prosecutions would handle that matter, Mr. Speaker. The Director of Prosecutions did, in full concurrence of all of their staff, laid appropriate charges, and this Attorney-General interfered without consultation, without obtaining their recommendation and changed those charges; and he talks and they talk about the pursuit of justice. He has ruined the administration and the reputation of the administration of justice in this province.

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

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The honourable member who purports to

speak on a motion before this House challenges and accuses the Attorney-General of his integrity in his office. It's got nothing to do with the motion before the House. It's an aspersion cast against the Attorney-General. It's completely out of order, Mr. Speaker. I call upon you to bring the member to order.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I note that all members have taken a good deal of latitude with the hoist motion, whereas an amendment to Bill 115, which I am sure the Honourable Member for St. Norbert would take note of.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General raised the question as to what we on this side did with his letter which he sent to us outlining at that time the status of the government's proposal on bilingualism. For the record, let it be clear that that was considered by our caucus and that a committee of our caucus met subsequently with members of the SFM. We had a long meeting with them, discussed the whole matter with them. They advised us that they were continuing discussions with the Attorney-General and they would let us know the result of those meetings and we never heard another word, Mr. Speaker. We never heard another word.

Mr. Speaker, this Attorney-General — (Interjection) — I can't give the exact date, but it would have been in January or February of last year. The Minister may be hard of hearing. I told him it was in January or February of last year, Mr. Speaker.

The Attorney-General has stood up in his place and said that we on this side did nothing with respect to French-speaking services. Coming from him, assuming that particular office, that is an unbelievable, misleading statement. He knows full well what we on this side did. He tabled many of the Cabinet documents that outlined the progress that was being made on that particular issue. He tabled Cabinet documents that referred to the hiring of Mr. René Prefontaine, the Deputy Minister of Cultural Affairs, who was going to report on the availability of French language services and make suggestions for how those services could be made available in the future. That paper outlined a number of areas in which an expansion of French services was being considered.

Mr. Speaker, that's as far as he got. Our government established the whole procedure for the translation of the statutes. People were brought here from the Province of Quebec, from the Federal Government, contracts were entered into with the University of Moncton, translators were advertised for nationally, Mr. Speaker. We were making all the progress that could possibly be made with respect to the translation of statutes, and if you examine Hansard, Mr. Speaker, he admitted that in his Estimates in his first year in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, he should know as Attorney-General that acting, as I said at the time, acting in the spirit of the Forest decision, we went well beyond the legal requirements in Section 23. Is he trying to tell this House and the people of Manitoba that when we, and I particularly as Attorney-General, authorized the translation of court documents at public expense, that

that was strictly within the legal requirements of Section 23? Even he will know that that's not the case.

He would acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, if we were able to question him here that the establishment of a French-speaking court was not within the strict legal requirements of Section 23. Mr. Speaker, he should know as Attorney-General that when I had a Family Law pamphlet translated into French and distributed in French communities, that that was not within the strict provisions of Section 23.

Mr. Speaker, we were making progress in that area through the French Services Secretariat that we established with regular meetings with members of the French community and progress was being made. To stand up in this Assembly and say that the only thing that was done beyond the legal requirements of Section 23 was the hiring of one person, is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — and an absolute misrepresentation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . of everything that was done on our side, and I resent that. I resent the fact that the Attorney-General has chosen to take that particular attack in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we did, acting in the spirit of that decision, expand French speaking services in the province. A number of members on this side have said, Mr. Speaker, there was no divisiveness among the people of Manitoba, there was no antagonism at that time. We were developing a reasonable program, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — You know, Mr. Speaker, the members of the government make an interesting argument. They say we opposed entrenchment, therefore we favour legislation. We have a bill, therefore you must support the bill. What a simplistic argument, Mr. Speaker.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, we support an election finances bill, we had an election finances bill. They chose to amend it and bring in a provision that would require the taxpayers to pay 50 percent of their election expenses. Just because we supported an election finances bill doesn't mean we have to support their election finances bill, Mr. Speaker. It is an extremely simplistic argument, and whoever convinced their caucus of that particular argument, Mr. Speaker, is using something that's simply not reasonable.

This government has brought in a bill, Mr. Speaker, is imposing closure, asking us to pass it on second reading when we still don't know what form the constitutional amendment will take. That will have an effect on the interpretation of this bill, Mr. Speaker. It could very well possibly have an effect on the interpretation of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, my Leader last Friday, for example, referred to an opinion that I had received from Legislative Counsel dated January 16, 1984, which I had requested from Mr. Tallin, asking him the question as to whether or not the 23.1 of the resolution would include and entrench the provisions of this bill if this bill were proclaimed in force prior to the adoption of the constitutional amendment. Mr. Tallin confirmed my suspicion that yes, indeed, it would.

I had also asked, Mr. Speaker, in that request for an opinion from Mr. Tallin, for a brief resumé of other laws

in Manitoba in force that would be included and would also be entrenched under the provisions of the existing Section 23.1 proposed in the amendment to the constitutional resolution by this government. Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tallin was under some . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . time constraints, but he does refer in this memorandum - and perhaps all members of the other side should obtain a copy - because there are many other rights and privileges Mr. Tallin refers to and other laws which will be entrenched under their existing Section 23.1. There are provisions, Mr. Speaker, with respect to The Public Schools Act which deals with the language of training. There are sections in The Builders Lien Act, Corporations Act, Employment Standards Act, and other common-law rights and privileges that Mr. Tallin refers to, and many minor acts, Mr. Speaker.

The point that I'm trying to make on this bill is that we don't know what the constitutional amendment yet will say. We're asked tonight to vote on second reading on the hoist and then on second reading with respect to the adoption of this bill and as many people on this side have said, this act flows from the constitutional amendment but we should know what the constitutional amendment says before we're asked to adopt this bill and deal with it, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Pardon me?

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General says the government and the Government House Leader has given an undertaking that if an amendment is possible, he will introduce it at committee to deal with that particular concern, and to pass the resolution first before the bill.

Then I would ask the Attorney-General to look at the opinion dated January 16 that the Leader of the Opposition tabled in the Legislature last Friday with respect to other matters that might become entrenched under the wording used in their proposed amendment of Section 23.1, because members of the Legislature may very well then realize that they may be doing something entrenching matters that they were not aware of. Mr. Speaker, in this particular bill there are matters that would appear to be unreasonable.

As I have said, we embarked upon a program endorsed by that government and carried on of providing reasonable French-speaking services. But it is questionable, Mr. Speaker, under the terms of this bill whether or not those services that are authorized and mandated will be reasonable services. There are definitions, I suggest to the government, that they will have to review and consider seriously, Mr. Speaker, that detail I would leave to the committee.

As the leader and others have said the role of the ombudsman is a matter that must be dealt with, it must be reviewed, in particular the wording which is rather imprecise, Mr. Speaker. Sections 16 and 17 which deal with the right to communicate and the right to receive available services, are very indefinite and imprecise and are matters that will have to be looked at carefully in order to be insured as to what they exactly mean, what can they be interpreted at?

I raise a minor matter, Mr. Speaker, in looking at that bill in Section 18 that refers to that part of the City of

Winnipeg historically known as St. Norbert, I believe I know it, Mr. Speaker, but this is obviously open to a very wide interpretation and I would ask that there be some clarification later on as to what the boundaries, in particular, are being referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be too long because there are many members on this side who want to speak. I do want to make the point, contrary to suggestions by the Attorney-General. One, Mr. Speaker, when he says that we on this side did nothing with respect to French-speaking services, except hire one person and perhaps one other, that is absolutely completely wrong. The documents that he tabled eight or nine months ago on this Legislature show otherwise. He should know from the office of the Attorney-General what was being done on that particular area, Mr. Speaker, and it is a gross misrepresentation of what was being done.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record clearly shows that we on this side of this House were embarked upon a program of providing reasonable French-speaking services. We have before us a bill that we have serious reservations about because of its terms. The terms of this bill, Mr. Speaker, appear to us not to go much further in providing reasonable French-speaking services, and that is something that we, and obviously the majority of the people of Manitoba, are very much concerned about. In this form this bill simply cannot be supported by members on this side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I heard somebody say that he's wiping the tears from his eyes. It is actually a pretty sad situation that we're faced with. I certainly find it a very difficult situation because of what it's doing, what's happening in this House, what it's doing to the people of Manitoba, and this is the main concern that I have.

I see more hate and misunderstanding than I've seen for a number of years. I remember a while back that we went through the same thing, that this was going to be political suicide, nobody would be elected and it was wrong and we weren't protecting the public and so on. It was the same thing and in those days there were threats on our lives, or some of us anyway, and this has stopped for a number of years now because, if you look back at any of these emotional things, anything dealing with languages or religion, it always passed when there was leadership from all sides of the House, and it is the only time that it went through.

Look at Bill 113 - I don't remember the name of Roblin's bill - it was the same thing. When a party made it possible for the other one to come in and legislate something very difficult, and it was to the credit of all the parties in Manitoba that things changed. There hadn't been, as far as I'm concerned, no threats on my life since 1974, but last week there was. I'm saying that to show that - somebody said from the other side that we seemed to be going backwards and that's it. Nobody can accuse me of having tried to get people excited on this debate. I think everybody will agree with me that I took a fairly low key. I spoke twice, I had very little to do except as a member of caucus in working on this.

All of a sudden it is the same thing. It is the same thing and you know some of the things that you're anxious to show, or some people are anxious to show, like today what we heard about the airport. There's nobody that hates those things more than I because it is me that gets it in the back. There is a backlash anytime that's done. This is not my invention.

I remember years ago when DeGaulle came in and he stood up in Quebec and says, "Vive le Quebec" then. They had to get that God damn Frenchman. If they couldn't get him he was too far so they had to phone somebody and they started thinking about me. I was getting the calls here and getting hell; I didn't even know what had happened.

Then I said, if that's the case, he has no business in this country. Tell him to go. Now the militant French people start phoning me the next day. I can't win. So don't get that in your mind that this is to help the French-speaking Canadians because it is absolutely wrong, it is ridiculous. I'm glad to see that that was changed even though I am told that it was never the question of translating the newspaper, but where to put the quarter, has to read it in French. If he can't read English, he doesn't want the Sun anyway.

A MEMBER: Some people buy it for the pictures, Larry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You don't have to put in the quarter, you just bend down and look through the window and look at the pictures.

So you know, I'd like people to get that out of their mind to blame everything on the French-Canadian and on the Société Franco-Manitobain, I'm a little tired of that. Those things have nothing to do with me, in fact, the whole bill, I think it has some significance as a gesture, as a principle, but it's not going to do very much for me.

I would much sooner, if I had my way, I would much sooner see something built on love, on trust and on exchange and on trying to do away with prejudices.

A MEMBER: Right on.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But it is not going to be done by the kind of speeches that I heard today. I'm not going to say that people are not sincere but it is not the speech from the Member for Elmwood. Let me tell you something about the Member for Elmwood. In 1967 he was listening to a historian named Donald Creighton who was saying that it was a very difficult situation that the Fathers of Confederation never meant for this country and this city to be bilingual. He was praising them, that was before the Forest case, of course, but he was praising them, because as soon as things got settled they brought laws that did away with all that.

You know the member that we heard today, he was in the audience, and there were Professor Jaenen and there were people from the newspaper who took exception to that. I'll translate literally, because this is in French and this is what they were saying about my friend — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? Well, if you can see anything to colour, I wouldn't put it past you. I don't know you'd probably put marks around here, but this is coloured for your benefit.

Now, they were saying that there was a French Canadian in the audience and he was saying that after

this conference, and Professor Creighton, it was the best argument in favour of separatism that he ever had, but in this the editorial of this French paper, they were saying: "But we would much prefer the positive reaction of a professor of history in Manitoba, Mr. Russell Doern, who is an NDP MLA." They quote Mr. Doern saying, "The way Creighton interprets history makes me much more sympathetic for the ideas that the French people are wanting and the rights they're defending, and also, I can say now that it encourages me to support their proposition of using French as a teaching language."

Then, he said publicly, he promised that he will convert the people in his party. I think he read that, but he did the opposite. Of course, this is before he swore vengeance for being left off the Cabinet, and that's his business. Again, as a French Canadian, I'm getting it in the back because he's mad at my Leader . . .

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

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa on a point of order.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . and I'll come to that, I'm glad you mentioned that.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health would table that document that he was quoting from.

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, there are citations which provide that. There is no requirement that public documents or newspapers be tabled because they are in the public realm. This is not a letter or any private document, there's no requirement that it be tabled.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: January 19, 1967, yes, and bring your translator it's in French.

MR. D. BLAKE: What paper was that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are some of the things that get me. I also want to say, because there were statements made that I brought in a motion of a six-months hoist. That's true. I certainly haven't said that the opposition have no right to do it, and it is an accepted motion, but let's not play games. I don't know of anybody that brought a six-month hoist saying that you bring it back in six months. If you don't bring a motion like that, you can bring a motion, you vote against the bill, so that gives you a chance to talk again like you're saying, so let's not kid each other, maybe we can kid somebody else. Let's not kid each other, we know what this thing is all about. You have every right to do it. I'm certainly not denying that. You were right, I brought this motion.

Now, there was another thing said that I said, to hell with the referendum. That's absolutely right and I say it again, but I did not say to hell with the people, that is not right. What I said is exactly what my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain said, that he does not believe in a referendum. Neither do I. I feel that if you're selected as an MLA you're not there just to count votes and then go and write it on the board. They wouldn't need the people with these high pensions and all these terrific things we're getting sitting here and all the fun we're having until 2 o'clock tonight. They wouldn't need that, they would need a phony little clerk like this guy here who has just marked the score.

I don't believe in referendums. I believe that if I can't deliver, if I've got the intelligence - and it's not a question of being . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well rise then.

HON. A. ANSTETT: A point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe you can find the word phony when it's applied to a clerk as being unparliamentary somewhere in our lists of unparliamentary expressions.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

A MEMBER: Whether you like it or not you had a referendum. Listen to the people whether you like it or not.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right. I don't believe in a referendum and, as I said, you wanted to know what I said, you were here and what I said is that I don't believe that's leadership, and I don't believe that any of the difficult things would ever be accomplished if you just listen to referendums. I also say to you that you'd have slavery today if you listened to a referendum. You can go ahead, be my guest, but I will do it my way. That is not a question of arrogance. You will answer to the people. There's an election every four years and you answer to the public and if they feel that you haven't represented them well with the facts that you had. — (Interjection) — If I say, yes I have, will you leave me alone for a minute, so I can make my speech.

Yes, I have, whatever it is I've got it. Well, watch out it's catchy, so don't come too close.

A MEMBER: Now that we've established that, what were the results?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would you ask him to shut up a minute.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The result, Mr. Speaker, is exactly this, and there's where I'm disappointed with

my friend from Turtle Mountain because he was saying that this are what the people are saying. He certainly left the door open to say well, yes, maybe it isn't true, I don't believe it. That's what they believe.

Can you just see if that was it, can you see the kind of help you would get from an opposition? It would be at their advantage to start any of these rumours to get the people mixed up because then you'd have to back down, you'd have the six-months hoist and nothing would be passed. It is the same people that would get it all the time.

Yes, it is right, I don't believe in a referendum. I don't think that this is why I was sent here. I think that people should use their judgment, first of all, the most important thing is to be fair with everybody. I don't believe that it has otbeen fair, so what is it that they want? This is not going to bring the end of the world. We were talking about what happens in Quebec, I don't like what happens in Quebec. I don't automatically think that because they're French-speaking people out there that they're right. It's a lousy rule, it's a lousy law. I don't like it at all and it doesn't help me either, so I'm not advocating that we be unfair in Quebec. I think we should have the same rules. We heard all of a sudden all these awful things that people had to bring in, could only advertise in French, and they are awful, but we've had this for generations here in this province. You'd have to hide your books when you were in class when I was a youngster. We talked French . . .

A MEMBER: We heard all about it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh you heard it, but you don't like to hear it. It's okay to hear about other people and see the kind of racist you are and that's exactly what you are when you talk like that. You don't like to hear it. If you had done like other leaders have we wouldn't have this battle here today and you wouldn't be giving anything away, and it wouldn't be that costly either. What would it be? — (Interjection)—

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, it is easy when you're in majority and then you say well these people out there they're . . . It is the role of an MLA also to try to educate the people and get them to understand and to show them that there are fears, real fears, yes. I don't blame the people; they're real fears but they're not founded. They are false. There is no danger at all. — (Interjection) — All right, my friend here who is yelling "balls" or something real nice again, whatever it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I started here 25 years ago they used to teach French as a subject starting in Grade 7 and I went through the same thing - I'll bring you the speeches - and the same thing, it was political suicide; you were defending the majority. It was going to be the end of the world. Then it was Grade 4, the same thing. Then there was a resolution for French teaching in 1965-67 and then — (Interjection) — I'm glad you mentioned that, I nearly forgot. I'll tell you why I'm on this side and the main reason is exactly that because some of the things that are dear to me, that are important to my people and things that I believe,

and one of them is aid to private schools the other one is the French fact.

If I ever had any doubts that I did the wrong thing in '69, when I saw my leader, who wasn't elected, who was running around up there organizing, and then I realized that I was on the right side. I believe in the sincerity of the man, he was my leader then, but that is not what I believe and I had no business staying with that party and that is why I crossed the line. Now do you know?

I would do it no matter what party because I've always said what I thought of parties. I always said and I've been a heck of a lot more consistent than the majority of you or certainly just as consistent. Mr. Speaker, we could forget all that. We've talked about, all of a sudden it's a black day, you don't let me talk. We've heard people that they wanted to speak 45 minutes, every one of them. I don't blame you because you've got to make it stick, you've got to show that it's awful, that it's a sin against democracy, but I hope they haven't got a camera and show the people yesterday - they were all challenging. "Well, you know what to do," and that wasn't said in confidence. It was said all around there yesterday. There's a challenge. Okay, you know what to do, pull the plug.

Fifty six years I think we were told, since the last time. When is the last time that they rang the bells four days in a row like they did last week? Are you going to tell me that in a democracy . . .

A MEMBER: Who did the threatening?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . that the opposition can and should be in a position to decide what is in the Order Paper? Is that happening anywhere in the world where there's a democracy and a Parliament like we have? Is that what you want? Some day there might be a change and you might be here and see what it is. Is that what it is meant to be, that the opposition can say no, or the Leader might say I want to speak on Friday because I might get the press on Friday, not Thursday, Friday? Is that what it's all about?

There were four days in a row that the bells rang. That is not permitting the House to proceed with the work and that is why we pulled the plug and I hope that we will do it again. We've talked about a six-month hoist. What have we done? I've got a department to run, and the same thing, during the question period and I get the media telling me how badly it is run and probably they're right, but I can't do much of a job if I'm sitting here all the time. This was the longest Session we've ever had and so on. We've run around in different committees and now there is going to be this bell ringing again. I don't think that this should be allowed. If there is a law in there, if you could put a limit on it, there has to be a reason, and the public will judge.

It is a difficult thing and if you abuse it you're going to pay for it and you should, but then I think that you won't make it stick. You're going to try and I don't blame you, that's politics, but you won't make it stick because then you'll have to answer why did you ring the bells and walk out four days in a row and it is not going to work. As I say, this would not be my way to

try to get the people of Manitoba together. I'd much sooner start dealing with children because I think we've got to try to eradicate prejudice and we're certainly not doing it, fellows, the way we're going today, not with the kind of talk that I've heard here today. That's not the way we're going to eradicate prejudice; and I think that's important and I think that is fine to play politics and to want to be elected but we also have a responsibility, a very important responsibility.

I would much sooner lose this vote and this legislation and so on if we could get closer and get the people together and not try to use every trick possible because the main thing seems to be we've got to be in power, and that's unfortunate because that's not the kind of work. When one of the members says here, yes, we know that they're mistaken, but let's back away; let's back away because the people - you don't back away. You just go forward and say, hey, you're wrong, and you stick together, then you look back at Bill 113, look at those things. Now did that cause a revolution? Did the French people take over? I was saying awhile ago, hardly 5 percent - they're going to take over. They were comparing them to what they were doing in Quebec. That makes an awful lot of sense.

The French people are reasonable too. It's not my fault I was born like that; I can't help it. I don't know if I should be ashamed. There was a generation on my mother's side; the first one came with Maisoneuve. That's a few years ago, so I hope nobody's going to tell me to go back to France because I've been here awhile; and then on my father's side, it's a generation before that and that's the way it is. I don't think that we could choose that. We were born that way and I'm very proud of it and I'm also very proud of being a Canadian and there is no reason in the world that things should be said to me that I should be at your throat and you should be at mine. There's no reason we can't live together in this province; we do in other ways.

I've been mixed up in a lot of sports and I liked it because there they didn't care if people made the sign of a cross or wore a funny little hat on their head or whatever they did. You judge people not by their colour and I don't see why we can't do it here. We're supposed to be a little more intelligent than that. All right, let's be honest; let's bring in our solution but let's quit this stuff of trying to find something with the Société franco-manitobaine and that kind which the people, they're not the ones that are causing those things in Quebec, for instance, and that hurts me more than it hurts anyone in this House, except maybe my colleague also who is in the same boat as I am and one from Ste. Rose. So I don't want this to be pointed with your finger and say, "See what DeGaulle is doing," I don't care about that, that is not what I want.

I think if I had my way and what I think we should do is look at the education thing. I think if people realized that then if they could speak more languages and that thing they wouldn't be afraid of losing jobs, they wouldn't be afraid of many things, they wouldn't need that kind of thing. I don't think this is so hot that we're going to get now but I don't think we can afford the thing and say, okay, let's do it again. They took your rights away from you years ago so back away because they're not ready yet. We've been doing that for over 100 years. It reminds me of that cat that's going up and down in that ad, in the front and all that and I don't think that's quite right.

What is it that we want? We can't back away from that; I'll never back away from that. You said that they were corrected by the Forest case. Why? Not because a provincial government decided that they wanted to bring fairness in there. It's because it was enshrined in the act and it allowed the people to go to the Supreme Court, and that is actually all I am looking for at this time. So when the climate changed - I think you are right; there is not a very good situation now - when the climate changed that if the Government of the Day doesn't want or can't do anything, fine, maybe then they can go to the court and get the rights that were taken by a provincial government and not the courts.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I speak on the hoist motion. After listening to the Member for St. Boniface, I see no reason why the government can't go along with this motion because he has admitted that this isn't the way he would choose to go.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, he said let's start with the children. This, all along, has been what we have been trying to do. We have French Immersion in the schools; we have been pushing to make sure that the core program stayed; and I understand that they have changed it to the basic French now with the program continuing. This is the sort of thing we have been asking for. As an Anglo-Saxon or an Anglophone, or whatever they are calling me these days, as a Manitoban, this is the sort of thing that we have been trying to do in this province. There is no need for this bill. They can proceed along the way that this government was going when we were in office, when the members on this side were in office, and the way this government was starting to proceed until they were turned aside from this somehow by the Attorney-General, by who knows whom.

But, Mr. Speaker, this isn't the way to go. Nobody wants this. Nobody wants this division. This is a sad day for Manitoba. Not the closure issue; that's sad enough. All that is doing is cutting off debate for us, but it is going to continue out in this province. That's the sadness in this issue. I think the Member for Turtle Mountain touched on it when he said it doesn't matter about the next election, it doesn't matter about politics. What does matter is about how we feel about one another and what has happened to this province.

Mr. Speaker, I think today when someone told me that a former member of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Schulz, Herb Schulz which everyone knows, when he opposed, he got turfed out of his party. He was turfed out. Well, today he was on the radio apologizing to the people of Manitoba for working to get the NDP elected ever, at any time at all, Mr. Speaker.

Now what is happening in this province when they are not listening to their own people? Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province was finally smoked out. He was finally forced to speak on this issue. When he was in Thompson, he said let's put the French language

issue behind us and get on with the job. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let's get on with the job. How do we get on with the job? We bring in closure.

Mr. Speaker, he also indicated that Manitobans asked that we complete this matter. They are asking that, Mr. Speaker, but not in the manner that this government is proceeding with, not in that manner. They want it to be set aside. The question that we get asked constantly is how can we stop them, meaning the government. What can we do? We have given our views in plebiscites; we have sent in coupons; we have sent money; we have done everything, but nothing is to stop this government.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier went on to say Manitobans prefer to see this issue dealt with within Manitoba. Well, I have spoken on that before, Mr. Speaker. This didn't start within Manitoba; this started from without. What's happened to our province, to the people in our province when constantly, when somebody phones me and has to explain that "I am Ukrainian; I am of Ukrainian descent?" I can't remember the last time someone had to say on the phone to me that they were of a certain descent. They could just phone me and give me their problem, but now they have hyphenated us in a way that should never have happened in this province. They have set this province back 50 years, I'd say, and more like 100.

What has happened to the people in this province that they have been forced to come out and unite and try and stop something that they were quite willing to let go ahead in a reasonable fashion? But now, Mr. Speaker, all we have in this province is division - one Manitoban against another. Blame - who cares about the blame, Mr. Speaker? That's not the point. I think this is a sorry, sorry day, not just because of closure but because of the issue that we are having to deal with.

The Minister of Health indicates that he can't get his work done; he hasn't got time. Mr. Speaker, they should have thought of this before. They thought this issue was going to go away. It's not going away. Mr. Speaker, I can't understand a government that will not listen to the people of Manitoba. They have done absolutely everything they could to make this government hear and they will not listen.

The Premier had the gall to stand up in this House and say they wanted to hold the hearings and that we held them up. It is almost unbelievable. Where has he been? Certainly not leading. He hasn't even been listening, Mr. Speaker.

He went on to say, public consensus for 1984. Well, he has a public consensus, and they are saying no, no, no. What more does this Premier need? He talks about being principled, and I have heard the Member for Ste. Rose shouting out "principle." Is it principle to ignore the majority? Is it principle to force an issue that this government gave no warning to the people during the election? Is that what principled means, that you can't trust the government you put in power? Even if you get rid of them, it's too late, the damage is done. Is that what principled means? Not in my books.

He spoke about policies that we accepted two years ago. Mr. Speaker, they have ruined it all. They have wrecked this province and they have divided the people, and we can't say it often enough because we don't want it any more than I am sure they do. For some reason, they can't make themselves stop. Why, Mr.

Speaker? The Premier just doesn't understand what they have done. He must look in the mirror every day and ask what happened. Well, I will tell you what happened. They didn't listen. He let it get away from him.

He hasn't been the leader in this House in any way on this issue.

A MEMBER: Any other one either.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, he also indicated that the members opposite, meaning us the opposition, are burning with hate. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker. He doesn't understand what we're talking about. The only thing that he can justify to himself why we are opposing this government on this issue is that we're filled with hate. Let me tell you. Hate is not what motivates us. Anger maybe, sorrow certainly.

I can't believe that this Minister, this First Minister, could have stood in his place and said that this opposition was burning with hate. Believe me, hate is not the motivator here, it's sorrow. We are more sorrowful and, as much as the Member for St. Boniface, when he talks about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it's a fine time for him to get up now and say that he would prefer some other route. Let's take the other route now. They've got the chance, they can vote for the hoist, Mr. Speaker.

Then what did the First Minister go on to do? He read a letter to the editor from someone from Portage la Prairie. A member tearing up his card for the P.C. Party. Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, for every card that's been torn up in the P.C. Party over this issue, there's been a hundred, there's been a thousand torn up in the NDP.

The Member for Charleswood called this government leaderless, a bad government. He was right, Mr. Speaker. Everything that they have done on this issue has divided Manitobans. Elections aside, what are you doing to this province? Mr. Speaker, what are they doing to this province? They've divided, they haven't listened to the people. If only they would stop and listen.

The Member for Roblin-Russell said he couldn't sleep last night. There's been a lot of sleepless nights for many people in Manitoba. They have a great feeling for this province. What is happening here? What is happening to our province? That's what they're asking constantly. This is our province that we're talking about, Mr. Speaker, not any other province. This is our province.

We have busloads of people coming from the Interlake to speak to the Minister, carloads from Lakeside, people coming in from constituencies, trying to talk to their government. What happens, Mr. Speaker? Closure. Closure is what happens. Mr. Speaker, they're not intending to listen, they want this to be full speed ahead and they're going to put it behind them. It will never be behind them.

Mr. Speaker, we have been taking this bill seriously. Our leader spoke on Friday and moved a hoist to give this government a chance to look at this issue without pressure. Well, Mr. Speaker, what is this government doing? They're going to go ahead in any case. Why don't they listen for a change? We can't repeat often enough, Mr. Speaker, 78 percent of the people in this

province are opposed to what this government is doing. Can they not understand this?

They have divided this province and they're going to continue to divide this province. We had an example from the former House Leader. He gave a good example this evening on why he was removed from both the House Leader and in charge of this issue. He didn't understand it at all. He still doesn't understand it, Mr. Speaker.

Somehow the people across this House, the members of the government seem to think they're the only ones that can speak for the people. On this issue you are speaking for no one but yourselves. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask this government to vote for the hoist. Give this a chance.

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in taking exception to the manner in which this freedom of speech has been throttled today. This on behalf of a government can only be a desperate move, a move to put this issue behind them. I know that they really want it behind them, but, Mr. Speaker, even the government, if it uses its majority to pass this bill, it will haunt them for the rest of their days.

I can't believe that a government could possibly fly in the face of adversity in the manner in which they have. The indications from day one has been that the electorate is in opposition to what they are attempting to do.

Mr. Speaker, the government had to be forced, kicking and screaming into the hearings, that we held and even throughout the hearings it was evident that there was strong opposition to their viewpoint.

I think the greatest strength came or opposition came from the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, where at least 125 municipalities representing thousands of people, were in opposition to what the government was trying to do. Then again there was the plebiscite in the October elections where approximately 200,000 people again voiced their opposition in what was going on.

Today, we have organized groups everyday. We're getting phone calls. We have messages. We have people organizing and coming forward everyday in opposition to what the government is attempting to do.

I'd like to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Fort Garry in his speech - I think it was a very well thought out speech. He began by saying, and these are the words of Mr. Sherman, "I rise to assume my responsibility and take up my duty to speak on the important matter before us. Mr. Speaker, namely, the government's latest revisions and latest version in respect to its resolution to amend the Constitutions of Manitoba and Canada. I say "responsibility and duty," Mr. Speaker, and I do not say "pleasure" because I think it can hardly be described as a pleasure to find oneself, as a Manitoban, still caught up in the turmoil and trauma of social and cultural divisiveness in this province after to these seven months of turmoil, trauma, and social divisiveness caused entirely, unnecessarily, Sir, by a government over there which unfortunately did not apparently know what it was doing. It remains

a duty, Mr. Speaker, and a heavy responsibility bearing on all of us on this side of the House to continue to serve in this ongoing debate and to continue to try to prevent the government from damaging our province further."

Mr. Speaker, I can't agree more with the Member for Fort Garry. Mr. Speaker, I was born and brought up in Manitoba and I'm darn proud of being a Manitoban. I was away for eight years and I came back to bring up my family and make my living here in Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

MR. S. ASHTON: A lot more coming back since we got in, you know.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Oh, that'll be the day too. — (Interjection) — Oh yeah. Well, you know anytime . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Any time you want to go we'll pay your fare . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: . . . Mr. Speaker, I come from a background of ethnic people who came here just shortly after the founding fathers of this province. My ancestors came here - it's really my grandfather - just a few years later, but my ancestors came by choice and seeking a new and strange environment. They came with books of learning and their dreams of a better life than what they had left. They suffered great hardships in the colony called New Iceland. They soon assimilated into the cultural mosaic and became part of the country and contributed socially, culturally, and became part of the life of this province. To this day, without any great fanfare or upheaval, they retain to some degree the ethnic culture and heritage that they originally had, as do so many other ethnic people that make up the great Province of Manitoba, and to me it is a sad day in my life to see and feel the animosities that have been created in the province over such a matter of language.

Mr. Speaker, I think with possibly a few exceptions, it is more important to Manitobans to be able to live in harmony with their neighbour, to enjoy the fruits of his labours. The average Manitoban is more concerned with economics than he is with language. If the working language of the country happened to be Pekingese, I think the average Manitoban would have learned it if it were for no other reason than to survive.

I implore the Government of Manitoba to listen to what is coming across from the citizenry of Manitoba. There's a very vocal and concerned citizenry out there that is asking to be heard. The government is not listening. A six-month hoist as was moved by our Leader the other day will give everyone time to reassess their position and cool off their feelings of anger and animosity that should be given a chance, and when you consider that the bill will not be effective until 1987, why not take a little more time and make the more little more rational stance on this bill. Though I do agree that most Manitobans would like to see this issue settled, but not in the manner in which the Government House Leader does.

History, Mr. Speaker, will confirm that with the stance of the Conservative Government of Honourable Sterling Lyon took in 1980 after the ruling of the Federal Supreme Court with the passage of Bill No. 2, Section 23 of The Manitoba Act was restored. The constitutional obligation had been honoured, the Conservative Government of Sterling Lyon went even further than the original act by declaring that English and French be official languages for the purpose of the courts and the Legislature and the printing of the statutes. As well, the Lyon Government set up a French language section to improve the capacity of the Provincial Government to respond to requests from the public in French language, also French translation services were expanded.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 1981, Mr. Bilodeau, defending a traffic violation lost his case in both the trial courts and the Court of Appeal. He further appealed to the Supreme Court. Rather than have the case heard by the Supreme Court, the NDP Government chose to make a deal, a settlement with Bilodeau, the Franco-Manitoban Society, and the Canadian Government. The solution that they arrived at was an entrenchment amendment to avoid Manitoba statutes from being declared invalid.

Legal minds differ in some respects, but Mr. Kerr Twaddle who is acting for the government and Mr. Dale Gibson both share the view that the court would not rule all laws invalid. Furthermore, the proposed amendments meet a crisis that does not exist. According to Mr. Twaddle, the proposed amendment of the NDP is entrenching conditions that no court would impose on Manitoba. The government is making a settlement even though the probability of the province losing the court case is small. Further to that, Mr. Twaddle points out that the amendment will have significant impact on Manitoba because the implications are unknown. The government will be unable to change the court's decision even if the court holds widely different views from that of the Manitoba electorate. The plebiscite held in the municipal elections in October - I'm repeating myself here again - gave a clear indication of how strongly the electorate feels and how vehemently they oppose the actions of the NDP Government; 76 percent of the voters in Manitoba voiced their objection.

The Progressive Conservative Party opposes the proposed amendments because once the amendment is entrenched, the courts, not the elected representative of the people will be interpreting it. Presently, the Government of the Day decides what the program of French language services will be, but with the entrenchment Manitoba forfeits their historic power through the Legislature to control the provisions of French language services, leaving this crucial matter entirely in the hands of the courts.

A dangerous precedent could be set if this is allowed to become a fact. Once entrenched, the amendment can only be changed with great difficulty as the Legislature and the House of Commons will both have to agree on any changes.

At the hearings, Maurice Prince, representing the Association des pro-canadiens raised the concern whereby he questioned how the government can recognize and accept as a negotiating partner the Franco-Manitoban Society that could only muster 576

votes of a population of approximately 86,000 people, and this figure is debatable; Manitobans of French extraction. A delegate of French heritage in the Swan River hearings vehemently expressed his feelings when he said that their Franco-Manitoban Society did not speak for him nor anyone in the Swan Valley area. They had never been contacted, so the Franco-Manitoban Society did not speak for them.

As the Reeve of Ste. Rose, Joe Van de Poelle found himself in a conflict with the upcoming municipal elections. I think the Member for Neepawa was there at that time and I think we all had a little empathy for him in the fact that - yes, you were there too, Mr. Minister - he did have a problem in that he didn't have a French name, and here he was in an area that was basically French speaking.

The other thing that came across in Ste. Rose was the fact that people said they didn't really have any great problem for the simple reason that if there was someone needing French translation or such, there was always someone there that could give it to them. Likewise, if they needed the service in Ukrainian, there was always someone of Ukrainian extraction that could translate or make it. So, the area was a little league of nations, and yet they got things done. They could communicate and they communicated in one basic language. Mr. Speaker, the other one, in the words of Reeve Heeney of the Rural Municipality of Elton states, "In a democratic system" — (Interjection) — Yes, I'll tell you this one. The Minister of Agriculture is interested in hearing this because he wasn't at the hearings. "In a democratic system it is a strange way of proceeding when the minority can have something placed in the Constitution but the majority that is affected cannot have it deleted." Now there's a parallel, eh?

Mr. Speaker, I know there are other members from our side that are interested in speaking and our time is rapidly running out, but I think that the one thing that we should bear in mind is that we are first and foremost Canadians, first and foremost Canadians, and I think it's just about time that we started to be Canadians first and maybe hyphenated Canadians second.

Mr. Speaker, I would, in closing, urge that members opposite give serious consideration to supporting the hoist motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not take any great pleasure in speaking to this hoist motion tonight. On a normal opportunity of entering debate there is some pride, there is some honour in entering into the debate. But in entering into this debate tonight faced with closure, for the first time in 54 years in the Province of Manitoba, there is no honour in speaking to this bill under these circumstances tonight.

This, Sir, sets a record for me probably in the length of my political career as an elected MLA; this debate will set two separate records. This will be the only time, Sir, I believe that I will ever be debating a constitutional amendment dealing with language, an issue of extreme importance to the people of Manitoba and to the future of this province. This will probably be the only opportunity under which I speak on a constitutional

amendment; and it certainly, Mr. Speaker, will be the only time I believe in which I will be forced to speak under the parameters of closure on a bill of this importance to the province at this stage in its development.

Mr. Speaker, what I find shameful tonight about this closure motion and the treatment the government has given to us tonight is that they have broken their silence on this bill and they have monopolized the opposition's time to debate this bill tonight. They limited us to eight and one-half short hours of debate, Mr. Speaker, and promptly monopolized approximately one-half of that time.

The Member for Radisson, from his seat, said we have wasted 14 hours last week. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government wasted that time because each and every time we stood the debate on Bill 115 we left the opportunity for the government to speak on it, and when did they take that opportunity tonight? They took it tonight on our time after they had invoked closure, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This, Sir, is the kind of New Democratic democracy that Manitobans are now faced with. Throw on closure, then monopolize the time and then criticize the opposition for saying nothing. This is some kind of an out-of-touch, incompetent government that we are now facing in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I lay squarely on the back of this new Government House Leader the four days where this issue was not debated. We gave him the opportunity on Friday the 13th to accept an amendment which he said was a major breakthrough, a turnaround, a reversal in position.

A MEMBER: Conciliatory.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This man, this Government House Leader, then proceeded to present debate on our amendment by calling Bill 115. And why did he do it for Monday and Tuesday? Because he did not want to have the government position on our proposed sub-amendment voiced to the public prior to the meeting of the SFM on Tuesday night. That, Sir, is what they were afraid of. That, Sir, is why they called Bill 115 and they remained silent on Bill 115 Monday and Tuesday and caused the bells in this building to ring.

On Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, this Government House Leader received information that our Leader was prepared to speak on Friday and that we wished to carry on debate on the resolution. I was extremely upset that that Government House Leader with that advice and discussed that issue with our House Leader during question period proceeded to call Bill 115, knowing that no member on this side of the House would speak before our Leader put our position on the record. But he called Bill 115 and then he had the nerve, Mr. Speaker, when I was going home, to be quoted on the news as saying it was his understanding with our House Leader that other members of the Conservative Caucus would speak on Bill 115 that day. That, Sir, is a distortion of the truth of the greatest magnitude and that, Sir, is why we do not trust this Government House Leader.

He was incompetent as an Assistant Clerk in this House; he misled Chairmen of Committees while he was a Clerk of this House while we were government, and he continues to mislead the public with wrong and untruthful statements, Mr. Speaker.

This afternoon, another example of his untruthfulness. He indicated that after my colleague, the MLA for La Verendrye, finished speaking, his Leader, the Premier would address this bill. And what happened this afternoon, Mr. Speaker? The Premier sat there and was willing to let you, Sir, place the question and finish debate. He was not going to get out of his seat as promised by the Government House Leader, and one of our members had to speak to avoid the question being put. Another untruthful statement, distrustful atmosphere from this Government House Leader, this man that we cannot any longer believe what he says to us in private or in public, because on the public airwaves the radio stations carry him with distorting the truth, Mr. Speaker, on issues of discussions between Government House Leaders.

And you ask, Sir, why the atmosphere in this House has been poisoned? We thought the Attorney-General was bad enough as the Government House Leader, but this person will do a much better job of twisting the truth, misleading the public than any other member over there and that is the reason for the acrimony in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier spoke on this bill this afternoon. He was dragged out of his enforced silence on this bill to speak this afternoon; and what he said was nothing to justify this bill. His total defence of this bill involved reading a letter of resignation from a Progressive Conservative Party member in the Constituency of Portage la Prairie and a read-back, Sir, of the policies that the Lyon Government put in place in 1980 - policy. The Premier still does not understand what this issue is about and he's demonstrated his ignorance of this issue this afternoon when he spoke. He cannot understand and bridge the gap in reasoning between constitutional amendments, legislation and policy.

The Attorney-General conveniently avoided tonight the question put to him by the MLA for Turtle Mountain as to why we even need legislation. All things promised in legislation could be done by policy . . .

MR. H. ENNS: And were being achieved.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and they were being implemented and achieved by our government in 1980, '81 and '82, and continued for some months by this government until the Attorney-General made the fatal proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Attorney-General if he is in the House, but the Attorney-General has managed to muster support amongst his friends and associates for this resolution, for this language amendment. It is indicated on the air waves of CBC, I believe it was, that now the Communist Party of Canada supports the Provincial Government's proposal. His influence still runs strong and deep, and he is able to bring his friends alongside on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting tonight - I apologize for being absent for a few minutes from the Chamber

tonight, but I was attending a meeting on the bilingual issue in Carman tonight, and on the way back I listened to a CBC program called - well, I forget what it was - it was on about 9:30 and it was dealing with Trotskyism.

MR. H. ENNS: Ideas.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Ideas was the program and it was dealing with Trotskyism. The main theme of these Trotskyites - I have difficulty with that word - the Trotskyites were talking about the class warfare and the class differential; and what did we have the Attorney-General say tonight, some reference about class distinction of referring to the former Assistant Clerk as the former Assistant Clerk. It was exactly the theme of the Trotskyites on CBC radio tonight. So much has not changed with the Attorney-General over his political career.

The Attorney-General tonight amused me, Mr. Speaker. He mentioned that there were 88 speeches made. Did I hear the Member for Wolseley indicate something? The Member for Wolseley indicates that telling the truth about the Attorney-General is disgusting. Well, Mr. Speaker, many people in Manitoba consider what you are doing as part and parcel of this incompetent, spineless government to be despicable. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And you see, Mr. Speaker, when you tell the truth to people like the MLA for Wolseley, they have no other comeback but disgusting; we don't want to hear the truth; we want doublespeak; we want the "thought police" to control everybody in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General mentioned about 88 speeches. He indicated that we convulsed Manitobans with 88 speeches to date, not counting this evening's debate. He said, Mr. Speaker, that there was little substance in those speeches. I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, all of those speeches addressed the original constitutional amendment as proposed by the Attorney-General when he had responsibility for the issue. Those speeches of little substance, as he says, had great results because they brought this government 170 degrees back to a stance which is acceptable to the people of Manitoba and good for the future of Manitoba; of little substance but of great result.

The Attorney-General also said that our opposition was political opportunism. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, of course, is not a fountain of parliamentary democracy, particularly with his political involvement at university which many of my people at home who went to university with him tell me about. He was a very interesting speechmaker in the good old days of university. Now, he doesn't understand, Mr. Speaker, what democracy is all about. Democracy is speaking for the people, for what the people believe is right, and the people believe that we, on this issue, are correct in the Progressive Conservative Party, and the people believe the New Democratic Government is wrong.

The Attorney-General calls our opposition to this bad legislation as political opportunism. Most people who

understand the parliamentary system would call that democracy, but not the Attorney-General for whatever reasons he cooks up in his mind. He goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that our political opportunism borders on bigotry, but yet the Attorney-General offered no defence, and cannot offer any defence, for the cartoon in *La Liberté* which had members of the Progressive Conservative Party, in the accompaniment of the MLA for Elmwood, dressed in Ku Klux Klan uniforms, burning the Société Franco-Manitobaine building in the background and burying the headstone of Louis Riel.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the only paper which has come up with racist, bigoted editorial cartoons is *La Liberté*, the official magazine, theoretically, of the Francophone Manitoba community. They are the ones that have fanned the flames of racism and bigotry; not us. There has not been one speech made in this House, nor one thing said by any member on this side of the House which smacks of the bigotry and the racism that the Minister of Health and the MLA for Radisson would like to accuse us of, but they are deathly silent about the cartoon caricature in *La Liberté*. They don't want to talk about that, Mr. Speaker, because that is objective reporting.

The Attorney-General, in mentioning those 88 speakers, was, as usual, slightly misleading, Mr. Speaker. He seemed to indicate that there was 88 speakers on this issue which we are dealing with tonight. I want to remind honourable members over there that the 88 speeches dealt with the original constitutional proposal. What we are dealing with here tonight is Bill 115, which was given to us on January 3rd of 1984. I remind honourable gentlemen, it is only 50 minutes into January 25th. That was three weeks ago this was given to us; two weeks ago we could have debated it. The government could have spoken to this all last week instead of allowing the bells to ring, but no, they wouldn't.

Now — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader asks how could the bells have been stopped from ringing. When my colleague, the MLA for Radisson, stood the debate, he said any member could speak to it, which included 32 government bench members. Each and everyone of you could have spoken to it last week, but you chose to force the issue and cause the bells to ring. They are the people that caused the bells to ring, Mr. Speaker; not us. Now they monopolize our limited time tonight.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the problem. This bill was given to us with less than two weeks to debate it, and after a day-and-a-half of debate they slap closure on us to thwart the normal democratic process of allowing a free and open and wide-ranging debate. What is dangerous about that, Mr. Speaker, is the very example the Attorney-General laid out for us earlier this evening - 88 speeches were required to get this government to come back to its senses and change their ridiculous constitutional amendment to something that was workable.

Mr. Speaker, with 88 speeches on Bill 115, I am sure the government would come to its senses, but they don't want to. They are thwarting the opportunity of the opposition to speak; they are preventing debate on this bill in principle, clause-by-clause, etcetera, etcetera.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Do you oppose the bill?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is asking frivolous questions, interrupting, and he wants to know, do I oppose the bill? Mr. Speaker, I have no question in my mind that the way this poorly drafted, ill-considered bill is not worthy of passage and I oppose it the way it is written right now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, people like the Government House Leader, will then go to the radio station and say with his usual misleading and untruthful statements that I oppose the extension of French-language service in the Province of Manitoba. That's what he will do tomorrow.

A MEMBER: Not true, not true.

MR. D. ORCHARD: After a number of his speakers have quoted what we did by policy for the Franco-Manitoban community - I have never objected to that, but, Mr. Speaker, I object to bad legislation being brought forward by an incompetent government and rammed through this House in the process that this bill is being done tonight.

So, Mr. Speaker, make no bones about it, I am opposed to this bill. You bet your bottom dollar and unless this government comes to its senses and accepts amendments to make this bill reasonable and acceptable, I will oppose this bill in third reading; I will oppose it for the length of time that this government is in office.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in putting that position on the record because unlike members opposite I have held a series of constituency meetings in Pembina constituency to explain to my constituents the latest proposal by the government, to try to understand what the feeling is out there. I know that the Member for Radisson will say that I didn't explain it properly and that I incited emotional feelings, that I incited bigotry and racism. That, Sir, is not true. We had an objective analysis of what the government was proposing. I can stand here tonight, Sir, after being to a sixth meeting in Carman tonight and I can tell you that with exception of one person in my constituency each and every one said we do not want this bad legislation to be passed by this bad government that we no longer trust. That's what my people told me.

Now, I challenge any member over there to indicate whether they have toured their constituency in the last 10 days, held public meetings on the French language issue. There is not one that has done that, Mr. Speaker, because none dare to.

The Minister of Agriculture, his constituents have to come in by bus to visit him in his office, in the glittering towers of his office because he won't talk to them at home about this issue. I have, Mr. Speaker. I have spoken to my constituents on this issue. I was extremely fair to this government. They have told me that they cannot accept in any way, shape or form this trade-off of chances. A chance that Bilodeau might succeed for a chance of greatly extended bilingual services in the Province of Manitoba that go beyond the intent of Section 23 as originally written into the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, make no bones about it. This bill is bad legislation. This bill requires substantive amendments. This bill is unclear in its definitions. What is a language service area and where will it apply? There are clauses in this bill, Mr. Speaker, and we're

not allowed to deal on second reading with clause-by-clause but there are flaws, errors and omissions in this bill. There is confusion in this bill, Mr. Speaker. This bill is unsound legislation. It cannot be passed in its present form. It must be amended, Mr. Speaker, by the government.

We will make those proposals for amendment at second reading. We will make them again at committee stage if necessary and we will make them again at third reading if this government will not accept them and make this bill workable.

Mr. Speaker, there is no obligation whatsoever . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . on any member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to help the Minister of Health get on with running his department by giving expedient passage to bad legislation. We were not elected to that, Mr. Speaker, and I am sorry that the Minister of Health is crying his crocodile tears tonight about how much time is being wasted on this issue and he cannot spend time with his department.

Mr. Speaker, we, Sir, are expected to pass bad legislation so the Minister of Health can spend some time with the Department of Health? That isn't the reason the Department of Health hasn't received attention, he has been too busy being the Lotteries Minister. The King Lotteries man in Manitoba. Mr. Big from Las Vegas is the new Minister of Health. That's why the Health Department is in trouble today because this Minister has spent his time on lotteries and not the health life of the people in Manitoba.

A MEMBER: But he does stop to visit with Madame Bégin.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, he also said that he does not agree with what is going on in the government right now. Well, this Minister of Health has been known to change sides of the fence before. He did it in 1969 for personal reasons, for personal advancement, for the dollars of a Cabinet spot. He could do it today on principle and serve the people of Manitoba well, but you won't see that kind of principle come from the Minister of Health on this issue.

He will talk that "I believe this issue is not being handled well" but he will stay in his Cabinet chair with the perks of office. He won't give those up, Mr. Speaker. His principles aren't that big today. They were in 1969 when the principles of switching from the Liberal Party meant getting into Cabinet. Different principle then because the price was right, Mr. Speaker. But today the price is wrong. He would lose his Cabinet spot and all those perks. So there's no principle involved in the crocodile tears from the Minister of Health tonight. There is none.

We know what his principles are involved with. Every man has his price and his is the honourable title that he has gotten from the Schreyer years and now from this weak and leaderless government. Mr. Speaker, there is no principle involved with the Minister of Health. None, none.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out - I want to point out to members opposite that this bill has been

tabled by an incompetent government that doesn't understand legislation, doesn't know how to write legislation, doesn't know how to present legislation. As full example, Mr. Speaker, I offer to you the Farm Lands Bill. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture had to go running back to his office from the first Session and bring back a redrafted bill.

Mr. Speaker, he could suggest to the Government House Leader, the Minister of Municipal Affairs for whom 23 municipal councils have now passed resolutions to have him removed as Municipal Affairs Minister, the Minister of Agriculture could sit down with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and tell him how easy it is to withdraw legislation and bring it back properly written, amended with a better intent to it.

Mr. Speaker, that is all we've been asking this government to do, to take this legislation, remove it from the public attention for the next six months, allow the mood in the province to become more conciliatory to the expansion of French language rights, to allow the debate to cool off and bring this bill back amended, improved, more definitive as to what its intent is and what the interpretations of the bill will be. Then we can have this debate. Not with closure, Mr. Speaker, to silence the opposition but have a full, honest and free debate on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, if they would take our advice on pulling Bill 115, they could give very serious consideration to the proposition that they have put on the record as being the hallmark of our government, and that being doing the things mentioned in Bill 115 by policy directive. They have the authority to do it, Mr. Speaker. We were doing it. It was not causing the animosity, the division and the permanent harm in the Province of Manitoba that their handling of this situation has done. We don't need Bill 115, even if it is improved. The government can do this by policy.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by urging this leaderless and incompetent government, No. 1, to accept our sub-amendment on the constitutional resolution; No. 2, by backing down from Bill 115 at this point in time and bringing it back when cooler heads will prevail; and failing those two options, Mr. Speaker, do the honourable thing and let the people of Manitoba decide who should handle this issue in a competent, honest and open fashion and call an election and allow the election of a Progressive Conservative Government to take over this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. H. GRAHAM: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, according to our rules, Rule No. 32, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, that the Member for Morris be now heard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden will no doubt be aware that it is not permissible to rise on a point of order in order to move an amendment or a motion or resolution.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter raised by the Member for Virden, Rule 32 clearly provides that a motion may be made as the member has so indicated. In Beauchesne, it indicates that a motion that a member be now heard must be moved before the member recognizes has begun speaking, and it was so moved. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it's fully in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When the cackling stops, I would be pleased to advise members opposite that I concur with the opinion of the Member for St. Norbert, and if the member wishes to move the motion, we, on this side, have no objection to the moving of the motion.

I would suggest, however, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Agriculture wishes only to make a few brief comments. It would probably be no more than 10 minutes, and if that then would allow another two members on the other side to speak to complete debate, we have no difficulty, but if members do want to insist and have the matter come to a vote, then — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, I'm trying to accommodate members opposite. If they have no such desire and they wish to move the motion and persist in the matter, then the Minister of Agriculture has the right to speak and he has been recognized. We don't wish to push the matter. The member suggested to me that he'll speak for 10 minutes and members opposite will have opportunity for two or three more speakers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader to the same point.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it passes beyond all understanding that the Government House Leader stands up in his chair and says we don't wish to push the matter. We are being pushed to 2:00 o'clock this morning because of the limitations that he's put on democratic debate in this House and, Mr. Speaker, we have now listened to five or six government speakers, speak on the limited time available to us.

Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I have to put these things on the public record because when we were apprised of the action being taken by this House Leader, I did ask him, privately - as House Leaders have to confer - would he restrain his government members from speaking to those limited hours that we now are being faced with. What have we seen today, Mr. Speaker? We've seen the Minister of Finance; we've seen the Minister of Government Services; we've seen the

Minister of Health. We've seen five or six members speaking when they wouldn't speak before.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to push that motion that is being presented by the Member for Virden, but let the record be clear that when we are finally being squeezed into this kind of corner, who is taking up the time and the Government House Leader says he's not trying to push any issue. Mr. Speaker, I ask for you to, once again, allow the two members to stand and you use - I'm prepared to let you use your good judgment with respect to who you recognize.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Closure and they're robbing our time at it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a duly moved motion. It's been moved and seconded and I don't think you can proceed with any other business until that motion is dealt with.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. For the benefit of all members I will read from Beauchesne, Section 234(2) which says, "A Member cannot rise on a point of order to move a motion," therefore the honourable member, in rising on a point of order, cannot move such a motion.

I have recognized the Honourable Minister of Agriculture as the next speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We really have just witnessed, by the exercise that we wasted 10 minutes on by the honourable members, what we've seen going on in this House since the end of June of 1983. That's really when it really began, when the Conservative Party realized that they had an issue which could whip up hysteria, to whip up fear in the people of Manitoba. That was the strategy that was begun by the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker. It was very clear.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back a bit one step further to the election in 1977. Let's go back four more years in terms of what the Conservative strategy was then and it is being repeated. When they were elected in 1977, they spread a document through the Civil Service in this province saying that if we spread fear in the Civil Service, if we fire at least a large number of civil servants and we offer a tax cut to Manitobans people will try and equate that if you fire enough people from government you will be able to save the public of Manitoba money or at least give that illusion, Mr. Speaker. That was their first move in the type of politics that the Conservative Party engages. We see it here again. We try and rewrite history in this province by saying they somehow muzzled us and somehow democracy has been thwarted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, members on this side, the Premier, and the Attorney-General offered the Conservative Party to hold public hearings on a bill in the Legislature on a resolution, and then what do they do? For

approximately seven weeks they ragged, and ragged, even when they had nothing to say, they kept on talking, Mr. Speaker. They just ragged and ragged and ragged. Now, Mr. Speaker, we come back after having those hearings, hearing the public, making amendments and changes and bringing a new package. Mr. Speaker, in four days they go ahead and ring the bells and don't want to speak.

Mr. Speaker, let's just understand what is being played. Let's talk about some of the members here in the House and outside the House and the meeting that somehow I don't want to meet with my constituents. Let's deal with that question, Sir, let's deal with that question. Let's understand how this thing was being orchestrated.

Mr. Speaker, my office got a call in the morning of Monday saying that a group wants to meet with me on Tuesday and they're coming in. Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone knows that one's office in terms of public life is usually booked up at least two to three weeks with meetings, every office. My office is at least three weeks in advance, Mr. Speaker. We said, and I asked my staff, and I said please phone the person. But I'll tell you the person who was arranging the meeting was not from my constituency, Mr. Speaker. The organization that was set up . . . — (Interjection) —

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

I will ask the Honourable Member for Lakeside not to disrupt the proceedings.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Honourable Member for Lakeside doesn't like to hear what went on because, Mr. Speaker, they've been making speech after speech somehow insinuating that I do not wish to meet with my constituents. That's been the remarks. Why, Mr. Speaker, why would they want to say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, they like to plant little meetings. Where was the meeting organized? Not from my riding, Mr. Speaker, it was organized from the community of Stonewall, Mr. Speaker. That's who were the organizers of the group, Mr. Speaker, it was from the community of Stonewall represented by none other than the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Speaker. Bobby Bend was the leader of the group, Mr. Speaker. But, you know, they really didn't want to meet with me because they really didn't want to meet. They had hoped that I would say, no, I will not meet with you, that I will refuse to meet with you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I welcomed them into the office. I welcomed everyone into the office and we had a good meeting, all the points that they wished to make. I want to say that the majority of people who were there were, I would say, as any Interlake would be - right on - in terms of what they wanted to ask, in terms of questions, polite and appropriate. We had a one-hour dialogue on the various issues, Mr. Speaker. I believe even though Mr. Bend, who was the leader of the group, went out to the media and said, you know, it was like talking to a stone wall. I think those are the words that he had used.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that was not my impression. Everyone and anyone who wished to raise

a point and receive information had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and we did have a good dialogue on that. But that's not what the honourable members want to leave on the record. They want to say that, look, he didn't even want to meet with his own constituents. Mr. Speaker, that is just total nonsense and total rubbish, Mr. Speaker.

But let's understand what some of the nonsense that is going on here - for example, the Member for Elmwood. I wanted to tell him, and I tell it on the record and publicly, why is the Honourable Member for Elmwood where he is on this issue? Not because for some principled reason he is opposing us, because it's been clearly pointed out that he supported the extension of bilingualism and French Language Services in this province. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, and he should know - because he didn't get a Cabinet post. That's the reason he's sitting there, Mr. Speaker, that's the reason he's there.

You know, tonight I saw Herb Schulz. I have to tell you, I saw Herb Schulz on television, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Herb Schulz is part of Bill 115 too, Mr. Speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Oh sure he is, Mr. Speaker, and you should be aware that he went on television today saying that I want to apologize to the people of Manitoba that I somehow had something to do with electing this government. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that Herb Schulz was going around and writing letters to the editor trying to discredit the leader of our party and our group from being elected in the Province of Manitoba. He did everything in his power not to get us elected, so he has nothing to apologize to the people of Manitoba. He did everything that he could to not have us elected.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I really had some faith in the new Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party. I really did have some faith in that gentleman. Once he assumed the leadership of that party that he could take control and stand up in terms of principles and fair play for the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling that the chains of the third row are too heavy on his shoulders. That the chains and the shadows of the third row still cover that party, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: The shadow is there.

HON. B. URUSKI: I'm afraid that even though the third row shadow may be quite small in terms of stature they overshadow that front row completely and there is just, you know, a total lack of comprehension of the issue that is facing Manitobans, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, as I understand, we have two motions before us: one considering the six-month hoist as proposed by my Leader, and I also acknowledge under the rules of closure to the main motion involving Bill 115. Most of us have indicated in our speeches why either the bill should not now be considered, why it should be hoisted for six months, but I ask you, Sir,

we do have a rule that we speak to the motion before us . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I would ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to be as relevant to the topic as other members have been.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I did have some hope for the Leader of the Opposition, but it appears there is great difficulty on that side of the House to really try and get out of the gutter in terms of this issue and be statesmen in the Province of Manitoba. There is only one member who I still have some hope for because I can't count on their leader and that is the Member for Turtle Mountain. — (Interjection) — No, I don't think he blew it. There is still a ray of hope that that member who indicated he believes there is need and there is a desire in Manitoba for increased services to the French people of this province, he at least acknowledges that, but we wonder and we will see how he stands, Mr. Speaker, on this issue when the vote comes before us here.

Mr. Speaker, there is just no doubt that the honourable members, when they talk about being muzzled, that they have had every opportunity. But, you see, the arrogance continues. They cannot get over that they lost the election and they will have to wait their turn in terms of when the election will be called again, Mr. Speaker, and the arrogance shows that they want to have total control of every issue.

What did they say yesterday? You could just see it through the ranks challenging members on this side, do something. Move with the closure. You know what to do. That was the challenge that was coming from honourable members. They maybe didn't come right out and say those words, but you can see what they wanted.

Today they get up and cry horrors, we have been muzzled, Mr. Speaker. You have had more time and we have been more than reasonable. We have bent over backwards to the nonsense that you have caused in the Province of Manitoba, and you will have to live with some of that nonsense. You will have to live with that because I don't believe in the short run, you may gain, there is no doubt that you will gain; but in the long run, the people of Manitoba will see through you and see through what you are portraying and what you are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also do rise to speak on the hoist motion. My comments will be brief this evening, as we have other speakers who want to put some remarks on the record before 2:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker, January 24, 1984, in my view is Manitoba's date that will live in infamy. Truly a tragic time in our province's history. Mr. Speaker, the remarks just offered by the Minister of Agriculture, of course, epitomizes exactly where we're at on this date.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why is it such a tragic time in our province's history? It's not just because of closure being brought upon us. As the member for Elmwood

indicated, it is totally out of character with the so-called virtues, the parliamentary virtues of the New Democratic Party and their great leaders in the past. Mr. Speaker, 54 years I understand it has been since closure has been called and used within this forum - 54 years.

But the tragedy, Sir, isn't just because of closure, it's because of the nature of the debate. Sir, the old wounds that I read about in my history books. For the first time in my generation, Sir, I'm seeing first hand and I ask the rhetorical question - why? Why at this time?

Sir, it's not English versus French. It's not French versus English. It's French versus non-French and I think that was indicated most clearly here earlier on this evening by some of the results and some of the analysis offered. I think we've said from many of us on many different speeches, when we're talking about either referral motions or whatever, indicated at that time there are no majorities in this province. We're all minorities. So, why, Mr. Speaker? - well it's a tragic time, because the government has chosen to ignore the wishes of the vast majority of its citizens, the vast majority of Manitobans - 78 percent. I don't have to speak long on that because we've addressed that particular concern many times.

Mr. Speaker, it's a tragic time because the government goes to whatever ends to strike a committee and force people of their political persuasion to go out and make a presentation at the committee. We saw ample evidence of that, Sir, at committee hearings throughout the province. Certainly I was not in attendance at the meeting at Morden, but I heard of some of the people from my own constituency and others who were forced by Ministers of this Crown by way of telephone calls to go out and make representation at that particular meeting. It's a desperate and tragic time. Sir, it's tragic because we're spending so much time on this issue when we have the economic problems that are just crying out and begging for solutions and addressing at this time.

Mr. Speaker, it's tragic because people outside of our province, people outside of Manitoba are viewing us from outside and not totally understanding the situation that we're in, are casting some doubts and aspersions as to what is going on in here, what's going on within this province and we see the editorials.

Of course it's tragic because investors are looking at this province and they see social disruption and they see turbulence in our social manner and they're wondering what is going on. Sir, it's tragic because of the attack on the mentality of our citizens. It keeps coming from almost every speaker over there who says, they do not understand the people of this province. I think it's tragic when our citizens are not given the credit to understand where we're at today.

Well, of course, it's tragic because the tremendous divisiveness caused by who, Mr. Speaker? - well the government opposite. And we have remarks of segregation, Sir. In our schools they're now being highlighted to some degree and we ask again the question, why?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the only aspect of the entire debate that is not tragic in my view is the fact that we on this side have chosen to be in line with 90 percent of our population, and to fight this government to every degree possible.

Why do the NDP, Sir, not believe, why do they not understand why the people will not accept today - and I stress that word "today" - their attempts to expand French Language Services in the manners in which they have suggested? Why do they not believe that, Sir? Well, they have chosen not to listen to the municipalities. I have, on other occasions, indicated and read a letter from my own municipality of the R.M. of Grey which has a considerable portion of French communities, French residents. Their resolution, Sir, indicated to the government that they not proceed. Sir, the NDP are responsible for the division that grasps us within this province.

We said earlier this summer, and we said it on many occasions, tell the people firstly what your intentions are, then bring in the resolutions, then bring in the statute or the proposed legislation, but tell the people of the province first. They chose not to heed that advice. They thought that they could sneak this whole issue through, because I suppose they believe that those of us on this side would fall into line quickly.

Well, Sir, we balked and we fought for time and we did so for good reason, because we have a strong understanding of what the makeup of the province is and what the people in this province want. So we fought for time. Today, of course, all Manitobans are asking us to continue the fight to the end and not to allow this government to proceed.

Sir, the members opposite accuse us of developing mistrust. They throw all the blame and the responsibility on our shoulders for creating this chaos. I suppose I could understand why to some degree they make that comment. We never developed the mistrust, but I can tell you as citizens of this province with our own histories peculiar to our own families and to our own areas have a certain mistrust. We are after all basic, ordinary citizens. We've seen the federal experience, and we have developed our own views upon it. So yes, we did harbour some mistrust, but building upon that was, of course, the tremendous drive and the tremendous energy by our constituents who asked us to continue and to give them time to more fully understand the situation and more fully fight this government.

In the examples that we've offered many times as to why our constituents are concerned as to the future for their children, and who will have the jobs, of course, has become critical, and we've expounded on those many times, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier, he appealed, he says, Manitobans want this - and I think his words were - issue resolved here. They want a made-in-Manitoba solution. Yes, Sir, they want it resolved here. They want it dropped right now. Hopefully, the members opposite will see the wisdom in accepting our hoist motion to drop this bill, to give the province and the people of the province time to more, in their view if they want to use their argument, fully understand the situation; in our view, just to cool down and to let us all again come down to the ground.

Mr. Speaker, we have been challenged by members opposite to speak to Bill 115. My Leader in his introductory remarks the other day spelled out quite clearly our concerns with Bill 115. Do we need Bill 115? Well, I suppose three years ago, I suppose nine months ago some would say that there was a need for a bill that would guarantee expanded rights, and probably that bill at that time would have proceeded. The NDP

said that we would have passed the bill in the summer. I think this is some of the comments that have come wafting across the floor, we would have passed the bill in the summer. Sir, I, for one, will never pass a bill that I have never seen, and I don't think there is a member on this side that would ever do that either.

Well, then they chastise us for not talking on the principle of the bills. Sir, I suppose I can support in principle, like I know many of my colleagues can, some guarantee by statute of some increase in French services but, Sir, I cannot support Bill 115. I suppose the best analogy was, and the Member for Pembina used it to some degree in his comments just offered, I could support in principle what Bill 3 attempted to do and that was to remove speculation in land. I could not support Bill 3. It was the wrong vehicle. It was the wrong instrument for what needed to be done. I would say the same thing about Bill 115. It is the wrong vehicle for guaranteeing expanded services.

Sir, I find the most interesting aspect of all the debates, whether it's been the referral motions in the summer or whether it's been the resolution over the last two months or Bill 115 over the last two weeks, has been some of the remarks offered by the Attorney-General. Of course, he chastises us. He says we do not understand. He says we do not understand where we're going. He says we lack political will. I think the point he is trying to make is that legislators have to at times step away from public opinion and use political will to direct the course of history in a way that would have people in his mind leading. Of course, Sir, what we know for sure is that the political will of the vast majority of people in this province is that this issue be dropped at this time.

Well tonight, Sir, I heard him make comment as to compromise. People on the other side are very upset that apparently, in their view at least, we refuse to walk one small step at all towards the compromise. We have offered a compromise, Sir, regarding the resolution. Have we heard the government address it? Not at all. We heard the Government House Leader extoll the virtue of that particular offering of ours on one day, and withdraw it a few days later.

Sir, compromise, there are some areas in which there can be no compromise, and our constituents en masse, in block, are asking us not to compromise at all on this issue.

Sir, we've heard this comment, the well of public opinion is poisoned, and it is. The number of calls that we're receiving as members on this side to not proceed, to not allow the government to proceed prevents us from supporting Bill 115 in its present form. Again we have spoken to that.

Where do we go from here, Sir? In my view, it's up to the government to take the lead, Sir, we can go nowhere from here. I ask them to drop Bill 115 and to support the hoist motion that's before us.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to speak very briefly on this Bill 115. Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell long on that because I know time is a big factor at

this hour of the morning, but I do want to speak just to indicate to the House and to the opposition the feeling of my people in the constituency of Portage la Prairie on this very important issue facing the province today, an issue where some 78 percent to 80 percent of the people have rejected time and time again their decision to support the French bilingual issue to the degree, Sir, that the government has finally decided now to force closure on this Assembly and to forbid any further discussion and debate by members of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, the government has misread the feeling of the majority of the people of Manitoba on this very important issue. The government did not have the mandate, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, they were not elected by the people of Manitoba, and they had not the mandate to go ahead and force this most important issue on the people of Manitoba at this time. The government did not have that mandate to force the issue. When we were government, we proceeded cautiously to the point where we felt we must go.

Mr. Speaker, why the Premier did not take note of the suggestions from this side of the House by my leader, by the Leader of the Opposition when he moved a six-month hoist to allow both sides of this Chamber to give the members time to cool off, as has been said before, to cool down and let's have some rational thinking on this very important issue at this time. Mr. Speaker, this once again has proven that the First Minister of this province has lost his full control of his Cabinet and caucus, and has let them lead him around actually by the nose, as the saying goes.

Mr. Speaker, two or three years down the road when the NDP Government gets up the courage to call an election, I can assure you, Sir, that three-quarters of the members on the government side will not be re-elected. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they have adopted the idea that they are God, that they do not have to account to the people for their actions. I could tell you, you are in for a big surprise when they believe that they're in that position, in that stead with the people of Manitoba; members like the Member for Springfield, our new House Leader, who has been rattling on, carrying on to the point that he has the mistrust of all members on this side of the House and, I can assure him, the people outside on streets of Winnipeg and Manitoba.

The Minister of Agriculture, he stood up this evening and he spoke about trying to cover up some of his misfortunes in his area. People don't drive in by the busload, they don't drive in by carloads and express their opinion in his office if they haven't got some concern. They will be taking and showing in great stead their feelings when it comes to the next election.

I want now, Mr. Speaker, just to mention the Attorney-General of this government that we have here today, the Member for Fort Rouge. You know, Mr. Speaker, at one time I said and vowed that when the time came up I was going to go out and I was going to work my little butt off to see that that man would not be elected once again to this Chamber. But, Sir, I have changed my thinking for one reason, that it would be dishonest to the young people of our province if I allowed him to go back to his old job and put hate in the minds of our young people in the University of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Keep him out of the classroom.

MR. L. HYDE: That's right. We must keep him out of the classroom. At least when we have him here, we have some control over him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, do these members that I have just referred to, and there are many others, do they think that the voters are going to forget? I suggest to you, Sir, no, they will not. Mr. Speaker, they will remember what we were forced with.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, a number of members on this side of the House wish to speak. I know we're running out of time. However, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister this afternoon made mention, Sir, of a letter that was written to the Editor of the Free Press and to the local paper of Portage la Prairie. It was a letter to the Editor, editorial page, January 9th, headed "P.C.'s lose members." Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that this Mr. André Bergeron who I am acquainted with, I'm sorry that he felt the way he did when he and his wife left our very successful meeting that night in Portage la Prairie, when they left and tore their card up. I am sorry that happened, but I can assure the Premier of this province, Sir, that for every member of our party, the Manitoba Conservative Party who tears their membership card up, there are 10 times more that they will be losing instead.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for my voice. I have had the misfortune, since the middle of November, to have been attacked by a virus and I can assure you that it's nothing to fool with. I have been a very uncomfortable man since that time early in mid-November. I might say that I wouldn't wish this here virus problem that I've had on anyone, even though I have dislike for the present House Leader and for the Attorney-General and a few more.

A MEMBER: Go and breathe on them.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that these people chose to act the way they did, but I can assure you, Mr. Premier, that for every one that we lost that you are probably losing 9 or 10 times as many.

I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, about an incident that I ran into the past weekend in Portage la Prairie where I had an opportunity to speak with a group of people. I know there's a number of them that did not support me in the last election and I can assure you right now, Mr. Speaker, these people that I referred to last weekend, they will not be supporting the NDP Party of Manitoba in the next election for the reason that they are fed up to the ears with the way the government has handled this here very important issue that we face and are dealing with tonight. That was probably No. 1; but No. 2, the determination, Mr. Speaker, of the NDP Government has on destroying the rights of the people of this province; third, the lack of positive leadership by the Premier and his Cabinet on issues pertaining to the economy of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we've requested the Premier and the members of this Cabinet to wind this up and let us get on and debate the most important issue, one of the

most important issues that is faced with the people of Manitoba, that being the economy of our country, especially, Sir, the immediate need of the farming community of Portage la Prairie and throughout the Province of Manitoba. We have problems that this government is not ready to act on, and I suggest to the Premier and to his Cabinet that they would do well to look into these problems as soon as they possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, the idea that this government chose to take and put closure on this bill that is before us tonight, why would they not give us the opportunity to express our full concerns? We know that we have the backing of the majority of the people in this province. Why did they take that privilege away from us? Well, I think it's evident to a lot of people that they know, Mr. Speaker, that they're beat when it comes to the next election. They know that they have no chance of forming another government in four or two or three years down the road - just whenever they should chose to have us go to the polls.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Three more minutes of drivel there.

MR. L. HYDE: That's right, we're waiting for the Minister of Finance to get up and pray his boss will allow him to get up to let us debate the next Budget that we're faced with and let us know where we're heading in the next year or two.

A MEMBER: We know where we're heading, down the tube.

A MEMBER: How about we deal with the payroll tax?

MR. L. HYDE: I did want to take now and express my displeasure that the Premier chose to bring to the attention of this House, that issue about the loss of memberships to the Portage Association. — (Interjection) — Well, that is right, that is, I would suggest is very small potatoes coming from a man who is supposed to be the Leader of our province.

Mr. Speaker, we know, as was stated by the Member for Charleswood this afternoon, if we have to face closure we will; but we know that 80 percent of the people of Manitoba believe in what we, the Conservative Party of Manitoba, stands for. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that is certainly the feeling of the people of my constituency of Portage la Prairie and I'm sure the majority in the province.

Mr. Speaker, just how much time have I got before me at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 16 minutes remaining.

MR. L. HYDE: I didn't quite get you, Sir?

A MEMBER: Sixteen minutes.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, I can't go 16 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that there's another speaker in the wings here wishing to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to enter the debate on the six-month hoist at this time to use up the 16 minutes that the Member for Portage la Prairie has left.

MR. H. ENNS: You have 30 minutes.

MR. D. BLAKE: I have 30.

MR. H. ENNS: You have 30 minutes. I want a good speaker - fire and brimstone.

MR. D. BLAKE: Well, Mr. Speaker, that shouldn't be any problem in filling in the 30 minutes on this particular debate, Mr. Speaker, because the motion to provide the six-month hoist on this resolution hasn't been come upon lightly. This was given a great deal of consideration and we felt that it was one opportunity to provide a cooling-off period to the people of Manitoba for this particular bill. As members before me have spoken on in the past, it's an unnecessary bill at this time. It's not going to come into effect until 1987. So we felt, Mr. Speaker, that the bill in the first place was unnecessary and for that reason the hoist was a necessary motion to bring in to provide us with a little bit of leeway.

Good, I've got a copy of the hoist motion now, Mr. Speaker. It's here in my notes somewhere, but the chronology leading up, that has been spoken to so many times this evening, I realize that the members have heard it time and time again, but we came into the House when the Attorney-General first announced that he had struck some kind of a deal with the SFM and the chap that was proceeding with a parking ticket and the Federal Government, that the case going before the Supreme Court was going to be withdrawn, and this was going to be a package that we would either accept or reject in totality.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what we've seen come before us over the last few months has been a watered-down version. It's been changed and adjusted. We've seen the Attorney-General who was piloting it through the House fluster and bluster and refuse to give us public hearings. He refused originally to go to public hearings and eventually was dragged kicking and screaming into it. Then the First Minister has the audacity to stand up today and say, they instituted public hearings. They were going to take this to the people. Mr. Speaker, I have never heard anything so ridiculous in my life as some of the statements made by members opposite.

An item that has been before this House for as long as this one has, that has had members on that side sit dumbfounded, stuck to their chairs for goodness knows how many days, then all of a sudden they get the bright idea they're going to bring in closure, and all of a sudden they're popping up like mushrooms all over the place. They all want to speak all of a sudden on the bill. We've finally smoked the First Minister out, the leader of this province, finally smoked him out this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I sat and waited and waited for some leadership on that side of the House. I thought that we would have had a little more than the Jobs Fund when we came back to debate the bill. We had great speeches on the Jobs Fund and they were announcing

goodies everyday. I picked up the paper today and there is a chap standing out on the corner of Sherbrook and Portage with a big sign, "I need a job." I'd like to know what the Jobs Fund has done for him. But that's what we heard when we came back to debate this motion. All we heard is the great wonderful things the Jobs Fund has done. Then taking up time in this House, Mr. Speaker, we have a great announcement of a bunch of heritage rivers, we're renaming a bunch of rivers or a new program. That was the big news one day.

Then another day we have a great announcement of big news. There were some housing statistics that came up, followed by an announcement that they were going to provide 10-percent mortgages. That was another big announcement. I think we had something from oil and gas. Well, we have lots of gas over there, we know that. We had an announcement from the Minister of Agriculture on how wonderful the Interest Rate Relief Program was working. But all of these things, Mr. Speaker, were leading up to the debate on the resolution and on the bill.

The members opposite make such a big thing out of the bells ringing for four days. They know very well why they were ringing. We were prepared to debate the resolution. We told them we were going to speak on the bill on Friday. They wouldn't allow us to speak on the resolution for three days and give our leader some time to prepare his notes properly so he could deal with it in the proper manner. It wasn't a 25-minute decision. No, that's why the bells rang. They shifted the responsibility. I should say they shifted the blame, not the responsibility, from the Member for Fort Rouge to the new member who said that he would never get a Cabinet post, that he would never be in the Cabinet post, that he would never be in the Cabinet, that he and the Premier didn't get along. Oh my, how we change our spots when we get a little bit of power handed to us, Mr. Speaker. My God, we become a little dictator inside of 48 hours and they slap closure on this House, the first time in 56 years. He's made his niche in history, Mr. Speaker. He'll go down in history, he might be a little infamous, but he'll go down in history as the House Leader who invoked closure.

What's all gone wrong with rules, Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure, because I thought the closure motion said we going to vote at two o'clock, but here we are still speaking and I don't know how long this is going on. I take it that I have 30 minutes, am I correct? I don't know who's going to get the floor after that, so I'm just not too sure on the ruling of when we're going to have the vote.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. BLAKE: I haven't got to the rotten things. I haven't gotten to the Natural Resources Department yet. I'll get to that in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources just advised me to talk about some rotten things. Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the hoist. Speaking of elk licences, if you have ever seen a hoist, the Minister of Natural Resources put such a hoist on the elk hunters of this province last month that it would really do your heart good to hear some of the stories around my area.

He couldn't fill up all of the licences with a draw, Mr. Speaker, so he threw a bunch on the open market. They're talking about shadows and doing things under the bushes. He did it under the bush. He laid out 125 licences on the open market, but he didn't tell anybody about it. I think they're all grabbed up by his friends or those who were on the inside and in the know. They walked in and bought their licences. But if he's planning on having a draw next year, Mr. Speaker, he's going to have a lot of licencing going wanting, because I don't think there are going to be too many applying for them.

But, Mr. Speaker, it's been said before the Member for Ste. Rose rambled on and on about the 1981 election and I just wanted to touch on that for a moment. — (Interjection) — The old rustler from Ste. Rose said that the election was in the bag, but he had finagled and he had pulled it out of the fire. He got his reward, Mr. Speaker. He was appointed Minister of Municipal Affairs. He'll stand up and say we went to the people. When we say the municipal people were opposed to the bill, they were opposed to the resolution, he will stand up and defend it and say, I went to all of the regional meetings, Mr. Speaker, I answered their concern, and I heard no concerns.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I represent a rural area. I was at some of those meetings and I know most of the reeves, and I'll tell you, you talk about a Charlie McCarthy show. If he hadn't of had his Deputy there to whisper an answer in his ear, he didn't answer their concerns. His appearance at those meetings was a joke, Mr. Speaker, absolute joke. So I don't want to hear the former Minister of Municipal Affairs stand up and say what a wonderful job he did hearing the concerns of the municipal people. He has heard them, he has heard them in the referendum, he has heard them in the resolutions that have been provided to this House on the opposition that they're facing on the track that they are on. It is wrong-headed, it is wrong, but he's not listening to them. The new Minister won't represent them, refuses to, has been asked by 27 or 37 municipalities. The Premier's been petitioned to resign, because he can't represent them, there's a conflict of interest.

If that's representing the people, Mr. Speaker, I am very, very surprised. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved a hoist on this resolution to give the people a little bit of time to cool off and allow that healing process to take in. Let's try and not set neighbor against neighbor, and friend against friend and let's get back to the Manitoba that we know, where those of French ancestry can have their culture and live in harmony with their neighbors, whatever their culture may be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

In accordance with our Rule 37, we're required to put the necessary questions to the House. The question before the House is the proposed amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the main motion. Do you wish it read?

It is moved that Bill No. 115, An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act be not now read a second time, but read this day six months hence.

Those in favour of the motion, please say Aye. Those opposed, please say Nay. In my opinion, the Nays have it and I declare the motion lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please, order please.

The question before the House is the proposed amendment to Bill No. 115.

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

YEAS

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

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyley, Fox, Harapiak, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas 22, Nays 29.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is accordingly lost.

The question now before the House is shall Bill 115 be read a second time.

Those in favour, please say Aye. Those opposed please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. That means particularly the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

The question before the House is shall Bill 115 be read a second time.

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

YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyley, Fox, Harapiak, Hemphill, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 29; Nays 22.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that at a subsequent sitting of the House immediately

before the order of the day is called for resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Attorney-General respecting the proposed amendment to The Manitoba Act and on any amendments proposed thereto, I will move that debate shall not be further adjourned. For the benefit of honourable members, the effect of adoption . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Unbelievable.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . of this motion when moved and passed will be that debate will proceed under Rule 37.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Such a motion is not necessary. We have reached the time of adjournment. This House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow.