



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 184 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 16-27 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 16-27 February, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for leave to make a short non-political statement. (Agreed)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that all the members of the House, as well as indeed all Manitobans, would like to join me in congratulating Mr. Gaetan Boucher, who won a gold medal in the 1500-metre speedskating, and this is to add to the gold medal that he won a few days ago in the 1000 metres, and of course, the bronze in the 500.

This is a record indeed. He's the first one to win a third medal with his two golds, and he participated, I think, in his third Olympics and he won a silver in 1980. I understand that he will take up bicycle racing seriously and he might be back.

Again, for all Manitobans, all the members of the House, we'd like to congratulate him and tell him how proud we are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members of the opposition we're delighted to participate in the congratulations and words of encouragement that have been uttered by the Minister of Health to Mr. Boucher on his marvellous achievement.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 50 students of grade 6 standing from the Niverville Elementary School. They are under the direction of Mr. Klassen. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Jobs Fund

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. In view of the recent information to the effect that the jobs that are being created under the aegis of the Jobs Fund are costing the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba \$10,000 per job; is it the government's intention to change the focus of job creation activities off the public sector where it appears to be very costly and results in only short-term job creation for the most part and onto the stimulation of the private sector where we can have some real long-term, positive effects for our province at less cost to the taxpayer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's well known that the Manitoba Jobs Fund has had a significant impact on the situation with respect to unemployment in the Province of Manitoba. The recent statistics indicate that Manitoba, in areas of employment creation and in unemployment, is amongst the highest and the best of those indicators of any provinces in all of Canada. So while we're still concerned about the level of unemployment in the province, it is certainly indicated by those statistics that the Jobs Fund has had a significant impact on the rate of unemployment in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, with 46,000 Manitobans still unemployed, I'm not sure that many Manitobans agree with the statement. But my question, Sir, is to the Premier; when did he relinquish responsibility for the Jobs Fund to his colleague, the Minister of Culture?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, quite some time ago. But if the honourable Leader of the Opposition would like me now to speak about the Jobs Fund I would be delighted to do so. I would encourage the Leader of the Opposition to ask me some questions specifically.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I wouldn't want to in any way bend the Rules of the House because we want to keep our questions to those things that are within the competence of the Minister responsible.

Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. In view of the fact that these expensive jobs that have been created with taxpayer dollars have lasted on average only three months; will the government now admit that its efforts in this regard have been a failure and start working towards the attraction of long-term investment, long-term private sector capital investment, and start working on efforts to stimulate the private sector so that we'll have some positive effects and not just use taxpayers' dollars for the short-term, make-work endeavours of the Jobs Fund?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'm not quite certain where the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Tuxedo, has been for the last while — (Interjection) — but the kinds of things he's talking about - someone said he's busy on the campaign trail - but that's precisely the kind of activity this government has been concerned about, that this government has been moving on with respect to job creation in the province. We would see a greater focus on working co-operatively with the private sector with respect to job creation, but to suggest quite simply that the job creation activities of this government, the Manitoba Jobs Fund, have been strictly of the so-called make-work nature does injustice to the truth. The facts of the matter are that there has been significant input and involvement from the private sector through a number of the Jobs Fund programs and it has had impact with respect to a number of businesses in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. In view of the fact that information is that the jobs created by the Jobs Fund cost \$950 per week to create, would the government now stop fighting the private sector with measures like the 1.5 percent payroll tax, the 53 percent increase in Workers Compensation, and using their tax dollars to create these jobs that cost \$950 per week and instead, turn their efforts to encouraging and stimulating private investment and the creation of real jobs in this province?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The member quotes figures with respect to job creation. I guess one of the problems has been the manner in which we've portrayed the amount of jobs that have been created through the Jobs Fund and what we've done, Mr. Speaker, is indicate those jobs that were created directly as a result of the Jobs Fund projects. We did not include in that any of the spinoff jobs that were created through the purchasing materials, through other benefits that have accrued through doing business on Jobs Fund projects.

We intend to continue to tackle what we feel is the most important task facing this government, and that is to continue to work to improve the situation with job creation, economic development in the Province of Manitoba because as I said earlier, the level of unemployment, while it is decreasing in the Province of Manitoba and while it is in a relative position better than most other provinces in the country, for this government it is still unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, and we continue to work in that regard.

In response to an earlier comment, the member also indicated that no one in Manitoba would agree with that statement. I suggest that he contact and discuss that with some people in communities like Deloraine who have written to us, and indicated that they are pleased with the work that the Jobs Fund is doing; from Carman; from the City of Flin Flon; from Morden and other communities that have written to us and said that yes, the Jobs Fund is working, that they're providing in some cases much-needed community infrastructure in those communities, and more importantly, jobs in those communities. So Manitobans are appreciating the interest in the Jobs Fund, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba's place in Confederation

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister and it has to do with the publication entitled, "Canadian Legislatures, a 1983 Comparative Study", and it's accompanied by a very fine photograph of the Premier - at least he photographs well.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is, in view of the fact that the Premier is quoted in this publication as saying: "Manitoba used to be a significant province in Confederation," will he then call an election and step down so that Manitobans can elect a new government which will once again restore Manitoba to a significant place in Confederation and restore confidence in our province, and a positive outlook for all of Canada on a national basis, so that people know that Manitoba is indeed, and can indeed once more be a good place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there was a period of time from 1977 through to 1981 in which Manitoba was relative performance-wise to other provinces in this country, was losing its significance as a provincial jurisdiction. It was losing its position relative to other provinces by way of most important economic indicators.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I was disappointed as a Manitoban during that period of time, as I believe were the vast majority of Manitobans, that we were slipping in our position in relationship to other provinces, including provinces like New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and other parts of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that indeed under this administration during the past two years - and that's the context of the statement - we are returning Manitoba to its rightful position within Confederation. We are returning this province to a position of economic relative importance, of social importance, of good quality care in respect to education and health facilities and, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in . . .

A MEMBER: No, you're doing that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . and most important, been judged by others from outside this province by the fact that our population increased by some 12,000 last year, the largest increase that has taken place in the Province of Manitoba in 20 years.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister's comments that Manitoba used to be a very significant province in Confederation came two years after his government assumed office, and in view of the fact that in that two-year period of time private capital investment in Manitoba declined to a greater extent than in any other province in this country, and also manufacturing output declined to a greater extent than other provinces in this country, were his comments designed to make Manitobans or others feel

good about our province and good about our opportunities when he speaks in these negative terms about his own government's abject failures?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let the Honourable Leader of the Opposition not misunderstand or purposely misunderstand the period, from 1977-1981 I've already dealt with including the unfortunate performance by the former head of the previous government in this province at constitutional conferences in which he fought to the end against the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights for Canadians in the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Leader of the Opposition what province led the national average by way of housing starts last year by four times? What province enjoyed an increase in population of 12,000, the largest such increase in 20 years? What province saw such a large increase by the number that were employed last month compared to a month a year earlier, 19,000? What province had 9,000 additional workers in its work force, Mr. Speaker? Yes, this government is indeed returning this province to an important and rightful position within Confederation, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, with the co-operation, with the assistance of Manitobans, whether it be in the North, whether it be in rural areas, or whether it be in the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba is taking its lead again as a province in the forefront of all other provinces in this country.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I ask this First Minister what province has had more than 20,000 more unemployed today than it did two years ago when his government was first elected; which province has had to impose a 1.5 percent payroll tax on job creation in this province; which province has had to increase its sales tax by 1 percent; which province has had a drop in its credit rating? Which province am I speaking of now, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I am saddened by the complete and total lack of information that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is possessed of. I simply refer the Leader of the Opposition to the Budgets that have been brought down in the past two years by other administrations. I refer the Leader of the Opposition to major tax increases that have taken place in other provincial jurisdictions. I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the hefty, sharp and often cruel increases in per diem fees on health care. — (Interjection) —

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says what about Manitoba. Then why, Mr. Speaker, did he rise in his place but a few moments ago and ask about other provincial jurisdictions? If it is getting too hot for the Leader of the Opposition, then let him acknowledge it is getting too hot for the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to credit ratings of other provinces such as British Columbia and Nova Scotia and other jurisdictions in this province during the last - and Quebec - in the last two years? Mr. Speaker, what provinces have done as well in relative provincial performance in respect to employment than has the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, is there another province that has done better by way of housing

starts, has done better by way of creation of additional employment?

Mr. Speaker, I must admit at times I become frustrated because this is a government of doers on this side. We don't hear any constructive proposals from honourable members across the way. We have an opposition of knockers. Let them continue to knock. We are a government of doers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. May I remind honourable members that we are in Oral Questions, and the latter statements have become more or less debate rather than questions. May I ask all members to respect the item which we are now in, which is Oral Questions?

K-Cycle Engines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In pursuit of action and initiatives by doers, I wonder if I could address a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Technology and follow up on some questions that he took as notice the other day relative to the K-Cycle Engine situation, and ask him, Sir, whether he has received any information or any response as yet from the Federal Government as to what it might be prepared to do vis-a-vis the K-Cycle's problem and vis-a-vis the pressure being exerted on K-Cycle Engines by the Federal Business Development Bank?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have not received any reply to the telex that I sent to the Federal Minister. Once I receive that information and that reply, I'll share it with the honourable member.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether he has received any indication, information or confirmation that, as current reports have it, the debenture at K-Cycle is to be sold to two other purchasers other than those principals who have heretofore been associated with K-Cycle?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't received any further information with respect to that other than that which has been reported in the media. As I indicated, there is a difficulty in our staff receiving information from the Federal Business Development Bank because of their concern, as I understand it, over confidentiality of matters of a commercial nature.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, in the same subject area, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and ask him whether some steps or action is contemplated or has been taken to apprise the 2,100 minority shareholders in K-Cycle Engines fully of the current situation and also to advise them of what may be done or is being done to protect their positions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I wish to thank the Member for Fort Garry for that question, because it does give me an opportunity perhaps to, in this way, respond to the question so that it might be brought to the attention of the shareholders.

I think the shareholders are not without remedy. The debenture holder, in a case such as this, does have a common-law duty with respect to all interests including those who hold equity in one form or another and cannot act carelessly or negligently in the dealing with that debenture, although of course they have the primary right to attempt to realize on that debenture in the best possible way.

There has to be, one would expect at a minimum, an attempt at least to accurately evaluate the worth of that debenture. Certainly one would expect that the value of the patents alone are such as to raise some question about the reported value that is being placed by either the debenture holder or receiver acting for the debenture holder on those assets.

The only other thing that I would note, but it can only be noted at this stage as a matter of concern, is that as reported, and that may not necessarily be the case, the purported sale or intended sale of the debenture is to two persons; one of whom was an undischarged bankrupt, and if still an undischarged bankrupt, it raises serious questions about whether or not that person in fact can be the purchaser of the debenture. So the common shareholders, I hope, would seek recourse through legal counsel.

Unfortunately, there's no legislation which would permit this government to intervene as a government. If there was, we would be glad to do so.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information and conclude my line of questioning on this subject area with one further supplementary, Sir, and that is to ask him whether there is a possibility of obtaining an injunction against sale of the debenture at the present time, until the discussions with the Federal Government and the Federal Business Development Bank are concluded, with a view to protecting the technical and developmental expertise that has accrued thus far at K-Cycle, with a view to protecting that expertise and insuring that it is neither lost nor exported out of the province?

HON. R. PENNER: In responding to the question, I have to be very careful here not to be seen as attempting to give legal advice in an area that is, at this juncture, primarily one of civil action. I can only answer therefore by generalization; namely, that where an action such as that apparently contemplated could, if carried out, do irreparable damage to an individual or a group of individuals that is normally the field in which an injunction can be obtained.

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was posing some questions that appear to indicate that he had not been informed of some important information,

I'd like to table, just so we can ensure that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a chance to read the background information that was tabled by the Honourable Minister of Finance, re the pre-Budget consultations.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I'd just like to inform the Premier that that was tabled by the Minister of Finance a few days ago. He may not have been aware of it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd Bilingualism in Manitoba

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

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago the Leader of the Opposition released a poll which was then commented on by the House Leader. I wanted to direct a question to the House Leader and ask him what the basis of his objection to the Conservative poll was? Was it the methods and techniques of the survey or was it the results, which indicated that 76 percent of the people of Manitoba were opposed to the government measure? Was that his objection that that figure was too low and should have been 86 or 96 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member should restrict his remarks to seeking information which is in the administrative jurisdiction of the Treasury Bench.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Perhaps he could rephrase that because I really would like to answer him.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then like to ask a question of the First Minister, who has made a number of statements both inside the House and outside the House on the question of free vote. I really would like him to clarify precisely what he means.

Can he indicate whether by a free vote he means that each and every member is free to vote as they please on the basis of what they believe, or is he now defining or redefining free vote as meaning that the government cannot force any particular member to support the government, and if they break ranks, then the government cannot coerce them. Can he give us a definition of free vote?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Honourable Member for Elmwood can do whatever he wishes.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister's position as follows - I

ask him again, because he has expressed his view - does he define a "free vote" in terms of the fact that on any government matter, any question of confidence, the government cannot coerce every member to vote the way they wish and that therefore, by free vote, he simply meant that an individual member might not vote with the government even on a matter of confidence.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I dealt with that question several times already, but I would not want to leave the Honourable Member for Elmwood with any impression that anyone on this side of the Chamber requires any coercion. Everyone knows where they are going in respect to this subject. The Honourable Member for Elmwood may still be having some problem but that is his problem, not our problem.

MPIC - customer complaints

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

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

In view of the large number of complaints about the delays in settlement of claims, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House if he has given the Corporation any direction in settling claims with a little more dispatch than has been the case in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not prepared to accept the assumption that the Member for Minnedosa has just made. As a matter of fact, following the comments that were made in the media last week, I did ask for a report from MPIC particularly with the allegations made by a number of Winnipeg solicitors. I was informed that a review of MPIC files reveals that, of about 9,000 injury claims settled during the past year, only eight resulted in trials.

They have also checked the number of writs issued and find that in 1983 there were something like 1,274 as opposed to 1,461 in 1982 which in fact demonstrates there is a decrease in the extent of litigation.

I have not any great number of complaints about delays in settlement of claims. Invariably, when I do follow up letters of complaints from complainants, I find that in most occasions it is because there has been a delay in receiving some information, whether it be from the medical profession, or there has been a delay on the part of the solicitor for the claimant.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if the Minister might advise the House, Mr. Speaker, what is the average time for settlement of claims in Autopac?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I didn't request that specific information. That would be very difficult to answer because every claim is quite unique and some are certainly much more complex than others.

MR. D. BLAKE: That is straightforward and easy to understand, but I wonder if the Minister might take

that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, and get that information for the House. I am sure he could come up with an average time for settlements of claims.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, I will gladly take that as notice and bring the answer back to the House.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Government House Leader, in view of the new Tory polling information, is the government analyzing those results and do they in any way influence the government's position on the issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question from the Honourable Member for Wolseley. The government has examined the information provided to the House by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Going beyond the information that was provided to the House was not something that was easily done, and trying to analyze the information provided to five out of six numbered questions - the first question didn't appear - was not considered warranted for several reasons, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the member's question, we have not done that analysis because a preliminary review of the information provided indicated that there was absolutely no reason to consider it reliable.

Those were three in number initially; the first one being the sample size. The Member for Sturgeon Creek, having some knowledge of marketing, should be aware of that. The second, Mr. Speaker, no reputable polling organization would predict any reliability in a sample size of the size tabled by the Member for Tuxedo, particularly the cell sizes projected on a gross basis, 335, would have a large sampling error, but the cell sizes which he presented to the House being well below that, the rural size being 110, the sample of error is beyond anything that would be considered reliable.

But, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, the wording of the question, particularly the first question, talked about a non-existent plan to "entrench French," and members opposite have agreed that that is not what is proposed, and the question itself.

Mr. Speaker, the third point is that in the sample itself, in the answers to Question 6, if we assumed any reliability to the data . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: I raise a question of order, Mr. Speaker. I understood the question from the Member for Wolseley clearly. The question was whether or not the government has made an analysis of the poll. The answer is yes or no, Mr. Speaker. It is out of order then to proceed to deliver himself of an analysis of that poll. That is another question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I would like an answer to that question, and I think the answer would not be that long if the Honourable Minister did not have so many interruptions from the opposition who do not want an answer to that question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member finished his answer?

HON. A. ANSTETT: I just have one other point, Mr. Speaker. I said there were three points: sample size, questionnaire design and third, Mr. Speaker, by its own admission in Item 6, an unrepresentative sample both in terms of age distribution, sex distribution and 1981 vote distribution, none of them being in conformity with the distributions that obtain in the real population and in fact in two instances being the exact reverse. Mr. Speaker, the sample on that basis is totally unrepresentative. I could go on in terms of the questionnaire design. I won't do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the honourable member's question is that the government did not analyze the poll results because on our analysis of the conduct of the survey, it was not worthy of analysis.

Mantario Rally

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he received an invitation from the Eastern Manitoba Tourist Association to attend the Mantario rally this coming Sunday and, if so, whether he's planning to attend that rally.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I have invitations from time-to-time to attend various functions. Some of those attendances are required by arrangements that I try to make.

I am trying, for example, to confirm arrangements with Her Majesty's Official Opposition in this House so I can attend in Ottawa on Monday, on official business. I'm advised that there's some difficulty in doing that because the honourable members refuse to pair.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: So, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me and my colleagues to commit ourselves to any specifics outside of this House because of the intransigence of Her Majesty's Official Opposition.

Mining industry study

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, that actually was not what I asked him initially. I asked him whether he was planning to attend a function in Manitoba where there

are going to be 1,400 people and he goes on a tirade about Ottawa.

Further to the same Minister. According to this government's Summary Report, dated August, 1983, the Whiteshell Master Plan on Page 6 of that report states, "Proposals for the development of mineral resources will only be approved when it can be demonstrated that the benefits far exceed potential loss of inherent values in the zone."

Will the Minister please inform us as to how one would determine whether the benefits of developing mineral resources is more important than loss of wildlife and natural resources in that same zone?

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, within the master planning process, we have taken into consideration economic development and, as the honourable knows, we have considered the needs of the areas of natural resource activity, including trapping, forestry and mining and the harvest of wild rice and we are assured that these developments can continue in an organized but in a planned fashion and not take away from the utility of the park.

As a matter of fact, there is economic activity in the nature of a potential mine development in the Whiteshell that is under consideration at the present time.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister, the Whiteshell Master Plan Report on Page 6 goes on to say, "The development of all-weather roads will not be permitted in the Mantario wilderness zone." Can the Minister please inform us how construction equipment can carry out mining of resources in that zone if all-weather roads are not permitted?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the Mantario wilderness zone, we are assured by our Mines Branch that there is more likely any great potential for mineral activity in that area; and that information was taken into consideration when the classification of the zoning was made.

However, as the plan indicates, if there is significant mineral potential, then there will be consideration of that question. It is certainly not anticipated that it will be a problem.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Government House Leader. In view of the fact that obviously very shortly closure will be imposed upon the House and there will only be one further day of debate with respect to the government resolution and in view of the concerns expressed on this side of the House with respect to Section 23.1, could the Government House Leader indicate whether he will be proposing any amendments to the wording contained in his present amendment to Section 23.1?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Clearly the member anticipates the results of several votes which have to be held in this House.

I do not presume to anticipate those results. If and when they are held, then the debate that is scheduled will proceed. I do not even make the assumption that it will proceed with a time allocation, although I certainly have, in numerous offers to members opposite, tried to find an accommodation on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose, nor do I think it would be appropriate on the floor of this House, to try to discuss with the member the substance of any proposed amendments or changes that the member wishes with regard to 23.1 or any other section. I have made numerous offers to members opposite to engage in those kinds of discussions since the first week of December. Every single one has been rebuffed. Now, at what the member opposite calls the eleventh hour, he finally seems concerned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if he's concerned, let's sit down and talk about it, but I've been waiting since the first week of December.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, without assuming how the government's motions to have the question put, etc., will be decided, will the Government House Leader just indicate whether or not he will be proposing any amendments to Section 23.1 under his present proposal? Will he be suggesting any further amendments, in view of the concerns expressed on this side of the House?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe I did answer that question. If the member has specific concerns with regard to 23.1, I would be happy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . Mr. Speaker, when the Member for St. Norbert can control his House Leader, I'll try to answer his question.

At this point, we have not even heard, in terms of an amendment, the position of the opposition with regard to Section 23.1. Instead, what we have is a suggestion that the whole clause be wiped out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is their position, then that is the question before the House at this time and after that question is dealt with, the question of any further subamendments will be dealt with. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of those is appropriate at the appropriate time in debate and it's not appropriate for those kinds of policy announcements to be made during question period.

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

HANSARD CORRECTION

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

MR. G. FILMON: . . . the right-hand side of the page, Sir, there is a whole section that is attributed to me. It occurs in the middle of the speech of the Member for Turtle Mountain. I believe, Sir, it should rightly be attributed to him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable member for that correction.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, and the motion pertaining thereto by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Member for Emerson has 27 minutes remaining.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it a bit unfortunate possibly that my remarks have to be split in two. I started making my remarks yesterday and after 13 minutes the House adjourned and as a result, what happens in a case like that is you maybe disrupt your train of thought to some degree. I would like to maybe repeat some of the remarks that I put on the record yesterday and indicate that giving it some thought over last night, it is with sadness that actually I stand here today and wind up the debate on this question. It's very unfortunate - I think it is historic - it's also very unfortunate that it should have to end this way, that after my remarks have been concluded today that we will have no alternative but to vote on an issue I think that is, as indicated yesterday, the most dramatic that we've experienced in this House ever, possibly ever will again.

I'm trying to establish why there was such a problem in dealing with this yesterday. One of the comments I made was "What a tangled web they weave when first they practice to deceive," and established to some degree the deception of this government from the time that they got elected. They got elected on false promises, and from that time on have continued to move in that direction of breaking their faith with the people of Manitoba, and one issue after the next, from the issue of promising a turnaround in economics, which was beyond their control, but they promised that. From there on, the thing has been going from bad to worse.

They've done the same thing with the language issue. The deception, from the time that this resolution was introduced in this House, they have had to change and change and squirm in their position time and time again. If we had stood and let it be passed the way it was introduced, as I indicated last time, the damage would have been done. Except for the alertness of the opposition to catch exactly what was happening, that is why we're still here today. The Member for Charleswood indicated that this government has already swung almost 170 degrees from where they were initially. It has indicated exactly what has happened; that they did not know what they were presenting; they still do to this day, I do not think, know necessarily what they're presenting and have created major problems and concerns. They've created concerns in the eyes of Manitobans.

The question they asked just this morning as I was leaving home to come in, they said, certainly this government must realize that 70-80 percent of the people are opposed to what they're bringing forward. If that is the case and the government knows that - they made fun about the poll that our Leader presented to them the other day and they already today issued a release under the New Democratic Party caucus heading, trying to tear apart that poll; always on the negative; always trying to destroy, never listening.

The people don't trust this government anymore. They say, why if this government knows that that many people

are against them and against this proposal, why are they pushing forward on it? They hold you suspect, they hold this government suspect. They say, did they make a private deal? There must be money involved through the back door somewhere. I'm not saying there is, but in the eyes of the public there is something why this government would force ahead against the kind of opposition that has come forward, why they would push ahead and try and bring this onto the heads of the people of Manitoba. There are many concerns out there, many concerns that were not there six months ago because people didn't realize at that time.

I have to compliment the Attorney-General. He's the one that initially brought this forward and very few people realized what he was bringing forward. It took a lot of flack and heat. Then, when we finally took them, made them, dragged them screaming and struggling down to have hearings, and then during the hearings, we had an interim while they were doing an assessment on the thing, they tried to play political games while we were having our leadership, and the Attorney-General, the instigator of the whole problem got himself removed from the scene. You have to compliment him, that is shrewdness.

Instead, what have we got? We got a young upstart there who compromises principles for anything, just to be there. The Attorney-General has been removed from the scene of criticism. I want to compliment him, he's looking well and fit ever since he's been removed. I think the little break that he had probably had some bearing on it as well. I was fortunate to have the same thing.

One of the things that it has created now in the minds of the people of Manitoba is mistrust. I said this yesterday, there's mistrust of this Premier and his government because they've broken their word too often; they've compromised themselves too often. The people don't trust them. No matter what you do at this stage of the game, the people of Manitoba do not trust this government anymore and will not for years to come.

I've had, Mr. Speaker, people come to me in the streets of my little town and say, if this goes through - knowing full well that it's getting towards the latter days of the debate because closure is being put on us - people have come up and said, if this goes through, do we have to learn French?

You know, it's funny but many people don't understand what it is all about, they don't understand. They say, if this government passes it do we have to learn French, do we have to have all our things in bilingual language, French and English? People are concerned. Our senior citizens do not know the workings of this House, they do not necessarily understand the workings of this House, but the conception left . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . by this government, a government that has continually broken and compromised its position on this issue from the time that it was presented.

The original resolution actually is a shambles by way of amendments. Now, granted that they have a

packaged it into a bill and removing some of the aspects of it out of the enshrinement aspect of it. They are creating a problem and one almost has to agree with some of the concerns expressed. Why would they pursue and push forward on an issue - remember, it wasn't that long ago when we had a deadline of December 31st. Remember in August when we debated, they said we have to have this in Ottawa before December 31st.

Then we compromised when it looked like it couldn't happen and they said, well, by January 5th at the latest. Here we are, February 16th; there are no deadlines any more. Why do they want to push ahead at this stage of the game?

I think the majority of the members across the House, if they followed their heart and their minds, would like to have this issue out of the way and not have to vote on it. The majority of them feel uncomfortable with it, but they haven't got the intestinal fortitude to stand up and fight against a few people who are pushing it. A few individuals are creating the problems right now; everybody's uncomfortable.

The majority of people in Manitoba are putting the heat and I think the Premier - he can yell from his seat if he likes - he is a weak Premier because if he was a strong individual, a principled individual, we would not be in this position and neither would the people of Manitoba. He has not got the intestinal fortitude to lead his party properly.

There's only a few individuals there that really want this issue. I could go through the members one by one and it shows how they feel about it. It shows by the fact that you refuse to debate this issue; it shows by the fact that you have promoted closure on this issue. Why closure on a thing that is so fundamentally important as a constitutional change? Why closure?

Mr. Speaker, on January 14th in the paper, "Tories ready to compromise on language bill." That's a month ago. It appeared, according to the minds of the government at that time, that we were making progress. Why the need for closure? There's so many things, when we come to the conclusion of this performance here in this House on this issue before us right now that a person would like to - like our leader spoke the other day, and very capably so for four hours - there's so many things that come to mind that a person would want to present.

Our arguments have been logical, presented one after another. You would think that the quality of debate after all this time would maybe be sagging on our side; it is not. It has been improving, but there has been no debate coming from the members from the government side to defend their position. The odd individual we've been able to sort of coax, tease into getting up for five or ten minutes and speaking, the odd one, but the majority of them are not comfortable to even defend their position because they know they're wrong.

Mr. Speaker, there's been so much ink spent on this in terms of our Hansard, in terms of the papers, not just in Manitoba, across the country. When I had the opportunity to be on holidays for awhile, even in Honolulu they were highlighting this issue here - they were. So it has been receiving so much attention and somehow this government is not listening. This is the government that got elected because they would listen to people. They've illustrated how they're listening.

Concern has been expressed about ringing of the bells and I want to come back to the suggestion by our House Leader the other day: why don't we adjourn for two weeks, everybody go home, cool off things here a little bit and let every one of us go out and talk to our people and gather a consensus?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The Member for The Pas is quite vocal about saying, yes, we should do that. Many of the members opposite have been hiding in this House. They don't want to go out to their constituencies and get a consensus from their people because they already know. If this government felt they were on the right track for one minute, they would be doing their own polling. If they have done their polling, they're not letting us know the results and certainly an issue of this magnitude would be worth polling. A government would poll on anything less than that. I know the Premier polled on seat belts. They polled on everything else. Why would they not poll on the most important issue, Mr. Speaker? I think they might have, but they know they're wrong.

Why then would they not go back, take an adjournment for two weeks? There's an old saying that goes - maybe somebody can help me with this - "It takes a wise man to admit he's wrong." Would they ever admit that they'd made a mistake with this issue? They have grudgingly made amendments and admitted that they were wrong. Why not continue a little further? In some of the speeches that have taken place it has been indicated that we're close to consensus. The House Leader - such as he is, and I have very very strong concerns about his ability - has indicated that we're relatively close to arriving at a consensus.

The Member for Turtle Mountain the other day said we're not that far apart. Remove 23.1 and we've got ourselves a ball game. We'll accept all the rest of it; and all these concerns have been raised by the members opposite somewhere along the line with the few that have spoken. Why? Why will they not speak? Why will they not speak and defend their position? The ones that have gotten up and spoken - the Member for St. Johns spoke about all kinds of divine guidance that he got, in his speech; the Member for Ste. Rose says the falling of this country is in our hands if we oppose this. Stupid, stupid statements! That is the defence we've gotten. Who on the front bench, of any magnitude, has spoken?

Just to illustrate the fact that there's uneasiness there, we see that by what happened yesterday when the Minister of Agriculture signed a document trying to weasel out of the pressure from the municipal people, and every one of them is getting that kind of pressure; and you have the options, you can do it. Are you just an arrogant, conceited government who doesn't care or is there really a payoff behind the scenes? I don't know. The Attorney-General is the one that initially has been involved in all these deals. He should know whether there's been a payoff or not. I don't know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member should choose his words with care to ensure that he does not impute motives to other members of the House.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will heed your warning. What I'm doing though is illustrating some of the concerns that are being expressed to me and I don't want to impute motives on the Attorney-General, but the thought is there for the people of Manitoba; the thought is there.

Mr. Speaker, if there's some concern about what the people of Manitoba think, I have reams of material here, reams of material here that was forwarded initially way back last spring when we started off. I even had one here with a picture of a person that looked very unusual, unless he's aged that much since that time, a picture of our Premier. It's signed by him at least, a very youthful looking picture. It certainly doesn't do any justice to him the way he looks right now. I don't know whether this issue itself has created that many problems for him but from that time on, when they forwarded this kind of material, when they did the propaganda pitch, and since that time the compromises that they've made - Mr. Speaker, if you feel that I'm getting a little close with my language in terms of making accusations, there is reason for that, because there has been a major deception going on for the people in Manitoba by this government. There has, and they cannot deny that and they feel uncomfortable.

The Minister of Finance feels uncomfortable. The Attorney-General, as I indicated, he's very lucky. He's out from under the hot box right now, the hot seat.

He's the one that has instigated all this and has created the doubt in people's minds. No matter what you do at this stage of the game, this is going to hang over your heads, not just this year, not just in the next election, but for many years to come.

A MEMBER: A long time.

A MEMBER: You bet.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A long time, because I doubt if in our time whether there will ever be the opportunity to change the Constitution again. This is history in the making. I wish that we were not in a position where we had to do it under these conditions. Why can't there be a compromise arrived at? Why can't we arrive at some compromise? They do not listen to what the desires or the wishes of the people are. Are you as government saying that you know better than everybody else? That was the attitude of the Attorney-General at one time - people don't understand - but I know best what's best for Manitoba. That is the Premier out there.

Now they're fighting a rear-guard action. Everytime we suggest something, they attack the individual. They attack the poll that our leader presented the other day and it's surprising how they attacked that; that it does not qualify; that it's a biased thing. The sample is much smaller than was ever advised for a poll which seeks reliable information about Manitobans and seriously overrepresents two groups who seemed particularly hostile in October surveys. As if the polling organization would take and pick on males, specifically, or senior citizens.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that they have done a poll. I suspect they've done a poll because even during the

seat belt and helmet legislation they did a poll that indicated that so many people were in favour or against. With an issue of this magnitude they will not have done a poll? I cannot accept that. I cannot accept that.

They have done a poll and that is why there's discomfort on their side. That is why there's tremendous discomfort on their side.

A MEMBER: It just confirms ours, that's all. It confirms ours, Albert.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It is an embarrassment. It's an embarrassment to the opposition as well as to the government because some of the people don't understand what this ringing of the bells is all about.

Do you know how I explain it? We're ringing them for freedom. We're ringing them for freedom and for the democratic system. There's one individual, a conceited, arrogant individual, that I consider deceitful and on the principle of Judas who would sell anything, do anything for his personal gain of this House; the House Leader would do anything for personal gain in this House. I just indicated that I felt our House Leader was arrogant, conceited, that he was an unprincipled individual.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . because of the way that he's dealing with this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I heard the honourable member say that another member of this House would do anything for personal gain. That is surely unparliamentary and the honourable member should withdraw those words.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw those remarks because they are unparliamentary. There are other adjectives also that I would like to use that are unparliamentary and I cannot use so I will refrain from that.

But I feel very strongly about the way the Rules of the House do not allow us to always speak the things that we'd like to say in this House and that is how strongly I feel about the House Leader that is running this thing. The people opposite, most of them know, they do not believe what he is doing but they allow this individual because a few individuals have the strength to run their caucus, that is why we're in this kind of a situation right now.

It is with sadness and with pain that I have to stand here and make those kind of statements. I do that because the majority of the people of Manitoba feel the same way about that. That is why we're having the fight on the issues that we have before us, Mr. Speaker.

I don't like to get involved in those kind of issues really, but the individual has prompted that kind of action because most of the members opposite don't feel that way. It is one individual that is running this show and it is because we have a Premier who is a weak Premier, who will not stand up and do what the people of Manitoba want. That is why the request that's been made many times, has been to call an election. Let's resolve it once and for all.

It is acrimonious. Things are not functioning properly in this House and will not as long as this government is there. Let them call an election. Let them call an election. The people of Manitoba are asking for an election. The issue is serious enough. They've tried to camouflage it and run from everything under the sun. They do not respect the people of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — They do not.

If I have made some statements, Mr. Speaker, that are very marginal, I feel very strongly on this issue and many people do. That is why I say, go home, let's adjourn this House for two weeks. Go home, talk to your people. Don't hide in this House here. Very few of you are getting out there and getting the message from your people. It is unfortunate what is going to be happening in this House. It's unfortunate what is happening in this House, Mr. Speaker. It's going to be on the heads of this government but it also will be on the heads of ourselves as opposition for the rest of history.

I still maintain it is because of a few individuals on that side of the House we are in this dilemma, that we are in here now, and a certain individual — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, that's fine. The Premier just indicated that I had an opportunity to be in Hawaii, yes, but if we want to pursue that kind of a discussion here then I want to talk about the Attorney-General having been gone for three weeks and the Member for St. Johns having been gone for two weeks in Hawaii, and the Minister of Tourism and Business is in Hawaii right now. If we want to get into that kind of discussion, then we will do that because there are three of their members that have been in Hawaii already, and one is there right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The honourable member knows that he should not comment on the presence or the absence of members from this House.

The honourable member has five minutes remaining.

A MEMBER: It applies to the Premier as well.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, the only reason why I'm involved in that is because the Premier of this province accused me of being in Hawaii. I was there and I just defended my position stating if I was there, there were others as well. But he's the one that started at that level.

I'll accept that. Mr. Speaker, actually I had anticipated by the time that I came back that this issue would have been resolved. I can see now that it is going to be a long time before this gets resolved.

A MEMBER: You're right.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: It's going to be a long time before this gets resolved and it is my hope that over the next few days . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: . . . There's three options that the government can look at very easily. Basically three options. You can be an arrogant government and go against the wishes of Manitobans and push it through;

or you can accept our amendment which removes Section 23.1 and make everybody happy and then we have consensus; or you can do what I think the Premier already had hoped to do at one time, withdraw the whole thing itself. Withdraw it.

There is no need, Mr. Speaker, to continue with this because under policy direction they can do anything they want with the language issue. As I indicated yesterday in my remarks, that in March of '82, they already had policy direction for all the changes they were going to make. There is no need for this legislation at this stage of the game, there is no need for all the time and all the money that's being spent. Ironically, the defence that they're using now, people like the Minister of Highways and others are now saying, well the cost factor. They're flanked about everything they could and have been thwarted at it. It's tragic when a government does not listen anymore, and that's what we have.

Mr. Speaker, we will have the opportunity, just because we have been thwarted by this government that we cannot speak any further on this issue, that it is not over yet totally, that we will be here to debate some more, but it is shameful that the people of Manitoba have to be exposed to this kind of a situation.

A MEMBER: Simply ignore it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: There are requests for an election. They have been sincere. Why don't we do it? Because if you are right and if you would win the next election, we would have to accept that, we would have been proven wrong. Why don't you do that? Let's clear the air once and for all. We'll come back, you will have defeated us - maybe. — (Interjection) — That was two years ago and not on these issues. You never had the mandate to go on this issue. We've let all kinds of controversial legislation go to deal with this issue, that was never approached. Call an election now on this issue. It is an important issue, call it now.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I don't know what course of action is going to remain to the opposition from hereon in, but whatever course of action the democratic system allows us we will take, to stop the activity of this government in this direction on this issue. I hope when they get a chance to associate with their people in the next few days - I understand they're having a convention - that possibly there will be some seeing of the light. Maybe they will listen to their own people if they will not listen to the people of Manitoba. I know for a fact that many of them are deserting the ship.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I, as the last speaker on our side, close the debate, I suppose. They have refused to debate it. I don't know whether they will defend their position at all. I feel it is very unfortunate. I know my time is running out. If the people of this government will not listen, they will listen two years from now when they call an election.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . for members opposite . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: The resolution ordinarily is entitled to close.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have but a few brief comments on the motion and the debate which we've seen for the last week on this subject. For those members opposite who have some concern that my few brief comments are in any way inappropriate, I would remind them that it is normal procedure in this House, on bills and on resolutions, that the member who moves them closes them. That opportunity does not exist — (Interjection) — I'm about to acknowledge that. If you'll just cool your heels for 10 seconds, I'll get to your point.

I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the previous question was to allow all members to debate, but to preclude amendments and subamendments, etc.

Matters of privilege, as I understand the rule, only afford one opportunity for each member to speak unless amendments are moved, and since I've raised the matter I believe I was considered as having spoken on it and, therefore, could not normally close debate even though that is the practice under our rules with regard to all other forms of motions.

The fact that the Member for St. James is choosing not to close debate and will not be speaking after me, I am taking that opportunity to make a few brief closing comments on a matter which I first raised in the House. Now, since that conforms with our normal parliamentary practice in allowing that kind of closing remark, I take some offence at the remarks of some members who yelled as they were walking out of the Chamber. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I remind members opposite who have remained, that for five days we on this side - and myself in particular - have been challenged to reply to some of the statements that have been made. Mr. Speaker, there haven't been very many that I deem worthy of reply but there are a few remarks that I think ought to be made.

One of the matters which has been raised by honourable members and, Mr. Speaker, I regret that I will deviate slightly from debating strictly the matter of privilege because if I were to reply to members opposite on that item there would be nothing at all to which I should reply, because very few addressed that issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, one honourable member opposite suggested during the debate - and it was confirmed by several of his colleagues - that members opposite never really endorsed the entrenchment of Sections 23.2-23.9, that their request that the government proceed only with validation was not really a request, it was really a statement that if we really felt we had to do something, we should do that. It was the Member for Turtle Mountain, he said that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the Member for Turtle Mountain also said it a week ago yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly it was an attempt to recover some ground that was lost to him some time earlier. Mr. Speaker, he said, "Let me say just once again to clear up the record" - I'm reading from the 25th of January Hansard - "from some of the comments that the government members have been making in that they have been misrepresenting the position I took on this issue earlier, again the Attorney-General today did the same thing again when he said that I'd acknowledged that we would see the need for validation, and the need to validate, we should seek validation if at all possible and that it would be a better solution if we could attain it."

Mr. Speaker, a little bit of backpedalling there because of the concern of members opposite that any possible attempt to be part of the solution would separate them from the extremists with whom they have associated themselves; the people with whom they have - and I refer them to yesterday's Globe and Mail editorial because I want to be short today and I won't even ask the Leader of the Opposition to put it in the same file with his London Free Press articles - but, Mr. Speaker, I remind him that the impression of the Conservative Party both in Manitoba and in the rest of Canada is that of inglorious blackguards who have associated themselves with everything that is mean and mean-spirited, and some of the things that have been the meanest and most mean-spirited in the last century of this province's history. Mr. Speaker, that is a sad commentary.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What do you know about the last century?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the last century of this province has been a century on which we should take pride rather than dredge from the very bottoms of the extreme right of this province sentiments that should have stayed buried, and that only people like the Member for Sturgeon Creek; that only people who are of the mental frame of mind and emotional instability of the Member for Sturgeon Creek would deem worthy of abusing a modern, cultured, tolerant province. Mr. Speaker, that's what's been happened.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the comments of the Member for Turtle Mountain because I think it's important to put two things - one from the Official Leader of the Opposition and one from his House Leader - on the record with regard to their support for the proposal which is before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the speech of the Member for Turtle Mountain of Thursday, January 12th. He says, despite his speech on Wednesday the 25th of January in which he was rapidly backpedalling - he obviously had been repudiated in the same way that his leader was repudiated a week ago today when he offered to vote immediately in this House - Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain was also repudiated. The only two possible leaders on that side, both of them repudiated by a caucus which is obviously more in tune with the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 5545 of Hansard, dated January 12th, Thursday, right at the end of his speech at 10:00 p.m., his concluding remark, the thrust of his speech

as he summarized to say that he would be going on again the next day, he said: "That is the issue to which we'll return when the House meets again and I would hope to be able to convince the honourable members opposite to some extent that, based on their own reasons, that they should in fact be dropping all of this resolution except those sections that deal with the validation of the laws."

Mr. Speaker, he wants to be able, the next day - and he goes on the next day to try and do it - to convince us that we should be dropping everything except those sections that deal with the validation of our laws. Two weeks later, he repudiated that. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition, sent a letter to the membership of his party.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it was on flash paper but it seems to have disappeared. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said to his members, after describing the proposed subamendment to the Member for Fort Garry which would remove Section 23.1: "This leaves in place the sections which confirm the validity of our English-only laws, thus eliminating the possibility of 'legal chaos' in the Supreme Court decisions on the Bilodeau case."

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, only the Member for Sturgeon Creek can have it both ways, but the Member for Turtle Mountain and the Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition, cannot. They cannot be both part of the solutions and remain entrenched with the 19th Century attitudes, emotions and fears of members like the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

I want to read a short quote — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface, the Honourable Minister of Health, says all kinds of things that I consider terms of endearment. He even, Mr. Speaker, sometimes makes me want to dump a glass of water on his head because I hold him so dearly as well. But I know that when the Member for St. Boniface speaks, he speaks both with his head and with his heart. He speaks out of principle; he speaks out of dedication to the spirit, history and future of this province. He is not a prisoner of everything that has been disruptive to the cultural harmony and future of this province. He is a not a prisoner the way the member opposite is.

Mr. Speaker, I promised members opposite I was going to be short. I will try not to reply any further to the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I am now convinced it is not the fault of the Minister of Health. It has something to do with the chair.

Mr. Speaker, on Page 27, 8:20, Commons Debates, October 6, 1983, a member of the House of Commons said as follows: "Mr. Justice Hand referred to it as 'the spirit of liberty.' He told the group of immigrants that the spirit of liberty is the spirit that is not too sure that it is right. The spirit of liberty seeks to understand the minds of other men and other women. The spirit of liberty weighs their interests alongside its own, without bias. The spirit of liberty knows that not even a sparrow falls to the earth unheeded.

"The spirit of liberty", he said, "is the spirit of him who nearly 2,000 years ago taught mankind a lesson that it is never quite learned and never quite forgotten;

that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest." That is what this resolution is all about today.

Mr. Speaker, some members opposite are crying with derision. Let me finish - there are only two sentences left - before you decry this great principled statement. "This resolution is about fairness. It is about decency. It is an invitation for co-operation and understanding. It speaks to the finest qualities in this nation. I say to you on behalf of my entire party, on this or any great issue that affects this nation, that we stand before you, Madam Speaker, united in the sunlight, ready to work for a better Canada."

Mr. Speaker, that speech, the end, the last two paragraphs of that speech, members opposite just decried, called it a great performance, spoke derisively of it, just now in this House. Mr. Speaker, that was the last two paragraphs of the speech on this same resolution by the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, the Honourable Brian Mulroney.

Mr. Speaker, some members opposite are calling out that it was not the same resolution. I should point out to the Leader of the Opposition, although I am going on longer than I thought in replying to the misinformation he provides to this House, that the resolution on which that leader was speaking contained in its final operative paragraph the statement that ". . . The House endorses, on behalf of all Canadians, the essence of the agreement reached by the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba with the participation of the Société franco-manitobaine on May 16th, 1983 to modify The Manitoba Act 1870; (2) the House invites the government and the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba to take action as expeditiously as possible in order to fulfill their constitutional obligations and to protect effectively the rights of the French-speaking minority of the province . . ."

Mr. Speaker, I endorse completely support and accept the support of the statements of the Honourable Brian Mulroney, Leader of the Official Opposition in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes for the benefit of minds like those of the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I am forced to go back into a time period with which many of us are not familiar. I go back to quote a great statesman and parliamentarian, Lord Salisbury, from the 19th century. Lord Salisbury was talking about political parties and their nature. Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba today, I think this statement by Lord Salisbury is entirely appropriate.

He said, "Combinations there must be. The only question is whether they shall be broad parties based on the comprehensive ideas and guided by men who have a name to stake on the wisdom of their course, or obscure cliques with some narrow crochets for a policy, some paltry, yelping shibboleth for a cry."

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing the paltry, yelping shibboleth as a cry from members opposite for nine months. They have, with only a few exceptions, really addressed the fundamental question about the future of this province and about the character of this province and about its role in the future of this nation.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other minor point that I think should be made and it relates to a letter received by the Honourable Minister of Labour recently with regard to the St. Boniface Museum, the curator of which

is one Maurice Prince, who is also the President of the Association pro-canadiene. Mr. Speaker, that association is currently fighting the certification of a union of its employees. Mr. Speaker, upon completion of reading this I'd be happy to table the letter as is normally required in such circumstances. I wish to read just one paragraph, Mr. Speaker.

"The language of operation in our establishment is French. We wish to assure the Honourable Minister we will comply with a request of the Manitoba Labour Board as soon as we receive the official French translation of the act in the bilingual form."

This, Mr. Speaker, over the signature of a man who said the documents which he now requests were not warranted; over the signature of a man who held an association meeting of less than a dozen people and had his position endorsed in this House a week ago last Monday by members opposite asking questions. Mr. Speaker, what a sad commentary on the position of members opposite when they realize to whose star they have tied themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I'll table this letter for the benefit of members opposite who may wish to consult it.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, I think it should be noted, since members on this side appear to know and therefore want me to put it on the record, the lawyer for the St. Boniface Museum is one Sidney Green who I understand is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . is a supporter of bilingualism in both Manitoba and Canada, but one who does not see merits in the government's current proposal. I think that's perhaps the fairest description.

What I would like to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, very briefly is that I listened closely to the two speeches opposite which dealt very directly with the question of bell ringing. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo, the Leader of the Opposition, who claimed that he'd spoken on over half the bills in this Session - out of a 114 bills that would imply 57. Mr. Speaker, he actually spoke only on 22, less than 20 percent - not half.

Mr. Speaker, I checked the other facts in his speech and I could go through the whole speech and repudiate factually, virtually every statement he made but I really don't have time. The fact of the matter is, the credibility of members opposite to justify the kind of parliamentary obstruction which you, Sir, ruled was an abuse of the rules; which you, Sir, in quoting Erskine May, said was a contempt of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, that obstruction cannot be justified. Those who seek to justify by the most erudite reasoning, something that is unjustifiable, Sir, can never succeed and for me to try and defend, even for them, the indefensible would be foolish and I won't engage in that exercise.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the only way a Parliament can operate is if it has the authority to make decisions, and, Sir, no parliamentarian who believes in the British parliamentary tradition will say otherwise. If the Member for Sturgeon Creek believes otherwise, Sir, I believe he challenges the principles of the system to which he pledged allegiance when he took his oath of office.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly tell you, I do not believe that is the case. I believe members opposite have a

fundamental respect for the parliamentary tradition, for the British traditions of Westminster. I believe they respect the rules and precedents, not only of this House, but of the House of Commons in Ottawa and of the Mother of Parliament, and I will believe that until they prove me wrong. They have, on occasion, given me cause to doubt - the belief has quivered on occasion - but fundamentally I believe that the gentlemen opposite are, as members on this side are - sorry, ladies and gentlemen opposite - as members on this side are, people who have a fundamental respect for the parliamentary tradition and will not abuse it or hold it in contempt.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite have at times talked about closure, double closure, triple closure. Mr. Speaker, I point out to those who I believe, in taking an oath of office of allegiance to Her Majesty and to the people of this province and to this Assembly, pledge themselves to respect the British parliamentary tradition. This government has, throughout its term to date, at all times observed the rules of this Chamber, the precedents of this Chamber and the rules and precedents and spirit of parliamentary law.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge any member opposite to tell us wherein we did not do so. For those who say that the use of the rules, whether it be by closure, by previous question, by the placing of a motion, or the raising of a matter of privilege is not within the rules of this House, then they don't know what they're talking about. Everything that's been done in this House with regard to this question by both myself and my colleague, the Attorney-General, has been in strict adherence with the rules, not just to accommodate members opposite, but because this is a very important question, because it must be done correctly and in accordance with the rules. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, most importantly, because members on this side respect the rules and respect British parliamentary tradition. This debate and the test of this vote is whether or not that respect is shared on the other side. I believe it is.

I ask honourable members opposite not to shake that belief because they will not just trouble me - I can get over that, I'm used to some of the things said by the Member for Sturgeon Creek - but, Mr. Speaker, they will shake the parliamentary traditions of this province to its foundation but, more importantly, they will shake the faith of the people of this province in the parliamentary process. Mr. Speaker, that is something which is our overriding concern.

We have two concerns, Mr. Speaker, the question of minority rights and the protection thereof, the British parliamentary tradition and the foundation it has in this province. That's what's at issue in this matter of privilege and for that reason I ask all members to vote, and vote in support of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is that this question be now put. Those in favour, please say aye. Those opposed please say nay.

In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. I have been advised by the Official Opposition Whip that the Official Opposition will provide me with not less than two hours prior notice of their intention to return to this House.

In view of this advice, I have informed Chamber staff that they will not be required to remain on duty outside normal working hours. I have made arrangements to secure the Chamber and the sounding of the bells will be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

I am accordingly leaving the Chair to return when the Opposition advises me of their intention to return.

(And the division bells having rung from 3:15 p.m. on Thursday, February 16th, 1984 to 2:45 p.m. on Monday, February 27th, 1984.)

DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS (Mr. Myron Mason):
Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour, P. McGonigal, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

HON. P. MCGONIGAL: Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly:

The work of the Second Session of the Thirty-Second Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the members for their faithful attention to their duties, including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committee. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our province.

Monsieur l'Orateur et messieurs, mesdames, les Membres de l'Assemblée législative: les travaux de la deuxième session de la trente-deuxième législature sont maintenant terminés. Je désire féliciter les Membres pour le temps qu'ils ont consacré à l'étude des projets de loi et des prévisions budgétaires, tant en Chambre qu'en Comité. Je vous remercie du souci que vous avez démontré pour l'intérêt public et le bien-être général de la province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

En vous déchargeant de vos obligations actuelles, au terme de la deuxième session parlementaire de la trente-deuxième législature, je vous transmets mes meilleurs vœux et souhaite que la province puisse, avec l'aide de la Divine Providence, continuer à travailler à la santé, au bonheur et au bien-être de tous.

In relieving you now of your present duties and declaring the Second Session of the Thirty-Second Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of our people.

HON. R. PENNER: It is the will and pleasure of Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this Legislative

Assembly be prorogued until it shall please Her Honour to summon the same for the dispatch of business, and the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

God Save the Queen was sung.