



**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. 167A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 24 JANUARY, 1984.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 24 January, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

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

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 60 students of Grade 9 standing from the Charleswood Junior High School. They are under the direction of Mr. Crew and Mrs. Arnold. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

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

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Bill No. 115 - closure motion

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. In view of the fact that we have before us a prospect of a relatively unprecedented move by the government to impose closure on debate of a major issue in this House, a major bill in this House in second reading, does the Premier plan to speak on Bill 115 prior to the closure motion being introduced into the Legislature?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Yes.

### Workers Compensation Board - firing

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Could he confirm that seven senior officers at the Workers Compensation Board, Mr. Hiebert, the Executive Director; Mr. Dyer, the Director of Assessments; Mr. Cross, a secretary; two doctors; the treasurer and the comptroller were all fired or forced to resign by the board, which was politically appointed by this government? They were fired, Mr. Speaker, because they did not fit in with the philosophy of the government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, there is a Minister that's responsible for Workers Compensation and the Minister will deal with that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm or deny the details of the honourable member's questions. There are a certain number of former employees of the Workers Compensation Board who were asked to resign and did so. There are others who took the early retirement option and I don't know which of those fit in those categories. I don't know the names that the member mentioned, whether they were among those who took the early retirement or whether they were among those who were asked to resign.

### Workers Compensation fees

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that there would be the odd thing that went on in Manitoba that the First Minister would take some responsibility for.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question then to the Minister. Would he inform the House as to the cost to the board and to the people who pay the assessments to the board of the firings or the forced resignations of the people I've referred to, the executive director, the director of assessments, a secretary, two doctors, the treasurer and the comptroller? What is the cost to the board and to the people who pay the assessments in Manitoba?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I definitely am not prepared to divulge individual severance pays. If the members concerned or involved wish to do so, that is up to them to do so. All I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is that I can look further into this matter and if there is further information that I can provide to the member opposite in this regard, I will agree to do so.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the costs of the severance pay and of the dismissals in these instances are going to cost the board a great deal of money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the First Minister a question then. In view of the statements by the doctors that they were not listened to before they were forced to resign, Mr. Speaker; in view of the fact that after no increase in assessment for a number of years there was a 9 to 20 percent increase last year; there's a recommended 53 percent increase this year; the Minister is unable to give us a projection for further years; would the First Minister, in view of the circumstances, in view of the statement of the chairman of the board that all of these people were fired because they didn't fit in with the philosophy of the board and this is causing havoc in the industry with the increased

costs to employers who are paying these assessments, appoint a judicial inquiry to investigate the operations of the Workers Compensation Board?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I'm beginning to think we have a judicial inquiry party sitting in the ranks of the opposition.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member across the way keeps insisting that these people were all fired and that is not the case, and I had indicated that to him a while ago.

I further want to indicate to the member opposite, Mr. Speaker, that in 1981 the assessment rate was not increased, in fact it was reduced when the costs that were going to be paid out, and were in effect paid out in that year were not going to meet the revenues or were going to be beyond the revenues projected, and the members did not increase the rate at that time, but in fact reduced it, thereby further putting the status of the Workers Compensation Board into decreasing the reserves that they had built up at the time.

In 1982 there was an overall decrease as well. In view of the difficult economic circumstances 27 percent of the employer groups were reduced as compared to '81 assessment rates; 16 percent of the employer groups experienced slight increase; that is less than 10 percent; the remaining 57 percent of the employer groups experienced no change in the 1982 assessment rates. As a result the overall 1982 average assessment rates showed a slight reduction to the average 1981 assessment rate.

So basically what this means, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1981, '82, and '83 the employers of Manitoba paid less in terms of compensation rates than they should have been paying in accordance with the projected costs on the basis of the projected payrolls for that year, which means the accumulated surplus over the good years was gradually depleted and we are still in a position, and that is a very important point, I think, that all Manitobans should realize, that contrary to the compensation boards in other jurisdictions in Canada who are, most of them, in an unfunded liability situation - if we look in B.C., who are in a half-a-billion liability or more situation, Ontario with nearly a \$2 billion unfunded liability situation, Manitoba still has a \$5 million surplus situation as of now.

Now, according to the projected costs and revenues for 1983 - and we have to remember that the employers have enjoyed the lower rate in the meantime - and therefore the rates, based on the projections of cost towards revenue for the year, would require a 53 percent increase.

Now there are a number of factors which bring this about and I have mentioned one - there are others - but if the members are interested, I shall go into them.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct a statement of mine a few moments ago and it may

very well have been also based on a misunderstanding, as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned - the question pertaining to will I be debating or speaking to the bill before the time allocation motion is presented. Of course the answer is no, I will not have an opportunity until . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . Bill 115 is introduced and I will be debating that this afternoon during the debate.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

### Bilingualism - advertising

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Services.

In view of the latest dictum from the Federal Government that The Winnipeg Sun now has to have its boxes and advertising changed in the Winnipeg International Airport, I would like to know whether under Bill 115 and its designated languages services areas whether the Free Press, The Sun, or rural weeklies will be required to advertise in the French language?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the member could answer that question himself by reading the bill. Very clearly it applies only to the Provincial Government, head offices and limited services in certain regions of the province where there is a large French language population. For the honourable member to allude to some implications for the private sector in Bill 115, Sir, is an incorrect illusion and that's all it is, an illusion by the honourable member. There is absolutely no provisions in the bill or in the resolution which impact on the private sector in this province, on the Federal Government in this province, or on municipal school boards, or other local governments in this province.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the suggestion that the Federal Government is in some way placing requirements, I can't speak to that. That is outside the administrative competence both of myself and of the government, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, that it is the view of this government that that requirement on The Winnipeg Sun or on any private sector concern in this province taken to that extreme is absolutely ridiculous.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the House Leader. Given that the original federal B&B legislation didn't mention newspaper boxes and advertising either, I would like to know whether the government is prepared to amend its legislation in Bill 115 to guarantee that the free press in the broad sense and the media will not be

encumbered and will not be required to either publish or advertise in the French language or hire bilingual staff.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm absolutely amazed that the honourable member has not read the bill which is now before this House. Some honourable members on this side might not be amazed at that, but I am.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wishes to support this bill to committee, I would be happy to discuss with him on clause-by-clause in committee any suggestion where this bill might have any implications for the private sector, whether it be the publishing sector or any other sector in this province. There is absolutely no such implication.

Mr. Speaker, the best evidence of that is the fact that both Winnipeg dailies have expressed support for the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member who asked the question would be well advised both to read those dailies and read the bill.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure the House that creeping bilingualism will not turn into rampant bilingualism?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I do not purport to be an expert on creeping. If the honourable member is, I would be pleased to hear his answer to his question.

### Workers Compensation Board

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment responsible for the Workers Compensation Board, following on the questions of my colleague. How does he justify the Workers Compensation Board making complex decisions and judgments based on philosophical reasons rather than medical evidence in arriving at its decisions on compensation awards?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I don't think it's strictly in accord with our question period to ask a Minister to justify a course of action. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wishes to ask for information, he may do so.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Chairman of the Workers Compensation Board was quoted as saying that she could concur with Dr. McPhail's claim that he didn't fit in with the philosophy of the new board and Dr. McPhail was quoted as saying, "My medical judgment was not in line with the policies of the board." How can he justify or how does he explain the fact that compensation awards are now being made on philosophical judgments rather than medical judgments?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What has happened on the board is that the board has gone

on to try and become more efficient in many ways. One of the those ways was at the medical level where they sought to get medical expertise through what we describe as rather than general practitioners as specialist medical expertise at the board level, and as a result they can better assess the claims than they possibly could before.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, is this change in philosophy the reason why the settlements for the Workers Compensation have increased so dramatically that they are now faced with having to put through a 53 percent increase in Workers Compensation fees?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, it amazes me how the Leader of the Opposition can misconstrue. Both of the premises in that question are false because, first of all, we haven't put through a 53 percent increase; and he assumes that the medical supplements or he pretends that the medical supplements have increased substantially, which is not the case.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that there was no increase in settled claims in 1983 over 1982?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, it would be very simplistic to look in terms of the cost of the Compensation Board in terms of numbers of claims. The Compensation Board could have one claim that would counterbalance 100 or 200 claims. One supplement in itself could be way out of line in one year or a few supplements could throw the whole cost of one year out of the average as compared to a previous year without the numbers having changed or even when the numbers may have decreased.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the numbers of claims were not up in 1983 over 1982 but the costs were, that does indicate that the average value per claim is substantially higher. Now is this as a result of the new philosophy that the board is now paying a great deal more per claim-out?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** That bears credibility to what I just said before. Furthermore, on a yearly basis, wages have increased between 1983 and 1982, between 1982 and 1981. That's the very reason why, even in 1981, they were not meeting the costs with the assessment rate being requested from the employers.

Secondly, the medical costs have gone up, thereby increasing the claims. Furthermore, there was a high percentage increase in the average time loss per accident. This has been reflected in 1982 and 1983 across Canada and across developed countries. The experience has been borne that through the difficult economic times due to a combination of factors, probably because - and we can only speculate - the medical doctors have perhaps been a little more flexible or lenient with claimants, and also because of the fact that employers have probably been more lenient or have discouraged in many instances employees coming back to the workplace because they didn't have sufficient work for them to do.

Those are but four of the factors which would have contributed in the last year and in 1982 and in 1981

and increasingly throughout the years in increasing the costs per claim in Manitoba as elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the member opposite that the percentage increase, and I stated it the other day, in Manitoba has increased by an average of 5 percent over the 5.1 percent over the last six years, whereas it has increased 19.3 percent in Alberta; 18.6 percent in B.C. per year; 15.6 percent in Quebec; 10.1 percent in Ontario.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like — (Interjection) — do you want the answer, or don't you?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. If the Honourable Minister has a great number of other statistics for members, perhaps he would pass the information over in written form rather than take up the time of the question period.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps if they're interested, they'll ask further questions.

### Capital Borrowing

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Turtle Mountain had a question yesterday which I took as notice with respect to the amount of money borrowed by the province.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** The actual amount of borrowing - I hear that cackling over there again - to date for this year is \$926,477,100.00. The expected borrowing between now and the end of the year will be a further \$92,360,000 approximately for a total of \$1,018,837,100.00.

### MPIC settlement re Adam Sokol

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Autopac, and I have given the Minister notice of this question. On May 30, 1981, a Mr. Adam Sokol of Winnipeg was involved in an automobile accident, after which Mr. Sokol suffered continuing anxiety and shock and eventually was hospitalized in July and August for approximately three weeks. He was unable to manage his grocery store thereafter and had to dispose of it at a substantial loss. He subsequently received a settlement of \$4,500 from MPIC. Has the Minister had an opportunity to personally review the details of this case?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Housing.

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** I would like to thank the Member for Turtle Mountain for giving me notice that

he was to be asking this question. I in fact have received a report, and the report provided to me by MPIC advises that a final release had been signed in April 26, 1982, and a cheque for \$4,500 was payable to the claimant.

I am further advised that, for whatever reason, after having signed the release, the claimant then decided that he would seek new legal counsel who advised MPIC that the previous release had not been binding. There were communications between MPIC and the alleged solicitor representing Mr. Sokol. There was no further correspondence between Mr. Sokol or his second legal counsel until March of 1983, at which time apparently one Michael Kibsey took on this case and was advised by MPIC that the information that he was requesting would not be made available to him, and if he wanted that information he could obtain it from Mr. Sokol's lawyer. As far as I know, there is no further involvement in MPIC in that a signed release had been obtained.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister had been: did the Minister personally review this situation? It seems that at the moment all he has received is a report from MPIC. I would like to ask the Minister whether or not, given all of the circumstances in this case, he believes that Mr. Sokol has been treated with justice and fairness by MPIC, especially in view of the \$500,000 out-of-court settlement which MPIC recently arrived at with another claimant?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** As I had indicated, I had received a report from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. It has been my practice as the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation that when a claimant is represented by legal counsel that the matter stay between legal counsel and the Manitoba Public Insurance. In view of the fact that a signed release had been provided to MPIC, I do not feel that there is any purpose in my getting personally involved with this particular claim.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, just one final question to the Minister, did he look into the circumstances leading up to the signing of the release? For instance, did he look into the way this case was handled by the Autopac adjuster?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** As I had indicated in my first answer, I was aware that Mr. Sokol had obtained a second lawyer a few days after having signed the release. It would seem to me that the responsibility as to determine the circumstances under which the release had been signed would be something that the new lawyer, Mr. Chris Lorenc, would be concerned with, and that is probably why Mr. Sokol hired Mr. Lorenc.

I don't feel that there's any part or any purpose in my becoming involved in this case, in view of the representation that Mr. Sokol has.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister had not finished his answer?

**HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK:** Mr. Speaker, just while I'm on my feet, last week I had been asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition as to how many of the apartment starts in the last couple of years were

subsidized by either federal or provincial housing dollars. I'd like to now provide that information.

As you recall, in 1980 there were 789 apartment starts; in 1981 there were 281; in 1982 there were 1,983; and in 1983 over 2,000. When we look at 1982-83, 450 of the apartments were started under 56(1), the non-profit section in 1982. This increased to 717 in 1983.

Under the Canada Rental Supply Program, and this is within the private sector, in 1982 there were 308 apartment units started; in 1983 there were 915 representing an increase of around 300 percent.

With respect to the non-assisted apartment starts, either provincially or federally, using MURB's and absolutely no assistance, in 1982 there were 105 units started; in 1983 there was a 400 percent increase to some 422 units started.

### Bilingualism in Manitoba

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister could advise the House and the citizens of this province if he or his government have had any letters, records, communications, transcripts, or any communication of any kind between the government of this province and the Government of Canada as to the approximate date Winnipeg was declared a bilingual city?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I know of no correspondence.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, according to a press release published in today's paper, Winnipeg has been declared - by somebody - a bilingual city. I'm just asking the First Minister if he's had any previous knowledge or transcripts that he can share with the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister then if he'll be kind enough to check the records of this province and his government to see if, in fact, any correspondence or transcriptions or anything has gone back and forth between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada to declare Winnipeg a bilingual city?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Never mind, we are moving in Roblin anytime now.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, of course this is a question of federal jurisdiction. All that I do know that back in 1980, Bill 2 was passed in this House which indicated the official languages in this province - French and English. The Member for Elmwood, reluctantly, but he accepted it, well not so reluctantly heralded the fact that indeed Manitoba was bilingual from hereon in, so I suppose if the honourable member wants to refer to records, there are records that date back to 1980 in this House. Insofar as the federal, he might take this matter up with his own federal member of Parliament.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for basically a "No" answer. Can I ask the Honourable First Minister then, according to the article that's in today's Winnipeg Sun under the writer, Steven Edwards, "It's all because the Federal Government says Winnipeg is a bilingual city," does he concur or agree with that statement, that Winnipeg, our capital city, is a bilingual city?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. It is an abuse of the rules of question period to quote a newspaper and ask a Minister if he's in agreement with it.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, would you repeat your comments, I didn't have my hearing aid on. Would you please repeat what you said?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I will not promise the honourable member he will be able to hear what is being said even with his earpiece in, there is sometimes a higher level of background noise in this Chamber. I pointed out to the honourable member that it is an abuse of a question period to read an article from the paper or a quotation from a newspaper and ask a Minister if he concurs or disagrees with it.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I'll ask the First Minister, does he concur and agree that Winnipeg is a bilingual city, the capital of our province, the capital city is a bilingual city? Does he agree or concur with that?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I don't know who I am to agree with.

### Bill No. 95 - Pension Benefits Act

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and would ask her whether or not the government has done any cost analysis with regard to the introduction of the Bill 95, the changes to the pension requirements?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be able to inform the House what the cost of the bill will be to government - and by government I mean to Crown corporations and the Civil Service - involved in this province?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest perhaps that's more appropriately dealt with in an Order for Return. Certainly the actuarial study was done. It would not have been proper to introduce a bill without

knowing what it would cost us as employers ourselves, and so we did that kind of actuarial analysis, had it done by the government's actuaries, Turnbull and Turnbull and we do that have that information. I certainly don't carry it around with me. I don't have it with me today.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, I'd appreciate at her convenience to have a copy of that particular study.

Could the Minister also inform the House whether her department or the Department of Economic Development has done any studies as to the impact on employers in the province? In other words, what the cost will be in increased payments by employers in the province with regard to this new bill?

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, that's one of the reasons that there is no retroactivity in the bill, so that there are not huge costs to be assumed by employers at this time. That's also the reason for phasing in the bill so that there will be some no-cost items that came into effect January 1, 1984 and the items that will involve the deferred wages of the employees and how they are treated and the earlier vesting will come in in 1985, so that the actuarial adjustments can be made. That's what they told us the time they needed and so we certainly acquiesce to that. It came from the employers and from the actuaries themselves. That's why the recommendation for phasing was followed.

The recommendations regarding no retroactivity also came from these groups and we agreed that we would not involve retroactivity in any of the aspects of the bill and those who attended the Law Amendments Committee will remember that all of those amendments were moved at that time, to make it very clear that the bill came into effect on the date specified.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** I wonder if the Minister of Labour could inform the House whether or not the cost to the government for the government's Civil Service, as well as the Crown corporations, could be in the figure of about \$80 million.

**HON. M.B. DOLIN:** Mr. Speaker, if everyone retired tomorrow and collected a full pension, then it would be costly. I don't expect that all of us civil servants are going to retire tomorrow and the the actuarial determination is based on actual cost to the government of its employees on an annualized basis, that's the second step in any actuarial determination.

So the question regarding the Crowns, we dealt with our own employees, not the Crown's employees, and I'm sure that since we are the second largest employer in the province that should give a good indication of what anybody else might expect.

I also should point out that this is private pension plans that we are dealing with in the Province of Manitoba that come under The Pension Benefits Act and each of those pension plans has been negotiated on the basis of it being deferred wages and in a different way. One cannot say that it will cost so much per employer, it depends on the pension plan they already have in place, the benefits they have in place and the ability and the timing with which they have conferred

with their employees about expected benefits. Some will have very little cost because they've been doing all these things all along.

### Waskada oil fields

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy. Could the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House and the people of Manitoba if a permit has been issued to construct a pipeline from the Waskada oil fields to the Cromer pipeline setup?

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

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** No, it hasn't, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister assure us that there will be open public hearings before that permit is allocated?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, there were advertisements with respect to open public hearings and no one showed up, and there were no hearings held because no one wanted public hearings, but there was sufficient advertisement for the open hearings and the opportunity for the public to appear was there, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the people the truth, that there was a notice on the door where that public meeting was to be held saying that it was put off and that I met one farmer by the name of Wallace Gabriel who came to this hearing and was rejected and not given the opportunity to go to that hearing? Will the Minister recheck what happened, that there was a notice on the door that the hearing was to be held at and there wasn't a hearing?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, the advertisement specifically said that there was a provision for a public hearing, that if people wanted to make an address to the public hearing they should get in contact. That was clearly spelled out. No one contacted the board to say that they wanted to appear for any hearing, Mr. Speaker, so therefore proceeded. It proceeded in-camera, in terms of discussions, with the applicants because they were providing information which would be of a competitive nature and that is a normal process, but the opportunity for the public to appear was there. It was specifically stated, Mr. Speaker. No one followed the procedure and applied to actually make a presentation to the public hearing as per the requisites of the advertisement.

Mr. Speaker, I will check it further because I'm quite certain that my record in presenting facts to this Legislature is 100 times better than the Member for - wherever he's from.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give the assurance that before any pipeline is constructed,

that the public, the farmers and all those people who are going to be involved, as well as the oil companies, will be fully informed as to all of the implications of the things that may have to be done because of the effect of a pipeline? Will he recall those hearings to make sure that all the public know and have them in a place where it can accommodate some of the people so they don't always have to come to the City of Winnipeg to accommodate this city-orientated type Minister?

**HON. W. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question, because it gives me an opportunity to reject totally the question of the Member for Arthur. It was this government that brought in The Surface Rights Act, it was this government that set up the Surface Rights Board, it is this government that has the Surface Rights Board having hearings right in the Virden area, locally. Mr. Speaker, we acted on that. We acted with support from the opposition, I agree with that, but it's taking place right now in Virden. They had four years to do that, Mr. Speaker, they did not act. They did not set up an entity that could deal with the local public, Mr. Speaker, so I find it rather surprising . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. H. ENNS:** I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy is now debating the issue and not simply answering the question.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 115, An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and on any amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

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

The Honourable Member for Virden on a point of order.

**MR. H. GRAHAM:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Are there copies of the motion by the honourable member available for other members of this Chamber?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader on the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, this is a standard substantive motion, copies are not usually provided. The Clerk prepares the motion slip as he does for any other reading of the bill. Copies of readings on bills are not normally provided.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, after the Member for Virden controls himself, I'll finish my reply to his point of order.

Mr. Speaker, clearly motion slips prepared by the Clerk and moved by members on either side of the House are not distributed to all members but go to the Speaker and to the Table. That's been the custom in this House. Sir, with respect, it was the custom followed by the Member for Virden when he was Speaker. I don't know what kind of preposterous suggestion he's making.

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

The Honourable Opposition House Leader on the same point.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. This is an unprecedented motion that is occurring and being presented. It has not occurred in the 16-17 years that it has been my privilege to be in this House. It's being brought by a government that prides itself as being one that is listening and being responsible to the people of Manitoba. Sir, this kind of a motion has never been presented in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the least that a Government House Leader could do is provide members with copies of that motion.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you if you would consider reading the motion before you put the question for those members who didn't hear it the first time. That may satisfy their concern.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would also draw to you attention Hansard of March 25, 1980, in Committee of Supply where after only one speaker in debate, without a motion slip . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

Whether or not the motion is in order is not a topic for debate before the House and any remarks in that vein are easily out of order. The Honourable Government House Leader, if he wishes, may make copies for such members of the opposition who wish it.

It is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of

Health that the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 115, An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and on any amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned.

The item is not debatable, amendable, or adjournable.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? 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:** Call in the members.

Order please. Order please. The question before the House is that the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 115, An Act respecting the operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act and any amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned.

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

### YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Desjardins, Dodick, Dolin, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohnman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uskiw.

### NAYS

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

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas 28, Nays 23.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion is accordingly carried.  
The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 115, please?

### ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

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

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader, the second reading of Bill 115, and the the proposed amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye has 20 minutes remaining.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I started speaking on this . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Yes, I just want to have your ruling on the provision of the bill with respect to speaking time and its application.

I understand by Section 37 of the rules, speakers are limited to 30 minutes. That I take it is without limitation as to who is speaking. May I have your ruling on that, Sir. I think it's important that we have that now rather than rising on points of order at various times.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker . . .

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

**MR. H. ENNS:** To the same point of order, the motion that was just passed by this House makes no reference to our Rule 37 and one would assume that normal debating time would be the order of the day - 40 minutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

It is clear that the motion we have just passed is the subject matter of our Rule 37, which says quite clearly that all members are limited to 30 minutes each on debate, no member to speak twice at any time, and that a 30-minute time limit applies to all members.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg of you for some further clarification. The motion, which unfortunately we didn't have before us before it was passed, but reads very simply that the debate on the motion for second reading on Bill No. 115, An Act respecting the Operation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and on any further amendments proposed thereto shall not be further adjourned. There is no reference to the vote that we had, to the motion before us, to Rule 37. There is no reference, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we are now operating under that section of our rules, namely Rule No. 37, which invokes closure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, are we now in a state of closure in this Chamber?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order.

Clearly the intent of the motion which — (Interjections) — Mr. Speaker, I listened to the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Opposition House Leader, I would hope he could control his colleagues so that he too could hear what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, the notice last night was the intention that debate be not further adjourned. It is in accord with Item No. 68 of Beauchesne, on Page 286, the page number which I gave the Opposition House Leader during the period when the bells were ringing after he had received a copy of the motion, I had moved, from the Clerk. Clearly the intent of Form Number 68, and the notice of motion I gave last evening is for the

operation of Rule 37. The form for the motion, Sir, is provided for in Beauchesne and was moved by me in strict accordance with that provision and on the advice of the Clerk who drafted the motion slip.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, the application of Rule 37 admits to only one interpretation, and it is the only rule in our rule book or in Beauchesne which limits further adjournment of debate. To suggest that some other rule, Sir, is being brought into force, or that the requirements of Rule 37 are not in force after the vote which was just passed, Sir, the logic of that escapes me. Clearly the vote we just passed brings into operation the provisions of Section 37 under Beauchesne, Form No. 68 on Page 286.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert to the same point.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to you, Sir. When the government attempts to limit the debate of members of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, they must be technically correct in what they do to the letter of the law. There is no mention in the notice given by the Government House Leader last night to Rule 37, nor is there any reference in Rule 37 in this motion which is adopted today. I therefore submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the only effect of passing this motion is not to allow any further adjournments of debate, but the members of this House have the full right to speak for 40 minutes and to continue speaking on this bill and any amendments or motions that are made with respect to it.

Mr. Speaker, we are not here to deal with what was in the mind of the Government House Leader, what was his intention. He did not explicitly deal with Rule 37. He did not refer to it last night. He did not refer to it in his motion, and he has not complied with it, Mr. Speaker. It's not in effect, I submit to you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. I quite realize that closure has not been used too frequently in this House, and members might not be too familiar with its use. However, notice was in fact given. The appropriate words were said in the motion. The House has adopted the measure, and it is in accord with Rule 37. Rules will, therefore, be according to Rule 37.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye has 20 minutes remaining.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, what we have witnessed today are the actions of a weak, bungling, decaying, leaderless government who has to resort to limiting the freedom of speech in this Legislature. That's what we have seen today, Mr. Speaker. We have seen a government move to limit the speech in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, we have seen the government move to try and silence the majority of Manitobans on this issue. I have no hesitation in saying, Mr. Speaker, that this government in doing this has once again proven to the people of Manitoba that they are not fit to govern, and

that they should relinquish that right and allow the people to determine who really should be running this province.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an indication today about how this government wants to down-play this issue and remove this issue out of the public arena. The First Minister today, in replying to questions from my Leader, even went so far as to say, this really wasn't a closure motion, it was a time allocation motion. Mr. Speaker, a time allocation motion is what he said it was. Mr. Speaker, when the rules of this House and my rights in this House with regards to speaking on different issues that affect my constituency, when those rights are curtailed by a government, that is not a time allocation motion, that is closure. It's a thing, Mr. Speaker, that I can't believe the now House Leader moved.

Mr. Speaker, we have a House Leader who, I guess, must have really sort of discarded all his past principles and beliefs to do this particular deed. I say that with good authority and good cause. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a speech made by that same member on June 23, 1982, Page 3535 of Hansard. At that time, the now House Leader broke ranks with the government when they were introducing their Speed-up Motion and voted against the government on Speed-up, because it really sort of curtailed the ability for a member to do a proper job in representing his constituency.

Now you have the same member who broke ranks with the government, was the only one that didn't vote for the Speed-up Motion, introducing a resolution which curtails the right of each member of this Legislature to speak on an issue which is so vitally important to all Manitobans. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is indicative in a few short months what power does to an individual. There was a member who only last year wouldn't even vote for the Speed-up Motion, now has introduced in my 11 years the first closure motion on a bill in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, he has lost his principles and power has corrupted him. The record speaks for itself on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, how did we get here? How did we get to this point? As I have said, time and time again, we got here because the Government of the Day misread the mood of the people of Manitoba. They misread their wishes. They don't understand what the people of Manitoba really wanted and what their real feelings are. I believe in this democratic system that when governments lose touch with the people they create problems, not only for themselves in any re-election bid, but they create massive problems for the population because they really do not emulate the true wishes of the people of Manitoba. After all, that is what our democratic system is all about.

Someone once said on the other side - I don't know if it was the Attorney-General, but one of the members opposite indicated awhile back that really their job was really to protect the people who were in minorities in a lot of situations in dealing with different issues. Well, I say to members opposite, while minority rights have to be protected and governments have to make sure that people are treated fairly, on major issues the government has to respect the wishes of the majority, because to do any other way - as one of my constituents put it - maybe next time when we run an election what we should do is we should have the party with the least

votes form the government, because they would best represent that small segment of society that wishes their certain things imposed on the majority. That is not how government runs, but obviously, Mr. Speaker, members opposite in their convoluted way of thinking really believe that's what should happen.

As I said before, how did we get to this situation? We had an Attorney-General who was riding high on what he considered his personal popularity and his intelligence in this Legislature. He was held up as being one of the shining knights of the New Democratic Party, one of the new branchilds of the group. The Premier, you could just see it every time he got up to speak last Session, just got up and smiled and banged his desk politely every time the Attorney-General said something.

The Attorney-General, in trying to solve his problem of political identification and trying to remove some of the stigma - and I use the word "stigma" I guess in not a complimentary way - but the problems of his somewhat shaded past politically, in order to try and vindicate his political past went ahead and convinced, along with a few other of the individuals such as the Member for Radisson, that they could bring in a piece of legislation and do a major constitutional amendment on this province to entrench French and English as the official languages of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that he felt the history books would be kind to him because he could go out in his political years and say, look, sure I once belonged to the Communist Party, but one of the basic reasons I belonged there is because I've always been for human rights and I've always been for minority rights, and look what I've done for minority rights in this province. It just really is my way of showing everybody that really I wasn't wrong, maybe a lot of people around Manitoba were wrong about me and my political stance. I truly believe that is what he was concerned about. The Attorney-General was not concerned about the people of Manitoba and what they thought. He was concerned about what the history books would say about him; that's why he did this. He managed to sell that proposition to his caucus, and I think a number of the members opposite realize now what kind of a bill of goods they were sold when the Attorney-General did that.

The First Minister realized that there were some pretty substantial problems developing and by the time the end of the hearings came some time in September, beginning of October, he realized that they were in big political trouble. He had New Democrats phoning him and telling him they were tearing up memberships. He had people calling him from his own constituency telling him how wrong-headed he was. He even had - I believe it was indicated here before - the now House Leader was even called a traitor by one of the New Democrats the other day. Mr. Speaker, he saw he had a major problem on his hands, so what did he do? - he made a shuffle.

He pulled the young Member for Springfield, the so-called rule of authority in this House, who quoted to us from the Magna Carta and everything, out of the back row there and pushed him into the front seat because that was going to be the young bright light, and how he was going to get around the problems the Attorney-General caused was to appoint this young

man to take over the reigns of this House and also to try and guide this through.

He says this is what we're going to do. We're going to water down the resolution which is supposed to go to Ottawa and the constitutional amendment, but we are going to toughen up the bill on the other side. Then we're going to take this as being a major new thrust by the government. We've gone ahead and moved back on the resolution but we'll entrench a few more things like a language ombudsman in the bill and things like that. Then we'll sell that, first of all, to the SFM. Then we'll come back into the Legislature and we'll tell the people, look, we've listened to you, we're removing certain things out of the resolution, but they wouldn't say, they were putting all kinds of other stuff into a bill.

This package, I'm sure the Member for Springfield, the House Leader, was sure he could sell to the people of Manitoba. After all, they'd backed down from their previous position. They'd listened to the people, but they would now be in the position of saying, well, we've listened and look, we've backed down a little bit and everything will be okay.

I'm sure that the members opposite had another thing in mind. They said, you know, the Conservatives are having a leadership convention and we are going to wait until that leadership is over and then we're going to present that new Leader with this new package. We're going to show him, we've moved back on the resolution but we're bringing in a companion bill. Mr. Speaker, they were waiting for that leadership to be over because they thought the now Member for Charleswood and our former Leader was really the stumbling block and that was where the whole problem lay.

Mr. Speaker, they don't know how the Conservative Party works. It's a collection of ideas, things in this party are arrived at by consensus. Mr. Speaker, that's how we work.

So what have we got now? We got, on the night of the leadership convention, them delivering a letter to the new Leader. The night of the convention, the winner at his victory party was delivered a letter to meet with the Premier - this was a Saturday night - and on the Monday he was supposed to sit down and meet with the Premier. Mr. Speaker, they had their game plan figured out. They thought they'd be able to snooker our new Leader, whoever he was, into exactly this particular ploy, and they had a plan, because that envelope would have been delivered to anybody that had won. It wasn't singling out one Leader over another, but they thought that they would be able to sell this to the new Leader and that they would be able to overcome this issue by removing the Attorney-General from the spot and then moving out over to the House Leader. Well, Mr. Speaker, it hasn't worked.

The old saying about you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't call, as the First Minister tried today, a closure motion - the stifling of debate in this Legislature, a time allocation motion.

Whatever you want to call this resolution, the entrenchment of the language rights, the bill which is before us, the people of Manitoba are not ready to accept that particular bill or motion at this time, and that's why our Leader got up the other day and said let's go for a cooling off period. Let's go ahead and let this issue cool down a bit. Let's move it up six

months. Now, that's a very rational approach; I think something that the government should have really seriously sat down and talked about, but they didn't because they realize - and they've come to realize over the last number of months - that this is not like a bad dream that is going to go away when you wake up.

Mr. Speaker, this bad dream is not, as a lot of people would have us believe, an issue which will go away three months from now, even if we are forced to close on the closure aspect and deal with it now. This particular resolution, this particular bill will affect all of us over the next number of years. It will affect our children; it will affect our grandchildren.

For the government to move as they have, to force closure on this Legislature, to curtail debate on this particular motion is something that I believe indicates to the people of Manitoba their unwillingness to listen to them. The people of Manitoba are finding out that really they don't count, their thoughts don't count, their wishes don't count. And what we have seen happen here now today, in the introduction of this closure motion, is a desperate move by the government to put this matter behind them.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that will not work, that this government has done the people of Manitoba, the ethnic communities, the Francophone community, the Anglo-Saxon community, they have done them all a big disservice. I think the history books will show that this particular government did something that was much more divisive and has caused many more problems in Manitoba than the majority of governments that preceded them.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in closing my remarks, that if the government opposite really believes that by moving closure on this issue and trying to move this whole subject matter through the Legislature as quickly as possible and thereby curtail the negative effects that it's going to have on them politically they have misunderstood the people of Manitoba again and misread them.

Mr. Speaker, it's a sorry day to see this type of resolution introduced, and I have to say that I believe we are seeing the death rattle of a government who is so inept that they will try anything at the expense of the people of Manitoba to try and recoup some of the negative effects and some of the complete bungling, as my colleague from Sturgeon Creek says, that they have perpetrated on the people of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have just seen another example of the First Minister misleading the people of this province. We've just seen an example this afternoon when he was asked if he was going to speak on this bill and he got up and said he would speak on the time bill and now we see the First Minister sitting there, not getting up to speak as soon as he possibly could on this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the member indicated I had misled this

House. That is untrue, Mr. Speaker. I said I would be debating this bill during the course of the debate; I intend to do so. I call upon you, Mr. Speaker, to call upon the honourable member to withdraw those statements.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the First Minister, as I recall, did not say what he would speak, but the First Minister of this province has the obligation to speak on a closure motion as soon as he can in this House. He had the opportunity about one minute ago to get up and do so and he didn't have the internal fortitude to do so. You know, Mr. Speaker, I can . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. So that there is no misunderstanding by the House, the closure motion is not debatable.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest that the First Minister should have got up and told us why we are ending the debate on this bill so fast. Mr. Speaker, it was rather ironic that after that vote was taken and debate started the Premier and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the House Leader, shook hands and must have said fine job, well done. Why would he shake his hand, Mr. Speaker? He very probably said thank you for protecting me, thank you for letting me stand behind you, thank you for getting up front, so I don't have to get up front on this particular position. You know, it's obviously why he's a Minister now because he said put me in the job and I'll run interference for you and what he's doing is running the government into the ground, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bill before us at the present time that, as my colleague from La Verendrye said, was an obvious arrangement between the partners that the previous Attorney-General used to talk about. When the partners decided that they couldn't put through the resolution as it was originally put forward, because the people of Manitoba did not want the government to move forward on this particular bilingual issue in any way, shape or form, the SFM obviously said, well, if we'll agree and they had a meeting and they agreed - they agreed to go along with the new resolution, the amended resolution - and obviously providing there was a bill put in the House that did many of the same things that the resolution did, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Then, Mr. Speaker, they bring the bill before this House at a time when the population of Manitoba - 78 percent of the population of Manitoba - absolutely opposed what the government is doing regarding bilingualism in the Province of Manitoba and they just laughed in the people's face when they brought that forward. They laughed in their face the day after the plebiscite.

The Attorney-General, then House Leader, stood up and he said he didn't care what the people had to say. He never did care what the people had to say. All he wants to do with this bill is to create confusion among

the people. Creating confusion among the people is almost what you might call "divide and conquer" and that's basically the way that the Attorney-General wants to operate. So he was set aside by the First Minister because it was very obvious that he had failed with everything that he had put forward.

Now we put a little twerp in charge of the operations of the House leadership of the government — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody talk about it being not parliamentary, and I expected I would hear that from the Honourable Member for Inkster, so I just will tell him what Webster says about "twerp." It says: "a silly insignificant or a contemptible person." You know, Mr. Speaker, if that isn't the ideal description of the present House Leader, maybe I could use the word "twit."

**A MEMBER:** What does Webster say about "twit"?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, Webster says about "twit": "a silly annoying person, a fool." If he wants me to be parliamentary, I will. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have given the Webster meaning of those words, so it's pretty obvious that the House Leader will know what we're referring to when we use those names.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province of Manitoba had one hope that they would not have something that they voted 78 percent against . . .

**A MEMBER:** 80 percent, 85 percent, 90 percent in Woodlands.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** 80 percent. In my constituency, it was 82.5 percent. As a matter of fact, in the constituency where the Premier used to live, it was over 80 percent, Mr. Speaker. They said, you know, the Progressive Conservative Party is there to protect the wishes of the people of the Province of Manitoba, Sir. The people of the Province of Manitoba, they got told by this Premier that he didn't really care and he doesn't really care what they say. They are being told today that they're not even going to let their one hope of changing the government's mind speak any longer than the time limit allotted under our Bill No. 37, which is closure, Sir; closure in the Province of Manitoba over something that has affected their lives as seriously as this has; closure in the Province of Manitoba on a subject that the people have spoken out on . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** Point of order, Mr. Speaker, there has been a ruling by the Speaker . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Attorney-General on a point of order.

**HON. R. PENNER:** . . . a few moments ago that members are not to engage in debate on the closure motion. It's non-debatable.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, it's fairly obvious that word is not liked by the government. Yet, the House Leader, that twerp, he can get up and he can make

statements in the paper last night about calling closure. He can make those type of statements about Section 37, and, Mr. Speaker, now we have a situation where these people in the Province of Manitoba — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the reason why the Premier has not spoken to date, it's very obvious that he was just shaking in his boots that he would have to get up in this House and say that he agrees with the bilingualism resolution and bill that they have presented to the Province of Manitoba. He didn't want the headline, "Howard Pawley Agrees With Bilingualism."

No, he fought behind, he hid behind, he's hidden so far. It would be interesting to hear him speak, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, so far he's hidden behind the House Leader. So far, he's hidden behind the Deputy Premier, which he chooses to hide behind her skirts most of the time. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that the Deputy Premier is one that does get up and state her case in this House as often as she is supposed to, and I'm sure she does. But no, the Premier has decided to hide behind.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, I hear reference to the Leader of the P.C. Party in Ottawa. I do not ever recall Mr. Mulroney being elected to a constituency to represent the people of the Province of Manitoba in this Legislature. I happen to have been elected by the people of my constituency, which is basically the Stevenson Ward in the city, and the Stevenson Ward has voted 82.5 percent against what this government is doing in the Province of Manitoba. In the Stevenson ward, Sir . . .

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Against the May 16th proposal.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Oh, here's that - oh, Mr. Speaker, now we have the twit. Let's see, I have to refer. Twit is silly, annoying person, and a fool. Now we have the twit telling us that it was the first resolution that they voted against. I will assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if you want to hold another election, if you are so sure that the people are for the subamendment, I say to the First Minister and the twit over there, let's have an election. Very simple, it's not hard to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hear from the Attorney-General who is chirping about this whole thing. We have an Attorney-General who tried to drop into the Constituency of St. Johns to get elected to this House. He got his tail rapped off there. Then all of a sudden, he jumps over to Fort Rouge where he decided to drop in there. He tried to drop in there, and he told the people and the NDP people in Fort Rouge . . .

**HON. R. PENNER:** On a point of privilege.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** He told the NDP Party . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of privilege.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I think this is one of the most significant points of privilege I may ever have to raise. I did not drop into Fort Rouge, I was living in Fort Rouge, and proud of it. I was born and brought up in Winnipeg's North End, and proud of it. So don't let that twit over there tell me about dropping in anywhere.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member did not have a point of privilege.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, after dropping into St. Johns and then from dropping into St. Johns, he flopped his way over to Fort Rouge, so he tells the people of Fort Rouge and the NDP Party that, I will represent you.

So this is the first time this gentleman ever came into this House, the first time this Attorney-General has ever been in the House . . .

**MR. H. ENNS:** Let's get back to the twits and the twerps, Frank.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Gentleman - check your notes, Frank. Does it say "gentleman" there?

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** . . . no, he's wrong, he's wrong-headed. His philosophy is terrible. There is no question about the fact that he has disrupted this province to the point that any person has ever done in my life, but you know, he is a gentleman when he does speak and I must give him that credit — (Interjection) — I mean, I'm saying that about the Attorney-General. I know you're all rather surprised about that. I don't agree with a thing that he does. There is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, he comes into this House after saying that he will represent the people, as all of them have. You know, the Member for Interlake, he came in in '69 when I did, Sir, has represented his constituency well, 100 percent.

**A MEMBER:** Frank!

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** No, but there are other members over there like the honourable member who has been my friend for a long time, who has been here a long time and a Speaker of this House who have represented their people. They were elected, and all of the times when I've been here, when I have been returned, they were returned on the basis that they had represented their people.

Today, Sir, because of the past, the plebiscite, and because of what the people have said, they no longer represent their constituents. They have said I don't care what you say, we are going to put this through as government, and today they said they're going to put it through on the basis of closure.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, all of those gentlemen over there, and the twerp, they not only say to the people, I'm not going to represent you, but you know when we go to the polls the next time you people are going to pay for my election? You people are going to pay for my election. You're going to ask them to vote for you. You're going to ask them to pay for your election. You're going to ask them to send a group of people back here that do not listen to the wishes of the people of the province.

**A MEMBER:** The landlords will pay for yours.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I heard that comment that the landlords will pay for mine.

I will tell you who will support the Progressive Conservative Party. It will be 80 percent of the people of Manitoba who have been let down by this government. — (Interjection) — That's right, we'll have to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, the chirping of the Minister of Finance, the chef on the Muppets really, I can assure you that his constituency over there was probably 80 percent against this. You know, he thinks it's smart. With all due respect, Sir, while you're in the Chair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the people of your constituency became upset about the pension plan of the city councillors in Winnipeg, when they spoke to you and they spoke to all of the members opposite, from city members opposite, and they said, this is disgusting, the people of Manitoba don't want this, the people of Winnipeg don't want it, the people within those constituencies don't want it. The Member for River East brought in a bill to say and do what the people wanted him to do. On this issue he says, go jump in the lake. Now is that not playing politics? We get accused of playing politics. Is that not playing politics?

Mr. Speaker, the legislation is not what the people want at the present time. You know, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature is here to discuss one subject. We kept getting accused of holding up the business in the House, and there is only one item of business before the House. Let me put it this way, there should have been only one item of business before the House, because there is an agreement that we all have signed by the Attorney-General, signed by our previous House Leader, that we would come back and discuss the changes in the resolution regarding Section 23 of The Manitoba Act, and also a bill was brought in. It's the same subject, but a bill was brought in. A bill that may not, does not, will not have any effect for practically three years. A bill was brought into this House on the basis of an arrangement with the SFM.

Mr. Speaker, the SFM, you know, I get a real kick that a bill brought in on the basis of 6 . . . you know the last meeting they had 618 people were there. That bill was brought into this House and under the agreement we said, well it's the same subject matter, they can introduce a bill to the House. But what did they do? They decide that the bill, although it doesn't have to be proclaimed for three years, becomes more important than the resolution. That's what they decided. Mr. Speaker, they accused us on the other side — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I hear the Member for Wolseley chirping again and I have said to her that, you know, I'd be very pleased, I don't know the member's age, but if she wants to join the old boys' club and give me advice, I'm sure she qualifies to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that this bill comes in not to be proclaimed for three years, or close to three years, and they pushed the other aside. Do you know with the accusation about the bells ringing last week, do you know we had the new House Leader, the twerp, he comes along, and do you know what he says to us? — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard the observation parliamentary, but the young man from Thompson over there has done nothing in this House but talk about leaderships, talk about other people's leaderships, conventions, what people say at conventions, and that's all he has to contribute. He

talks about leaderships, that's all he has to talk about in this House. So you see, Mr. Speaker, he has absolutely very little contribution to make unless some party has a leadership convention.

So, Mr. Speaker, we come back into this House and we have before us this thing, but that little twerp over there stands up and he comes to us, and he says on this side of the House, or he says to our House Leader, you've got to speak, you must speak on Bill 115. He didn't just tell us we had to speak, he said, when you speak you must tell us the principle, what do you agree with, or what you think of it. He didn't just tell us we had to speak. That little dictator over there was coming to us and telling us what we had to speak on. — (Interjection) — That's right. He actually ran, he saw our House Leader one day and he didn't get any agreement from the House Leader, and where did he go, he went running down to the Leader's office to try and make some agreement, or has he told you people about that.

**A MEMBER:** He didn't see Sterling.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I know who my leader is, but you don't. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you if you have a leader, this province has not seen it. If the Member for Selkirk is the Leader and the Premier of this province, he's the only one in history that has disagreed with 80 percent of the people in this province. That's your leader. — (Interjection) — I'm not in this House about the papers, Mr. Speaker, as the Attorney-General says. His first three months in this House or in this Legislature was running around the halls trying to meet the press, and the little twerp's doing the same thing. Mr. Speaker, it's typical of all the House Leaders that have been appointed, typical. — (Interjection) — Absolutely, you're right, typical. I use the word office . . . it's what you call typical of socialists, no question about it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer back to some of those members and I mentioned the Member for Interlake and you know he's not here, but I will tell him because I think I know him well enough to tell him that he represented his people well. He's called Billy up there. I've been in his constituency at curling bonspiels, golf tournaments and everything else, and he's well-liked. Now he's not going to represent them. He has a group of people from his constituency come to this Legislature to talk to him about it and who did he bring in to talk to them?

**A MEMBER:** The twerp.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Yes, the twerp.

Mr. Speaker, he told them about the fact that official languages - and he goes back through the Hansards and he plays all the games whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, this person who arrived in this province just 10 short years ago — (Interjection) — I would doubt that. I heard the Member for The Pas talk about his accomplishments and I could list them for you very nicely and you would be surprised. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you 10 short years ago this person arrived in this province and all of a sudden, today or yesterday, we have never seen a more dictatorial attitude by any

House Leader in this House. He has decided that he will go down in history telling us what to do and what not to do. Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of how far you can trust the Member for Springfield. We know because he used to hang around our office the odd time when he was Deputy Clerk. We know how far you can trust him.

Mr. Speaker, the letters that the Premier has sent out have used the word "official." He keeps referring to official and there is nothing in Section 23 at the present time that has the word "official" in it. Mr. Speaker, the people of this province, the many people that are here from all walks of life and all ethnic origins are want to be in most cases Manitobans, Sir. They sincerely - and I heard that said on the other side - want to be Manitobans.

My ancestry came here in 1862, I believe, I'm just not quite sure, from another country and they wanted to be Manitobans. They lived beside people of other ethnic origins who wanted to be Manitobans. They wanted to keep their heritage, they wanted it respected and there never has been a province, as far as I know, that has respected the heritage of all ethnic people that come to this province, proven by our Folklorama and everything that goes with it. They haven't asked for any special privileges. When we get to talking on the resolution, I will discuss very very sincerely and directly what those people believe in regarding the change in the resolution that is being put forward by the government, how they sincerely feel.

But this bill, an ombudsman for languages in the Province of Manitoba? — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General says it's a good idea and I'm always worried about the Attorney-General's motives of confusing people, trying to get them in little groups fighting against one another, which is a division of divide and conquer. I said I don't believe in his philosophy, but I always worry that that's what he's talking about when he says it smiling.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I'm going to stop smiling.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, they haven't asked for any special privileges and we have all the ethnic groups within these provinces. They always have prided themselves on being able to get together. Then we have a situation where Mr. Trudeau comes along and decides he's going to change the country and then zeroes in on Manitoba with the Franco-Society of Manitoba, provides them with all the money he could possibly give them - I'm pretty sure if he found more he would give it to them - creating a situation in this province among all of the people within this province, creating division like we have never seen before and, Mr. Speaker, at their last meeting to decide whether they agreed with the government's new subamendment there were only 618 people at the meeting. I have met many Francophones in this province and most of them, other than their 6 percent Francophone in this province, and 618 went to a meeting. — (Interjection) — That's correct. 112 voted against the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba and the people of this province have spoken, whether you believe in plebiscite or whether you don't, they have spoken. They deserve to be listened to. Mr. Speaker, there are many

members over there, including the Member for St. James, who believes that what he is doing is the right thing, but he doesn't seem to realize that what he is doing is wrong for the people of Manitoba, wrong for his constituency. They told him it's wrong and for the second time he has gone against it. Then he's going to ask them to pay for his election.

Mr. Speaker, when we get the jibes across the House and I say he's finished, I get members saying, "Well, are you going to run against him?" I'm not going to run against him. My constituency is Sturgeon Creek. I intend to run there, or intend to seek the nomination there. But I can assure you there are people that are born and raised in St. James that will see that the Member for St. James is beaten again, and I single him out because I know the situation well. Mr. Speaker, the situation is the same in Dauphin. The situation is the same in The Pas. It's probably the worst in Springfield. I was in The Pas two months ago, I talked to a lot of people up there, the situation is the same in The Pas. Selkirk, Mr. Speaker, a constituency named after the Selkirk settlers in this province don't want him anymore.

**MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding:** The Honourable Member for River East on a point of order.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, could you tell me when the Member for Sturgeon Creek began his speech, at what time?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has approximately one minute left.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**MR. F. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Transcona, in the Transcona Shops at the present time, bilingualism within the CNR Shops, ask the men what is happening in there? The Member for Transcona, you know, his constituency was about - the percentage - it was nearly the biggest. It was 7,024 against or said "yes", pardon me, and 1,640 said "no."

There's another fellow that jumped around to get into this House. He went from Riel to Transcona, told the people that he would represent them, comes to this House and he doesn't represent them. Mr. Speaker, I assure you, you don't represent them. This government, led by a spineless Premier who has turned his back on the people of Manitoba, will be turfed out of office. They will not forget what he has done.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. Before recognizing the next speaker, I should mention to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that I heard part of his remarks when I was not in the Chair. I would hope that his language would not be a precedent for the members of this House to use in referring to other members of the House.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak after the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. I'm glad that I waited in a way until after the Honourable

Member for Sturgeon Creek had completed his remarks because, Mr. Speaker, I say this not lightly to you, but if we wanted a demonstration as to why this particular issue should be brought to a head, should be finished, it is the vulgar speech of the member that just spoke in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, when honourable members have to resort to name-calling, when honourable members do not have the facility or the strength to debate issues on the contents, on the philosophy, on the direction; if all that honourable members can do is flash and attempt to utilize McCarthyite tactics when they want to name call honourable members in this House, then - and let this be very clear - we know how very very weak and untenable their position is.

Mr. Speaker, I say this more by way of sadness than anger, because I had hoped that during this discussion we could have had the elevation of debate, not the downgrading of debate in this Chamber. I had trusted that with a change in leadership across the way, and Manitobans had anticipated that there be a lifting of the intellectual calibre of the debate in this Chamber from honourable members across the way. Mr. Speaker, I say this, and I say this also without reservation. Rather than an elevation, rather than an improvement in the level of debate and intellectual grasp and research from honourable members across the way, we have seen a deterioration on the part of debate in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to become engaged in - and I assure you that I accept the admonishment that you have delivered to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and to other members in this Chamber. I do not intend for a moment to stoop to those kinds of personality attacks because, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with this matter on the strengths of the arguments that we present to this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I heard comments just a little earlier that we were attempting to silence members, that we were attempting to stifle debate. Mr. Speaker, I ask through you to this Chamber whether or not there has been another occasion on another subject matter in which there have been as many words written in Hansard, where there have been as many hearings, where there had been as many briefs presented than there has been on the matter that is before us today. Mr. Speaker, what Manitobans are asking for and what Manitobans deservedly expect from their members is that we complete this matter, that we get on with the basic, essential task of this province. That is the creation and the preservation of jobs, and the improvement of the economy of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we do not apologize for rejecting attempts in this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition to hoist this bill for six months so that he can bring this matter back for further debate and detract this Chamber, the elected representatives of the people of the Province of Manitoba from dealing with the real human and economic issues facing Manitobans in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with, again for the record - and I regret again that we haven't been able to discuss in a way that we should, because of the lack of response from honourable members across the way - as to the reasons and the rationale. Rather than deal with rationale, honourable members prefer to muckrake. Mr. Speaker, we will deal with the rationale.

First, Mr. Speaker, it is our view that the vast majority of Manitobans prefer to see this matter dealt with in Manitoba by their elected representatives in this Chamber, rather than having a solution to this difficult matter imposed upon them by way of the Supreme Court in Ottawa, a Supreme Court made up of appointees of the Federal Government.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we have demonstrated on this side strength in respect to this issue because - and I again want to repeat, because there has been some misunderstanding on this matter - towards the latter part of June, we wanted to take this matter to public hearings. In an address to this Chamber, I made that very very clear, June 25th or June 24th.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

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

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** And honourable members across the way prevented the committee from going out to receive the briefs and submissions of members of the public. But, Mr. Speaker, we eventually did obtain the views and the submissions of the public.

Mr. Speaker, we changed our position. We changed our submission as a result of submissions and briefs that were made. We listened to the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, unlike honourable members across the way that had been struck by a paralysis of thinking, this side of the Chamber listened and responded and made appropriate changes.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that it is not a sign of weakness to make change when constructive views and proposals are made. Mr. Speaker, that is a sign of strength on the part of any party, on the part of any government. Mr. Speaker, what is a sign of weakness? It is when after seven months of debate there is a continued digging of the heels by honourable members across the way to a position, unprepared to rethink any position, continue to attempt to use fear and emotion to deal with what is an important issue in this province. Mr. Speaker, we have . . .

**A MEMBER:** Back into the flower pot, Sterling.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, is it the Member for Sturgeon Creek that's into the flower pot?

**A MEMBER:** No, no, it's Sterling.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I don't mind that because really what is there left for honourable members to do if they can't participate in intellectual discussion of this matter but to puff and woof away.

Mr. Speaker, we dealt with this matter and have proceeded on this matter, yes, because it is a matter of human decency and ensure that human decency is translated and reflected insofar as the passage of legislation, resolution in this Chamber.

We proceeded with this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because, unlike honourable members across the way, we do believe that we're living in 1984 and not 1870. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should be developing a public consensus and respect to the needs of 1984 rather than following the dictates of 1870.

Mr. Speaker, we also proceeded on this because, as I mentioned, it is a matter of principle, it's a matter of human decency. It is not a matter, Mr. Speaker, of expediency. If honourable members feel across the way that they can appeal to honourable members on this side on the basis of expediency and opportunism and fear, let me tell honourable members they've missed the mark by 10 miles because honourable members across this way, unlike members across the way, are prepared to stand on this issue on the basis of what is decent, what is honourable, what is principled, not on the basis of what is expedient or opportunist.

Mr. Speaker, there was a comment that was made by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye that I want to deal with because it was one that was touching, because we have a deep responsibility in this Chamber to ensure that we do leave a legacy insofar as those that follow us in this Chamber and those that follow us as Manitobans in the years that come ahead. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye had left an impression in this Chamber that what we were doing was going to affect in a very negative way the grandchildren that would follow in this province. Mr. Speaker, I wondered just where the honourable member has been this past two years, three years . . .

**A MEMBER:** Rip Van Winkle.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . because what is both reasonable and sensible but parallel to our policy on French Language Services, we have established an intercultural council which is, I think - and am proud of this - is building the awareness of the multicultural fact in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, what is translated in this bill is a policy, and this has been stated by honourable members across the way, that they established the policy in respect to French Language Services in this province and I have paid tribute to honourable members across the way that indeed that is the fact. It was the Conservative Party. It was a Conservative Party that was led by the then Premier Lyon in this province that first initiated French Language Services and established a policy. Mr. Speaker, that was a policy that was endorsed by all members of this House. I remember as we sat as opposition we did not take issue because it was right. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it might have been expedient for the then opposition in this Chamber to have attempted to stir fear in this province, but we recognized it was right, and we were not going to bend to the temptation of expediency in order to attempt to spread fear throughout the Province of Manitoba. We support it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I announced a policy which is the principle of the legislation that is before us. I announced a policy close to two years ago in this Chamber, and I want to repeat that policy announcement that was made at that time . . .

**A MEMBER:** When did you make it?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . close to two years ago. That policy announcement has been endorsed frequently by honourable members across the way and, Mr. Speaker, I want to read the specifics of that policy announcement that was read in this Chamber close to March of 1982.

1. Services provided by the Government of Manitoba shall be made available to the extent possible in both official languages in areas where the French-speaking population is concentrated. These areas are defined, and I read this close to two years ago in this Chamber, as the urban regions of St. Boniface, St. Vital and St. Norbert. The rural areas covered by the Seine River, by the Red River, by Mountain, by Whitehorse Plains School Divisions, the towns of St. Lazare, Ste. Rose du Lac, Laurier, St. George, Powerview, Provincial Government offices serving the entire Metropolitan Winnipeg area, the province as a whole.

2. All written correspondence received from members of the public in English or French should be answered in the same language, read out in this Chamber.

3. Where feasible, forms, identity documents, certificates for use by the general public shall be in a bilingual format.

That was announced openly in this Chamber close to two years ago, endorsed by honourable members across the way. I don't think there's an honourable member across the way that will claim they did not endorse these points I'm reading now.

4. Government information, documents destined for the general public shall be in either bilingual or separate language formats depending upon cost efficiency require distribution.

5. Where practical, signs and public notices in the regions of the province that I mentioned earlier shall be in both languages.

Finally, priority in the introduction of French Language Services shall be given to departments which have a greater impact in the general population and, particularly, young people, senior citizens.

This was all announced two years ago, Mr. Speaker. The above policies, of course, cannot be implemented. Mr. Speaker, they were announced openly in this Chamber. They were not hidden in the darkness like honourable members across the way that hid their actions in the darkness because they're afraid of generating fear in the province. Mr. Speaker, we were open; we announced these policies in the Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members across the way have given endorsement to these policies, and let them not try to wiggle about that because I noticed the Leader of the Opposition went out to speak to a group that were on the steps of this Legislature that were critical of the government's action.

**A MEMBER:** That's not true.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, if it's not true, then I withdraw on the basis of newspaper reports that were there that indicated the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was out there. It appeared to me, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member was attempting to . . .

**A MEMBER:** Inside.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** inside the building? Well, I don't care if it was outside or inside the building. What I do know is that the honourable member across the way, I'm certain, did not indicate, did not clearly outline to those people that were present, that indeed what I just

read was in fact their policy that they have given endorsement to.

Mr. Speaker, I have a document here signed here by the President of the Council, October 5, 1980.

**A MEMBER:** Who was that?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Sterling Lyon.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** This one isn't signed but I don't think it's been questioned at all as an official document of the previous administration of the Province of Manitoba.

In the document it states, "It does not seem necessary to set forth an official policy on this matter at the present time" - the time was October 5, 1980 - "on this matter." — (Interjection) — It's already been tabled. "at the present time, nor should this matter be addressed publicly, unless it is raised in such a manner that requires a response." In other words, boys and girls within the club, this is our policy. I'm sending a memorandum to you, my colleagues, but this shouldn't be raised publicly, unless it's raised by somebody else and in such a way, but in only in such a way that requires a response. Mr. Speaker, why the fear?

Mr. Speaker, on the part of honourable members across the way, come on says the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. Come on, why in October, 1980, then, did honourable members across the way continue to keep their ideas in the dark? Why did they not light a candle to their ideas? Why did they not let all Manitobans know what their policy was? Why did they say they wanted to keep their ideas in the dark?

The answer is clear, honourable members have made it very clear for the last number of days. Honourable members are thinking only in expedient opportunistic terms. Mr. Speaker, they're only thinking in terms of the next election. They're only thinking in terms of polls. They don't want to deal with principle and what is right, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there could not be any more clear-cut evidence than the document that I have now in my hand, as to the statements that I have just made. Mr. Speaker, in addition . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** . . . there is a lot of support for the proposal from people throughout this province and we've heard from many of those groups and organizations and people at the public hearings.

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the First Minister would be kind enough to table the document that he just read from, in accordance with our rules.

**A MEMBER:** It's been tabled, Sterling.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, there's no problem. Mr. Speaker, it's yellow, but I will table it. It's the second

time the same document has been tabled. I don't blame the Honourable Member for Charleswood because I notice he probably has not reread the document since October, 1980.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we've heard further comments of a personality nature, which again goes to demonstrate that honourable members across the way, burning with their hate and their inability to accept the fact they lost the election November 1981, unable to accept the fact that they do not divinely have some inspiration to continue government, are unable to deal with substance, with policy, with detail.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote a news story, Myron Spolsky, a spokesman for the Ukrainian Community Development Group, states and I quote, "When somebody in the community asked what French language rights have to do with Ukrainian rights, I simply remind them that the same provincial law that closed French schools in 1916 also closed 118 Ukrainian schools."

Or another comment and I quote, "In a multicultural society, sensitivity in the rights of two official language groups helps create an atmosphere that promotes the rights of all minorities," says Israel Ludwig, Chairman of the Joint Community Relations Committee of the Jewish Community Council of Winnipeg.

Or, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chandra, President of the National Association of Canadians of Origins in India, adds and I quote, "This letter to you is to express the unqualified support of the East Indian community for the constitutional amendment proposal to entrench French language rights. We want your government to be aware of our belief that the protection of minority rights, especially that of languages, is fundamental for the cultural growth of the ethnic communities, the only way institutions like democracy can survive and can strive."

Support has also been addressed, Mr. Speaker, by other groups and organizations in the province: the Manitoba Metis Federation; the Portuguese Association of Manitoba; the Italian-Canadian League; the Mennonite Heritage Centre; the Vietnamese in Central Canada; the Parents for German Education.

Mr. Speaker, we believe these positions that we're presenting are shared by many people in Manitoba, and particularly the resolution and the bill that is before us, a bill and a resolution that reflects the opinions and views that were expressed to members of this Chamber sitting in committee, but also it expresses the views of Conservatives in this province, not just New Democrats, not just Liberals.

Mr. Speaker, there's a letter written to the editor by a Conservative from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I want to read and place on the record, Mr. Speaker, the words that were expressed by that member of the Conservative Party in this province — (Interjection) — former member, and I quote: "At the annual meeting of the Portage la Prairie branch of the Progressive Conservative Association, my wife and I tore up our membership

cards and walked out while the President of the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Association rambled on about La Société Franco-Manitoban being in collusion with the Liberal Party of Canada. Collusion is synonymous with such words as plotting, conspiracy, scheming. To me that carries with it an inference of wrongdoing.

"I have first-hand knowledge of what it is like to be a second-class citizen in Canada. I can remember my very good English-speaking friends in Quebec who were subjected to the atrocities of the provincial Bill 101. They considered Quebec their homes as much as French-speaking Canadians did. Their families had toiled over the generations for the right to call Montreal their own; yet, they were subjected to sending their children to French schools or alternatively selling their homes, leaving the province.

It is this very sort of injustice that I do not wish to see in Manitoba. I do not want to see history repeat itself with the French-speaking Canadians in Manitoba.

I would like honourable members just to listen for a moment to these words because the gentleman in question who tore up his membership card I think expressed it very clearly in this sentence. "I do not wish to see history repeat itself with the French-speaking Canadians in Manitoba being the English-speaking Canadian counterparts in Quebec. Canada is one country where we should be first and foremost Canadians. I admire the sense of unity portrayed by all three federal party leaders and more so the courage and determination . . . "Well, I'm not reading this for this purpose, Mr. Speaker, ". . . shown by Premier Howard Pawley and his NDP Party. I despise," says this former Conservative, "people like the President of the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Association and the province's Progressive Party. Although I continue," he said, "in my allegiance to Brian Mulroney and to the Federal Progressive Conservative Party, it's more than I can say," he says, "for my own constituency which has not even bothered to inquire why we tore up our memberships. If there are other members of the Progressive Conservative Party who feel as I do, let your constituencies know that they do not represent you."

Mr. Speaker, clearly the Conservatives have not been listening. They haven't even been bothering to listen to members of their own party. They haven't troubled to listen to the positions and the views of even members of their own party representing the Province of Manitoba and the House of Commons in Ottawa. They haven't bothered to listen to the Member for Provencher. They haven't troubled to listen to the Member for Lisgar. They haven't troubled to listen to the Member for Marquette and they haven't listened to the Member for Brandon-Souris. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they do listen to the Member for Winnipeg-St. James, because what we hear from honourable members across the way is an echo of the views, an expression of views of the Member for Winnipeg-St. James in the Federal House.

Mr. Speaker, throughout this debate this government has set for itself high standards, standards that I think are perhaps best articulated by the following phrases: we must put forward our own policies and clearly demonstrate that we have a better way. — (Interjection) — Somebody is squirming. My emphasis will be on team building, I'm motivating people to work together.

The objective that we must have is to bring people together to work in harmony for a common goal.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Getting rid of you, Howard, that's the common goal.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** We've heard more statesmanlike remarks from the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, the present Leader of the Opposition, that indicates that this was all wash, that the common objective was just to get rid of the government. Mr. Speaker, these words, if you're talking about taking new approaches, setting new priorities, putting forth new challenges, you have to ensure that all of the people who are going to be affected understand at least what you are doing — (Interjection) — probably, Mr. Speaker, familiar sounding phrases to the honourable members across the way.

Well they should be, Mr. Speaker, because they are the expressions by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo. The Honourable Member for Tuxedo in his leadership speech on Saturday, December 10, 1983, in his interview the following morning, Monday morning, with CJOB. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it must be difficult, it must be humiliating for the honourable members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa on a point of order

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I just wonder if the Speaker could tell me what time the Honourable Premier started to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has approximately one minute remaining.

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I know it is embarrassment to the Leader of the Opposition to be stuck with a dogmatic, a stubborn caucus. I know that it is indeed embarrassing and awkward for the Leader of the Opposition in view of these phrases to be hostage to his own caucus, rather than be able to accept a new challenge to move forward with new ideas, to have been held hostage by members of his own caucus to oppose legislation that the Conservatives had endorsed by way of language services. Mr. Speaker, or indeed will we see that they will continue to be stubborn and dogmatic?

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives, despite having a Leader, are still following that same path and that path is the same path that has been travelled by the former Leader of the Conservative Party, the Member for Charleswood. Mr. Speaker, the Tories under their former leader were wrong. They continue to be wrong.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please. The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate again, especially coming on the heels of the speech made with the Province of Manitoba's original rubberman. He has wobbled so much on this issue that he looks, as Churchill would say, like one of the rubbermen who used to sit on the opposition benches back in the first decade when Churchill was in Parliament, men of rubber with no spine. The speech that we were treated to this afternoon by the First Minister gives us full proof, Sir, as to why this leaderless, rudderless bunch of people are in their death agony at the present time and that the people of Manitoba today, as my colleagues have said, are witnessing the death of a bad government, a government, Mr. Speaker, with no credibility at all.

I had to lecture this man, this Member for Selkirk, when he first became Leader of the New Democratic Party about the truth. It's in Hansard. I gave him pretty good advice at the time. I told him not to go for the quick trick. I told him to pay some attention to the truth, because he had at that time a tendency to slip away from the facts. Mr. Speaker, today he stood in his place in the House and said that there had been some mistake made in the debate about the willingness of this government to call public hearings on the matter of the constitutional resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take the time of the House to reread the question period for June 17, 1983, but it was on that occasion that this government was asked, this First Minister was asked, the present Attorney-General was asked if they would hold intersessional committee hearings on the question of the constitutional entrenched reference. You know what the answer was, Sir? Here it is, Mr. Speaker. Let me put this into the record. When I asked the First Minister in Oral Questions: will he "... give an undertaking to the House this morning that the suggestion that has been made that the committee meet intersessionally, that is, after we have concluded the business of the House this year, that suggestion be followed?"

Page 3770 of Hansard: "Hon. H. Pawley: Mr. Speaker, no. This is a matter that will be dealt with not on intersessional basis, but as a consequence of the kinds of meetings that have been outlined by the Attorney-General to deal with the information." And on and on it goes, Mr. Speaker.

They wanted to have only their propaganda meetings. We forced them, kicking and screaming, into legislative committee hearing meetings. They persist, Mr. Speaker, and I use the word advisedly, they persist in lying about it in this House time and time again.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member knows that he may not accuse other honourable members of lying. He should withdraw that word.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**HON. S. LYON:** I didn't say the member in question, Mr. Speaker, was a liar. I say, he is a stranger to the truth.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, time and time again, we have had to call this government to account, because the misinformation, the deceit, the attempt to mold facts to suit their own version of history is replete among all of their members. They think they can get away with

it. They think that because they fooled the public in November of 1981, they can fool them again on this issue by lying and cheating, sleight of hand and so on. Mr. Speaker, we're not going to let them get away with it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I must remind the honourable member again, he may not accuse other members of lying in this House.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** He's doing it as a group.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "lying." I think the import of what I'm saying has struck home, however.

So we are engaged now, Mr. Speaker, in an historic debate on closure brought about by a fumbling, bumbling collection of individuals who no longer deserve the name to be called a government, and who have caused a kind of social agony in this province, the likes of which I have never seen before. Some of their members drift in and out of this province and sit on the Front Bench or Treasury Bench for awhile, and then God knows where they'll drift off to when they're defeated after the next election. It may not matter to them the harm, the legacy of pain and harm and rending of the social fabric that they are doing to the people of this province, but it matters to us. For that Leader, so-called, to stand in his place today and to try to turn this whole series of misdirected events on the opposition and, by implication, to turn it on the people is really a reflection of the depravity to which this government has sunk when they say, Mr. Speaker, 78 percent of the people are wrong and we're right.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister just finished saying that the Leader of the Opposition was hostage to the caucus. The Leader of the Opposition is not hostage to our caucus, but he is serving the people of Manitoba. He's serving them in a way that this government would do well to take example from because, Mr. Speaker, in our parliamentary democracy, you can't turn your back on the people. Because if you do, then, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate weapon of the people will come to bear.

I say to this man who just finished speaking, the Member for Selkirk - he no longer deserves to be called Premier. He's not a Premier. He doesn't act like a Premier. He fills the office, that's all, occupies the office under false pretences. If he is so concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the opposition and our Leader of the Opposition and his position vis-a-vis the caucus, vis-a-vis the people of Manitoba then, No. 1, let him have a free vote among his own members. Yes, let him let his own members vote freely according to their conscience, and then we'll see how the chickens fly.

Then secondly, Mr. Speaker, if he believes a word of what he says about the Leader of the Opposition, let him then in the face of 78 percent rejection of his ill-starred plan dissolve this House and go to the people of Manitoba tomorrow on this issue. Then we'll see who is hostage to who.

Mr. Speaker, what we have just been treated to is the spectacle of a person who occupies the office of

the Premier in this province who so little understands the waves of resentment that he and his colleagues have created in this province, who so little understand it - and they've created it themselves - that they now seek and now have passed this extraordinary remedy in this House to cut off debate on perhaps the single most important issue that this House has had before it in generations.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the First Minister, I say to his colleagues and I say to the people of Manitoba that the people of Manitoba will see this action taken today by this government as shoving bilingualism down their throats. That's the way they will perceive it. If my honourable friends think that this trick they have pulled with respect to House rules is going to save them in terms of the contempt with which they are regarded by the people of Manitoba then, Mr. Speaker, I can only suggest that they think in an altogether wrong way.

Mr. Speaker, Parliament is a talk shop. That's why it is here. Parliament is a place where matters are to be discussed. We on this side know, Mr. Speaker, that the initiatives taken by this government back in May of this year when the Attorney-General announced them were wrong. They were against the public interest. It was a bad deal that should never have been negotiated. It was not necessary to negotiate the deal at all.

Today, Mr. Speaker, unlike the remnants of this government across the way, we know on this side of the House that we are nourished by the people of Manitoba and by their support. We know that. We know, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House that the people of Manitoba will not be denied on this matter by the mishandling that has taken place, the negligence, the contempt that these people have shown for the history of this province, what the people of Manitoba are prepared to tolerate from a government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are conferring on this Opposition Party, they're conferring on the Member for Elmwood, they're conferring on the Member for Brandon West, they're conferring on people who are speaking on their behalf a kind of vitality to continue this debate that my honourable friends across the way really have never experienced. They don't know what it is to have public opinion saying to them, yes, you are right. Not only do we support you because you are right; we support you because what you are fighting is wrong for the Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in an exercise to prevent a bad government from making bad law. We will continue on that exercise as long as God gives us breath.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider again, what would the course of events have been? The Member for Selkirk from his place reads a memorandum that was sent by the President of the Council. He's had it photostated so often, or he cribbed it from some place, that you can't even see any signature on it, typical of the skulking way that they go about obtaining documents and so on.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the document that says here's how we are going to give some implementation to French services, a document addressed to the Cabinet. He tries to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that because we were engaged in that process that somehow or other we have got to click our heels and come to a full salute and say, yes, Member for

Selkirk, we will support what you're doing even though it's wrong, even though you have poisoned the well of public opinion to the point where the people of Manitoba will no longer support perhaps even what was put forward in that document in 1980. That's the damage, that's the indictment I lay against these people, Mr. Speaker, that they have so poisoned public opinion in Manitoba by their ineptitude, by their ideological stupidity that they make impossible to be done now what reasonable people would ordinarily want to see done. They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, not the opposition, not the grass-roots people, none of them at all, they are the ones who have brought this ignominy upon the heads of themselves.

Mr. Speaker, all I have to do to prove that proposition is this, that if we had been favoured with public support in November 1981, would this matter be before the House today? No, no it wouldn't. The matter had been dealt with, Mr. Speaker, by an act of the Legislature in 1980.

Their plans were proceeding, Mr. Speaker, for the gradual implementation of reasonable French services as a matter of government policy at that time. Was there a need for a grass-roots organization? No. Were Francophones at odds with their other friends and fellow citizens in Manitoba? No.

There was no need for that to happen at all until these foolish inept people took it upon themselves, Mr. Speaker, to try to settle a constitutional case. In the long annals of British and Canadian justice, has anyone every heard before of somebody trying to settle a constitutional case? How silly, how completely silly, and look at the wreckage that has flowed from that first silly initiative on their part.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all of this agony would not have happened because we would never have considered for a moment a constitutional amendment of the nature that this government put forward in May of this year. I'm going to talk in a few minutes about how far they've backtracked from that. We would never have done it. There would have been peace and tranquility in Manitoba today, because we would never have embarked upon that kind of a foolish venture, never.

Then, Mr. Speaker, after having started the initiative to "settle", and I put that word in quotation marks, to "settle" the Bilodeau case, Mr. Speaker, they've spent tens of thousands of dollars of public money on misinformation, on ads, on buying support wherever they could find it, on making special grants, Mr. Speaker - and we're going to be getting the details of those grants during the course of the next Session, if not this Session - special grants that they made all over the field to different ethnic groups to say, look, we're on your side, won't you come and be on our side on the French language issue.

We know what went on, Mr. Speaker. We were told. We were told that the public's money was being used as a form of veiled bribe in order to catch the odd supporter here and there for this government in its ill-starred venture. We know, Mr. Speaker. So I say that the misinformation, the deceit, the attempts to rewrite history that this government has participated in, Mr. Speaker, will live and will endure in the annals of the history of this province to the discredit of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, for a long time. I freely predict, and I'm not one who ordinarily makes

predictions about electoral outcomes, but I freely predict that this party as presently constituted under this Leader, the Member for Selkirk, will never hold office in Manitoba again for at least a generation because of what they have been doing to this province.

Mr. Speaker, what are some of these deceits and misinformation that they've talked about? We heard some of it today from the First Minister when he spoke from his place talking about minority rights, human decency, restoration of constitutional rights. That's all baffle-gab, Mr. Speaker, it's all baffle-gab. There was no restoration of constitutional rights involved in their constitutional document of last May. There was nothing to be restored. It had been restored by the Supreme Court, and by the act of this Legislature in 1980. There was nothing further to be restored. Let's put that piece of misinformation and deceitful propaganda to rest.

There was no question of minority rights involved at all, Mr. Speaker. The constitutional rights had been restored. What our government had been doing, what this government announced, and you notice the First Minister read his statement in March of 1982 and he said, the Tories didn't object to that. Of course, we didn't, Mr. Speaker, of course we didn't because it wasn't a constitutional document. They hadn't poisoned public opinion in Manitoba. There wasn't an act backing it up to give bureaucrats, faceless, nameless bureaucrats whom they hire by the dozen - particularly when they're their friends bankrupt or otherwise - there wasn't, Mr. Speaker, objection taken by the opposition at all. If my honourable friends had continued on that reasonable course, there wouldn't be this debate taking place. But, no, they had to settle the Bilodeau case.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just for a minute let's remember what happened in the Bilodeau case. It was a traffic ticket. The proposition advanced by Mr. Bilodeau in seeking to defeat that ticket was that because The Highway Traffic Act had not been translated into French, that the law was invalid, and that ergo all of the laws of Manitoba since 1870, which had not been translated into French, were invalid.

A really funny proposition, Mr. Speaker. I say funny because it was dismissed out of hand at the trial court. I say funny because it was thrown out in the Court of Appeal, and was on its way to being thrown out as an evidence of frivolity in the Supreme Court of Canada until these marvelous fixers across the way decided that they were going to save us from the possible chaos of this case.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the reason they advanced at that time. They didn't talk then about minority rights because they knew there were no minority rights to be protected. They didn't talk then about restoration of constitutional rights because there weren't any to be restored. They didn't talk then about human decency; no, they talked about the Bilodeau case, period, paragraph. That's what they talked about. You see how they've shimmied and slithered all over the field trying to grasp at some resemblance of intellectual probity to clothe the stupidity which they inflicted upon the people of Manitoba by this bad agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to rehearse any more. It's well known what happened in the Bilodeau case. It's well known now, Mr. Speaker, just how far that government has backtracked from that original agreement. Read June 17, 1983, read the Attorney-

General when he said in answer to my questions, no we can't change that agreement. We've either got to accept it or reject it but we can't change a word. That's what he said then and they talk about flip-flops. They talk about flip-flops - well, Mr. Speaker, have they ever changed the agreement - have they ever changed the agreement! It demonstrates, beyond any question at all, how bad the original agreement was, just how much they were giving away in the original agreement, that they didn't have to give away. No question of minority rights; no question of human decency; no question of restoration of constitutional rights then. They didn't talk about those idealistic goals then, because they didn't exist then and they don't exist now.

The government's retreat, as I said the other day on this issue, Mr. Speaker, makes Napoleon's retreat from Moscow look like a walk around the block. They have practically gutted their original proposition that they weren't going to change a word of - they weren't going to change a word of it - they were going to accept it or reject it. They've practically gutted it now and the key to understanding just how bad the negotiation was, Mr. Speaker, the key, as I have said before, is that the Franco-Manitoban Society, Mr. Bilodeau, the Government of Canada, are all willing to accept - now - something that is watered down to the point where you would hardly recognize what they started out with.

Doesn't that suggest - even to common fixers like the Minister of Municipal Affairs - doesn't that suggest, even to his kind of mind, that they must have been giving away a devil of a lot that they didn't have to give away, if the other parties to the agreement are now prepared to accept this watered wine? Of course it was a bad agreement, badly negotiated by a bad government, with no understanding of the history of this province and a contempt for the people of this province who have said to them again and again, don't do this, you're fools. That's what the people of Manitoba are saying today.

I had a phone call this morning and we get them daily. We don't read Letters to the Editor. The Honourable Member for Selkirk stands up and reads one letter to the editor that came from Portage la Prairie. What about the dozens, what about the scores that have appeared in the paper, pleading with this man and with his government to drop this constitutional initiative? No he wouldn't read those because they represent the majority opinion.

No, Mr. Speaker, we now face closure because we stood up, from Day One against this government's ill-starred venture - from Day One. We said from Day One, this is not good. It is not right that you would constitutionally entrench this kind of an agreement into the Constitution. My honourable friends across the way, at that time, said well that's what we're going to do and we're going to have propaganda meetings and that's it. That's what they said, and we forced them, Mr. Speaker, kicking and screaming into constitutional hearings and we now stand up today and speak on behalf of the vast majority of Manitobans, who don't want any part of this government's bilingualism program and won't have it, and they can use all of the muzzling devices that Socialists love to use. They can use closure all they want but the people of Manitoba won't have it, and we will continue to talk and to support the people of Manitoba on this issue, because we know that we

and they are right and that this government is wrong, sadly wrong, sadly wrong, Mr. Speaker, in tearing the social fabric of this province in a way that it need not have been torn at all.

We know who speaks in this House for the people of Manitoba - we do. We do. We know that the Member for Elmwood speaks more closely for the people of Manitoba than anybody on the government side of the House - he does. I think he has shown - if I may say so, Sir, as a fellow backbencher - I think he has shown a kind of bravery that many people in Manitoba and many of us on this side of the House acknowledge for standing up for his principles, for standing up for what he thinks is best for the people of Manitoba, and he's right too.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we have to face closure because we stand up for the vast majority of Manitobans, we'll face closure, but we won't give up our responsibility to speak on their behalf. We won't turn our back on the people of Manitoba the way this government is doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they've dropped the guillotine of free speech and consider, if we had not fought this package from Day One, starting last May, if we hadn't fought this package, if we had not adjourned the House as we did on the 17th of June - the very day when they refused to have committee hearings - we adjourned the House that day and let the bells ring. Why? Because they were going to have committee hearings? No, because they weren't going to have committee hearings, that's why, and this First Minister has the temerity to stand up in this House and say oh, they always wanted to have committee hearings, read June 25th, says he. I tell him read June 17th and ask him why did we adjourn the House that day, if he was prepared - as he tries to say now in his devious way - he was prepared to have committee hearings? Why does he treat this House to that kind of misstatement and expect to get away with it? He talks about intellectual probity, Mr. Speaker. What about sheer basic honesty in dealing with this matter? Why can't the members of this government at least tell the truth once in a while about this issue?

No, Mr. Speaker, we fought then and imagine if we hadn't fought. Think of the abomination that this province would now be saddled with - a constitutional amendment entrenched, approved by their friend, Pierre Trudeau in Parliament, and the people of Manitoba would have been saddled forever with that abomination.

Well the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, now see that a 170 degree turn has been made by this government and we want them to come 10 more points back to sanity. We stopped that and, Mr. Speaker, if God gives us breath, we'll stop this - what's left of this initiative - because it's still wrong, because it is not possible to do it in the climate that they have created in this province today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I'm not going to speak about closure because that is not a debatable motion, but I am going to speak in my final words about Parliament. I would have thought that this government would have grasped the opportunity when the hoist motion was put on - the six-month hoist and the First Minister stands in his place and tries to pretend that the six-month hoist means to debate it six months hence. The six-month hoist, Mr. Speaker, is meant to kill the bill. He knows that. If he doesn't know that, he shouldn't be sitting in the front row.

Why didn't they grasp that opportunity to say let time heal the wounds that we have created and we'll come back when tempers are cooler on this matter, and do what we can, and start off in a different way? No, they wouldn't do that. They wouldn't do that and, Mr. Speaker, they dishonour this institution. The House Leader says, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition are anti-democratic because they ring the bells. Who's anti-democratic? Those who turn their backs on the people and try to force something onto the people that the people won't have, or those who speak for the people and ring the bells and do the other things that have to be done to stop a bad government from bad action? Who's anti-democratic? I know, Mr. Speaker. I only wish that they had a little bit deeper understanding of this institution, what it means, what it's capable of doing.

My God, Sir, haven't they seen since last May what we forced them to do in this House and what the public have forced them to do, and yet they try to pretend that things haven't changed. I feel for Parliament as an institution. I love it as an institution because it works. It's one of mankind's creations that works.

"During the height of the Second World War," Mr. Speaker, "in 1941, Winston Churchill was leaving the House of Commons one night and he took one of the members by the arm and he steered me into the deserted Commons Chamber." - and this is from "The Finest Hour" by Martin Gilbert - and I ask my honourable friends opposite to listen to this. "All was darkness except for a ring of faint light from concealed lamps under the gallery. We could dimly discern the untidy litter of papers on the floor and the table, but the walls and the roof were invisible. 'Look at it,' Churchill said, 'this little place is what makes the difference between us and Germany. It is in virtue of this that we muddle through to success and, for lack of this, Germany's brilliant efficiency will lead her to final disaster. This little room is the shrine of the world's liberties.'" Mr. Speaker, this little room is the shrine of Manitoba's liberties and this government has dishonoured it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please.  
The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Charleswood appeared to be a little more like a pussycat than he appeared in previous months. Maybe it's because he's become a flowerchild, but his predictions are still no better than they were over the years. In 1981, he predicted the defeat of the NDP; in 1983, that man was making all kinds of wild and ignorant predictions with respect to the Budget, the deficit with respect to spending, with respect to revenue, that sort of thing. That's the kind of thing he's into.

I listened all afternoon to hear anybody on that side talk about Bill 115. The Member for Sturgeon Creek

talked about it a little bit. He referred to the ombudsman, but the Member for Charleswood did nothing in terms of Bill 115, and I think that it would be about time that we, in fairness to the people of Manitoba, started talking about the issue that's before us and that is Bill 115. It is not an amendment to the Constitution. It is a statute of the Province of Manitoba which can be changed by any government at any time. It is, indeed, putting into statute what our Premier said we were prepared to deliver two years ago before we were involved with the Bilodeau case in terms of any discussions of changes. This is the service that we were prepared to put into effect for French-speaking Manitobans then. The opposition said they were prepared to put it into effect. Why are they now opposing this bill? What is it about this bill that they don't like?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Let's have a little bit of the history of this. Let us look at a bit of the history of this. "What is the hurry? What is the hurry?" they say. Mr. Speaker, we started off well over a year ago talking about the fact that we have a problem bringing this whole system back into effect. More than a year ago the Conservatives were made aware that there were discussions going on. In December of 1982, they sat silent in the bush until May or June of 1983 and the Member for Charleswood said that the Premier had said that we had never opposed committee hearings. That's not true. That's not what the Premier said. The Premier said, in June of 1983, he was saying, we were going to go into committee and they know that well. Before that, we opposed it. That is true. We changed our mind and we were probably wrong.

After those committee hearings we heard hundreds of Manitobans representing thousands of Manitobans telling us how we could change that package and make it better. We listened to the people of Manitoba. We saw the results of the plebiscite. We came back with a proposal that is not increasing French speaking rights in Manitoba in our Constitution; it is not doing that. We are providing for increased services in a bill.

The members of the opposition were saying: let's have this finished by December 31st. Last summer, we spent all summer on this. Then they said let's have a six-month hoist. They didn't say it in those words, but the Member for Fort Garry introduced a motion bringing the . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return at 8 o'clock when the Honourable Minister will have 26 minutes remaining.