



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



MG-6048

VOL. XXXI No. 179A - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 9 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 9 February, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

My question is for the Premier. In view of the rather large turnout last evening at a public meeting in his constituency, many of whom I understand were opposed to the government's French language proposal, and in view of the strong representation made by many of those in attendance for him to withdraw the proposal, Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier is will he now acknowledge the error of the course upon which he and his government are proceeding and one which is contrary to the wishes of the vast majority of Manitobans, will he now support our amendment that will allow this matter to be settled and done with for the benefit of all Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was not present last night, but the media reports are quite correct in indicating that there was a great deal of support as well as a great deal of opposition. Mr. Speaker, there was also a large number, in fact I believe there were probably more people speaking from the mike in support of the government's proposal than speaking against the government's proposal. So, Mr. Speaker, rather than have the Honourable Leader of the Opposition think that it would cause any regret on my part or any reluctance, I was impressed by the fact that there was indeed a large number of people present at the meeting that expressed support, and media reports are correct in indicating that it was a mixed reaction, just about evenly divided according to the media. I think that the majority, in fact, were in support of the government's position.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, given that the Premier is a less than objective observer of it . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: This wasn't Transcona, Gary. This wasn't Transcona.

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

MR. G. FILMON: I realize that the government members are very sensitive about this issue and the Minister of Finance has many problems to deal with, but I wish that they would just keep themselves under control while I'm in the midst of my questioning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, given that the Premier is not a very objective observer of this, and the quote from the newspaper article says, and I quote: ". . . but Pawley's message in the main appeared to fall on deaf ears"; and the second portion of the media coverage said that, "The largest cheer occurred when one individual called for the Premier to call an election and go to the public on the issue"; given that, Mr. Speaker, will . . .

A MEMBER: It was a cynical laugh.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . I think maybe people ought to be cynical of the role of the Minister of Environment who came out, I understand, with 17 of his own supporters - 17 of his own supporters - to try and pack the meeting; given all of these circumstances that definitely don't square with the Premier's interpretation of the mood of the crowd, will the Premier come to his senses, withdraw this proposal and put an end to this convulsion that he's putting Manitobans through?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first, if there is any reference to "falling on deaf ears," it was the fact that the people that were in the audience were overwhelmingly either one side or other of the issue. That indeed was the case. There were very few there, Mr. Speaker, that were not on one side or the other of the issue except . . .

A MEMBER: I know I saw Doern there.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Well, yes, I saw Mr. Doern there and he clearly is on one side of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest for the Leader of the Opposition that he follow the advice from the former Leader of the Conservative Party in Manitoba, one that is held in high esteem on this side of the Chamber, when Mr. Spivak indicated a few days ago on radio, "There was an opportunity with the change in leadership for Gary Filmon to take a look at the national scene and to follow the example of the national leader, Brian Mulroney. What he should have done is allowed a free vote by the Conservatives. If a free vote would have taken place, in my opinion there may have been one or two or even three or four who would have supported the government's position, or would have supported an amended position of what the government proposed." Mr. Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I think the former Leader of the Conservative Party reflects considerable thinking within

the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, he reflects the thinking of Mr. Epp, the Member for Provencher, that according to reports was not received well by the Provincial Conservative Caucus; he reflects the thinking of Conservative Jake Murta in Lisgar constituency; Lee Clark in Brandon-Souris constituency; Charles Mayer in Marquette constituency; reflects the thinking of many Conservatives that feel that this Conservative Opposition is not following a very constructive leadership position in respect to the debate before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker I am . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources has a great deal to say but none of it is worth listening to, so I wish he'd just curb his childish desire . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . to be heard. We'll give him an opportunity tomorrow and ask a question tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, given the Premier's fixation about free votes on this issue and given some of the concerns we've heard expressed publicly by people in his caucus such as the Member for Riel and the Minister of Technology - or whatever the Member for Lac du Bonnet's current role is - and others.

If we were to consider a free vote on this side, would the Premier then take the Whips off and allow a free vote on his side?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition lives in some sort of wonderland, thinking that in fact there is some sort of disharmony on this side of the Chamber, because obviously, he can't look beyond the mirror that reflects the faces of the members of his own caucus and the members of his own federal caucus. They are dissatisfied and unhappy with the irresponsible opportunistic expedient manner in which the Conservatives in the Province of Manitoba have dealt with this matter. Rather than seize the opportunity, as was offered to the Conservatives across the way before Christmas to proceed in a bipartisan manner, rather than deal with this matter before Christmas so we can get on with other issues, Mr. Speaker, it was the Conservative Opposition that refused that opportunity to provide leadership, to provide guidance, to provide the opportunity for a public consensus within this Chamber. It was the Conservatives and not this side of the Chamber that prevented a co-operative effort in order to arrive at a Manitoba consensus in respect to the amendment to the Constitution.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Premier seems to have a fixation now about "Alice in Wonderland" that he keeps repeating. I'm wondering whether he perceives

himself in this whole issue to be the Mad Hatter or the March Hare. But, Mr. Speaker, it's a very simple question and it's a topic that he's brought forward today, so all I want is a very simple answer from the Premier if he's capable of giving one and that is: will he permit a free vote on his side on this issue?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it would not make any difference to this side of the Chamber. It might make a difference to that side of the Chamber; it would not make a difference to this side of the Chamber.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Is the House prepared to allow the First Minister to complete his answer?

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be in fact worthwhile for all of us to have a free vote and complete this matter right now.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have still not heard whether or not the Premier has said that he will allow a free vote on his side. Mr. Speaker, he may want to answer that in conjunction with the next question that I had and that is, has he had an opportunity to review the translation of the article which I referred to yesterday from the front page of *Le Devoir*? Has he had an opportunity to review that? — (Interjection) — No? I'll ask it in two parts because we still haven't heard the answer from the Premier.

Firstly, is he going to take the Whips off and allow a free vote on his side?

A MEMBER: Right now?

MR. G. FILMON: And secondly, has he had an opportunity to review the article from the front page of *Le Devoir* to be able to confirm whether or not that was indeed what he said on the front page of yesterday's *Le Devoir*?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the honourable member forwarded to me the translation that I asked for, *Le Devoir*. I don't have it. Whether he filed it with the Clerk, I don't know. I must admit that my access to the receipt of the Montreal *Le Devoir* is not nearly as good as the honourable member's. I believe I asked for it yesterday. If the honourable member forwarded it to me, I apologize, but I don't believe the honourable member did forward it to me.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Let's vote, let's vote.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'll give a copy of the translation that we have of the *Le Devoir* article for the Premier.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that he has still not yet answered the question of whether or not he'll permit a free vote on his side of the House on this issue.

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

HON. H. PAWLEY: I suggest that the free vote is right now.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the fact that there would be a free vote, we would be glad to have the time to get our members in . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Bring the Whip.

MR. G. FILMON: No, no, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: Right now.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, all we want is an opportunity to call in our members, some of whom are absent, and we'll be glad to have that vote for the First Minister, if he will go on record that it will be a free vote.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Two hours? How long do you need?

MR. G. FILMON: A free vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Question?
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest our House Leaders work out the appropriate arrangement. We would prefer one hour, but I think our House Leaders should work out suitable arrangements between the two parties, unless you want it right now. We're prepared to have it right now and not even involve the Whip or have discussion with the Whips.

A MEMBER: Right now, come on. Right now.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Right now is our preference. Mr. Speaker, maybe we have arrived at agreement that we could have the free vote right now.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear, right now.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. D. BLAKE: I'm sure the people of Manitoba are proud of your performance today, Howard. I'm sure the people watching are proud . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will try just one more time. After the normal conclusion of the debate, I know that we could make that kind of arrangement with the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, I don't . . .

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

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's within the rules of this House to ask the House leave at any time. I believe there appeared to be between the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable First Minister an agreement to proceed on short notice, an hour, perhaps two hours, to a free vote on the questions before the House. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of that, I would like to at this point, on a point of order, ask if there is leave of the House to so proceed before we get into other issues?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, to the same point of order. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times, but I have certainly heard it four or five times from the First Minister, from the Government House Leader, that the New Democratic Party will not allow a free vote on this issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, part and parcel of allowing a free vote is to let the constituents of the different members to know that is taking place . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Right, right.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and to communicate with their members that that is the case and at such appropriate time, yes, by all means, then let's have a free vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

A MEMBER: We have to wait for Sterling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
Would the Honourable Government House Leader please clarify what leave he is seeking?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, members on this side have indicated a willingness to move by free vote to decide the issues that are currently outstanding that we'd been debating on our Order Paper for the last five or six weeks. We are prepared to do that immediately. There may be some time required to call in members. We're prepared to agree on that and we're prepared to ask the House, Sir, leave to hold a vote this afternoon. I think that would be reasonable, which would be before the adjournment at 5:30 on the questions outstanding. Members on this side, Sir, have indicated that a free vote, whether it's free or the Whips are on, would make no difference for all those members who are on this side, plus the Deputy Speaker. I can't speak for any other members, but for those on this side it would make no difference. We're prepared to call it free because all of our members are committed.

Sir, I ask leave to place all the questions outstanding on the Order Paper with regard to the amendment that

stands in the name of the Attorney-General and the bill which stands in my name - sorry, not the bill, because we've got it in committee stage - with regard to the amendment that stands in the name of the Attorney-General, this afternoon by 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, now that we've established that the government will allow a free vote on this issue, I'm happy, and I so indicate to the Government House Leader, and I want to indicate to the Government House Leader that I will do the appropriate consulting with him within the next few days to arrive at that . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Cop-out!

A MEMBER: So much for Gary's undertaking.

A MEMBER: You just stabbed your Leader in the back.

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

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Smile, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He's the Premier, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

A MEMBER: If they could get back to the books of the province they'd be a hell of a lot better off.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, it speaks again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

May I remind the members that we are still on Routine Proceedings under Oral Questions. Leave has been requested by a member to suspend Oral Questions and that the House decide on the other matters on the Order Paper. Does the honourable member have leave? — (Interjection) — Leave has not been granted.

Oral Questions, the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me clearly record it that members on this side were prepared by leave, it was members opposite that were not prepared by leave to grant . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That was not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister concerning the meeting in Selkirk last night which I attended, along with about seven or eight members of the government side. I would like to ask the First Minister how he can square his new-found thesis that a silent majority supports the government position, in view of the fact that when a

questioner at the meeting asked how many people were opposed to the entrenchment of the government proposals in the Constitution, about eight or nine out of 10 people in the audience held up their hand?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The question is plainly argumentative. Would the honourable member reword his question to seek information from the government?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to know how the First Minister can explain away the opposition that he witnessed in his own constituency when eight out of 10, or nine out of 10 people at the public meeting in Selkirk indicated they were opposed to entrenchment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member is referring to a matter not within the administrative competence of the government. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. I don't know if I can reword the question. Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the First Minister, given that there is increasing evidence that more and more people are opposed to the government's plans . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's not true. That's not true.

MR. R. DOERN: . . . and I cite two pieces of evidence: one that 80 percent or more of the people in Selkirk, at a public meeting, indicated they were opposed to entrenchment; and that 102 people signed a petition at that meeting against the government, and only 13 in favour, how does he feel that there's a silent, growing majority supporting his government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Out of 500 people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

For the third time, the question is not in order. I will permit the Honourable First Minister to reply to the allegation.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order, I still would like to suggest and remind the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order, that we would like a response. We still would like a response to our question of dealing with this matter today on a free vote, as it was indeed the Opposition Leader that called for a free vote to determine this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we'd like to hear unequivocally from the Leader of the Opposition whether he's prepared to have a free vote on this matter today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister is, if he is prepared to give a free vote, and we have a number of members who are absent, some out of province, and we need some time to get them

in for the vote, what's the difference if the free vote takes place today or takes place subsequently? What difference is there?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition prepared to agree to a free vote in one hour, in two hours, in 24 hours? Is the Leader of the Opposition prepared to allow a free vote now? Or, Mr. Speaker, is it all that we were hearing a few moments ago was fluff, just fluff on the part of the Leader of the Opposition? Was the Leader of the Opposition presenting a position that was based upon conviction in this House, or was the Leader of the Opposition simply grandstanding in this Chamber a few moments ago? Was the Leader of the Opposition playing tricks in this Legislature? Was he playing tricks, or can we indeed accept the fact that the Leader of the Opposition meant what he said and that he was prepared to go for a free vote and go for a free vote today?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Premier that there will be a free vote on this side of the House on this issue.

My question to the First Minister is: what is the difference between a free vote for his side, whether it takes place today or tomorrow or next week? What's the difference? What's the difference?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we will have to check Hansard, but it was my understanding but a few moments ago that the Leader of the Opposition was challenging us to have a free vote and have a free vote now, today. We want to know from the Leader of the Opposition is it yes or no, is he still prepared to accept the free vote that he indicated he was prepared to accept but a few moments ago in this Chamber?

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the First Minister that we will accept a free vote on our side of the House at any time, whether it's today, tomorrow or next week.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: But, Mr. Speaker, I want to know from the First Minister what is the difference for his side, what's the difference between the free vote today, tomorrow or next week? What's the difference?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to have a free vote today. We're prepared to have it tomorrow. We want indication when. We are prepared to pair. If the honourable member is concerned about

pairing, we're prepared to pair now, any honourable member across the way that is not here. We're prepared to pair, and have the free vote now.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. BLAKE: I hope the people of Selkirk are watching TV. I hope Selkirk's watching TV.

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

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, because up until now this contentious issue has been debated on, and the debates have been so argued with the well-publicized knowledge that the Whips were on, that there were no free votes. Sir, you know that if we enter the debate on a question where we know there's a free vote, then the style and the nature of the debate changes. Then we direct our remarks to specific members of the backbench or anybody else, knowing that there will be a free vote.

So, Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the nature and the very style of the debate changes under conditions of free vote. We have given our guarantee there will be a free vote on this side. The First Minister says, he's prepared to give a free vote this Thursday, but what is his rationale for not a free vote next Thursday? What is his rationale for not a free vote next Thursday? Let us carry on with the debate, Sir. Let us carry on with the debate.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order raised by the Member for Lakeside - and, Sir, at the end of my comments, I would like again to raise the question of leave because I think a new wrinkle has been introduced by the Member for Lakeside and the Leader of the Official Opposition. In his last question, Sir, to the Premier, he said that they are prepared for a free vote at any time. Sir, we are prepared to have that free vote today.

A MEMBER: That's what you said.

A MEMBER: No.

HON. A. ANSTETT: We, Sir, are prepared to have that free vote.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Be honest. You made a mistake. Admit it.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, when the Opposition House Leader controls some of his more boisterous

troops and I manage to do the same on this side, I'll proceed.

Mr. Speaker, we are also prepared to acquiesce to the inability of the Leader of the Opposition to get leave from his side to do what he committed himself publicly here in this House to do today. We are prepared, Mr. Speaker, to allow him to caucus between now and tomorrow, and make that same offer tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker, the question that the Opposition House Leader asks as to what difference it makes, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is ready for a free vote any time which is what he said, then why does he need another week? Mr. Speaker, the only reason he could need another week would be if there were members absent, and we have offered to address that concern by granting pairs even though earlier this week pairs were withdrawn by the Opposition Whip for Ministers on government business. We are prepared to offer those pairs. We are prepared to hold the vote today, tomorrow.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: If the Opposition House Leader wants to wait till Saturday, we're prepared to waive the rules and sit on Saturday if he needs two days to do it. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared and, for that reason, I would once again ask if there is leave to proceed to a vote and discuss under a point of order the timetable under which that will take place - today, tomorrow or even by leave on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, based on the Opposition House Leader's comments, do we have leave to proceed to a vote on the resolution and the amendments thereto?

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

MR. H. ENNS: The Honourable Member for Springfield will have that leave when his constituents have an opportunity to discuss with him the new set of rules that have been announced by his Premier, that the Minister of Government Services, the Member for Springfield, can now freely express his opinion.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is no point of order. Leave has been requested by a member to suspend the operation of question period and deal with the language resolution now. Does the honourable member have leave? Leave is not given.

MR. D. BLAKE: Point of order.

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

MR. D. BLAKE: On a point of order, I wonder if you could . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. BLAKE: I wonder if you could tell me how much time is left in the question period, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The House has eight minutes remaining on question period.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

Education tests

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, an article yesterday in the Winnipeg Free Press indicated that school children in our largest provincial school division, namely Winnipeg, are far below the national average in the area of basic skills. I would ask the Minister of Education whether her department has further analyzed the test results to determine whether the problem is associated with cultural breakdown or teacher shortcomings or whatever the reason. What is the cause and the solution of the problem within that school division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we have not had an opportunity to look at the results of the test, but I am glad to be able to say that we did not need to see the results of the tests to know that we had a serious problem on this side, and that we had to make moves to give help to poor schools, poor kids and poor families, because it's time that we stopped blaming it on the kids. It's a very complex problem.

As the Member for Morris will remember, when I brought in the funding for this year, although I said that we were very limited in our funds, I said we were going to put the money where the need was the greatest and that was for poor kids and poor schools, and we did that, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not finished. I was going to the specific question of what is the problem. It is very clear that there are very many problems but, if a child is cold, if a child is hungry, if a child has moved 10 times, if the family is unemployed, if all of those things are in place, a child cannot learn, Mr. Speaker. So we can't blame it on society and we can't blame it on the teachers, but we have to recognize that while the family is unstable, when so many families have one parent, when kids don't have enough to eat and when they're cold and hungry, that's going to affect their ability to learn. The compensatory programs and other programs that we brought in are going to give special help to those kids.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I'm not attempting to blame it on the children or society or the teachers or the level of funding. I guess I'm asking the Minister what can be done about it; and secondly, I would ask, are there other school divisions with the province that are experiencing the same level of test results, and can the Minister make available to all of us the results of those tests for all the school divisions within the Province of Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, the test results that were done, the CTBS tests are done by most school divisions, I believe, in the province and if they want the information, then I think they could get it from the school

divisions. My feeling is that there's probably not been results that are like this, or we would have heard about them before.

In terms of what can be done, Mr. Speaker, it's a very complex problem and we have begun to address it in a number of ways and I just want to mention what a few of them are.

The first thing we did was give a special \$2 million grant to Winnipeg School Division. The second thing we did was identify socio-economic factors as one of the problems in the Nicholls Report and ask them to address that problem for the education system. The third thing we did was bring in compensatory grants for poor schools that are faced with very high concentrations of high-risk children. We put money into an Early Identification Program, money into education, ESL for Native children and for immigrant children. The Winnipeg Core Institute is designed to allow special teachers and special programs to inner city children.

Mr. Speaker, we have done more in two years than was done in 20 years before, and I can only wish that when the members opposite had brought in a new foundation program called the Educational Support Program, they had even tried to begin to address these problems.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. C. MANNES: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we did recognize many of those problems, and obviously throwing dollars at all the problems do not create the desired solutions.

MR. SPEAKER: Question?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, where does the province, as a whole, stack up against the Canadian average in the quality of education regarding the basic skills? Obviously the Minister knows the answer to this. She has access to the test results from all the school divisions in the province. Where does our province stack up?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we do not bring into the province all of the testing that is done at the local level. We have tests done at the provincial level, tests done at the local level. The CTBS tests are tests that are designed and are used by local school divisions to measure their curriculum and their students and we do not pull it all together. So I think if he wants information about a school division, he should get it from the school division.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Has the Premier sought a legal opinion as to whether there could be a direct reference to the Supreme Court of Canada of the resolution before the House, to determine the implications of the resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the province cannot do a direct reference to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. H. CARROLL: Does the First Minister have a written legal opinion, and if he has, would he be prepared to table such written legal opinion?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that a legal opinion is not necessary. I think it's very clear in the appropriate statute, quite clear in the appropriate statute and I think the only reference can be made to a Court of Appeal at the provincial level. The honourable member is a lawyer as well and I think that he can examine the appropriate statute which deals with the question of reference of matters to the Supreme Court.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I point out that it is inviting legal opinion, which I gather is outside the rules of the Chamber.

MR. H. CARROLL: My question wasn't asking a legal opinion. My question is: Has the government sought a legal opinion as to whether this matter could be referred, and if it has, is it prepared to table such an opinion or is it prepared to get an opinion and table such an opinion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was some consideration during the early stages of discussions on a settlement of the Bilodeau case with regard to a reference to the Supreme Court. That reference could only be made by the Government of Canada directly and because of the nature of the case then before the court which addressed the very question which would be referred - at least in part and some would argue to a very large degree - it was suggested that with a real case, the court would regard the reference as a moot point. That was the opinion expressed by several constitutional lawyers. I don't recall whether those opinions are in writing or if those were the opinions given directly in meetings of consultation with the special counsel and others on record in this particular case.

I should point out to the honourable member though that the reference at this point, after eight months of debate and with the case still on stay before the Supreme Court, would once again almost certainly be a moot point because of the difficulties associated with addressing that when it is still before this Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a correction in Hansard of Monday, January 30th on Page 5788. It stated in the middle of the page, ". . . as of January 1, 1984 there were 23 opted-out physicians." That should read 83, eight three.

Thank you.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order with regard to the business before the House in view of the discussions that took place during question period today. I have a proposal, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make publicly to the House with regard to the ordering of business over the next three days.

Mr. Speaker, it's been suggested that honourable members opposite are ready for a free vote at any time, that their concerns relate to some concerns about some of their members who may be away - and I believe the statement was, out of the province or out of the country, be able to return.

Mr. Speaker, there's also been some concern by members opposite over the last several weeks about the inability of members to debate as well, although that concern did not raise itself in the House today, I would like, Sir, on that basis to make the following proposal.

Since there is some time left today for debate and tomorrow, if members were willing with the waiver of question period and again on Monday, the total time available would be in excess of 13 hours between now and the time of adjournment on Monday. We, Sir, on this side would be willing to grant leave to extend the hours of sitting, either this evening or tomorrow or both, or provide additional hours on Saturday. Mr. Speaker, that would allow at least every member opposite to speak a full 40 minutes at least once on the resolution . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: . . . or the amendment or sub-amendment which is before the House. So, Mr. Speaker, I make the offer to honourable members opposite, more particularly to the Opposition House Leader, that we on this side are prepared . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Leader is the one.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Well - and more particularly to the Leader, that in accord with his proposal made in question period today, the government is prepared to waive those rules and procedures which are necessary including the normal hours of adjournment, extend the hours of sitting to allow a free vote to take place on these questions with the vote taking place. I think, Sir, that's an important question, that the votes will take place much as they do on the Budget and Throne Speech at the hour of adjournment on Monday next. Mr. Speaker, that vote would be a free vote for members on this side. Members opposite have said that it will be a free vote for members on that side. I do not offer that as a condition, Sir, I only say that if members want a free vote and they have said in the past, although they didn't say it today, they wanted an opportunity for all of their members to speak. The offer I am making

to suspend those rules from this side to allow that would allow every single member to speak at least 40 minutes. More importantly, Mr. Speaker, the concern about all members being present because this is an important question. I think, Mr. Speaker, that between now and Monday evening at 10:00 p.m. members on both sides who may be away on government business or other business will have an opportunity to return.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would think that under this proposal for the ordering of the business of the House, members opposite could even bring someone from outer space on the Challenger if that was the requirement. So I think there is a clear opportunity here to get people from anywhere in the world into this Chamber by next Monday night at 10:00 p.m. to allow members opposite to accommodate the procedures, to have a full opportunity for debate. Mr. Speaker, as a point of order, then respecting the business of the House, I make this offer to suspend the rules, to make the accommodation and meet the request that the Leader of the Opposition has placed before this House in question period today.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And now for the Academy Awards.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Do you want to recess and discuss it?

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

I doubt it is a point of order for one side to engage in negotiation with the other side. I would remind members that we have not yet reached Orders of the Day. I will permit the Honourable Member for Lakeside to respond.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that opportunity.

You see, Mr. Speaker, despite the reasonable tone of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Government House Leader, it doesn't mask the arrogance that he just displayed and that has been the problem. All our negotiations, the reasons why bells rang two weeks ago was, well, if you agree to do this by then and then, you know, we'll allow you to debate the issue. That is what he is saying now, if you will do this by that hour on this day, we will gratuitously come to some conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, Parliament doesn't run that way and we're teaching them that it doesn't run that way and we'll keep on teaching them, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I am more than prepared to leave this Chamber, carry on the negotiations that the Honourable Government House Leader suggests and we will resume those discussions. I think there is some merit in what the proposal is being offered and certainly we will discuss as we should as opposing House Leaders carry on that kind of discussion, but Mr. Speaker, not under any veiled threat of closure. Not under any veiled threat of closure. That has been at issue in this House for the last month.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

I hope that both House Leaders continue their negotiations in the traditional manner which is usually not across the floor of this Chamber.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the discussions and the opportunity that the conclusion of those discussions would lead to an immediate resumption of debate, without the use of the closure motion, I would ask if members opposite are agreeable to a 15-minute recess of the House immediately? No recess, don't you want to caucus?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You used this House in this way, you rotten little . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order. Order please.
Would the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek contain himself? Order please.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: On the motion of the Honourable Government House Leader and the motion of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources thereto, the Honourable Member for Roblin Russell has 28 minutes remaining.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
What a strange day for Manitoba. What a strange day for Parliament, Mr. Speaker. What a strange day for this government, Mr. Speaker, for this First Minister who has emphatically said time after time after time that their Whip will be on on this issue . . .

A MEMBER: No free vote.

MR. W. McKENZIE: . . . no free vote, no free vote. And here he is today singing like a bird and now we have a free vote, Mr. Speaker. That changes the whole debate; that changes the whole issue.

I wonder now if in fact this is a government resolution, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what the Honourable Minister of Health said yesterday, he didn't tell us there was going to be a free vote. Because now, Mr. Speaker, we are at liberty to go and talk to the people in these constituencies where we know that some of these members are in trouble and spell out to them, now their MLAs have a chance to vote one way or the other. If they are on the government side, Mr. Speaker, and they oppose the resolution, they will not be kicked out of their caucus. Now that is a nice way to have this thing resolved.

It's almost like having an election, but it's not quite just like having an election because I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, when you get a free vote on a matter like this, there are a lot of members in this House, and especially on the government side, are going to have to do a lot of soul searching. A lot of soul searching, Mr. Speaker.

I only have to refer back to one of the members in the House when he stood in his place here not long ago and seconded the Throne Speech. I'll just read some of his remarks into the record because this honourable member will have a guilty conscience on this issue if he votes with the government on their proposed package to bilingualize this province.

This learned member, Mr. Speaker, he quotes - and it's February 26th, 1982. He said that, "Activism in government also means that we shall always do what is appropriate and honest and moral and virtuous for the good of all the people of this province." That's what that honourable member on the NDP bench said on February 26th. I wonder, now that the Whips are off and we're going to have a free vote, how this honourable member is going to justify himself to his constituents on this issue.

He went on and said, ". . . not just for the good of particular individuals or particular corporations or particular interests, but activism in government requires power and an unhampered discretion." That's what that honourable NDP member said.

A MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. W. McKENZIE: He went on and said, "We all know that the exercise of power will not be irresponsible."

A MEMBER: It sounds like Larry.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, he went on and he said, "First, I have said, any government can be responsive, such as a government must be representative of the people that it is supposed to serve." The people that it's supposed to serve. He says, "Secondly, not only must the government be responsible and representative, such a government must also be rationally competent and serve as fulfilling to meet all the needs of all the people."

That's what one of the New Democratic members read into the record in this House in seconding the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker - strange. "For the good of all the people of the province," he said, Mr. Speaker. He also said, "Responsible government means that we should not be in a hurry to do anything that later on we cannot undo." That's what his honourable New Democrat said in this House, and he said, "Just as in private life, it is also true in public life that haste makes waste."

Now there's a member, now that the Whips are off on the New Democratic benches on this matter, Mr. Speaker, that he will have to take a different look at this issue. I wonder now if he has any concerns about the motion that we're debating before you at the present time, Mr. Speaker. That is the motion that was put before the House yesterday by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that the question be put, double closure. Double closure. We don't need double closure on this issue, Mr. Speaker, if the Whips are off. We don't need double closure; we could have had this debate a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering about this style of democracy that we're seeing being proposed by this government and these members opposite in this province, this new socialist style of government where they don't let the people be heard.

We saw a case last night in Selkirk, Mr. Speaker, where the First Minister refused to answer a question from an honourable citizen of this province, because he happened to reside in another constituency. Is that the type of socialist democracy that the people of this province are going to have to get themselves acquainted with with this government in power? Are we also going

to have a Premier in this province who takes a priority - it's 58th out of his list of priorities - and drag the people of this province through all this turmoil, this anguish, this hatred over an issue that's 58th in his priority list and the government's priority list - and in the midst of the debate, Mr. Speaker, change the rules in the middle of the game? Change the rules in the middle of the game.

They changed the rules yesterday. They said that the bells shall only ring for two hours. They changed the rules, and the Minister of Natural Resources stood in his place for the first time - and I've been here since 1966, Mr. Speaker, I have never ever seen in this Chamber a Minister of the Crown stand up and say that the question should be put immediately and debate cut off. I have seen it in committees; I've seen it in public meetings in the province, Mr. Speaker. I have never seen it in this Chamber - never. That is the new socialist type of democracy that they want to muzzle us and muzzle the people.

They first of all brought in a resolution, Mr. Speaker, that limits the bells to two hours. That's a change, Mr. Speaker. Then secondly, the Minister of Natural Resources stands in his place and says the question shall be put immediately. Today, Mr. Speaker, they come and they change the rules again, now the Whips are off over there. All of a sudden, the Whips are off. There are three changes that they have made in this debate in a matter of a very few days, Mr. Speaker. That's what scares me about this government, and that's what scares me about the type of leadership, the double closure tactics that they're using.

Why would a government, any government that's got any courage or audacity and integrity in this province, have to change the rules three times in a matter of a few days to deal with this people of this province and the resolution that's before us? It's because they are a sick government. They're a bad government; they're leaderless; they are gutless. They don't know what they're doing over there, Mr. Speaker, and that is dangerous.

That is dangerous not only for us in the Legislature. That's dangerous for the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, and it's dangerous for Canada to have these wild-eyed socialists running rampant over here and don't know what they're doing. Change the rules two and three times at their own discretion and here, in the midst of a question period today, find that now the Whips are off.

Well, why didn't the First Minister tell us weeks ago when they had come to a vote on this that the Whips were going to be off? Why didn't the Minister of Health, one of the longstanding members of this House, tell me yesterday when he stood in his place in this debate that the Whips were going to be off? He didn't say it. That shows how shallow they are, Mr. Speaker. That shows how much thinking they put into this issue where, if we pass this package, we'll make this province a bilingual province.

Mr. Speaker, they scare me, these left wingers. They scare the daylights out of me. I'm sure they are scaring a lot of the people, because they don't have a mandate; they don't have a consensus. Eighty percent of the people of the province are opposed to them on this package, and they're still ploughing ahead.

Mr. Speaker, a gentleman yesterday passed on to me a little document. I'm going to read it into the record.

It is extremely interesting, and it wonders about where the political payoff on this issue is at. Why would this First Minister and why would his government Treasury Bench members take this terrible pasting day after day after day, going against the tide of the people, going against 80 percent and some say it's close to 90 percent of the wishes of the people of our province, pursuing ahead without a mandate, pursuing ahead without a consensus to make Manitoba officially a bilingual province? Well, some honourable gentleman or some constituent threw this into my mail yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I'll read it. It's interesting.

This article says: "In May of 1919 in Dusseldorf, Germany, the Allied Forces obtained a copy of some of the Communist rules for revolution. Nearly 60 years later, the Reds in this country are still following them. After reading this list, stop after each item and think about the present situation where you live and all around our nation."

I quote from the Red rules, Mr. Speaker. The first thing it says there, "You corrupt the young and you get them away from a religion."

The second thing it says: "You get control of all means of publicity, the propagand machine."

The next thing: "You get people's minds off their government by focussing their attention on athletics, sexy books, plays and other trivialities."

The next one, it says, "You divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters."

The next thing it says, "You destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up for contempt, ridicule and disgrace." We saw the First Minister do that here yesterday to Mr. Russell who heads up the Grassroots.

And here's the one that relates to the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources who rose in his place yesterday and said for the first time in this Chamber, "The question shall be put before any debate has been held."

"Always preach democracy but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible." Remember that one; this is what the Reds do. They always preach true democracy, but they seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

The next thing they do, it says, "You encourage government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent."

"No. 6, you incite unnecessary strikes in vital industries. You encourage civil disorders and you foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government towards such disorders." I recall the flag burning incident over at the American Embassy would be one we could relate to that one here.

"No. 7, by spacious argument, cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, self-restraint, faith in the pledge word, 'ruggedness'." The letter closes off, Mr. Speaker, and it says, "That was quite a list, wasn't it?"

Now just stop and think. How many of those rules are being carried out in your province today? I don't see how any thinking person can truthfully say that the communists don't have any part in the chaos that is upsetting this province, or is it just a coincidence? Or is it just a coincidence? And we know one honourable

member from this Legislature, who unfortunately is absent, was the author of this resolution that we're wrestling and discussing for the last eight or nine months. I wonder. We certainly know something about his political background and we have a fair knowledge of what an interest he had in that particular party. That is scary, when you read that and go back through the history and the way this debate has been carried on, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing that concerns me on the motion that was put yesterday by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources that the question be put. I wondered if any of the honourable members over there understand democracy or what it's all about. The First Minister doesn't.

I wonder, he talks about this silent majority. Where is this silent majority of people that's out there someplace in the bushes that's offering him support on this issue? They're not in my constituency. They did a poll there. It was 100 to one in Russell yesterday; 100 to one. What was the poll last night in Selkirk, down at the door of the First Minister's constituency? 102 to 13. What's it in Flin Flon? I'll bet you Flin Flon is 80 to two or three. I'll bet it's the same in The Pas; it's the same all across this province. It doesn't matter where you go, curling rinks, coffee shops, theatres, restaurants, dance halls, public meetings, there is public opinion to 80 percent and higher, I dare say, against the Premier's wishes and the government's wishes on this issue. So where is this silent majority? Where are they, Mr. Speaker?

Do you mean to tell me that the First Minister couldn't muster more than 100 of his own supporters in Selkirk last night to prop him up on this issue? The steelworkers alone should fill two halls in Selkirk. Were they there? They were not there with the First Minister on this issue, Mr. Speaker. They're annoyed at the Minister of Natural Resources who put this motion before us that we're debating today that says the question shall be put and will not be allowed to be debated much longer.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the members opposite, there are literally thousands and thousands of people today turning in their New Democratic cards on this issue, and they know it. I had phone calls from Dauphin, long-time standing New Democratic supporters phoning me up and telling me they wrote to the Member for The Pas, they wrote to their Member for Dauphin, they wrote to their Premier, they don't get any answers. They are not getting any answers. They do not answer them, and do you know why? They are scared to answer, but had they known, I'm sure if the Member for The Pas had known six weeks ago or six months ago there was going to be a free vote on this issue, he wouldn't be in the problem that he's in today.

Now that we learn there is going to be a free vote, I'm sure my friend, the Member for Dauphin, he is in deep trouble on this issue. Now that he's got a chance to go on a free vote, would he go against the wishes of his people? Now that I see the Honourable Member for Burrows has taken his seat, and I wonder where he's going to stand on this issue? I just read some of his excerpts of his speech into the record, he seconded the Speech to the Throne not so long ago.

How can he, the Honourable Member for Burrows, after making those kind of statements and then go back against the wishes of his people on this issue?

That is the tragedy. That's the tragedy for poor old Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that's the tragedy for the people. We have a government that's not listening, doesn't want to listen and are pursuing and pushing this thing ahead full steam without the people, without a consensus, without a mandate, and without any idea of where they're going.

It was asked again of the First Minister today by the Honourable Member for Brandon, how many of these statutes are going to be enshrined? How many? They don't know; they haven't got a clue. We're going to amend the Constitution? Yes, we're going to amend it on their plan, but they don't even know how many of the statutes in this province are going in that package. They have not told us. The question was raised by my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, it was raised today and it's been raised before.

Mr. Speaker, that is the sign of a sick government, that's going to make this province a bilingual province and they don't even know how far it's going to go. Does anybody know? Is there any member who is sitting in his seat over there today that's prepared to stand up and tell me and the people of this province, stand in your places, how many of our statutes of this province are going to be enshrined in this package? They don't know.

Mr. Tallin, we have his legal opinion on it, he doesn't know; the Member for Ste. Rose doesn't know; the Minister of Agriculture doesn't know. They don't know, yet they're prepared to go ahead. That is a scary situation, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Societe franco-manitobaine knows. I wonder if Bilodeau knows, Bilodeau's a lawyer. No, the Minister of Agriculture shakes his head sideways, they don't know either.

Well, I'll tell you, a chap by the name of Maurice Prince, a well-known Francophone in this city, he's concerned about the same problem. He's concerned and he said, if they're not going to go and check it out, I'm going to hire myself a lawyer and I'll try and find out for the people of this province and for this government. I'll take the thing to the Supreme Court and ask the Supreme Court to make a ruling. And don't you think, Mr. Speaker, we'd be wise to wait until that judgment comes back? Don't you think that's the least we can do in this argument for the people of our province? Take it to the Supreme Court, let them take a look at the package and then come back and tell us how many of our statutes are going to be invalid or enshrined with that package. I wonder does Serge Joyal or Trudeau know. I don't think they, Mr. Speaker. I don't think they do but Maurice Prince, Mr. Speaker, certainly is a honourable gentleman and a honourable citizen and if he has the courage and the audacity and the intestinal fortitude to take this and try and get some answers, why wouldn't this gutless government do the same thing or at least offer him the outer support. But they're not because they're making a deal with Societe franco-manitobaine, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Prince doesn't think that the Societe franco-manitobaine represents the Francophone population of this province on this issue and that's an interesting subject. Who does speak for the French people in this province? Maurice Prince's group? Well the Minister of Environment over there laughs. He belongs, of course, to the SFM. I don't notice him challenging Maurice Prince's stature and the method that he's going to try

and bring some saneness back to this issue by taking it and getting a judgment on it. At least he's trying.

Then of course, Mr. Speaker, we have this strange statement that appeared in *Le Devoir*, Montreal's newspaper yesterday. Headline, "Pawley admits he is ready to trash the word 'Official'." Pawley is ready to admit to trash the word official. Now, Mr. Speaker, that will settle this argument once and for all. If this First Minister said to the reporters that interviewed him in his office last week, that he's prepared to drop the word "official" on this package, the debate is over. We don't need no deals or ringing of bells. The debate's settled and that's what it is all about. Drop the word "official" and it's over.

But you know what? The question was asked of the First Minister today and he tries to lead me and the people of this province and this House that he never saw the article. I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, five bucks that after this question was raised here yesterday, the Premier's staff was on the wire to *Le Devoir* in Montreal and had a transcript of that thing within the hour. He stands in his place today and says he doesn't know - he hasn't seen the article; he hasn't heard of the article. That's the kind of a Premier that we've got in this province. Hiding behind shadows; hiding behind skeletons; misleading the public; telling half-truths, quarter-truths; will not stand up to the issue; pounds his hands on the desk and uses his place like a toy pen. He's a sickening person on this issue, Mr. Speaker, and I think he's a bad Premier and he's got this government bogged down, and likely the record will show it'll be the worst government that this province has ever seen.

So, Mr. Speaker, where do we go from here? We now have three rule changes in a matter of a few hours or a few days. The motion that the bells shall only ring for two hours was brought in and the Speaker dealt with it yesterday. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources jumps up in his place for the first time in the history of this Chamber that I've been here, and I've been here since 1966. I checked today with the Honourable Member for Charleswood, who has been here much longer than myself, and the Member for St. Boniface, I understand, has been here equally as long and they have never seen that happen in this place before, in this Chamber. So that's the second change.

The third change is here today, the First Minister of this province stands in his place and says that the Whips are off. They're going to have a free vote over there. Now is that not a dangerous principle? Is that not a sign of a weak government? Is that not the sign of a sick government, Mr. Speaker, who are making all these changes and I know the reason that they're making these changes. They don't have a mandate. They don't have a consensus and close to 90 percent of the people are against them on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel in standing and opposing this precedent that was set here yesterday in this Chamber by this Minister of Natural Resources - a Minister of the Crown, would you believe - who would stand in his place and try and cut off debate, before we even had a chance to get to it, says the question shall be put? I daresay, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker hadn't got sitting down yesterday when he was on his feet and moved that the question be put.

That's a terrible precedent for this House to set. That is not democracy, Mr. Speaker, in any sense, especially coming from a Minister of the Crown, from the Treasury Bench. Had it come from a backbencher, I wouldn't have been as concerned, but coming from the government, a Minister that sits in a government - in a weak government, in a bad government, a government that doesn't understand, a government that's going against the wishes of the people - I have only one choice and that's to vote against that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I feel sorry for the people of this province. I feel sorry for them. They are getting taken down the garden path by a bad bad government and a whole bunch of left wingers and socialists that don't know what this province is all about. They don't care. They don't give a darn, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people in my constituency and the people on this side of the House, we care. God bless Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is shall the motion be put.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, last night I was one of those who attended the meeting of the First Minister in Selkirk. Not only did I attend the meeting last night in Selkirk, but I also attended a previous meeting on Monday night in Selkirk. I think that's about the most I've been in that fair city in a long time.

The first meeting, in fact, was called by people in the area - several of them were at the meeting last night - in an attempt to have a discussion and a debate over the question of the government's proposals on official bilingualism.

When we arrived at the meeting, the Premier's staff passed out a pamphlet which said, in effect, that he would be holding his own meeting on Wednesday and if this meeting wasn't acceptable - for what reasons I'm not certain - he would have his own meeting and his own chairman and hopefully his own supporters in Selkirk on Wednesday.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order?

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise with some degree of reluctance on a point of order.

MR. R. DOERN: Not much.

HON. A. MACKLING: I particularly hesitate to interrupt a former colleague, but he knows the rules of this House and he knows that the matter that is before us permits him to offer in debate matters that are relevant to the motion that is before us. I would be delighted to hear a discourse by the honourable member on any subject; however it is not within the rules for the honourable member to talk about any subject and matters that happen in Selkirk, matters that happen in Springfield or in Oakbank are all very interesting. But the matter that is before us is a motion by the Honourable House Leader dealing with a reasonable limitation on bell

ringing and the honourable member should try and address his remarks to that motion, not matters taking place elsewhere in Manitoba, that may or may not have some indifferent relevance to the question.

Thank you.

HON. S. LYON: Why are the bells ringing? That's what's relevant . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the House is, shall the question be put? And that refers to a resolution regarding the role of bell ringing in this House.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows as well as I do that this whole resolution is related to the government's determination to force closure and to cut off debate in regard to the French language proposals. My remarks are entirely addressed to that subject, and they are entirely addressed to the fact that the First Minister is attempting to defend his proposals, as is the government, as is the Minister who just spoke, and is meeting with a total lack of success. Even in the Premier's own riding, in the Town of Selkirk, which is an NDP stronghold which has as its basis the Selkirk Rolling Mills and the labour unions and a tradition of voting for the government and almost, Mr. Speaker, on a knee-jerk basis would support anything that the government put - almost, but not quite. They, themselves, do not support the government on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, when I looked at that audience last night - and I was there twice - I was there on Monday, and that was an open meeting. Then I was there last night. I looked at that crowd, and I recognized many people in that crowd, Mr. Speaker. I recognized all kinds of people. I even recognized the Member for Thompson. He was there. He was wearing his sweater, looking very Selkirkish. My good friend, the Member for The Pas, he was there. He has a right to be there, and he was there. He was disguised as a Selkirk citizen, or a Selkirk settler. Mr. Speaker, if he had shaved his moustache, that might have done it, but I recognized him right away.

Mr. Speaker, there was quite a good turnout. There were a lot of civil servants. I'm not going to name them, but there were a lot of civil servants there from this building. There were a couple of people from Elmwood who are not known to be my supporters, who always talk to the Winnipeg Sun and tell them what's going on or what they'd like them to know is going on. I recognized a lot of strong NDP supporters - that's fine - from Winnipeg. That's okay.

Then I recognized a number of Ministers. The Minister in charge of Autopac, he was present. The Minister of Environment with a bunch of loud clappers, I don't know who they were. They were in the back. The Minister of Finance was there. He was interested. He was present. I don't know his latest title, the Minister who sits beside my friend, the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The issue before the House is, shall the question be put? The question refers to the role of bell ringing in this House.

The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, that was the question, Mr. Speaker, that was being discussed by the Premier. He was making the argument to the audience that they had to stop the bell ringing, and get on with the business of the people of Manitoba. He was making the case for his government stand. He was explaining away all the problems about how the government had to do it to save millions of dollars. He was putting the entire government on the line, Mr. Speaker, and not only the government on the line, but he was defending himself in his own constituency.

Mr. Speaker, every single member on the government side, if there is a free vote, is going to have to vote in accordance with his or her conscience and his or her constituency. There is going to be a problem. I hope . . .

A MEMBER: You'll have a problem too.

MR. R. DOERN: Oh, I don't have any problem, because the people of Elmwood are 80 percent to 90 percent on the same side of the issue. They voted 80 percent in the Winnipeg plebiscite, so I know what they think. I know what the people think in Burrows and in St. Johns and in Flin Flon and in Concordia and in Riel.

Mr. Speaker, the only constituency in my opinion, and I could be wrong, which might - underline "might" three times - tell their member to support their government is the Member for St. Boniface, maybe. We don't know for sure, because I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of people who are French-speaking Manitobans, they don't want this legislation anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I had a conversation on Monday night in Selkirk with a gentleman, a French-Canadian. He came up to me at the end of the meeting. He was dressed casually. He was wearing blue jeans and a jacket. He had a beard. We were talking. He said, listen. I'm a French-Canadian, and I don't want this legislation. It is hurting me. He told me that he lived in the Town of Gimli which is an Icelandic town, and he's a businessman, and he's a French-Canadian and he has a French name. He is getting hurt by this. I guess people are saying, what the hell are you guys doing? You are causing all this trouble. You are forcing our province to be in a state of turmoil.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? A lot of the people who are of French descent and French-speaking, they never wanted this in the first place and they don't want it now. They don't want legislation that is expensive, and is causing them problems with their neighbours and is useless. We know who wants this legislation, Mr. Speaker. It's the members of the SFM.

I'm not even sure. I would like to hear, and I'm looking forward to hearing what the Minister of Health has to say about this legislation. I would like to hear what he has to say, because my information is that it was the Attorney-General that decided on this legislation without consultation of the Minister of Health — (Interjection) — yes, and the Minister of Health is agreeing with that, and I believe that's true.

The Attorney-General, the guy who ran the government for two years, who brought the government

to this state of affairs and now has blown the country, he made the decision on this issue, put the government on the hook and even put the Minister of Health on the hook because he would know better than anybody. He knows better than the Premier, than the Cabinet, than these people in the backbench. All they know is what the party thinks. All they know is what their constituents think, and all they had going for them was common sense.

He knew better. He knew what was the solution for this problem. He was going to clean up this old Manitoba problem. It had been around for awhile. Leave it to Rolly. He'll take the document; he'll make the amendment; he'll get it through the House. He'll go down in history, and he and Pierre Elliott Trudeau will shake hands in a photograph solving this historic problem, correcting this historic injustice, going into history as the man who broke this question and so on.

What did he do? He has jeopardized the Government of Manitoba. He has put the Pawley Government into a state of self-destruct, and he has personally - one man, aided and abetted by a few others who bought this phoney position - that one man has put the New Democratic Party on the line. And if this thing goes through, there isn't a single seat on that side that is safe, Mr. Speaker. Maybe my friend from St. Boniface, I think he might survive.

But I'll tell you, the Minister of Agriculture, who's a nice guy, his riding is against him on this issue. They're against him. Mr. Speaker, I can prove that. I had a bunch of his students, by coincidence, they came to my door. They phoned me up and said, we're here from - I don't know, was it Arborg? I don't know what town it was - they said, we have spoken to the Minister just a couple of days ago and we'd like to hear the other side and so I told them the other side.

Mr. Speaker, we know about the delegations. I mean the Minister - look I've known him a long time - he's a nice guy, he's a nice guy. — (Interjection) — And here he is - you know they showed my picture today in The Sun, Mr. Speaker, at the rally and it said, "Russell Doern watches in icy silence." I got my picture in there because I wasn't talking. That was news. That's why my picture got into the paper today, Mr. Speaker.

But the Minister of Agriculture, he got his picture in the Winnipeg Sun on January 18th because he wasn't smiling. He is a very happy-go-lucky guy, a nice guy, but he doesn't look very happy in this picture. He is explaining, with his back to the wall, to his constituents his position on French language proposals, but some of his constituents weren't impressed. And then it goes on here and one person came out and said well this wasn't very nice. They said it was just like talking to a wall, okay? Because, Mr. Speaker, the members of the government are on the hook. They are on the hook and they started out in the month of May, with the Attorney-General coming into caucus one day waving a paper, saying, I have solved the language question in Manitoba for all time. You know who said that?

A MEMBER: Who?

MR. R. DOERN: Chamberlain at Munich. Remember he solved all the peace problems in Europe in the 1930's, didn't he? He said, I have a piece of paper in

my hand and I've made an agreement and that is, in effect, what the Honourable Roland Penner said, and he put the government on the hook and they've been on the hook ever since.

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it's not easy to get off. It isn't easy to get off. You know I was talking to a friend of mine the other day and he said, look this is a tough thing, but he said aren't the Americans pulling out of Lebanon? That was a pretty good parallel. They have to pull back from Lebanon. The French pulled back from Algeria. I remember when they pulled back from Algeria under General De Gaulle, who was put in by the French in Algeria and I think he made the absolutely right decision - he then pulled the army out later. Mr. Speaker, the British pulled out of India and that wasn't easy. That was not easy and this government has a much simpler problem . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is, shall the question be put. The question refers to the issue of bell ringing in this Chamber. I would appreciate it if the Member for Elmwood could restrict his comments to those which are relevant to the issue of bell ringing in this Chamber.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll give you my position on bell ringing. I'll give you my position on bell ringing. Let the bells ring forever on this issue. That is my position on bell ringing, because if it means that when the bells stop ringing the government imposes official bilingualism on Manitoba, then I want to hear those bells ring forever, because that will be music in the ears of the people of Manitoba - "The Sound of Music." Mr. Speaker, when those bells stop ringing and bilingualism is forced on this province, that will be the sound of discord, that will be the sound of disharmony and it will be a very terrible and a very ugly sound for a long time to come. I don't ever want to hear those bells stop ringing, and I say to the opposition, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, if it comes down to a crunch, the opposition should let the bells ring and should not be forced to re-enter the Chamber and vote to give the government its vote, so that they can vote down the opposition and impose official bilingualism.

Mr. Speaker, I don't need any lessons from the Minister of Mines. He's the last guy that I need a lesson from here. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in all seriousness, to the Minister of Mines and to the government, if you want the perfect language ombudsman, you have two choices.

The No. 2 choice is the Minister of the Environment, the language zealot with the black cape and the "Z" on his chest, but if you want the guy that'll strike terror into the hearts of people, appoint the Minister of Mines. He's the one, I'm sorry, Natural Resources, the Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, if a businessman or a citizen gets a phone call and they say it's the Minister of Natural Resources on the other line, that guy will capitulate instantly. He'll just cave in instantly. Whatever the Minister of Natural Resources wants he'll get because if he starts talking to somebody and he starts brainwashing them and he starts giving them arguments, they'll collapse. They'll collapse.

He's the guy that they sent out against poor Mr. Shields, that 68 year old man. Mr. Shields is the one, a fine gentleman, who gave his card back to the House Leader and they sicked the Minister of Natural Resources on him and he went out there and arrived at that man's place at noon hour and spent the afternoon with him and drove him to the rally and probably hung onto him. Well, Mr. Speaker, I tell you again, that is cruel and unusual punishment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: That's against the Charter of Rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is, shall the question be put that refers to the issue of bell ringing in this Chamber. I would appreciate it if the Member for Elmwood could restrict his comments to those relevant to the issues before this House.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the notion that the bells should keep ringing. I do support that position. I sincerely support that position. I don't want the bells to stop ringing and I don't want the debate limited and I don't want closure. I know this is the first time that closure has been invoked in 55 years and that's a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, on the position that the government is in.

Mr. Speaker, the public wants this legislation scrapped. They want it scrapped. The members of the government keep saying, there's a silent majority supporting them, an ever-growing silent majority. It's silent, all right. It's invisible. There is no proof whatsoever that any of it exists, and the point is that the government keeps saying that there is this silent majority.

Mr. Speaker, what about some of the real evidence that has come out on this issue in recent days? Mr. Speaker, there is the Minister of Health. There is the Minister of Natural Resources. The House Leader can't even walk around this building anymore without a bodyguard. Any time he goes out of this Chamber, he might be confronted by another group of hostile Springfield residents.

HON. A. MACKLING: Another one of your friends.

MR. R. DOERN: You see, the Minister of Natural Resources says, one of your friends. You see, it's all a big plot. All of these people are people that I send out into the field, or they're members of Grassroots, or they are the same people who go to all the rallies and all the meetings.

So when Grassroots has a rally of 2,500 people, it really isn't 2,500. It's really maybe 2,000 or probably about 1,800. Someone will then say, well I don't know if it was 1,800. I heard it was around 800. They didn't hear the 18; they heard the eight. Someone will say, well that's a high figure. They probably had about half. Everything is explained away. No matter what evidence is produced to the government, it isn't real evidence. It's all explained away, Mr. Speaker.

Take, for example, the evidence that I accumulated to the government on this question in regard to petitions

and ballots. Does the government - are there people there who really believe that I cannot prove within 60 seconds that I have those ballots and petitions, or that Grassroots has 40,000? No, they can't accept it, because it's damaging. So the First Minister gets up and he starts saying, well I didn't really see them. They weren't actually left in my office.

Mr. Speaker, for good reason, they weren't left. The Minister wants to know why they weren't left. I'll tell you why they weren't left. Because there were people in this building who came to me and gave me ballots and said, I hope this isn't going to be turned into the Premier. Why? Because they work in this building.

One fellow came into my office and threw down a petition and said, I hope that this isn't going to be actually given to the First Minister or the government. I said, no, it isn't. He said, I'll tell you why. He said, because I work at Revenue Canada, and these 35 employees, all federal people probably working on York, are all federal employees. They didn't want their names given to the government. I'll bet you there were thousands of civil servants out of those 17,500 I had.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is evidence. I have those ballots. I have those petitions. I will show any member on that side of the government at their convenience and mine. We could work it out quite easily. I will actually show them. I'll give them the package if it's broken down into their riding - most of them are - and let them look through it. I won't give them the package. I won't let them take the package away, and write letters to those people or phone those people or say, hey wait a minute. Here's Louis, and he works in the Finance Department, and what the hell is he doing sending this in here. No, I don't want any of that. I would trust those people not to do that, but I would not give them that material to take home. I would give them the material to look at. They could look at it. It wouldn't bother me. I would hope that they wouldn't memorize three or four names, and then go after those people.

Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that, no matter what evidence is produced, the government members are told by somebody, it's not really evidence at all. It isn't real evidence. It's the same old group.

There were 800 people here, Mr. Speaker, one night - 800. That rally, so-called, was organized in a little over 24 hours. It was spontaneous. It was in reaction to closure. The people were infuriated. I want to tell you right now about the big Grassroots rally and about these other rallies.

Some of the people are disturbed about the French language proposals, yes, absolutely, you better believe it. But a lot more are now angry with the government because of the way they're handling the matter. It's because of closure, and it's because of the arguments that are being used that people are highly upset about the matter. They believe, and I say this to the Minister of Natural Resources and to the House Leader in particular who isn't here - I say to them in particular, they believe that this Parliament is being choked and threatened and has a gun stuck in its ribs, and that the government is forcing this issue without popular support and without a mandate. That's why they're angry.

They are not bigots, jumping up and down, screaming against people who speak French. They are people who say, we don't need this rotten legislation, and we object

to the fact that the government doesn't listen to us. That's what is making them frustrated. Talk to a Manitoban sometime. Take one home for lunch. There are 225,000 of them who voted in the plebiscite, and they say things like, well we spoke on this issue. We told the government what we thought, and they continued to ignore us. The public is getting more and more and more and more frustrated and angry.

They're getting angry, first and foremost, at the government, the Pawley administration, and, secondly, at the New Democratic Party. They're tearing up their cards. They won't fight for you in the next election. They won't renew their memberships. That is going to be a serious problem. Finally, some of that hatred - and I'm now quoting Professor Pressey who was at the hearings and is a psychologist. He said: "The tragedy is that that hatred will be transferred over onto the French-Canadian people in the long run. That is going to be the real tragedy of this piece. The fumbblings and bumbblings and determination of the government on this issue will not only haunt the government and haunt the New Democratic Party, it's going to haunt and hurt people who are of French-speaking descent." So that's, Mr. Speaker, why the bells must continue to ring.

The government really only has a few options. If I were going to advise them - and they don't listen to me. I mean, they didn't listen to me when I was in caucus, so why would they listen to me right now? — (Interjection) — no, I just listened to the House Leader. He took up two hours of every caucus meeting, telling us - the House Leader, he took up two hours out of every two-and-a-half hour meeting. I mean, there's a guy that's phenomenal. He was phenomenal. He knew everything about everything. So, yes, that's true. I didn't say that much. I was just listening like everybody else. Andy had the floor, and he never yielded it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the government that at the big rally that was held, the big rally that was held in Winnipeg — (Interjection) — it's perfectly relevant. Well, it's certainly relevant to the issue of whether or not the government should be allowed to kill the debate and force official bilingualism through this House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to tell the government members and I'm going to tell them something I shouldn't. If you think the rallies are over, if you think that was the last rally, stick around. There are going to be a couple more rallies, next week; and if there were six more months, everybody would have their own rally. Each one would have his own rally and you could attend or not or bring your supporters or not. You'd each have your own rally and you could each persuade your constituents to the best of your ability. Mr. Speaker, at the big rally, and that rally was clear evidence of the opposition to this issue and the depth of the opposition to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, there were 96 cities, towns and villages represented at that rally - 96. There were probably more, but there was a circulation of a petition and those numbers were called. The Member from Roblin-Russell mentioned a poll taken last night at Selkirk. A lady was standing near the door and she had collected it. She got 102 people against the government and 13 in favour - 90 percent against the government.

The big rally, Mr. Speaker, that was held in Winnipeg at the Convention Centre was organized in 48 hours and I'm telling you that if there was a week or 10 days

- it was organized quickly because nobody knew when closure would be invoked, when the bells would stop ringing and when bilingualism would be forced on the province - so within 48 hours, 2,500 people came to that rally. I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, if there was a week or 10 days to organize that rally, you would have had 7,500 people, minimum, maybe 10,000, maybe more.

Mr. Speaker, who spoke at that particular rally? You know, the names are interesting, they really are interesting. D.L. Campbell came out, now maybe you don't like D.L. Campbell. The Minister of Health should like him; he should have some respect for him.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can tell you some of the things he told me.

MR. R. DOERN: Right. An 89-year old gentleman who has served this Legislature for 47 years . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Don't forget Bobby Bend.

MR. R. DOERN: I won't forget him. D.L. Campbell served the people of Manitoba for 47 years . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Those guys are still Liberals, Larry. You used to be a Liberal with them until you switched . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's because of them that I'm not.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's a lie, they're not Liberals, they're Conservatives.

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

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

Mr. Campbell was a Progressive. He was a member of the first Progressive Party in the 1920s. That's not related to Mr. Green's party. He was a Progressive in the Bracken administration and then he became a Liberal. He always regarded himself as both. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that he was a Liberal and a Progressive.

Bobby Bend was there; he was a Liberal. He was the Leader of the Liberal Party in 1969. He was there, and he was representing a spectrum of opinion, large "L" Liberal and so on.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Maltman was there; she's a nurse and she was the co-leader along with Bill Hutton. — (Interjections) — Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister of Health and the Member for Pembina will allow me to finish my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, Grant Russell was there, and I just want to say one thing in passing here to the government. I think it was a cheap shot to go after Grant Russell. I think that when a person has a heart condition, that must be taken into account. Mr. Russell is a fine gentleman. Most of you don't know him, but I assure you he a man with some integrity and he has a heart

condition and he's on a disability pension and he's fighting this fight and one of the reasons he's fighting it, is No. 1, he believes it and No. 2, he has the time. He doesn't work 16 hours a day as the Premier suggests. He is a person, a citizen, who is fighting this issue.

The same with Bill Hutton, and you know Bill Hutton. Bill Hutton has a heart condition too. I think it's very dangerous, so does the Minister of Health. I think it's very dangerous to start putting undue pressure — (Interjection) — my problem is that you're sitting beside me; that's my problem. I have to listen to this outpouring of garbage that comes, Mr. Speaker, from the Member for Inkster without interruption.

Mr. Speaker, when a person has a heart problem - I don't want to lecture you so I'll wind it up quickly - I think it is very unfair and I think it's hitting below the belt to go after them and that was done. I want to tell you that's not all that's being done to Mr. Russell. He's having pressure put on him in other ways and some of those ways will come out in the next few days and weeks.

Also at the rally, Mr. Speaker, the big rally, were Sid Green, Herb Schulz and myself. Mr. Speaker, Bill Hutton wasn't a speaker, but I want to tell you that the government members will have to somehow or other attempt to explain away the fact that Sid Green, who is a bilingual person, who believes in a bilingual country, is against them on this legislation. It's almost a contradiction because Green is not anti-French and no one can say he is. Green believes, in my understanding of his position, that this should be by a process of evolution and it should be as a government policy.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sure.

MR. R. DOERN: That's Green's position. Well, if the Minister of Health wants to challenge that, let him. Let him tear Sid Green apart. He's a good debater. You're a good debater, you tear him apart, but that's his position.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Hutton is perfectly bilingual; he has been to Europe many times. He is against the government on this issue. He has tried time and again and is trying right now to persuade the government to change the legislation, as a good New Democrat, as a former president of the Manitoba New Democratic Party. No one can say that Hutton is some kind of a Conservative or he's a bigot, no one can say that.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to talk about myself because the members will laugh. They will say, well, you know, that's ridiculous. But I want to tell you that I taught history for a long time and I want to tell you that I always taught a sympathetic account of French Canadians. I always taught a sympathetic understanding of the Province of Quebec and I haven't changed my position.

I'll tell you why I'm against this. I'm bitterly against official bilingualism, that's why I'm in this fight. I am not against the French language, I'm not against the French-Canadian people and I'm not against French culture, not against it at all, but I am totally against official bilingualism.

We don't need it, the people don't want it, and it's causing a lot of problems. — (Interjection) — Well, I'll

tell you what it is. You don't know what it is, after all this time? Mr. Speaker, official bilingualism is when you, first of all, make French an official language of the province. If you don't do anything else, you are in a big problem.

You have a big problem because then you're going to have Civil Service jobs that are going to be created bilingual; then you're going to have the ethnic community being very upset about the fact that one segment is raised up and therefore they are going down in relative terms. Mr. Speaker, and then your troubles will begin. Then you will have the horror of the bureaucracy, people who work for the Minister of the Environment who are going to say, "Ah, I see, the game's on, eh? The government wants this sort of bilingualism, let's start making positions bilingual because we'll score Brownie points and we'll get promotions for ourselves. We'll hire more staff, we'll get more grants, we'll build an empire." The civil servants know what's cooking, and if the government wants bilingualism, you have all kinds of people, boy, they'll give it to you. They'll let you have all that your little hearts desire.

Mr. Speaker, that's what we don't want; we don't want that in Manitoba. Maybe official bilingualism makes sense nationally, maybe, because 25 percent of the people are French-Canadians. It certainly makes sense to me in New Brunswick. I think it's a disaster, but at least there is 30 percent or more there who are of French background, but it doesn't make any sense at all in the Province of Manitoba where 94 or 96 or 97 percent of the people are non-French speaking Manitobans.

So I'll simply conclude on that particular point. The government members have an awful lot of explaining away to do. I hope there is a free vote. I think each and every one of them is going to have to think long and hard about how they're going to vote in relation to their own constituencies, in relation to the whole new democratic party, and in relation to whether or not the government's going to have any chance of electing any members in the next provincial election.

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

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in a debate, the question of which is that the question be now put. That is a debate, Sir, of a second form of closure, which has been applied now by this government on many occasions to the proceedings surrounding the constitutional amendment and the bill that they have brought before this Chamber for consideration.

In the course of my remarks, I will probably repeat some things that I have said before in this House and some things that other members have said before, and for that I offer apology, but it seems that some repetition is necessary in order to keep one's eye on the ball.

The people of Manitoba have their eye on the ball, Mr. Speaker. I was at a meeting the other evening a week ago in Winnipeg, which is the largest political gathering that I have ever addressed in 26 years in political life in this province. The people of Manitoba have their eye on the ball, Mr. Speaker, they know what's going on. The only people in Manitoba who don't seem

to know what's going on are the 31 or 32 members across the way, a handful of editorial writers here and outside of the province and very few others. Mr. Speaker, I'm not bothered either by the members across the House or by the editorial writers, never have been and never will be.

So I rise today to say that I'm going to be speaking about why the bells are ringing. I'm going to be speaking about why the bells are ringing under another motion of closure that this arrogant government has brought before this House in order to try to close down debate on a constitutional amendment which they still haven't got right.

As I said before, it's a form of parliamentary obscenity, Mr. Speaker, that a freely elected parliament should be asked under the guillotine of closure to pass a law, which when passed becomes irreversible. That to me is a form of obscenity. For people across the way to talk blithely about democracy being in jeopardy because we're ringing the bells on closure, Mr. Speaker, is the highest form of hypocrisy.

All they have to do to stop the bells from ringing is listen to the people of Manitoba. All they have to do to stop the bells from ringing is to withdraw the package, the ill-starred package that they have before this House. All they have to do to stop the bells from ringing, Mr. Speaker, is to resign and call a provincial general election. That would stop the bells ringing; and it would end, Mr. Speaker, a sorry sad chapter of perhaps one of the most incompetent, insensitive and arrogant governments that has ever been seen in this province since 1870.

"Why," the people of Manitoba are saying, "will these people not listen to us?" That's why we're ringing the bells. That's why they can place closure motion upon closure motion and we will have to give consideration day by day as to whether we continue to ring the bells, because we're ringing the bells for the people of Manitoba, not to be offensive to the parliamentary system. We're trying to preserve the parliamentary system from an overriding arrogant government, consumed with its own ideology and consumed with its own self-importance, that they are going to tell the people of Manitoba what is right. That's why we're ringing the bells, Mr. Speaker.

The additional insult that was proposed yesterday when the previous question was moved, which is just another form of closure, because let the record show that the previous question - which I've seen before in committee - when it's moved, has the effect of precluding any further amendments to the motion. It has the effect, Mr. Speaker, of causing a vote to be taken immediately on a motion, and what is this motion? It's just a procedural motion to call the House Rules Committee into being in order to look at the question of bell ringing; and, secondly, to cause a change to be made in the rules of debate in this House, contrary to the traditions of this House, which would permit the bells only to be rung for a period of two hours.

The people of Manitoba, I think, are entitled to ask the question, Mr. Speaker, are these changes that are being sought by this desperate government, are they being sought in the interests of Parliament or in the interests of the government? I think the question is quite clearly answered, Mr. Speaker. They are being sought in the interests of the government or what they loosely call themselves as a government.

They're not a government anymore, Mr. Speaker. They're a bedraggled collection of, at one time I suppose, well-meaning individuals who by accident and mistake, some of them, wandered into this province, wandered into the New Democratic Party, wandered into a seat, got a nomination, were elected here. Some are going to be here today and gone tomorrow. It's our job to make sure that they don't do too much damage in the short time that they're going to be in office.

That's why the bells are ringing. But the procedural change that they are seeking is not for the benefit of Parliament so much as it is for the benefit of what's left of the New Democratic Party. Why are the bells ringing, Mr. Speaker? The bells are ringing because they want to impose closure. Why do they want to impose closure? Because they can't stand the pressure that is on them from the people of Manitoba and from this opposition. Why are the bells ringing, Mr. Speaker? They're ringing because they have a political convention coming up next week, and they will sell their political souls, if indeed they have any souls at all, in order to ensure that this debate is cut off finally, put to an end, killed, cudgelled, hemorrhaged to death or whatever.

That's why the bells are ringing, Mr. Speaker. That is what they want to stop, and they will pay any price, and they will ask Parliament to pay any price and the people of Manitoba to pay any price, because they can't go into that political meeting of theirs in Brandon, I understand it is, a week Thursday or Friday with this issue unresolved in this House.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I think we may have a message for them. I think that unless they see what the people are telling them and unless they listen to what the people are telling them, unless they see the light of public interest that is being held for them to acknowledge and respond to, they may well by their tactics have guaranteed that the debate on this matter is going to go on much longer than ever it would if they had not moved closure. I merely say to them across the way, Mr. Speaker, that if they hadn't moved closure, they might well have been out of all of this debate by now.

They try to be too clever by half. They put a petty fixer in as a House Leader whose credibility is zero in this Chamber, and they expect, Mr. Speaker, that anybody can deal honestly or honourably with him. Well you can't. We know that. Mr. Speaker, they compound that by acting in a tactically stupid way and saying, well we're going to show the Tories. We're going to checkmate them by putting on closure. Mr. Speaker, if they hadn't put on closure, I daresay the debate might well have been wound up by now. But they, Sir, contrary to the old cliché that they are too clever by half, I've always said of this government, it is just not half clever enough.

That's the problem. You've got petty fixers laying down procedural policy on behalf of a substantive matter which goes to the constitutional roots of this province and which will be around for generations to come, and we have people of that ilk, Mr. Speaker, who are laying down the rules, people whose credibility is non-existent? No. That's why the bells are ringing, because this group of people don't dare face their political convention a week from now with this matter unresolved. They want to close it at any price. Well,

Mr. Speaker, they may have a few surprises in store for them yet.

They want to impose closure on this House, having left unresolved very serious questions about their constitutional amendment. Let's deal with it for a moment. Here I apologize for repetition, because I did raise some of these points the other day.

We have before us the fourth version, I think it is, Mr. Speaker - can you imagine that? - of a constitutional amendment. The first version, when they brought it in, their Attorney-General stood in his place and said, you can't change a word or a tittle of it. You can either accept it or you can reject it, but you sure can't change it. Well so much for his credibility. He was unceremoniously booted out of office as House Leader and as the Minister responsible for the carriage of this matter.

Then they replaced him with a common fixer. Mr. Speaker, the common fixer now brings in the fourth version. In this fourth version, they say: "As English and French are the official languages of Manitoba . . . "which is a statement that is only half-true, like most of their statements, everyone has the freedom to communicate in that language, and no existing law - and I'm paraphrasing, I don't have the exact words in front of me - can be restricted in any way after this constitutional amendment comes into effect.

So to abridge my remarks because time is limited, Mr. Speaker, we have asked on this side of the House, what does that mean? First of all, why is it necessary to have any amendment to Section 23 of The Manitoba Act? Section 23 of The Manitoba Act provides very simply that English or French may be used in the courts, may be used in the Legislature, and that the statutes of Manitoba and the Journals of this House shall be printed in both languages. That's all Section 23 says.

Why is there any need to amend anything in connection with Section 23? Section 23 was restored by the Forest case in 1979, and by an act of this Legislature in 1980 which repealed the 1890 statute. The restoration was done.

They still in their propaganda, paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba, talk about matters such as: "This act is going to correct the historic injustice." Mr. Speaker, that is so much garbage. Any historic injustice was long since corrected by the Forest case, by the action of this government in 1980, supported by the then opposition in the NDP, and by the administrative actions that were then under way to give vitality, force and effect to that law and to the judgment of the Supreme Court.

What is this nonsense about this constitutional amendment restoring historic injustice? That's nonsense. They have been fed a line of guff across the way.

So, Mr. Speaker, we've raised questions: (a) why are you amending 23 at all? Why? Because any amendment to 23 is liable to provide an extension of 23, and 23 is chiseled in stone and 23 will not be able to be changed once this Legislature makes an amendment to it. So we'd better have it right.

Mr. Speaker, their own Legislative Counsel who is a servant of this House and of this Legislature in a letter dated the 16th of January to my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, a letter which has been tabled in this House, says in effect that 23.1 as presently drawn will

have the effect of entrenching certain statutory provisions that exist now in the laws of Manitoba which, prior to the passage of 23.1, could be changed by the Legislature and I'll deal with this in a minute, but after 23.1 is passed - if we're foolhardy enough to let this government do it - will become entrenched in the Constitution forever and we've asked, Mr. Speaker, for them to deal with that argument that is raised by their own Legislative Counsel. This is not a frivolous argument. It's raised by their own Legislative Counsel. Indeed we had to bring it to the attention of the House Leader, the common fixer, that this section - this 23.1 that they are playing around with so casually - will have the effect of entrenching Bili 115, unless they're very careful about the order in which the two are proclaimed. I don't think he realized that because the quality of advice they're getting is not bad, it's just that they either (a) don't understand it, (b) are oblivious to it, or (c) are contemptuous of it. There is no way that intellectual argument, Mr. Speaker, can overcome pig-headedness. We know that, and I'm afraid that what we're seeing on the other side of the House is either a want of intelligence, contempt or straight pig-headedness, because they haven't yet - not one of them has stood in his place and answered those questions.

Here's a question I want to ask to the Minister of Education, and I think the Minister of Education should stand in her place when I sit down and tell me what the answer to this question is, because it's a legitimate question.

If she reads Mr. Tallin's letter of January 16th, she will see where he refers on Page 2 of his letter - he says and I quote: "In addition, there are a number of statutes where specific rights relating to the use of English and French language are set out. Perhaps the best known provision dealing with language is contained in Section 79 of The Public Schools Act which deals with the language of teaching," etc.

Then he goes on to say, "However there are a number of other provisions in the statutes which specifically provide for the use of either the English or the French language; e.g. Section 10 of The Builders' Liens Act, records required to be kept for purposes of the act; The Corporations Act, Section 10, name of corporations; The Employment Standards Act, Subsection 5(1); records of employees hours, wages, etc.

"I have not had the opportunity to go through all of the statutes to see where else there may be reference to the use of English or French language, however I am sure that all the above provisions would probably be considered as included in 'freedom to use' in the proposed 23.1 of The Manitoba Act."

Now my question to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, is this: my recollection is that Section 79 of The Public Schools Act is the section that was put into the act by the Schreyer Government, which made it possible for 23 parents in a particular school division to petition to ask for French language instruction. That's a statutory provision and that statutory provision was made by this Legislature. Once 23.1, as moved by the current House Leader, comes into effect, it will have the effect, because that section deals with language, of entrenching. So if a Legislature two or three years from now says, well, we think that 23 parents is not

fair. We would like to move that down to 20 parents. The question I ask the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker is: will this Legislature be able to reduce the number of parents who can ask for French language instruction, or will that become frozen into the Constitution of Manitoba? Question No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, if the Legislature, three or four years hence says, we think, in certain circumstances, maybe that figure should be increased to 25 and we want to make some change and we want to ameliorate it, we want to make any change at all in it, can the Minister of Education give this House the assurance that when 23.1 of the constitutional amendment is passed that that section will not be cast in stone forever and this Legislature will be deprived of the ability to amend the statute of this Legislature?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not a frivolous question. That's a legitimate question that is raised by the Legislative Counsel of the Province of Manitoba, one of the most distinguished Legislative Counsels in Canada. Now if he can't answer that question. If he says, in his opinion, that the effect of 23.1, as presently drawn, will be to entrench other statutes and he can't tell us what those other statutes are, and he doesn't begin to try to tell us all of the other statements about French or English that may appear in the common law, which is also part of our heritage, why then, Mr. Speaker, are we passing 23.1 before we know the effect of it?

Now if that is a question, Mr. Speaker, that is based on bigotry, that is based on racism, that is based on being anti-French, that shows that the questioner is one who doesn't care for relations in Manitoba, I stand indicted. I think it's a legitimate question and it has nothing to do with racism or bigotry, or all of the epithets that are thrown at us who are trying to stop the passage of this bill, because we don't have the facts and because we have the strong suspicion that the government still hasn't got it right and that they're going to enforce upon the people of Manitoba a form of legislative and constitutional straitjacket that will become a form of tyranny, that most people in this Legislature, given the choice, would not want to impose.

But I think my honourable friends opposite are so taken up with slogans, as we hear announced by the First Minister particularly. What does he always talk about? He talks about freedom being an issue. I don't know anything about any freedom being at issue in the question that I've just raised, except the freedom of this Legislature to amend an act of the Legislature, which may well be frozen like a fossil if we pass 23.1. That's the only freedom that's involved. The freedom of this Legislature to act.

He says, Mr. Speaker, that he's proceeding on a course that is reasonable. If he's proceeding on a course that's reasonable, let him answer those questions. It's unreasonable for him not to answer the questions. If he's proceeding as he says on a course that is principled, well then let him explain, let him explain, and let him give us the undertakings from his lawyers and from his own knowledge of constitutional law, shallow as it may be, that what the fears that many of us have about this legislation are not true. The fears, Mr. Speaker, that are raised by his own Legislative Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, he talks about a made-in-Manitoba solution. Some solution, when we're going to be

imprisoning every future legislator in Manitoba from dealing with French or English statutes, just because they mention the word French or English? Is that, Mr. Speaker, the kind of made-in-Manitoba solution that this collection of people want to impose upon the people of Manitoba? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been persuaded that there was too much intelligence, individually or collectively, across the way, but I appeal to whatever faint bubble of that quality may be residing in some of the grey matter across the way, to listen carefully to what is being said to them and to start answering some of these questions. Because I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that while the people of Manitoba, while the average citizen of Manitoba - 78 percent of whom are vastly opposed to this - while they may not understand some of the nuances that the Premier talks about, while they may not know that even the questions are raised that I've mentioned today from the Legislative Counsel's report, they may now know about those things, but, Mr. Speaker, never underestimate the wisdom of the people. They know there's something wrong. There is something rotten in Denmark in this package, and they're right. They're absolutely right.

So, Mr. Speaker, here's a government that refuses to stand up and answer legitimate questions based upon an interpretation of this section, and then has the further arrogance to impose closure upon the debate of the constitutional proposal and says, "We (a) will not answer the questions; and (b) will use our majority to impose a muzzle on this Legislature so we can push through a constitutional amendment even though we don't know how it's going to be interpreted and even though it may imprison this Legislature for generations to come.

Why are we ringing the bells, Mr. Speaker? We are ringing the bells to prevent that kind of pig-headedness becoming public policy in Manitoba. That's why we're ringing the bells. That is not a statement of government policy on their part; that is pure unadulterated blind pig-headedness, and the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, I think are on to them. They're on to them because they can't answer any of these arguments. They haven't tried to answer any of these arguments. They've used half-truths, misinformation throughout the whole piece.

A MEMBER: They won't even talk.

HON. S. LYON: So, Mr. Speaker, here we are faced with double closure now. The previous question is put on a procedural motion to refer to cut out bell ringing so they can get on with their dirty deed. That's perhaps the best expression, Mr. Speaker, their dirty deed, their dirty constitutional deed which they haven't the bravery to explain to the people of Manitoba because they can't. They can't explain it; they sit there mute.

Their Attorney-General is away holidaying, probably in some Marxist state, as he did last year, with his friends from Grenada. He's not here to answer, Mr. Speaker, on their behalf. They claim to have a lawyer or two on their side. They've got the common fixture, the House Leader, he's not a lawyer, but can nobody on that side of the House - how about somebody with some flicker of intelligence like the Minister of

Education? Can't she see how important this is and try to give some reasoned answer instead of speaking in slogans to the people of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, that's not good enough and if the members of the government across the way think that this opposition and think that the people of Manitoba are going to lie down like a doormat and let them move their barely functioning NDP truck over us, they've got another long thing coming.

Mr. Speaker, they seem to think that if they say that this represents a political consensus of the '80s that that's it, and that the thing's done. This act of theirs doesn't represent the political consensus of the '80s at all.

One of the persons who appeared before the committee, I believe it was Professor Pressey, said that the violence which this government had done to the social contract among its people was what he resented more than anything. Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Pressey a racist? Is he a bigot? Is he a redneck, as the Minister of Resources would have members of the committee feel they were, until he apologized to them? No, he's not. He's telling them some home truths, that they, because of their insensitivity, because in many cases they have people on Treasury Benches and in their background or in their back bench who don't understand this province, they have touched cords in this province that run as deeply as the Manitoba school question and they didn't know what they were doing. It's just like an elephant being loose in a china shop. That's the kind of government we have here, insensitive, uncaring, here today, gone tomorrow. Let's do what we can while we're here. Oh, are we doing some damage? Sorry about that.

Then where are they going to drift to when they're kicked out of office? The hosts at the meeting last Saturday, the Minister of Finance and his co-member, what are they going to be doing? Are they going to be drifting on into some socialist oasis somewhere on the face of the earth after they're kicked out of this House? Here today, gone tomorrow, and that's part of the problem. Part of the problem we face in this House and dealing with this matter which goes to the very roots of our being as a province and as a people is that we have insensitive, coarse, crude people elected temporarily to office who do not understand this province and who are doing great violence to it, without perhaps even understanding what they're doing.

We're not dealing with the question, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier would have us believe. In a letter, I'm told, that he sent to all of his party members dated February 7, 1984 - I'll be happy to table the letter if my honourable friends haven't seen it - here's what the Premier says in this letter. I hope it didn't go out at public expense like most other things that the NDP do. The letterhead, as Legislative Assembly, we'll perhaps have to ask the questions: how many were printed? at whose expense? who got the letter? I got the letter, Mr. Speaker. Here's what it says. I'll just give you one paragraph to show you, Mr. Speaker, how sickeningly this government resorts to misinformation, half-truths and so on. Here's what the Premier says on Page 4 of this tome that he has sent out to the fast diminishing numbers of the members of his party. "There are only two possible solutions:" - he's talking about the language matter - "To have an Ottawa court-imposed decision with

unknown results and probable further court battles, or we can have Manitobans settle this issue in Manitoba once and for all." Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, I continue. "We are committed to a made-in-Manitoba solution. We believe our new proposal reflects the political consensus of the 1980's rather than that of the 1870's. It will also provide a saving for the taxpayers of Manitoba. But most importantly, we believe that our proposal is reasonable and principled and will correct an historic injustice."

Mr. Speaker, there are at least four lies in that one paragraph. There are at least four lies in that one paragraph. So, Mr. Speaker, what are we to believe?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The honourable member should restrict his remarks to parliamentary language and not use unparliamentary language.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about a letter that is signed by the Premier, God knows if he wrote it. I say with as much sincerity and integrity as I can, knowing the facts of this situation, that those statements are lies. Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking about a statement he made in the House, they're full of lies too. I'm talking about a letter that he has written to his people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member knows well enough that the words he has used are not parliamentary in this House.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

HON. S. LYON: All right, Mr. Speaker. The Premier's statement as usual, the Premier's letter is full of terminological inexactitude. Mr. Speaker, let's take a few minutes to look at this letter because we are constantly told by the spokesmen, those who are brave enough to speak, and it's only recently that the Premier really got into this debate - he left all the hard work up to the Attorney-General and then the fixer from Springfield - but now he's forced to get into the debate by his own constituents, and here's the kind of mishmash that he's turning out - he gives, first of all on the first page, an historic rundown. I say, Mr. Speaker, that historic rundown is probably as interesting as much for what it doesn't say as for what it says, but let's leave that to one side in the interests of time.

He goes on to talk about the Bilodeau case in Page 2, and Mr. Bilodeau's fighting a traffic case. He says, "In effect, Mr. Bilodeau's case will impact on the validity of every law passed in Manitoba over the past 90 years. His case is still pending before the Supreme Court of Canada. If the Government of Manitoba loses the case, the results could be disastrous. The Supreme Court could rule that all Manitoba's English-only laws passed over the last 90 years are no longer in effect or valid. The province could also be required to translate 4,500 English-only statutes at a monumental cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba."

Let me tell you about some of the terminological inexactitude in that paragraph, Mr. Speaker. First of all, when we passed the bill in 1980 after the Forest case in 1979, we acknowledged that one of the responsibilities under the rule of law was for the

Government of Manitoba to proceed in a reasonable way with the translation of statutes. If a schedule could be worked out for that in consultation with reasonable people from the Franco-Manitoban community, well and good.

That's been the obligation since the Forest case. Why hold that up as a threat? That's no great threat. We knew what the cost of it was going to be. We knew it could be done over a period of time, if need be, and it was under way. He carefully fails to mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Bilodeau case had been tried in a trial court, tried in the Manitoba Court of Appeal and had been thrown out unceremoniously in both courts; carefully fails to mention that passing little fact, Mr. Speaker, that one would have thought would have engaged the attention of a man who carries the letters Q.C. after his name.

Mr. Speaker, he then goes on to say, "In order to prevent a potentially disastrous defeat in the Supreme Court of Canada, the government had only one option, to settle the matter out of court as many citizens and governments do every day on any number of cases before the courts," a little bit more, Mr. Speaker, of terminological inexactitude on the part of this Q.C., the Member for Selkirk.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any citizen, and I've checked with a few lawyers, who have ever been able before to settle a constitutional case with a level of government in Canada. Now there may be some, so I'm not going to stand in my place and say it's never happened before, because it may well have happened before. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is, I've never heard of it before, and I have talked to a number of lawyers and they've never heard of it before, of a government knuckling under on a highway traffic case and making concessions on a highway traffic case that affect constitutional provisions that will be in force, in place in this province forever. I've never heard of it before, Mr. Speaker, but this Q.C. from Selkirk, he says that it happens every day. You know, citizens settle cases every day. This is sort of a yawn, a ho hum thing that the government was involved in. Mr. Speaker, that just isn't true.

Then he went on to say, Mr. Speaker - here is the favourite echo of what the Member for Springfield was caught in the lie of saying. I'm quoting from the Premier's letter. "In May, 1983, the Government of Manitoba reached an out-of-court settlement with counsel for Bilodeau, the Franco-Manitoban Society who have represented the Franco-Manitoban community since 1969, and the Government of Canada."

I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, it's already on the record, ". . . the Franco-Manitoban Society who have represented the Franco-Manitoban community since 1969 . . ." - says who? The legislation doesn't say so. No. The legislation, unlike the Member for Springfield said, wasn't passed by the Weir Government. It was a private member's bill brought in and passed by the House to set up a society among Franco-Manitobans, the same as the Kinsmen Club, the same as the St. George's Society. Whoever dubbed the Franco-Manitoban Society since 1969, as this Q.C. from Selkirk says, as being the spokesman for the Franco-Manitoban community? More terminological inexactitude, Mr. Speaker. I'm afraid we're just finding

them all over the place, just like rotten Easter eggs from last year.

Mr. Speaker, he then goes on to say that, "The Franco-Manitoban Society . . ." and I remind, Mr. Speaker, I remind the House again, that's the same Franco-Manitoban Society who, in 1980, supported separation in the Province of Quebec's referendum. He is now dubbing them the official spokespeople of the Franco-Manitoban community. I think rather not, Mr. Speaker.

Do we see the word "extend" in this letter where he talks about extending the constitutional provisions? No, he doesn't deal with that. Did he deal with the questions that I have raised in the House and other speakers have raised in the House about the inappropriateness of dealing with 23.1 at all, because we don't know the meaning of the words that they have put into the statute? Did he deal with that? No, he didn't deal with that, Mr. Speaker. He wouldn't deal with that at all.

He just talked in slogans. He says at the top of Page 3, "In short, the government would preserve the validity of its laws from this and future court challenges in exchange for a guarantee of limited French language services." That's how it started out. That was the first bad deal they made, and they have now backed away from that and put the French language services into a bill as we told them to on Day One, and said it was inappropriate they should have it there in the first place. Talk about misinformation, misleading the people of Manitoba under the signature of the First Minister of this province.

Mr. Speaker, that's why the bells are ringing. That is why this cowardly government has had to move a second form of closure on its procedural motion. That's why we are going to stop them from bulldozing this constitutional amendment through this House, because it is ill-considered. It does not represent any consensus of the 80's at all. It flows entirely against the will of the people of Manitoba. It is not necessary. There is no question of freedom involved. There is no question of restoration of Franco-Manitoban rights involved. They were restored. Section 23 was restored in '79 and '80. There is no question of minority rights involved.

Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of 3,000 the other night, one of the speakers said, would everybody in this room who speaks a second language hold up their hand? And 60 percent of the room held up their hand. Were they all racists and bigots, as the Minister of Resources would have you believe just because they speak a second language? No, they weren't, and they weren't rednecks either, Mr. Speaker. They were ordinary people of Manitoba who are appalled at what this government is doing.

I say, let them pull this whole package back. Instead of fiddling around with procedural closure motions, let them have some final breath of concern for the public interest of Manitoba. Pull the whole matter back and if they can't, resign and call an election.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. STEEN: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you've recognized me. I didn't hear you over the noise, but I didn't see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: . . . any members opposite rising to enter the discussion.

Mr. Speaker, what we are facing here is a rule change and a motion to put the question. The rule change says the committee should meet and that the rules pertaining to bell ringing should be perhaps revised. I think that members on both sides of the House would agree that when this hotly-contested, debated item has passed this House, that such a happening should take place, that there should be some ceiling on bell ringing for the future.

The second reason why I would agree with that, Sir, is I know that the Filmon Government of the future doesn't want to be bothered by bell ringing, as it proceeds to introduce its legislation into this House and put Manitoba back on its tracks.

The part that I do disagree with in the Government House Leader's motion is we should change the rules in midstream. What has caused the uproar, Mr. Speaker, of the last day or so, is the Minister of Natural Resources' sudden outburst that the question be now put, so therefore members on this side of the House and two from that side of the House have risen in their seats and have spoken on that question.

Today's question period, Sir, I think was a most interesting one, where the Premier was being asked and answering questions regarding a public meeting that took place in his constituency last evening. I find it interesting that when a publicly concerned group of citizens - who have called themselves the Grassroots and they are people of all political stripes and people of all nationalities, etc., who have gathered together to try and fight a piece of legislation that a government has introduced, that they are deathly opposed to - call a meeting for the Premier's, the First Minister's constituency for Monday night and the Premier is unavailable to attend such a meeting, such an excuse is perhaps legitimate. He claimed, at the time, that he had short notice of such a meeting taking place and was unavailable to attend.

The interesting part though, Sir, about that meeting was the fact that some of his staff members were at the meeting and handing out a leaflet saying that he, as the First Minister, was unavailable to attend the meeting, that he wasn't given sufficient notice, but that he would hold a meeting on Wednesday night of the same week, which was last night, Sir, and that such a meeting would take place.

So obviously the meeting that he was holding was one that was being orchestrated by he, as the Member for Selkirk, and being sponsored either by his Selkirk NDP organization or by his office, as Premier of this province, or perhaps a combination of both. But such a meeting attracts 400 or 500 persons in attendance by all reports, both from having seen it on television and having talked to four or five persons who were in attendance in person. They tell me that the crowd was about two-thirds opposed to the government's

intentions and perhaps about one-third that were supporting the government in its intentions.

There was a poll taken at the door by a woman from Lockport who has, to the best of my knowledge, never belonged to a political party, but is opposed and wanting to stop this government in its tracks, as it introduces its legislation and she collected signatures from persons who were prepared to sign the petition. She collected somewhere over 110 signatures of people opposed to it, but was only able to scare up some 13 signatures of persons that were supporting the government in their attempts.

The Premier goes on in the question period today to talk about Sid Spivak, a former Leader of the Conservative Party, who is supporting his legislation. He talks about the odd other person who may not belong to the NDP party that is supporting his concept, and so on, but he never never, Sir, ever seems to want to bring up the names of the people that are leaving his party, that are leaving in droves, whether they be public figures from the NDP Party or be people that are sending in their memberships.

One only has to think back a couple of weekends ago in this very building, when the hearings were on for the bill when it was at committee and representation was available to the public at that time, when a group from the Springfield constituency came in to see their member and to protest against the actions that he was taking and what the government was taking. There have been meetings held with various other members of the government, Treasury Bench in particular, on this matter. And then today, Sir, we find out the new news, the Premier is prepared, under conditions of course, to have a free vote on this matter now.

Now that puts a slightly different outlet onto the whole ball game. Now, not only do the members of the Treasury Bench support him, now we're going to find out whether the backbenchers from within his caucus are going to support him. Whether the people who are not members of his Treasury Bench are going to be able to go back to their constituencies and say to the people, I had to support it because I was honour bound by caucus rules, etc. Now he talks about a free vote, so such an alibi or such an excuse is not going to be made available for members opposite now regarding this very very important piece of legislation that is before us, Mr. Speaker.

I often wonder whether members who represent constituencies in the East Kildonan area and members who represent northern ridings and members who represent areas such as Dauphin, the Member for Dauphin has an area that has a constituency with a population of likely 50 or better than 50 percent of the people being Ukrainian - whether they really want him to be supporting such measures in this Legislature. I have my doubts, having mentioned in a previous speech in this Legislature, Sir, having attended a meeting last June in Dauphin, I have my doubts whether the people in the Dauphin constituency support this government's motion to proceed with this French resolution.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: There's no argument. Ask Jim Wynes. He'll tell you.

MR. W. STEEN: What's his name?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Jim Wynes.

MR. W. STEEN: Well I'm told by my deskmate, the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell, and he was telling me, Mr. Speaker, some few days ago about this gentleman by the name of Jim Wynes that called him and said that he was a member of the Dauphin NDP Association and that he and about 15 others were sending in their membership cards, because they were opposed to the action that this government was taking.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: All one sweep.

MR. W. STEEN: One thing I would like to comment about, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why members on the opposition are speaking on this particular occasion and taking the advantage of this opportunity that is available to them is that the government has brought in closure. They are protesting the bell ringing and they are allowing for very few opportunities from members of the opposition to speak on this matter.

So therefore, on this motion of the Minister of Natural Resources, it does permit members and give them an opportunity to once again voice their concerns on this matter. I might just put on the record, from a news release that was issued by our party earlier in the month on the 6th of February, where we say that the insistence of the government, through closure on the constitutional amendment on French rights, is the reason for the bell ringing, is the actions of the government wanting to close off debate and have the vote taken on that very day.

It goes on to say, for instance, most organizations require at least two-thirds majority at an annual meeting, in order to change the by-laws of an organization. When we speak of the by-laws, I recall when we were on the Government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that on a few occasions I brought before this House a Private Member's Bill and the Private Member's Bill was usually changing the charters and the by-laws of curling clubs. For example, one was the Rossmere Golf and Country Club; on a second occasion it was the Charleswood Curling Club and the Member for St. Johns at that time, Saul Chorniack, constantly would ask the question, did more than 50 percent of the people who belong or are shareholders of the club, did they vote on this issue? Did they voice their opinions to make these changes to their Charter? In many cases, what we would have to tell him was that many of the members couldn't be reached and that all that was required was a quorum, but he was so insistent that at least 50 percent or better of the membership of the particular club in question had to be notified and be given the right to vote to approve of any changes that curling club was going to make and so on.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, the government across the way is so insistent upon trying to get this package of theirs through this Legislature as quickly as possible. So much so, as I said earlier, they wanted to have the vote taken right today. I, along with other members on this side of the House, only have to remind them that even Prime Minister Trudeau worked for 13 years to achieve a consensus on his constitutional package. He worked with the provinces and I know that the Attorney-General of that time, the Member for St. Norbert, spent

many weeks meeting with similar ministers from other provinces and the honourable minister for the Federal Government, Chretien, who at that time along with Roberts, were the two spokesmen at these various meetings on behalf of the Federal Government. He met week in and week out to try and iron out all the flaws in the proposals of both the provinces and the Federal Government. It took many many hours and weeks of meetings to try and arrive at some consensus. It took a committee of the House of Commons and the Senate, a joint committee, to listen to briefs and to hear people on the subject. As I said, it took some 13 years from the time that Trudeau first started talking about having a constitutional package until the day it finally received its royal assent, and so much so, that here we have a Premier in Manitoba that only a matter of a couple of weeks ago, I think it was, or less than 14 days ago, stood up in this House and said that this issue was only 58 out of a list of 61 important items that were facing this government. Yet, he is so insistent, as he was last night at his meeting in Selkirk, to proceed and to carry on and to have this resolution voted on and to have this bill passed.

The Premier and the members of his government are not listening to Manitobans. I have never seen, in my short years of being a Manitoban, and I have been a Manitoban all my life, any issue that has riled the people up like this one has; meetings at the Convention Centre that attract over 2,000 people; meetings in the Premier's constituency attracting 200 and 300 persons when the Grassroots held a meeting on Monday night. Then they came back on the Wednesday night of the same week, only two days later, and they attract some 400 or 500 persons at a meeting to discuss the French issue. We have never seen Manitobans divided as they are today and now there are meetings planned for other centres throughout both Winnipeg and in rural Manitoba. I understand there is one for next Monday night in Brandon. Then after next week in Brandon, there's the NDP annual meeting, and I'm sure that the NDP, as they are usually good organizers, will organize and orchestrate their annual meeting so that this subject isn't even mentioned.

A MEMBER: Maybe it won't even be on the agenda.

MR. W. STEEN: I'm sure that it won't be on the agenda, but perhaps, Sir, there will be some brave soul that's a member of the party and still a member of the party that is concerned about the issue and will rise at the convention and see if he or she can get on the floor and have this issue discussed. A member who attended the meeting last night, Mr. Speaker, in Selkirk pleaded with the Premier and this was on CBC Provincial News last night, the 11 o'clock news, pleaded with the First Minister, saying that he is ruining the NDP Party, that he has taken the party down the drain with this issue that is dividing Manitobans and pitting Manitobans against one another.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we made some progress today here during question period, when the First Minister offered a free vote. He attached some conditions to his free vote - it was vote today. But the House Leader later came along with another package and he said, well, we're prepared to go along with the free vote providing it takes place by, I think, Monday.

So, members opposite, such as the Member for Dauphin, who is usually quite vocal from his seat, will have the opportunity to go home this weekend and find out what the people in Dauphin really think. Hopefully persons involved with the media in the constituency of Dauphin will be able to use the media, both the print media and the voice media in that constituency and get the word out to his constituents that a free vote on this issue is going to be permitted. It will be most interesting to see what happens with the Member for Dauphin next week, or whenever the vote takes place, now that he has been taken off the hook by his Leader and he is permitted a free vote. When one considers the population makeup of the constituency of Dauphin and I repeat, Sir, more than 50 percent of the people of Dauphin are of Ukrainian background and all one has to do is to go up there in the summertime and attend the Ukrainian Festival and see how the people of that community are so proud of the fact that they are the Ukrainian capital of Canada, and they love it, as the member says.

I'm just wondering how long he is going to get along with his Anglo-Saxon and Ukrainian constituents if he supports this measure. Yes, it's been said by members on this side that he has an out now. He has now got an out by exercising his right to the free vote, so he can vote against the government and still hopefully be with the government and still honour his constituent's general desires and wishes.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a letter that was written by a constituent of mine to the First Minister. The letter is dated January 31, 1984, from a Mr. Harold W. Brown to the First Minister. He goes on to thank the Minister for a letter that he received from the First Minister of January 26, but he goes on to mention in there that the Honourable Serge Joyal, Secretary of State, sent me a copy of his speech which he has been so often quoted from. I resent the particular bald statement that this man, Serge Joyal, made, but, he goes on to say, and he quotes Serge Joyal: "The best way to use the status of French in Canada, as someone said, is to play the Canadian game to the hilt. In other words, to plunge into and change, adapt various structures, ideals, ways of understanding citizens' rights and freedoms."

So this is very often what people here in Western Canada, Sir, think of happenings in the Province of Quebec. As the Member for Elmwood had said earlier in his statements that the Province of Quebec is more than 50 percent French and that Canada is approximately 25 percent French speaking, and therefore he can accept the fact that we, as a country, are a bilingual country. But here we have a province where the French-speaking people might total 6 percent, and yet we have a government that wants to go against 94 percent and support 6 percent of the people.

These are the concerns that a lot of people have, is that, are Manitobans in the future going to be forced to adhere to what 6 percent of the people say? I have a lot of constituents that constantly raise the item with me, Mr. Speaker, that for their children or their grandchildren to get ahead in the Civil Service in the future in this province, does it mean they're going to have to be bilingual? No member opposite will tell us and try to assure us that's not the case, but I understand there are a number of senior civil servants in the province who are already taking French immersion

courses. And why are they doing it? So that they can communicate with 6 percent of the people. I say no, the reason they're doing it is to protect themselves, to keep their jobs for the future, because they know that in Manitoba you're going to have to be bilingual if you're going to have a senior position in government in the future.

In an editorial from the Virden newspaper, Mr. Speaker, which was dated February 1, 1984, the editor of the newspaper writes some interesting statements in this editorial. He goes on to say, and I quote: "We in Manitoba today are facing one of the strangest situations which any Canadians have had to put up with since the days that this huge and somewhat strange country was put together. The situation, of course, is to do with our government, and it's the strange indeed situation which affects each and every one of us a little more each and every day."

He's talking about the French issue, how it's affecting Manitobans a little bit more each and every day, and how we are pitting people against one another. This is in Virden, an area 150 to 170 miles away from Winnipeg, and likely about as far removed from this building and the difficulties that take place within this Chamber as you can perhaps get in Manitoba. Yet the people in the Virden area are somewhat concerned about the fact that the socialists in Winnipeg are the people that have got the rose-coloured glasses on and are forcing bilingualism.

This person, the editorial writer goes on to say: "Bilingualism in the federal Civil Service" and he quotes, "'which often is neither civil nor much of service in itself' all too often means a transition from the essential English-speaking service to the essentially unilingual French-speaking service."

Someone asked me the other day about the RCMP, and I might, Mr. Deputy Speaker, mention to you because you and the Clerk were present when we were at a parliamentary conference in Regina last fall and at such a time we were invited to tour the RCMP training facilities. There were some 31 persons in the class there of which approximately 10 were of Indian or Inuit background, but of the remaining 21 members in the class, every one of them had to be bilingual in order to be accepted in the RCMP.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And it doesn't even offer police service in Quebec.

MR. W. STEEN: Yes, my colleague, the Member for Pembina, says that the RCMP doesn't and isn't the official police force of the Province of Quebec.

It is basically a federal police force out of Ottawa, the capital, and the Maritime Provinces and Western Canada. Yet the honourable member for La Verendrye tells me that in the detachment in Steinbach, almost to a man they're bilingual. I'm sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that detachment does serve such areas as St. Malo, St. Pierre and so on from time to time, even though St. Pierre does have its own detachment.

But what is bothering people, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to be a bilingual province. We are not going to be in a position to change it in the future; that it's going to be entrenched by this government, and that it's not going to be changed in the future. It has

been the entrenchment that the members on this side have been fighting against from Day One. We show and we have indicated many many times about the plebiscite of 78 percent of the people last fall that voted against this action, Sir, that you and your government are taking.

It has been often said by people on this side of the House and Manitobans in general, the '81 election, nothing was said about this. Yet government members often refer to the bill that was passed in 1980 within this House to make changes after the Forest case. We went through the fall of '81 election campaign and nothing was said about this.

So the question is: does the government have a mandate to push ahead with this legislation?

MR. W. McKENZIE: No, no, they haven't.

MR. W. STEEN: I believe they do not have a mandate to push ahead with it. We've had a plebiscite, whether people believe in them or not. It was taken last fall, and people were against it. We have seen public rallies where people have come out in large numbers to protest what the government is doing. We have seen members of the Legislature get phone calls, get letters from constituents in record numbers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, opposing what the government is trying to do. Yet the government says, we're going to forge on ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that maybe we made some progress today when it was said that we perhaps will have a free vote. I would think that members opposite from hereon in are going to hear a lot from their constituents now that there's a free vote. As I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, there are constituencies that are held by NDP members of the Legislature where this is a major issue.

Your own, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is one of them, and there are a number of them. The two that I think are certainly worth talking about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are yours and Dauphin. Those are two where I think that the people are going to be taking a hard look at how their member votes on this issue. You now, Sir, have the right to have a free vote on this issue, and perhaps, Sir, save your seat for the next election. I know that in the last election, Sir, it was a very closely-contested election, and you didn't win by any landslide, but you now have some hours on your side between now, Sir, and when the vote is taken on this issue.

Your Premier has released you from an obligation within the caucus to a caucus-binding vote. You now have the chance for a free vote. In the constituency of River East, if I know anything about politics - and I've been through a number of elections, six of them, in fact - Sir, I would say to you that you have Thursday evening and Friday and perhaps Saturday and Sunday to do a lot of soul-searching, to really take a look at your political future, the future of Manitobans and the future perhaps of the NDP Party.

I think that if you, Sir, arrive at the conclusion that I think you should and that is that you should vote against such a package, rather than voting against such a package you'll do an even better thing. You will go to your Leader and you will ask him to withdraw it, rather than have you vote against it. Then, Sir, I think that your Leader, the Premier of the province, can do

the right thing to save perhaps seats like River East and Dauphin, and that is withdraw this package and not have you voting against him and not putting you in an embarrassing, difficult position.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The honourable way out.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I notice, and it was handed to me by one of my colleagues, what I would consider as a franking piece, "The province that works." It is put out by the Honourable Member for the constituency of Osborne, the MLA for that area, Muriel Smith. It's a well-written document. It goes on to talk about the progress despite difficulties in Manitoba, the concrete results that are happening as a result of your Jobs Fund. Building a better Manitoba is in here; investment is growing. There are charts about population changes and how Manitobans are coming back.

There is an interesting paragraph in here that is entitled, "Our sons and daughters return." They go on to mention how, "Our sons and daughters were driven out of Manitoba by acute protracted Tory economic misery." It carries on and says that now sons and daughters of Manitobans are returning.

It talks a little bit about the livestock industry . . .

A MEMBER: In Osborne?

MR. W. STEEN: . . . in Osborne, however we have resource investment in Manitoba and so on, and a personal message from the Honourable Member for Osborne, Muriel Smith. But there isn't one word in here, not one word in here about the French issue.

MR. W. McKENZIE: You're kidding? No! You're kidding?

MR. W. STEEN: Not one word in here.

A MEMBER: Nothing?

MR. W. McKENZIE: Not one word?

A MEMBER: It's taken eight months and she hasn't said a word.

MR. W. STEEN: Perhaps this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is proof of the pudding, that as far as the Premier is concerned, this issue is 58 out of 61.

A MEMBER: That's the truth.

MR. W. STEEN: This might be it in writing.

MR. W. McKENZIE: No mention of it.

MR. W. STEEN: So that when the Deputy Premier puts out an information brochure that goes throughout her constituency, and nothing is mentioned . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Not one word . . .

MR. W. McKENZIE: About biligualism.

MR. W. STEEN: . . . about bilingualism or the bill that's before the House.

MR. D. ORCHARD: There's a list of requests on the back . . .

MR. W. STEEN: Yes, I must mention, Sir, that she says if you would like additional information about the Home Energy, check it off, Jobs Fund, Pension Reform, Highway Safety, Rent Review, the Provincial Parks Plan - oh, that must make the Minister of Natural Resources pleased. He's even going to be able to get another opportunity to send out some more mail, or else to get up in the Legislature and talk about his parks.

MR. W. McKENZIE: What about bilingualism? Is there a question on bilingualism?

MR. D. ORCHARD: But there's no request on the Constitution.

MR. W. STEEN: But, Sir, there isn't a thing in there regarding the government's package, not a thing.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Not a line. That's the Deputy Premier.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I have said that a number of constituents have contacted me. I quoted from Mr. Brown's constituent's reply to the Premier who is upset, firstly by Serge Joyal, the Secretary of State, and his statement.

But a question that is thrown at me regularly is, what is in it for Pawley? Everybody wants to know why he is going along with the Federal Liberals. They fight with the Liberals as often as they can, although he did say at a recent Premier's Conference that he felt a little out of step with the other premiers. I don't doubt it that he would, because the rest of the premiers in Canada are Conservatives. I can see why he's out of step.

MR. W. McKENZIE: He rode at the back of the bus.

MR. D. ORCHARD: He rode in a limousine to get away from them.

MR. W. STEEN: In fact that was the time that the host government provided a bus to take the premiers and their staff people to a function, and Manitoba's premier couldn't get in the same bus with Conservative premiers, so he had to go and take his own taxicab.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, a limousine.

MR. W. STEEN: Or get a limousine to take him. But people keep asking me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what is in it for the NDP government? Or is the Federal Government going to give us more money and transfer payments? Are we going to get more money to look after our deficit? Are they going to make a separate arrangement with Manitoba than what other provinces get on health costs? Are we going to get unusual educational funding grants from the Federal Government? What's in it for Manitobans to go along with this?

MR. W. McKENZIE: It's got to be something.

MR. W. STEEN: The odd one even says, is there a chance that the Premier will be made the Governor-General? And I said no, that spot has already been filled and so on, that they have done.

MR. W. McKENZIE: How about a senator?

MR. W. STEEN: Will he be made a senator? No, he wouldn't take a Senate spot now because he's a man of principle. He couldn't take a Senate spot because he has said that he's opposed to the Senate, that the Senate serves no useful purpose to Canadians, so he couldn't and wouldn't take a Senate spot. So the question goes back to what is in it for Premier Pawley and the NDP Government for going along with the Federal Liberals and making French and English the official languages?

It's been said in questioning by our Leader, when he questioned the Premier in the House yesterday about the French newspaper and he mentioned that the Premier was quoted in this French newspaper as saying that the word "official" might be taken out.

Now I think we offered an amendment some weeks ago, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that would reduce "official" from there, and unfortunately the Speaker ruled it out of order and unacceptable, although at the time I thought that we, on this side, had the proper architect draft such a resolution for us in getting legal counsel, who members on both sides of the House speak so highly of, to draft such a resolution. But it was a long and wordy one and perhaps it was too wordy or too long to be acceptable by the Speaker, Sir. But I think that if the government were to take out the word "official" that they might find some greater support from all sides of this Legislature regarding their French bilingual package.

It was also said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the other day or quoted in the Winnipeg Sun where the member for Riel said to some constituents that the package could be dropped. I would say, as I was saying to you earlier, Sir, that if you go back and talk to your constituents and they talk to you, knowing full well that you are going to have a free vote on this issue, you will do the right thing and you will go to your First Minister and your premier, your leader, and you will say to him, "Sir, I would prefer you to withdraw the package, make amendments, accept amendments from the opposition, so that we can get support from the opposition on this and you will save my behind and you'll save that of other members on our side, and perhaps you might save our party and keep our party together."

Sir, perhaps it's not too late to make that change and maybe we got a signal from your leader today when he talked about a free vote. Certainly when he uttered the free vote out this afternoon, he threw some conditions on it, but I think perhaps that he is going to offer you, Sir, an opportunity for a free vote in this Legislature on this very subject.

Another comment I'd like to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, is I think that the First Minister was stooping about as low as he could the other day when he attacked Mr. Grant Russell, the chairman of the Grassroots organization. He talked about this man devoting so much time to an issue that they have a difference of opinion on, but he talked about the man's private life

and the fact that the man was drawing a pension from the Federal Government, a disability pension, and he wondered whether this person should be drawing this pension when he could muster up the strength to put in the hours and the driving force behind this citizen's group that was opposing him.

Now I wonder if he was just talking about the man's disability pension or was he threatening the man by going perhaps to the Federal Government, where it's obvious that the First Minister and the Federal Government are, in my opinion, in bed together on this issue and saying to the Federal Government, you better check into this man and his disability. Perhaps he shouldn't be drawing the disability cheque. He perhaps isn't medically unfit for work.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to me that stoops about as low as one can, when the First Minister in the province attacks a citizen who is trying to put up a good effort on behalf of a cause that he believes very much in, and a cause that he is working on to the best of his ability, and trying to handle himself and conduct himself in a gentlemanly manner and he cannot defend himself in this Chamber and the First Minister attacks him.

I say that members on this side at least can cover up or can defend Mr. Grant Russell in that regard. I would say if Mr. Grant Russell's disability pension is disturbed in any way, shape or form, it will be a direct result of interference by the First Minister, likely with the Federal Government. If his pension proceeds in the future are disturbed in any way, shape or form, I would think that this First Minister of this province can take full credit for it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think in concluding, I have said to you and I'm hoping that you are prepared to at least listen to me, and I have said to the Member for Dauphin, he was in his seat earlier, and hoping that other members on the government side are listening, if you have a free vote, I hope that you will exercise it in a manner that is in agreement with your constituents, the majority of your constituents.

Think of your constituents, Mr. Deputy Speaker, think of your own political future, think of your party's political future, think of Manitobans, and lastly, think of your children or your grandchildren and think of the fact that, will they have to be bilingual in years to come in order to secure a senior position in government in the Province of Manitoba? If you're not bilingual and you're with the Federal Government and you're working out of Ottawa, the nation's capital, you might as well forget it, your chances of being promoted are very limited.

I would say, Sir, Mr. Speaker, to you and to the members opposite that if 6 percent of Manitobans can rule this province and at some future date force Manitobans to be bilingual and to be able to converse in both French and English of equal ability in order to be a Deputy Minister, an Assistant Deputy Minister or some senior government administrator, I think that we are in a sad, sorry situation.

This government should never have climbed into bed with the Federal Liberals. They have done so. They were defended last weekend by Lloyd Axworthy when he was home here in Manitoba and I hope the people of the federal constituency of Winnipeg Fort Garry will remember Lloyd Axworthy interfering and meddling into provincial affairs, because he says and Manitoba's Provincial Government often says they want a made-

in-Manitoba policy. Well, now we've had the Federal Minister come home to Manitoba and meddle into provincial affairs. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Axworthy will be taken down in the next election as a result of being a partner of Trudeau's, but he has now put the last nail in his coffin by climbing onto the bandwagon of the French factor and meddling into provincial affairs.

Yes, he talked about former Liberal Party Leaders, Mr. Campbell, who the Member for Elmwood spoke so highly of before and who I know have had the privilege of going for years. He spoke of Mr. Campbell in such a light that he was scorning Mr. Campbell for being on the same side of the fence as Mr. Lyon on this issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think progress has been made this afternoon. Some days it's very hard to understand and to leave here at 5:30 and wonder if progress has been made. But the offer from the First Minister of a free vote, I think, has been a step in the area of progress and members opposite who are sitting in constituencies where the vast majority of those people are opposed to the government's actions, now can vote and vote with the wishes of their constituents and not be honour bound by the club of the Whip of the government side, Mr. Speaker. So, I believe now that members opposite have a new course of action available to them and what they should do, now that the Whips are off, is get to their First Minister and tell them to withdraw this legislation and get on with governing the Province of Manitoba in 1984.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. D. James Walding: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on this, but I would like to ask leave for 5:30 so that I can continue my speech after we recess. I'm asking for leave, that it be called 5:30, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to call it 5:30? — (Interjection) — Leave has not been granted.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Leave has not been granted? — (Interjection) — Okay, Mr. Speaker, I too rise, but not with any amount of pleasure and enter into this debate. I can think of many other things that I would rather be doing, but the fact that the government has taken the stance and the actions over the past few weeks forces me and we on this side to stand up and protect democracy as we see it and protest the action of closure, of arrogance, you name it, they've got it.

The one thing that I do understand from the people who have been coming before us in the various open and public meetings that we hear is: what is this government trying to do to this province? What are they doing this for? Why are they doing it? Why aren't they listening to the people? Why are they taking a language issue and making it a racist issue and who is suffering and from what? Who is being denied and what are they being denied?

These are questions that are being asked by people all over this province and, Mr. Speaker, not just by the official opposition. The numbers of concerned people in this province is growing every day. People who have

taken no particular interest in the political scene are now becoming aware that something is very unsettled and very bad in this province. They see bitterness and acrimony all around. They see communities being separated and looked upon with suspicion. Everything is different. People holding opposing opinions to the government are being labelled as bigots and rednecks.

We now have two classifications of humans in this province. We have those who are of French expression, who are called Francophones, and there are only about anywhere from 60,000 to 80,000 of those people who are in this province. Then there are about a million of us who are classified as Anglophones. Many of us of other ethnic backgrounds. You know, here we are, two different factions fighting against each other, and it's all been created by this government, the Government of this Day. The government is lamenting this divisiveness and frustrating the whole province.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the reaction of the general public, why does this government not accept the subamendment, for instance, of the Member for Fort Garry and get this over and done with? Public opinion demands that this be done. Can't you, as a government, accept the fact that you are not always right? Does this position always have to be wrong, or surely the First Minister with his principles could admit to that?

As of today, now here we have a situation where a free vote has been asked for from our side of the House. Up until now it has been a caucus vote on the other side. There has been a government vote. Now I wonder just how many of those people on the other side, if we're given the freedom to vote as their constituents — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: How many are going to be hiding?

MR. R. NORDMAN: Yes, how many will be hiding from that vote? Yes, how many? The Member for St. Johns, will he be voting with the government if he has a free vote? The Member for Riel, will she be voting with the government if she has that free vote? Will the Member for River East, will he have the courage to stand up and vote as his constituents state? We, on this side, are convinced. There isn't one of us that isn't convinced that we are doing the right thing, but the Member for Inkster, he probably won't even be in the House when the vote comes.

Why is this? It was a non-issue. Language was a non-issue in the election of 1981. Neither party was concerned whether a French question was here; a language question was not here. Why did it all of a sudden become a language issue? Why didn't the government of today just carry on? All they had to do was just carry on with what had already been put in place by the previous government. The previous government had put into place, after the Supreme Court had come down with its legislation, they had put it in place, and there were French language services being given where and whenever it was necessary.

But this government, when they came in, for fear — and that was all it was — of the fact that there might be a problem with the Bifodeau case where the statutes of the province would be invalid. They made a deal, and they made a deal with the Franco-Manitoban Society and Serge Joyal for a few votes, and that's all. But they negotiated themselves right into a black hole, you might say.

The only solution for this is either for this government to call an election and let the people of Manitoba decide, or pull the bill. The First Minister . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: . . . any time that you're ready to fold it up, we're ready to go.

The First Minister claims that the government has the support of the silent majority. Okay, I would love to see that silent majority. We know that we have the support of the majority that is out there, and we're ready and prepared. All you have to do is call it. Resign. Pull the bill, and call an election.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: We have no fear that who will form the next government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time being 5:30, when this motion is next before the House, the honourable member will have 33 minutes remaining. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m. this evening.