



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 182B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 14 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Viriden	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

Tuesday, 14 February, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. On the motion of the Honourable Government House Leader and the motion of the Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Thank you to the Member for St. Johns for that warm welcome. I appreciate very much his enthusiastic response to my words earlier.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, earlier today I spoke about the motion before us. As I said it's a complicated maze of procedural initiatives that we're dealing with. The matter of putting the question now is really a form of closure, on top of a motion that seeks to limit bell ringing to two hours, which is another form of closure, and ultimately, to allow the government to impose the closure on the constitutional resolution and amendments thereto. So we have a form of triple closure all intertwined in a procedural endeavour that was masterminded by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the fact that rule changes can be and should be dealt with on an orderly basis, that there was a great deal of foreknowledge of the potential use of the bells for the purpose of stalling or in some way holding up the government's initiatives in this particular regard, and the fact of the matter is, this government should have been aware of the potential use of the bells. They were aware because they insisted that a two-week limitation be placed in the agreement that they signed last August. They could have read, as I did earlier today, the Speaker's Ruling from Madame Speaker Sauvé in the House of Commons, who indicated that Parliaments and Legislatures have an obligation to examine their rules, bring them up-to-date, and to deal with them on an orderly, non-partisan basis, on a consensual basis rather than have the matter come up as it is today under duress where a government is attempting to impose its will on the opposition because it has the majority in the House, and forcing through a change of rules midstream because they don't like the way the rules are working to the advantage of the opposition in this particular instance.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the nub of what we're dealing with, a government that is attempting to change the rules of the game in midstream; a government that has by agreement in the past set forth the rules under which we all operate in this House. Yet, today because it doesn't suit their purpose, they want to change those rules and they want to change them to the disadvantage of the opposition. That's really the issue that we are dealing with.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, aside from the procedural wrangling that has gone on, there has been a force, a pressure on the proceedings ever since the new Government House Leader, the Member for Springfield, decided that he could demonstrate to everybody, all and sundry, his side and ours, that he was the master of the rules, and that he had the parliamentary skill . . .

MR. H. ENNS: All that he'd learned at public expense as Assistant Clerk.

MR. G. FILMON: That he'd learned and gathered at public expense, as the Member for Lakeside says, as the Assistant Clerk of the House. He could put together all of this skill and knowledge in a package that would ensure that the government could always impose their will on the opposition, because he had the answer procedurally to every possible move that we could make.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that obviously hasn't happened but, as I said before, our options are being narrowed and narrowed and narrowed by all of the various ploys and tactics that are being used by the Government House Leader in order to try and restrict our capability to block the proceedings that are before us, because we fundamentally disagree with the government entrenching various things such as the statement that French and English are official languages, and such as the various statutes which can't be identified for us by the Government House Leader or anybody else on that side that bear any reference to the use of French and English, they will now be entrenched without any of us knowing whether or not that's a good thing or a bad thing.

The Government House Leader says, he doesn't care. It doesn't matter to him. He feels that it's okay to have it all entrenched, and that we should be the ones who, if we have some concerns, do the research and find out what's involved. Well that's not the way it ought to be.

MR. C. MANNESS: It's a cop-out.

MR. G. FILMON: That is a cop-out, as my colleague from Morris said. But, Mr. Speaker, further at issue in this whole matter is the fact that really, because of all the procedural wrangling, because of the debate and acrimony that occurred last summer over whether or not this whole issue would go to public hearings because of the imposition of closure that has caused the bells to ring on many occasions in this new year portion of the Session that started previously, that in fact started in the late period of 1982, so this is a Session that has spanned three years, Mr. Speaker. Because of all that, I think many of us have lost sight of the fact that the constitutional resolution and the amendments thereto have really not been debated to all that great an extent.

For instance, as my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert, mentioned yesterday, he is one of a group of

people who have not spoken either on the main resolution or either of the two amendments thereto and, you know, he is one of our prime spokesmen, a constitutional - expert may not be the word, but certainly a knowledgeable man in constitutional terms, because he represented our government in the constitutional talks in 1981 and 1980 with the Federal Government. He's a former Attorney-General and all those things. He above all should be on the record, but he was not given an opportunity because of the manner in which this government moved heavy handedly and precipitously to bring closure in on this whole issue.

I ask why this government can't act normally, openly and allow things to proceed to their normal ultimate conclusion? Why must we be so offended by the imposition of closure?

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If government members are going to have a conference with their back turned to my Leader while he's speaking to this important issue, I would ask you to do the usual courtesy . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . of asking them to have their conference somewhere else.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. I would ask all members to remember the usual courtesies that are extended to the person having the floor.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My fellow caucus members are well aware of what I am saying here. We discuss these things regularly in caucus. We are very concerned about this issue and we take the time to discuss it and discuss it thoroughly. I am not as much concerned about which of my members are here at this point in time as I am of which members of the government are here and who's paying attention, because it is they, Mr. Speaker, who have something to learn. It is they, Mr. Speaker, who ought to know what is being said by the people who disagree with them because the people who disagree with them on this issue are in the vast majority in Manitoba. That's something that they should learn, and they should learn by listening to the debate in this House. They're unwilling to speak, obviously, on the matter and I refer to the fact that many members on my side had not had an opportunity to speak on the constitutional resolution and the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, beside the Member for St. Norbert, the Member for Assiniboia has not spoken on either the main resolution or the two amendments, and the Member for Portage la Prairie has not spoken on either the main resolution or the two amendments. There are three others who have only spoken on one out of those three. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that they have a right to be heard on this.

What bothers me even more than that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there are so many on the other side who have spoken on this issue. As I look through the records in Hansard as to who has been put on the record on the other side of the House, on the government side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I'm shocked at how few have actually had their views placed on the record on this issue. I just want to go through them so that people are aware that not only are we dealing with a government on an issue in which the Whips are on, and I'll talk more about the freedom to vote as they choose, and whether or not the Whips are on this issue, but we are dealing with a government who has muzzled most of its members on this very, very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the back rows and surveyed the records in Hansard and we have, for instance, somebody who has not spoken either on the resolution or either of the amendments, the Member for Ellice. Now the Member for Ellice as I recall — (Interjection) — no of course you're right. He used to speak all the time when he was in opposition. Mr. Speaker, there was nobody who had more on the record in Hansard in the Sessions of 1979, 1980, 1981 than the Member for Ellice, and now he doesn't speak on perhaps the most important issue: he's going to have to deal with in his term of office in this Legislature. He has not spoken, not a word.

You know, when he ran for Mayor, though, I'm reminded he definitely had an opinion on the issue. Do you know what his opinion was? He thought that there ought to be a free vote. He felt that this was an issue of such importance that it seemed to cross party lines, it seemed to cross ethnic lines, it seemed to cross geographic lines. He felt, Mr. Speaker, that there ought to be a free vote on this issue. So he obviously has some very serious concerns about the government's position on this; yet he has not put his views on the record in this Legislature. His constituents will not be able to know just where he stands on this issue and I would be concerned about that if I were the government, Mr. Speaker. Who else, as I went through the members in the back row, the Member for Riel has not spoken on either the resolution or the two amendments thereto, Mr. Speaker. I correct that very slightly because at one point in the debate she stood up and said, Mr. Speaker, I took the adjournment on behalf of the Attorney-General. That's her contribution to the record, and I'm reminded by the Member for Lakeside that over 2,000 of her constituents have asked to know her position on this issue.

The other day in the Winnipeg Sun she was quoted as saying that, well, maybe the government should take another look at this. There certainly seems to be a great divergence of opinion out there amongst the people of our province and maybe the government ought to take another look at this. So, maybe she should stand up and place her views on the record. But, of course, Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances in which we operate today with closure hung over our head, with the knowledge that when this procedural discussion and the matter of privilege is dealt with, we will have closure on us and the matter will go through in the course of less than a day and it'll be gone, over with and on to Ottawa. That's the reason why, we, on this side, are so upset with the whole process, the whole

procedure. Many people's views are not on the record and should be on the record on this issue of such vital importance to the future of our province.

I went through and I found further along the way the Member for Concordia had not spoken on any of the three aspects of this resolution or the two amendments. He's a former Speaker. He's somebody who has participated in the House to a great extent in the past and who should have his views on the record, Mr. Speaker, but he does not.

The Member for Rupertsland, Mr. Speaker, is not on the record on this issue. The Member for Rupertsland has not placed his views on the record or taken a stand on this matter. Now, you may say to me, "well, it doesn't really matter. Everybody will know where they stand." But, you know, we've heard all sorts of whispers in the hallway, we've heard whispers in their constituencies. I travelled the province as members know during the course of the months of September to December. I was in every area of the province and we'd be in some of the constituencies of members opposite and the whisper would be: well, you know, he's told us that he doesn't really agree with the government on this issue, but you know, the Whips are on and it's a government decision and he's going to have to go along with it, but the Whips are now off. We'll talk more about that in just a minute, Mr. Speaker. They say the Whips are off, at least that's what the Premier said last Thursday.

Further along the way, oddly enough a person who has a great deal to say in this House on anything and everything, the Member for Wolseley, is not on the record in either the discussion of the constitutional resolution or either amendment that's been proposed to it, not on the record. Mr. Speaker, that's not only a surprise, I think it's shameful.

A MEMBER: What about Mary Beth?

MR. G. FILMON: Now we get into the second row, and we find some interesting people who are not on the record on that — (Interjection) — oh, I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. Here's somebody else in the back row who has a good deal to say, if not a great deal to say, on anything that happens in this House. The Member for Inkster has not spoken on the resolution or either amendment. He spoke yesterday on this closure form of motion, the procedural motion, but not on the resolution or either amendment. Isn't that a surprise, Mr. Speaker? I certainly think it is.

Then we go on, as I said, to the second row, and there the Member for Kildonan, the Minister of Labour and Urban Affairs — (Interjection) — the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, she reminds me, has not spoken on the resolution or either amendment.

MR. H. ENNS: Not a word.

MR. G. FILMON: Now it's a matter, I would think, of great concern to her constituents. In fact, I know it is. I know that some of the greatest opposition to this constitutional amendment comes from her area of the city. I know that people are constantly in contact with ourselves on this side of the House. They're contacting, I think, the Grassroots organization. They are in very

significant numbers, and yet the Member for Kildonan has not let them know where she stands.

She is content to very passively let it go by, and then on the thought that later on when the next election is called, she'll be able to say, well you know, I really didn't agree with what they were doing. But on the other hand, you know if I had voted against it, the government would have gone down. It was a matter of confidence, and so on and so forth. Well I think that's shameful.

We go along further. The Minister of Education . . .

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

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I realize this is my first term of office in this House, but I'm wondering if the Leader of the Opposition is, in fact, imputing motive to me. I would hate to think that he might be doing that, because I would certainly want to assure anyone in this province that I do not intend at any time to qualify the position I take now. I would suggest that he is saying that I shall do that. It is not true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I listened quite closely to the member's remarks and I did not hear him impute motives, but I'm sure that he knows it is against the rule to do so and will watch his words with care.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

You're absolutely right. I did not impute any motives whatsoever. I would have no idea what the Minister of Labour's motives would be on any issue quite honestly and I wouldn't dream to impute any for her.

The Minister of Education has not spoken on the resolution or either of the amendments. I would think that her constituents would be very, very interested. You know, it has been pointed out that a number of the acts for which she is responsible will be affected by entrenchment that's contained within 23.1. She says she's not at all concerned with it and there'll be more on that later, because I think she ought to be concerned. I think she ought to be concerned that they may be carving in stone issues that she will have to deal with later and it will remove her flexibility as a Minister in dealing with these issues. I think she ought to be on the record, but for some reason she's chosen not to be.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Treasury Board, as we go further along the second row, the Member for Churchill, has not been on the record on this issue. Now I have heard that he's one of the people who's soft on this issue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, you know, the members opposite think that's a joke. Mr. Speaker, I would say that any observer of this House in recent years would have to say that the Member for Churchill was never reluctant to put his views on the record on any issue, any time,

and any circumstances. Now all of a sudden on this issue he has not been heard. He is not on the record anywhere and his constituents will have no idea where he stands, or why he has taken the position he has. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs says to read the Leaf Rapids paper. I'll be happy to do that. As a matter of fact, I intend to be visiting Leaf Rapids in the not-too-distant future. I'll ask the people there if they know the position of the Member for Churchill and if they understand why he's taken it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have the record of Hansard and I will say that despite the calling from his seat of the Minister of the Environment, the Member for Churchill is not on the record with respect to the resolution for either of the amendments. — (Interjection) — Well, a committee referral is an entirely different issue, Mr. Speaker. We're not dealing with the substance of the motion. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is saying that because people spoke on a motion to refer this matter to committee, that they've spoken on the issue. That's where I take issue with it, because we . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about bell ringing, the tactics that are being used in the House, the response to the closure motion and why we're offended. Why all of these things have happened is because many members have not been allowed to speak on the resolution or the amendments, many people have been denied their rights, Mr. Speaker, under the tactics that have been used. — (Interjection) — Absolutely so, Mr. Speaker, and that is the case. I'll go on, okay, I'll go on now.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Why don't you say vote now . . .

MR. G. FILMON: I'll go on now. You know, the Minister of Finance is very uncomfortable about this situation. I understand that he's one of the people in caucus who wants to dump this issue as well and is trying to convince his colleagues of that.

A MEMBER: Who's that, the Minister of Finance?

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister of Finance, you know, he's the one who always has a great deal to say but, you know, he doesn't seem to be too - and I'll get to him because I'll be at the front row soon and we'll know about him on this issue in just a moment.

But the Member for Gimli . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is having just as much success with me as he did in persuading the people of the Winnipeg Labour Council about his 3 percent — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Labour says that they wouldn't invite me. I will tell him that when I was the Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee of the City of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg Labour Council did indeed invite me. Their Executive Secretary, or Executive Director, Mr. Harvey Patterson, was very cordial.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Anybody can make a mistake once.

A MEMBER: Yes, but why don't you recognize your mistake.

MR. G. FILMON: I met in the Labour Union Centre with Mr. Ed Blackman, who is the head of CUPE, and I went to the Union Centre and we had a number of fine discussions.

Mr. Speaker, I understand well the nervousness and the concern of members opposite. They see their entire base of support eroding and disappearing, including labour, because organized labour now realizes what a disaster they are to this province in every way, shape, or form, in every respect, and they keep telling them that every time they have an opportunity. These people are very upset. The one who's most upset, of course, is the Minister of Finance, because he has not been able to persuade the organized labour movement in this province that he knows what he's doing. Of course . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I sure persuaded them about bell ringing.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: You know fortunately, Mr. Speaker, we aren't dictated to by the Manitoba Federation of Labour as members opposite are. We don't have to listen to them. We're free of our bondage, not like the members opposite who are in chains to the Manitoba Federation of Labour and when Dick Martin says, "Jump," they say, "How high?" Of course, the Minister of Finance can't get out of his office unless he gets permission from the president of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, but that's another story, Mr. Speaker.

I'll go on with various members in the second row who have not yet spoken on the constitutional resolution or the amendments.

A MEMBER: You're a real statesman Filmon, you would know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: The Minister of Government Services has not spoken on the constitutional resolution or the amendments thereto. He has not spoken on any of those.

Now I come to the front row, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Oh, I'm sorry, there's the Member for

River East, the famous bowler in the government caucus has not spoken on the resolution or the amendments.

MR. H. ENNS: He had a lot to say at 3:00 o'clock in the morning about burning an American flag.

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, as I come to the front row now, no I'm sorry, in the second row, I've forgotten that the Minister of Agriculture has not spoken. Now of course from the Interlake he has a big problem. He has had one of the strongest, best-organized oppositions to this proposal of any member on that side of the House. The people of the Interlake area are very much opposed to what the government is doing and he has not spoken, so they have no idea just really where his sympathies lie and how strongly he feels about this issue and why he's supporting it, if he's supporting it. Mr. Speaker, I think that that's absolutely astounding, absolutely astounding.

Let's get down now to the front row and let's talk about two of the very very significant and prominent absentees from the debate on this issue. Right sitting next to each other, two of the prime candidates for the next leadership of the New Democratic Party, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Energy and Mines have not spoken.

MR. H. ENNS: Not a word, not a word!

MR. G. FILMON: Not on the resolution and not on either amendment. They may have spoken on referral; they may have spoken on this, but not on the resolution or the amendments.

A MEMBER: You mean Schroeder is possibly a leader of that party?

MR. G. FILMON: Well there have been rumours to that effect, Mr. Speaker. The gold-dust twins, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Energy and Mines are not on the record. Does anyone suppose that they might want to get out from under this if they are future leadership candidates in that party? Would you think that this might be the millstone around their neck in future?

A MEMBER: They want nothing on the record.

MR. G. FILMON: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that there would be ample opportunity for them to have spoken on it but they have not taken the opportunity.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Brandon East, the Minister of Income Security and . . .

A MEMBER: Whatever.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . whatever.

A MEMBER: Incompetence.

MR. G. FILMON: And Employment Services. That individual is not on the record on this as well. He's got enough problems of course . . .

MR. H. ENNS: . . . think he could save himself from the McKenzie Seeds thing by supporting this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: He has enough problems on his plate with the McKenzie Seeds issue and everything else. It's obvious, of course, that he doesn't want to take on another millstone by supporting this issue or making some statement that will be on the record that can be quoted by his opponent in the next election, I can assure you. It's best to leave these things unsaid and unfortunately a very large number of the government members have left a great deal unsaid about this proposed amendment to the Constitution and the various other amendments that are on the record, Mr. Speaker. They have chosen to be silent on this issue.

A MEMBER: I don't blame them.

MR. G. FILMON: Well here we have it, an issue on which, as I said, we take great exception because members opposite have chosen not to speak. Members on our side have been denied the opportunity to speak by the tactics and the imposition of closure that has occurred. Closure - the first time in 54 years on a substantive matter in this House, we have closure on this issue. Why have they imposed it? Why have they imposed it? First on the bill, now on the constitutional resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, members opposite said that it was because we had spoken too much on the issue. The Member for Thompson referred to the fact that over 100 speeches were made by this side of the House on this issue and I have the information and the information does not verify his claim. The information says that we had, to this point in time, four speakers on the resolution . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Four? Four? We had four speakers and you impose closure . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Four speakers on the resolution, 17 on the amendment proposed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and 12 on the sub-amendment . . .

A MEMBER: Shame.

A MEMBER: A long way from 100.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, 12 additional ones, I'm sorry. Since then there have been four others, so we're now up to 37.

MR. C. MANNES: A long way from 100 Andy. You don't count the referrals. That was unprocessed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: So they have said that there's been too much discussion and too much debate on this issue, therefore we have to impose closure. But we're imposing closure because the government doesn't want to let this take the normal course, doesn't want to have to

deal with the amendment in the normal form, doesn't have to face the possibility that there may be other potential ways to arrive at agreement on this issue. They don't want to deal with that.

HON. A. ANSTETT: What potential ways?

MR. C. MANNESS: Drop it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we put forward an amendment to the constitutional proposal and the amendment of the Government House Leader. We put a sub-amendment - the Member for Fort Garry - and when it was put forward the Government House Leader said, "I'm pleased with it." A major reversal. He said, "Now we're at a point where we can do something about it." You know the opposition has obviously become seriously involved in this whole process. That's the kind of things he was talking about. What happened was that immediately after that he started talking closure. He started saying we're not getting anywhere, we don't agree with what you're doing and therefore we've got to impose closure. That's what he said. Only a few days before that he had said, well, I'm very pleased with it - a major reversal. — (Interjection) — Well, he's telling me it wasn't called for 10 days, and that's true because the Government House Leader insisted . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, he has very correctly pointed out to me - the Government House Leader - that debate didn't take place for about 10 days because they didn't call the resolution for about 10 days. What they kept doing was calling the bill and they kept insisting that we would be forced to debate their bill, that they would not try and accommodate our wishes in debating the resolution, but they would force us to debate the bill. So, as a result, the bells rang for a few days, Mr. Speaker. I think it was four days and, at the end of that time, I put the position of this side of the House on the record. That was a Friday. The following Monday, Mr. Speaker, they imposed closure on that Bill 115, after I had been the only speaker on this side of the House to put our position on the record, they imposed closure. The other speakers were speaking to the six-month hoist, Mr. Speaker. I was the only one who spoke to that bill and then they imposed closure. That's how they dealt with that issue.

Mr. Speaker, what a Draconian measure by a government that says it prides itself in upholding civil liberties. We've had speeches about freedom; we've had speeches about the democratic process and their desire to protect it and enhance it; we've had all those lovely sounding speeches and yet their response to our side, after one speech on Bill 115, was closure. That's what they think about freedoms; that's what they think about protecting democratic rights.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If other members wish to enter the debate, they will have their opportunity to do so in due course. In the meantime, would they kindly extend the same courtesy that other members of the House have received.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: We should have known about this government's commitment to the truth when we saw "A Clear Choice for Manitobans," their election platform document that was widely circulated throughout the province during the fall of 1981 that was signed by Howard Pawley on behalf of the New Democratic Party. It said, "No, we can guarantee that no Manitoban will lose his job, no Manitoban will lose his home, no Manitoban will lose his farm, no Manitoba business will go out of business." They can guarantee. That's what they said in writing and signed it, Mr. Speaker. We should have known about their commitment to the truth. Now, at the same time as their talking about a commitment to democratic rights, to freedoms, they're trampling on them by closure, Mr. Speaker.

Well, as I said earlier in the debate, the wolf is out of sheep's clothing, Mr. Speaker, and we know that it's alive and well on the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the further irony of it all is that all of this is being handled and rammed through by a Government House Leader who prided himself so much on the protection of democratic freedoms and traditions in this House, who recoiled from Speed-up, saying that the long hours and the relaxation of the rules wasn't conducive to proper decision-making, wasn't conducive to doing things in the proper democratic manner, that forcing passage of legislation through long hours of sitting and under duress was bad for this Legislature and refused to support the measure of Speed-up. That person is now the person who, for the first time in 54 years, brought a closure motion to this House on a substantive motion and who is trying to ram through this legislation and this constitutional amendment, more particularly, under the threat of closure. Well, I ask him, Mr. Speaker, does the end justify the means?

As well, we have the prospect of a Premier, a Premier who - and I refer to the get together we had in his constituency at a Youth Parliament in which he spoke in glowing terms about a commitment to democracy, a commitment to freedom, and who told people in his constituency, young students, about how important it was for us to protect our democratic freedoms and rights in this province, who talked about his discussion with an older woman in Chile in 1978, who told him, you should be proud of and you should cherish and you should always protect your democratic freedoms in your area of the world, because she said to him that they had had democracy at one point in time, and then they woke up one morning and it was gone. It was gone. No longer was it there for them.

So, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how this government's imposition of closure squares with that kind of statement by the Premier, how he can deal with a constitutional amendment that will be entrenched for all time in future, that will affect the lives of yet unborn Manitobans in terms of the distribution of linguistic rights, how he can deal with that under closure. I ask, Mr. Speaker, how that can possibly be?

I go back to the point that has been made over and over again, that constitutional amendments above everything else ought to be dealt with by consensus, ought to be dealt with by some special measure that seeks to give it an extra consideration, an extra opportunity to bring more people on side with the initiative.

I spoke about the fact that the New Democratic Party requires a two-thirds majority of members present at an annual meeting to pass a constitutional amendment - two-thirds majority. Many other organizations require you to give notice at one annual meeting for imposition of an amendment at the next annual meeting, a whole year to come. Pierre Trudeau, committed as he was to the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights and the patriation of our Constitution, waited 13 years, 13 long years to get consensus amongst the provinces, the opposition and his party in Parliament. Yet this Premier is prepared to have it go through with a simple majority which may be as little as four or five votes in the final analysis . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, does the end justify the means?

MR. H. ENNS: If that's what you need, call an election.

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

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I'm having some difficulty hearing the speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Now we have what we're dealing with, courtesy of this Government House Leader, an individual who is trying to work by a manipulation of the rules rather than let debate take place.

This House has been off on a tangent for most of this issue. Firstly, it was the argument over whether or not they would allow the matter to go to public hearings on an intersessional basis to allow the public to be heard on this fundamental matter of importance. All last summer, for six weeks we debated that issue because the government refused to allow the public to be heard. Finally, we dragged them kicking and screaming into those public hearings, and they indeed heard the public on the matter, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with this motion of privilege, because the government, rather than have the constitutional resolution and the amendment dealt with, spoken to, debated in this House, has chosen instead to impose closure. So we on this side have used the means at our disposal to block closure from happening. That's why the bells have been ringing; that's why we are on to those procedural debates; that's why we're on to this motion of privilege and not dealing with the issue. Because the government says that they're going to force this thing through one way or the other by closure, and we do not want to submit to closure

on a constitutional amendment that may never be able to be changed in future by future Manitoba Governments - may never, I say.

We regret, Mr. Speaker, that we have had to resort to the bell ringing. We would rather that it didn't have to be this way, but the government and the Government House Leader won't listen to reason on this - won't listen to reason. When we ask for hard answers, there are none forthcoming.

Let's look at today's question period where we were attempting to deal with what is covered by Section 23.1, where we are going to be entrenching all provincial acts that make reference to the use of English and French. We're going to be entrenching those for all time in future. We asked which are the acts that are covered. We asked that of the Legislative Counsel. As the Member for St. Norbert read the response, he can't tell us. He can tell us off the top of his head of a few, but he can't tell us all of them.

A MEMBER: What about the Minister of Education, what did she . . . ?

MR. G. FILMON: There are many regulations. There are all sorts of laws of our province that are going to be affected by that entrenchment provision, and the Government House Leader says he doesn't care. He says it doesn't matter to him because he wants that provision in there. It doesn't matter to him that these are going to be entrenched, and people will not be able to deal with them. Future governments of this province will not be able to deal with them.

MR. A. BROWN: The Member for Radisson says it's good, and Andy says, me too.

MR. G. FILMON: He says it may hamper future Legislature's ability to operate, but it doesn't matter to him because he feels that it's protecting rights. But when you don't even know what rights are in those laws, I think that you can't honestly say that you know what you're protecting. I believe that you can't honestly tell anybody in this province why you're doing it if you have just simply made a blanket provision that all laws that refer to English and French are going to be entrenched in the future.

It seems to me that there is a responsibility on behalf of the government to have this matter thoroughly researched to ensure that we know what we're entrenching, why we're entrenching it, and whether or not it's a good idea. Blanket provisions like that will only get us into trouble, will only invite litigation, will only invite court challenges, and will only invite the kind of bitter divisiveness that we've been talking about throughout. But he's flippant. He's totally flippant about it, Mr. Speaker. His response was, what rights do you want to take away from someone? We don't want to take away any rights, but we want to make sure that we know what's in there.

Just as an example, Mr. Speaker, The Public School Act refers to the fact that if the parents of 23 school-age children come and ask for a French Immersion Program in their school division, they can have it. It must be at least 23.

A MEMBER: That'll be entrenched.

MR. G. FILMON: Now that's going to be entrenched. Now what would happen if in future some government wanted to change that to 21 or 20 or 19? Mr. Speaker, that may well require a constitutional amendment.

A MEMBER: Absolute nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Open your eyes, you dummy.

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

MR. J. DOWNEY: Go back to your dummies . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Honourable Member for Arthur and the Government House Leader wish to hold a private debate, would they kindly do so outside the Chamber?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. J. DOWNEY: And he should know better, he's a former Clerk of this Chamber.

MR. G. FILMON: The problem is that we're not able to obtain the straight answers on these things. We are not able, because the government hasn't done its homework, hasn't had the proper research done, has been doing constitutional amendments over the Cabinet table. They have been drafting them on an ad hoc basis, and they have said this is what we want to do. Go ahead and have it done in legal terms so that we can present it to the House, and they haven't backed up their research and the information. They haven't brought the information that we need to this House as legislators to make this kind of decision on a constitutional amendment, of all things, something that will be entrenched in the Constitution of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that's the same problem that we had in dealing with Bill 115. They imposed closure after one speech on second reading in this Legislature on our side - one speech. They imposed closure. They took it to committee and at committee they were told by person after person of serious concerns, problems with the definition of the words "available services"; problems with the definition of the "right to communicate in French and English at principal administrative offices," and so on.

They haven't worked out what the various provisions might be of that bill, what the consequences were. They have no idea how many staff might be involved in the provisions and the requirements of Bill 115. The Attorney-General has blithely told us that there will only be 300 positions affected by that bill - 300 positions approximately.

Mr. Speaker, we have been looking into it and we have been trying to come up with a ballpark figure and we think that it may be indeed much higher. We believe that there may well be 1,000 Civil Service positions that are affected by the provisions of Bill 115. But, you see, the problem is that the government doesn't really know. They really weren't all that aware of the effect of saying that the language districts that were served by various offices of the government would require

services in both French and English. So you take an area like that represented by the Premier, Selkirk, and right off hand you'd say, "well, certainly that's not going to be affected by Bill 115." Who's going to need to provide French language services in Selkirk? Except that there are adjacent municipalities that come under the 800 or 8 percent and government offices in Selkirk that service those areas may well have to provide French language services. I'm just giving an example by way of reference to the bill, Mr. Speaker, of how the government hasn't done its homework, of how the government doesn't understand all of the requirements that it is getting Manitobans into by this whole proposal.

Mr. Speaker, all that the Government House Leader is interested in doing is showing his own caucus and the people of the province that he can out-manoeuvre this side of the House. That seems to be all that he is attempting to do. That seems to be his only concern in this whole issue, that he can show people that he learned so much as the Deputy Clerk of this House that he can now out-manoeuvre us in a procedural sense. That's what's behind this whole thing. He has indicated that he can force the government's will on us as the opposition and on the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, all he had to do was let the debate take place and he wouldn't have needed to resort to all of these tactical maneuvers, to the heavy hand of closure, to all of these kinds of procedural proposals. All he would have had to do was to let the debate take place.

Mr. Speaker, since he's embarked on this course - and it really doesn't matter at this point because we've gone on for two weeks basically on procedural matters, off on a tangent - in those two weeks, we could have probably dealt with three or four substantive amendments to the constitutional resolution and had everyone on our side speak on them and we would still have gone through all of those areas because, you know, we've shown it by this debate, that even if everybody on this side speaks, we can only go for about four or five days maximum. That's what it takes to cover this entire side in terms of speeches on the matter. But that would have required an interest in the democratic process having taken place. If we look at it, we have made one substantive amendment, the removal of 23.1, the one that the Government House Leader said was a major reversal, the one that he said he was pleased with.

HON. S. LYON: The first one was out of order, the major reversal was out of order, you've been out of order since you came into the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, after the removal of 23.1 is dealt with, we would have other options, but we have told this government and this House Leader that our opposition is to 23.1, and I suggest to you, that no matter how creative you become, there aren't too many substantive amendments you can make to 23.1 without eventually running out of options. Now, if you had two or three different amendments that you were prepared to try on 23.1, that would be about the limit, Mr. Speaker, yet this Government House Leader didn't want us to be given that opportunity, didn't want

us to deal with that at all. He wanted to cut off the debate and ram it through and that's it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they still have the opportunity to deal with our amendment, our subamendment which is the removal of 23.1, and we hope that they will come to their senses and they will deal with that in a reasonable sense and they will support our amendment and allow this matter to proceed because that is the best way to go, Mr. Speaker, that is the alternative that we have given them and that is the alternative that carries the support of this side of the House. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader said on Monday the 6th of February on Page 5869 of Hansard in introducing his matter of privilege, a number of things. He talked about the willful disobedience of orders and rules of Parliament and the exercise of its constitutional functions are breaches of privilege, privileges of the House. Of course, we are not dealing with the willful disobedience of the rules and privileges of the House. We are dealing with the use of the rules to the advantage of each side of the House and in this particular case . . .

A MEMBER: No, we're not.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . we're dealing, Sir, with the use of the rules that are at our disposal.

Mr. Speaker, he said further, the opposition is stalling and obstructing the government business which is currently before the House. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, there is any wish on behalf of members opposite to deny that is occurring. Well, Mr. Speaker, there isn't. We're not denying that we are attempting to block the government's passage of this constitutional amendment. Our backs are against the wall. He has given us no options. He has given us only one option and one option only and that is closure.

Mr. Speaker, this is our last line of defence and we are exercising that last line of defence and that's why we have allowed the usage of the bells to defend against a bad proposal by a bad government.

Now another matter that I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker. We on this side of the House have wondered over and over again, how can they be so bullheaded about this? How can they be so obstinate? Why are they forcing this through under any circumstances? They're prepared to use whatever means available to them — closure.

A MEMBER: The Member for Radisson is in control over them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Closure has not been used in 54 years. They're prepared to use it, Mr. Speaker.

Well, how can they be so sure they're right on this issue? The Premier has given us their answer, Mr. Speaker. He said that the silent majority supports them. He said the silent majority supports them.

He has said this on a number of occasions in the House and outside the House. We, of course, wondered who that silent majority was. We tried to find out. Where are they? Who was he listening to, Mr. Speaker, because we couldn't determine that there was a silent majority

out there. In fact, you know the Premier had done such a good job of convincing people, he had media people convinced that the silent majority was on their side, that there was a great tide of public opinion that wasn't being heard that really believed that we were wrong in opposing this, that we were wrong in using the tactics we've been using, and that the public were angry with us, not with the government.

That's the position that he's been taking and this is unbelievable. I don't know who he's trying to kid, but this is unbelievable, we thought, but we had to keep trying to find out a little more about this. Maybe the Premier knew something we didn't know. Maybe he did.

I got a phone call, Mr. Speaker, from one of the people in the eastern Manitoba area, a gentleman who happens to live in the constituency of Lac du Bonnet, who has supported the Minister of Business Development and Tourism in the past couple of elections, who honestly believed that he was a supporter of the New Democratic Party in the past, and he always regarded himself as such. He phoned me to tell me that he didn't like what he heard in the media and in the reports of the meeting of the Premier in Selkirk last week, because the Premier said that the meeting was evenly split, that it was a saw-off — about half the people supported him and about half the people opposed him. He said further that after they heard him speak, he was able to convince a lot of the people at the meeting of his position, and in fact it was a very very favourable meeting to him. That's what he had said, and he kept saying things like that to people on this side of the House that really there wasn't all that much opposition in his own constituency.

Well, this gentleman phoned to tell me, as a former New Democrat, just exactly what happened at that meeting, and he told me a variety of things. He said firstly the Premier was roundly booed when he arrived at the meeting, roundly booed. He said the vast majority of people at that meeting were not supportive of the Premier, not supportive in his own constituency.

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's a crock, Gary, that's a crock.

A MEMBER: That is not a crock.

MR. H. ENNS: He didn't have more than 60 people at that meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: The rest were brought in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: There were 40 from Lakeside.

MR. G. FILMON: He said you know what's even more astounding . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, this gentleman said, you know what's even more astounding than that? He said

the day before the meeting, I sat in the Premier's constituency office in Selkirk. He said I wanted to get to talk to the Premier or somebody close to him and he said I made an appointment and I got an interview with Mr. Sig Lazar, who is the Executive Assistant to the Premier, a special assistant to the Premier. He said I sat there for a full hour trying to talk to Mr. Lazar, and during that full hour I was constantly interrupted by phone calls that Mr. Lazar had to answer. He said from my side of the phone conversation, all Mr. Lazar was doing was apologizing and trying to explain the Premier's stand on the French language issue. He said it was obvious that every single phone call was opposing the Premier's position on the French language issue.

He said I sat there for an hour and he said you know what else was happening? At another desk adjacent, on another phone, was another assistant in the Premier's constituency office and he was phoning out to people saying, would you mind - and he said that the individual had a beard. There's somebody in the Premier's office who fits that description. In any case . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: In any case, the person on the other phone was phoning out and he was obviously phoning to a list of New Democratic members in the constituency and his message was, you've got to come out, you've got to support the Premier. You've got to come to the meeting, we need your support, the government needs your support, the Premier needs your support. Please come out to the meeting and support us. He was fighting with these people because they were turning him down, quite obviously.

Mr. Speaker, then of course it was said that a poll was taken at the door of the meeting and this lady was there collecting names on a petition for or against the government's position on this. It was reported that the count was, I believe it was 102 to 13 against the government's proposal. That was a poll taken at the door in the meeting of the Premier's own constituency.

MR. H. ENNS: The Premier's meeting in Selkirk.

MR. G. FILMON: Well, that shouldn't surprise members opposite because a poll was taken of people last fall, in October, throughout the Province of Manitoba and that poll was called the plebiscite, and at that time 78 percent of the people of this province said they were opposed to the government's proposal - 78 percent.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Premier kept insisting that things had changed, that in fact the silent majority out there now, after they'd watered down their proposal, after they changed a great deal of what they were doing in this whole French language proposal, after they'd made many changes, he was saying now, in the new year of 1984, the silent majority was with them.

In fact, further to that he said that people were offended by and very upset about our party's position on this whole issue. He was saying this so often that members on our side, my caucus and I, started to wonder whether it was possible that we could have

misread public opinion so badly on this, because the phone calls that we were getting, the letters to our offices, nothing seemed to indicate what the Premier said on the issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, we decided that what we ought to do is commission a public opinion poll on this matter to find out, have it professionally done and have people respond to us on this issue. As I said, it was conducted by a professional organization that does polling and certain questions were asked.

Now, I will say for the benefit of the Member for Thompson that I assure him that this was done by a professional polling outfit, that it was conducted last Wednesday and Thursday, so the results are very very fresh and I think they're indicative of just what the public mood is on this matter.

Now, the government chose to ignore the poll of last October, the plebiscites.

A MEMBER: The people's vote.

MR. G. FILMON: Now I want to tell them what the people think today. This is accurate, this is not the kind of analysis that's done from the seat of the Premier's pants as he talks about silent majorities. This, Mr. Speaker, is accurate information done by a professional polling organization.

Here's the first question. I'll tell members opposite that the sampling was about 225 in the city and about 110 in the rural areas. — (Interjection) — That's right. Mr. Speaker, the sampling of about 335 is enough to have accuracy we're told within about 7 percent. So it's of a sufficient sample, on a random sample, to be accurate and to give information of where the public mood is on this whole issue.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the first question could be argued with in terms of what it says because I know it's difficult to capsule it in one statement or one sentence, and really what you're attempting to do is just get the public opinion knowing that there may not exactly be an accurate understanding on the issue. But I think you want to ensure that the concept of entrenchment is there, and the concept of official languages is in the question, because we on this side are opposed to 23.1 which has the concept of official languages entrenched in the proposal.

So the question was: do you think the Provincial Government is correct in attempting to entrench French in Manitoba's Constitution as an official language? It is already entrenched, but this is as an official language.

Okay, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I'm quite prepared . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. FILMON: I'm quite prepared to accept that that question can be argued with because it's difficult to capsule it in one statement. What you're really trying to do is gain a sense of the public's mood on the issue and their understanding of the issue. You don't have time to try and explain it and if you try and explain it you can be accused of influencing the

statement, so this is as good as any. I'll accept another statement if the government wants to do its own poll. But here's an indication of where the response was:

76 percent of the respondents in the city were opposed to the government's position; only 17 percent supported the government's position; and 7 percent were don't know, or no answer. So out of 93 percent, 76 opposed the government's position.

In rural Manitoba, as might be expected, the numbers were slightly higher: 76.6 percent opposed the government; 17.4 supported the government. Again, that's out of 94 percent.

A MEMBER: What was the question?

MR. G. FILMON: I've already stated the question. The member can read Hansard.

Now, I want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that I don't regard that first question as being the important question on this. I'll tell you why - because the public mood I think is very obvious, by virtue of all the petitions, all the public meetings, the plebiscites. The public mood on the issue is fairly well established, but what members opposite and particularly the Premier and the Government House Leader were telling us was that we were responsible for all the bitterness, the acrimony, all of the divisiveness, all of the upheaval and all of the convulsion.

So the next question, Mr. Speaker, was: who do you think is responsible for the bitterness of the current legislative debate on the French language issue? Is it the NDP Government, the PC Opposition or some other group? You can say whichever you want and that could be the Federal Government, that could be Grassroots, the SFM, Trudeau, anybody else they could say was responsible for the bitterness. But let's see what the people said on it:

In the City of Winnipeg, 47 percent said the NDP was responsible; 12 percent said the Conservatives were responsible; the remaining number were either "somebody else," or "don't know," or "no answer." That's the distribution of where it stands.

In rural Manitoba, the distribution was as follows: 50 percent said the NDP was responsible for the bitterness, the acrimony and the divisiveness; 7.7 percent said the Progressive Conservative Party; and the rest were "others," or "didn't know," or "no answer." So that, Mr. Speaker, is what the public thinks about it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FILMON: Here's another one. Mr. Speaker, I know that members opposite are very exercised over this and I'll tell them that the punch line comes at the end where the people are asked: how did they vote in the last election? So you'll know whether or not these people are PC supporters, or plants, or whatever. You'll know where they stood in '81 when they voted, so just hang on.

The next question was: what action do you feel should be taken on the French language issue at this time? They were given four alternatives:

(a) The proposal be passed and French entrenched in the Constitution as an official language.

(b) The government be forced to drop the proposal.

(c) The government and opposition get together and work out an agreement.

(d) Debate on this issue be adjourned for six months.

In the city, 9 percent said that the proposal should be passed; 51 percent said the government should be forced to drop the proposal; 26 percent said the government and opposition should get together and work out some compromise; 10 percent said that debate should be adjourned for six months; 9 percent said that the proposal should be passed. That's in the city.

Okay, let's look at the rural area and see what the response was. Surprisingly, 13.3 percent said the proposal should be passed - in the country; 40.7 percent said that the government should be forced to withdraw or drop the proposal; 18 percent said the government and opposition should get together and work out an agreement; and 11 percent said that debate on the issue should be adjourned for six months. The remainder were "no answer" or "other."

Now, here's another question. The members opposite are saying, ah, but the public is turning against you, you can't use these tactics, you can't ring the bells. You can't do all these things, because the public doesn't want you to. That's what the Government House Leader said. You guys are getting nervous, he told us. You guys are being under pressure from all your people. He keeps referring to people who are telling him that we're going too far on this. We're going too far on this.

Okay, let see what the people say.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Go right ahead. Go too far.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Six months from now, we'll find out how far we've gone.

HON. A. ANSTETT: I'll call your bluff.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: The next question, in your . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: You'll listen, Andy, when you're down the tube next election.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: In your opinion, should the Progressive Conservative Party intensify, maintain or reduce its pressure on the government on the French language issue? In the city, 26 percent said, intensify; 27 percent said, maintain; 28 percent said, reduce; and the remaining 19 percent said, don't know or no answer.

In the country, 31.4 percent said, intensify; 40 percent said, maintain; 20.9 percent said, reduce; and the remaining 7.6 was don't know or no answer.

So just to capsulize, in the city, 53 percent out of a total of 81 percent answering, 53 out of 81 said, intensify or maintain the pressure on the government. In the country, 71 percent out of 91 percent said, intensify or maintain. So that's what the public thinks; that's what the silent majority thinks of this government.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. H. ENNS: We can have a better poll.

MR. G. FILMON: Where did these people vote in the last election? Who did they support?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: In the city sampling, Mr. Speaker, 23 percent voted PC in the last election, and 30 percent voted NDP, 8 percent Liberal. The rest were "other" or "refused" or "no answer." Fair enough. Many people don't indicate where they stood, but those who did indicate indicated that they were very heavily supportive of the NDP in the last election.

Yet today, they don't support this government at all in this issue. In the country, 40.7 percent had voted PC; 19.4, NDP; 6.7, Liberal; and the remainder were "refused" or "no answer" or some other support.

Mr. Speaker, those results stack up very closely to what the distribution of voting support was, city and country, in the 1981 election, very close. What does that — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say

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

A MEMBER: Six hundred people want your resignation, Andy.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. STEEN: Vic, you know, if you had an election now, you could fix the pension plan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: The Government House Leader said that this is opposition by Goldfarb. I want to remind him that his government spent \$15,000 last spring or summer on a poll, 15,000 of taxpayers' money on this particular issue. They took their poll, and they obviously took advice from their poll and took direction from their poll. We as an opposition have the right and the responsibility to do what we did, and we have conducted that right and responsibility. We believe that it was the right thing to do.

We've gone even further; we are making the government aware of it. We didn't have to, because this was not from taxpayers' dollars, this was from our own funds. We did this because we felt it was the responsible thing to do in response to statements made by the Premier and statements made by his Cabinet Ministers.

Here's one on the 11th of January by the Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways. He said, "The Leader of the Opposition on Monday, Mr. Speaker, in his speech of this divisiveness. He talked about "divisiveness, acrimony, convulsion of the entire province," but he did not say what was the major cause of that convulsion, of that acrimony and that divisiveness. He did not say that those people there in opposition were largely responsible for that divisiveness in this province by the position they took in this issue over the last six months. By exploiting and inflaming that divisiveness, they have for their own political benefit - that's their main purpose in this whole debate - and not for the benefit of Manitobans like they say, this concern that they bring forward, that they are concerned about this divisiveness in this province."

That's what the Minister said, Mr. Speaker, and I just want to remind him for the record that the people of Manitoba don't agree with him and don't believe him. Because, in fact, 12 percent of the residents in the city who responded to this poll attribute the divisiveness and acrimony and blame to us, and 7.7 percent of the people in the rural area - that includes his seat - attribute the responsibility to us.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's our response to the talk about the silent majority. That is our response to the talk about responsibility for the debate in this House. That's our response to what his government has been saying about this whole issue. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if, after hearing that, they're still confident about their position on this issue, let them call an election. Let them call an election!

Mr. Speaker, one of the other areas that has come up frequently in the debate on this motion has been the topic of freedom, of protection of democracy, of all of those things.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, members opposite have continually referred to freedom, protection of democracy, and they have been lecturing us over and over and over again. The Premier - I told members earlier about his speech on the protection of rights and his visit to Chile and all of those things, his talk about not wanting to trample on minority rights and all of those issues. He has asked us: what freedoms would we like to remove? So has his Minister of Government Services. The Minister of Natural Resources has taunted us saying, "Why don't you support democracy, why don't you support freedom, why don't you support all of those things?"

You know, it's ironic that the member who participated or was present at the flag burning at the U.S. Embassy is now speaking about the protection of rights and the preservation of democracy. What an outrage, what an insult, Mr. Speaker, all of these people, who practice Big Brother in all of their dealings in government, telling us about commitments to freedom and democracy. What an insult! The party and the government whose major premise has been throughout its time in office, not only now but in the 70s, to become more and more involved in the private lives of individuals of this

province, more and more involved in limiting and restricting their rights and their freedoms of choice in particular; these people are telling us that they're doing all of this in the name of democracy, in the name of freedom.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they're the people who have in the past opposed public aid to private and parochial schools, denying people the free choice of a place to educate their children, denying that free choice in the past.

Mr. Speaker, on a free vote . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . with respect to the issue of aid to private and parochial schools, there were only three on that side who had the courage to support that public aid to private and parochial schools. That was back in the former government's term and that was when the Member for St. Johns, the now Member for St. Johns, the Minister of Health and the former Premier Schreyer stood out and apart from their caucus and supported public aid to private and parochial schools.

This is the government that brought in farm land ownership legislation this past Session. A great deal that does for freedom of choice, a great deal that does for people's ability to look after their own economic affairs when they prevent Canadians outside of Manitoba from owning farm land here. That's a great commitment to freedom, Mr. Speaker. They restrict the use of the corporate ownership vehicle to own land in this province. That's a great commitment to freedom of choice where even Manitobans can't chose the manner in which they're going to own farmland because of this government's action in The Farm Lands Ownership Act.

They further restrict the rights of individual farmers to chose who they can sell their land to. You know, they can't now sell to the highest bidder, they have to sell to the highest qualified bidder.

Mr. Speaker, they don't believe in the free market, in the free economic activity of this country, that this country was built on, and they continue in law by law, statute by statute, to limit the freedoms and the opportunities that people have to live in this province and to practice their own way of life.

Mr. Speaker, you know farmers always are people who live very very meagre existences because their biggest asset is their land and they make a living, despite the fact that we have a tacit low-cost food policy in this country and in North America, because they worked to build up an asset and the only asset they have is the land which they farm, the land which they work. Then this government doesn't even want them to be able to sell it so that they at least can retire in reasonable economic circumstances, because they want to restrict their market. That's the kind of commitment they have to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, talk about freedom, talk about a commitment to freedom, what about their compulsory helmet and seat belt legislation. There they are restricting people's freedom of choice. Admittedly, there are all sorts of medical issues at stake and all sorts

of issues about that, but their major premise was that people shouldn't have the choice, that they wanted to restrict that freedom of choice for people to make that decision as to whether or not they wore helmets or whether or not they ought to be compelled to wear seat belts and so on.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I have said often times that that would not have been a measure that we would have brought in as a government. Mr. Speaker, I said that it was an omnibus bill and that I happened to agree with the medical evidence on seat belts, that I wasn't necessarily in favour of helmets, but, Mr. Speaker, that's what a free vote is all about. That's what a free vote is all about and I am happy to have taken that free vote. I am happy to have had that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, these people opposite have piously talked about their commitment to freedom, and that's what they do, they bring in legislation restricting people's freedom.

Mr. Speaker, they bring in rent controls, restricting people's right to own property and restricting people's right to a fair return on investment. Mr. Speaker, I have said before that there are rent controls and there are rent controls, and we had a form of rent controls that worked, that was reasonable, that offered a fair return on investment. But these people bring in a kind of rent control that restricts people's freedom of choice as to what type of accommodation they'll live in because they've got the vacancy rate down below 1 percent and people can't move anymore. People can't find a place to move to because there are no vacancies in this province because of the kind of rent controls that they brought in, terribly restrictive, terribly bureaucratic, rent controls that will not allow people a fair return on investment and will not allow tenants the free choice to move to accommodation that they choose because there is no choice anymore. They have taken away people's freedom of choice and made them dependent on government, made them totally dependent on government for their protection and for their opportunity to live in rental accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, in every way possible they're attempting to pass laws which make individuals dependent more and more on the government. When they have them in that position, then they can use scare tactics and fear tactics as they do during every election campaign. You know how they go door to door and they tell people, if you vote for the Conservatives - this is in a provincial election - they're going to cancel Unemployment Insurance. Even though it's a federal matter they go door to door and they tell people, if you vote for the Conservatives they'll cancel Unemployment Insurance. They go door to door and they tell people, if you vote for the Conservatives they'll cancel Medicare. You know, the big lie, the fear tactics. They tell people in personal care homes, if you vote Conservative you're going to get turfed out after the election. That's the kind of tactic they use because they want to make people more and more dependent on the government so that the people are afraid to vote for any free choice. Mr.

Speaker, they take away people's self-reliance and independence by everything they do and then they have the audacity to come to us in this House and on this issue talk about freedom and the democratic process. They have the audacity to do that to us.

Mr. Speaker, any time you take away people's responsibility to look after themselves to some extent, if they're capable of it - and the vast majority of people in this province are capable of looking after their own independent economic affairs - you take away part of their freedom and that's what this government has done throughout its term of office despite the fact that it hasn't been a very long term of office. Some would say it's been too long already, but they have taken away people's freedoms throughout their term of office.

Mr. Speaker, you know, when we talk about freedoms, when we talk about real freedoms, members opposite don't know what they're talking about. Members opposite don't, in most cases, come from circumstances in which their families really had that kind of commitment to freedom because they had to flee oppression, because they had to flee governments of all sorts of different stripes that were very oppressive that took away rights, that took away freedoms, that did not allow people even their own livelihood, even their own homes, without government control. Many of us on our side did.

I know my father, for one, fled during the First World War, fled oppression in Eastern Europe. So did the family of the Member for Lakeside; so did the families of many other people here. They came to this country to get away from oppression of governments who imposed their will on people and took away their freedoms. People fled with the clothes on their back to come to a place of freedom, and we on this side appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. We don't talk piously about it, we don't talk in platitudes about freedom, Mr. Speaker, we talk in real terms because we know what real commitments to freedoms are.

Mr. Speaker, my father, even though he was here before he died more than a half century, wouldn't dream of going back to the Eastern European countries. I used to say to him, you know, you can speak seven languages, you could go over there and enjoy travelling in Europe. There are many beautiful places. You see it today, you watch the Olympics in Sarajevo and you say, my, wouldn't that be a wonderful place to visit? Wouldn't it be wonderful to visit some of these countries behind the Iron Curtain, some of these countries that are under communist rule, some of these Eastern European areas and just see what it's like? He wouldn't set foot in there, not on a bet, not if you offered him a million dollars would he go back to those countries because he fled with the clothes on his back, lucky to escape with his life, and never again wanting to put himself at the risk, or at the fiat of a communist or socialist regime.

Those are the kinds of talk about freedom that people opposite should be interested in. Talk to the war veterans of this country who fought in the Second World War and the First World War. Talk to them if you want an understanding of freedom, if you want an understanding of a real appreciation for democracy. They went and risked their lives; they were willing to lay down their lives to protect freedom. Don't tell me about your platitudes about your vision of freedom,

your vision of government controlled freedom. Don't tell me about that, because it's empty words, that's all it is, and that's all we get from that side. Your commitment to democracy is meaningless.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side are not going to be lectured to in pious terms by the socialist theorists across the way. We are looking to protect the freedom of people in this province because we know what freedoms people are looking for.

MR. H. ENNS: They don't understand that in the Politburo. They don't ring bells in the Politburo or in the . . .

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, their use of extraordinary means to ram through a measure for a constitutional amendment that may never be changed in future by a future government, their desire to ram that through by closure is not a commitment to freedom I say to you, is not a commitment to freedom. How dare they lecture us about their commitments to freedom in the democratic process? They're constantly chipping away at people's freedom of choice, their economic freedoms, their freedom of speech and everything else. You know, they talk out of both sides of their mouths about their commitments to freedom, Mr. Speaker. We see it for instance in their talk about political activity in the Civil Service. You know, all the time they've told us how they opened up the opportunities for civil servants to become politically involved. You know, that was in the mid-70's and quite a few members on that side took advantage of it.

The Member for Wolseley is a former civil servant of this province; the Member for Transcona is a former civil servant of this province; the Member for Inkster, a former civil servant of this province; the Member for Radisson. We have, Sir, people on that side of the House and people who are on the payroll on that side of the House.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Teulon, Teulon.

MR. G. FILMON: We have executive and special assistants to various Ministers on that side are defeated candidates. I believe one is a special assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources; one is a special assistant to the Minister of Government Services; one . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

A MEMBER: Unemployed school teacher.

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

MR. G. FILMON: The former NDP candidate in River Heights has a sweetheart deal with the government we found earlier this week and so on and so forth. I could go all through it. The point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is we're not the ones who raised that issue. We're not the ones who have boasted about, you know, that this was a good thing that they were allowing people to become politically active. Mr. Speaker, they are the ones who have bragged about it. They are the ones who have prided themselves about it, but what have

they done on the other hand? There was a gentleman, who is the Chairman of Grassroots, and he happens to be a federal civil servant on medical pension . . .

A MEMBER: An ex-RCMP.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . and the Premier has the audacity to take public shots at him, saying that he shouldn't be allowed to do what he's doing. So it's okay, Mr. Speaker, for members on that side, if they're of the same political faith, to bring all of their friends, all of their defeated candidates into the public service, to have them run for public office, to get them at the public trough. It's okay because of their political beliefs, but if you dare to have a different political belief, then you will be publicly chastised and publicly condemned. That's their commitment to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, after the last election there happened to be a candidate who ran for the Progressive Conservative Party in Elmwood, who was in the provincial Civil Service. What happened was that immediately the word went out - a vendetta I understand that was led by the Member for Wolseley - to get rid of her and it took them over a year, because fortunately the MGEA supported her position, and tried to defend her but they could only take it so far and eventually they got rid of her.

There were other people who were communications officers on behalf of Ministers, who were immediately on the hit list, immediately on the hit list. Harry Mardon was one and I remember the Premier saying, as soon as we get into office he'll be gone, and indeed he was, and there were communications officers for many other departments. Yet these are the members opposite who talk about the freedom . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, these are the members opposite who talk about their commitment to freedom: freedom of political expression, freedom to belong to a political party, participate in the political process, but only if it's the NDP Party.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Right, right!

MR. H. ENNS: Let one man step out of line - Grant Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that the Premier had the audacity to criticize Mr. Russell because he was on a disability leave from a private insurance scheme, it wasn't tax dollars, it was a private insurance scheme and here he is publicly criticizing this man because he did what? What crime did he commit? He got involved in a non-partisan organization to organize opposition to the government's French language proposal. That's the crime he committed and that's what he gets, that kind of public criticism.

Talk about duplicity; talk about two sets of rules, depending on which side you are, the members opposite

took great offence when one of the news media in this province turned up the fact that the Minister of Labour had been on a disability leave herself for the first nine months or so that she was in government. She was collecting from a disability plan that she had had, because of an illness - most unfortunately, none of us would choose to have her or anybody else have an illness and be taken off work - but she not only after that illness, ran for election, successfully, sat in this House, was a Legislative Assistant, and continued to collect her income from the disability plan. Mr. Speaker, we didn't raise that matter on this side of the House, but I tell you government members and representatives screamed to high heaven that that was dirty, cheap politics.

A MEMBER: Yellow journalism.

MR. G. FILMON: Yellow journalism, but the Premier is allowed to practice that exact form . . .

A MEMBER: And none of them will report it.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . of dirty cheap sensationalism under the same set of circumstances.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, it's not only members in this House. It's not only the Premier and his members, but it goes even to Ottawa.

Yesterday in the House of Commons, Terry Sargeant, the NDP member for Selkirk-Interlake, pulled exactly the same sleazy trick. He got up in question period yesterday in the House of Commons and he accused Mr. Grant Russell of organizing bigotry in this province, and he suggested that as a federal civil servant, he ought to be stopped.

Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, who are the bigots that they're referring to, that these NDP people are referring to? Who are the bigots, Mr. Speaker? Because 80 percent of the population of Manitoba is classified as a bigot under their definition, and their definition is being opposed to the government's French language proposal. That's their definition and that includes many many fine people, fine upstanding people, who have reputations beyond reproach in this province, yet they and their NDP cohorts in Ottawa say that they are bigots.

Mr. Speaker, it's a shame, it's an absolute shame. I tell you that not only will these members of the government side of the House be shown what it means to be a bigot in the next election, because their electorate will tell them that they're not bigots, they don't consider them to be bigots, and they object to being called bigots. But sooner than that, Mr. Terry Sargeant will be shown by his electorate in the next federal election, that they aren't bigots because, Mr. Speaker, the populace in Selkirk-Interlake are as

strongly opposed, as in any area of the province, to this government's French language proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this further because I want to tell you about the continuing misinformation that is being spread everywhere on this issue. By way of preamble yesterday in question period, Mr. Sargeant referred to this proposal as restoring the French language rights of 1870.

MR. H. ENNS: Lie, absolute lie.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely patent nonsense. That was done by Bill 2 in 1980; that was done by the actions of the previous government and it is continuing to be done.

MR. H. ENNS: Zorro the zealot! Get up and speak Zorro.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Their only commitment to freedom of assembly, to freedom of speech, to the rights of people to pursue their individual interest; their only commitment to that is if it agrees with their position. If it doesn't, then they're not committed to those freedoms, Mr. Speaker. That's the message we're getting from this whole thing, and further to that, you know, they're talking about rent-a-crowd and organized orchestrated opposition - well, we had the best example of that today when the lap dog of the NDP - or I'm not sure if it's vice versa - but Dick Martin, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour . . .

A MEMBER: The Deputy Premier.

MR. G. FILMON: He went on television yesterday and condemned the opposition for opposing the government and for doing such a terrible thing as to use all the tactics and all of the techniques within their disposal to stall and stop the government's proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour when asked said, he didn't care what means the government used to enforce its will. Closure? Yes. Force the vote? Yes. He didn't care as long as it went through. He believed that the government had the right to do it, no matter what means it used.

Mr. Speaker, like the Minister of Government Services, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour believes that might is right. Mr. Speaker, these . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: . . . these are the great defenders of freedom. These are the great defenders of minority, the underdog. What rubbish! What rubbish! Mr. Speaker, they only support freedom if it agrees with their views.

Mr. Speaker, let's talk a little bit about the misunderstanding of this issue on a national basis. I talked a little bit about . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. FILMON: I talked a little bit, Mr. Speaker, about what was said in Ottawa, and that's just one example of the misinformation and misunderstanding when Terry Sargeant, the Member for Selkirk-Interlake, gets up and says that this is merely the restoration of the rights of 1870 - total rubbish and total nonsense.

Let's take a look at it. Do you wonder why we have a problem on this? Members opposite are saying, well you know, the national media and the national press and people all over the country are branding us as racists and bigots, and they're saying all these terrible things, and it's all our fault. But you wonder why there's misinformation.

Here is an article that appeared in the January 20th edition of the London Free Press. It's entitled, "Practical Compromise." Along the way, it says in reference to the whole issue in Manitoba, "Democracy is not just a question of majority rule. It's majority rule in conformity with minority rights as enshrined in law and the Constitution." We agree with that. We support Section 23, and we agree that those rights are enshrined and entrenched in law.

The issue is not a disagreement with rights and laws that are enshrined at the present time. The issue is with an effort to change the distribution of rights, to confer new rights on only one group. Out of all of the people of Manitoba, only one group is to have new rights conferred on it.

Mr. Speaker, here is the real ultimate sham of this whole thing, and I quote: "For the past couple of years, the Pawley Government has been struggling to bring Manitoba law into conformity with that Supreme Court judgment." Mr. Speaker, they have done nothing but carry on what we left in place and, in fact, and I have said in earlier speeches on this matter, they didn't even do many of the things that we had on the books and on the papers to go; that we in Cabinet papers, that we in Treasury Board commitments were going to do far more than they have done in this last two years, far more than they have done in these last two years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when this motion is next before the House, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The House is adjourned, and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).