



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. 179B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 9 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupert's Island	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 9 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 Honourable Minister of Natural Resources thereto; the Honourable Member for Assiniboia has 33 minutes remaining.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment I was speaking on the fact that we on this side, we are prepared and we are not afraid for a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Any time that the Premier is prepared to call an election on this issue, we are ready.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. NORDMAN: Very funny. I'm speaking for our party, yes. You bet, I'll speak for our party. We are not afraid to take you on an election.

A MEMBER: But that's the reversal of what he says.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: I didn't say vote; I said an election. You misunderstood what I said - when we're ready to vote on an election. You call the election; we'll be there, you betcha.

In 1979, when the Supreme Court made its ruling on the invalidity of the 1890 act, the government of Sterling Lyon brought forward Bill 2 in 1980 which dealt with the operation of Section 23 in regard to statutes, and restored Section 23 as it was passed in 1870.

As well, the PC Government of the Day extended French language services by establishing a section for French language translation and services. It was a non-issue, Mr. Speaker, in 1980; it was also a non-issue in 1981 when the election was called. There was no issue, as far as either the PC's or the NDP were concerned, brought forward during the election campaign.

When the NDP were elected all they had to really do was carry on with the services that were already provided for through Bill No. 2, and were being performed every day where the need was befitting; and what was the big deal with this government? When they came into power, all they had to do was continue on in the manner in which it was going. There wasn't any great problem. French language services were being extended and expressed to the people that needed it without any great fanfare, but then I guess the fear that was generated by the Government of the Day, the feeling that probably all the legislation between 1870 and 1980 would be invalid so they chose to negotiate

and they negotiated a bad deal with the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Federal Government. So they were backed into a corner and here we are to this point.

The First Minister claims that he has the support of the minority - of the silent minority, he calls it - and we feel that we have the support of the outspoken majority. So, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, we have no fear of who will form the next government of this Province of Manitoba.

So, Mr. Premier, call an election on this issue and the people of Manitoba, the silent minority and the squealers, as we will call our majority, they'll speak; they'll let you know where we are at.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think back to last spring when this action first came before us, and I think of the meetings that were scheduled here. I think they were called informational meetings. They had a couple here in Winnipeg at the International Inn; they had another one, I believe, in Brandon, another one, I believe, in Thompson where the Attorney-General got up at the meetings. These meetings were scheduled for two hours. He got up and spoke for the best part of an hour explaining what he was going to do and what was happening, gave his version of it, and then through the meeting, open for the last maybe an hour to half an hour for the general public to respond.

Mr. Speaker, if you recall those meetings, the general public was given five minutes to make their contribution. I mean, this was supposedly an exercise in democracy. I mean, it was really just a farce. Democracy was seeming to be served, but as it was in 1969 and 1970 with the previous NDP Government when they, in their wisdom, decided that the City of Winnipeg was to be a united city by amalgamating the 13 different cities and municipalities into one. This was the same thing then. Democracy appeared to be being done, but I can fully recall the night out in St. James at the St. James Civic Centre when the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs - I imagine that's what his title was at that point - Mr. Saul Cherniak listened to about a thousand people in protestation of his plan and then went beyond that. He was listening but he wasn't hearing and it's the same thing again. We are going through that same exercise all over again. We have thousands of people in Manitoba that are in opposition to this. They are speaking out and letting this government know how they feel but again this government is not listening. They are not listening to what is being said.

Finally, in October, after a lot of consternation and a lot of back-and-forth talk, we went into the travelling show through the month of September. There again, the very first day of that particular set of hearings, the Attorney-General came forward with a set of amendments to the resolution and we hadn't even gone into the meeting - we were just starting it - and before any speakers were called, the Attorney-General made his motions or his amendments, but bear in mind prior to that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities had been making its feelings heard and it was really blistering

the government and the Minister of Municipal Affairs. So more than likely to cool off the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Minister probably felt that he had to do something and one of his amendments to the resolution was that it excluded municipalities and school boards. But during the out-of-town hearings, it came across loud and clear again that the municipalities weren't particularly enamoured with the amendments because we had briefs and submissions from about 125 municipalities in strong opposition to the amendments and the resolution.

The public hearings were finally completed in Winnipeg on October 4th, and I think it was something like 403 submissions that had been placed before the 18-day hearings. In October of 1983, the municipal elections were held and along with the election, plebiscites were held in 22 municipalities and in the City of Winnipeg.

In the City of Winnipeg plebiscite, 76.5 percent of the voters voted against the amendments; in the municipalities 79 percent were in opposition to the amendments. So, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the electorate is saying and what they said in those municipal elections and in spite of the growing numbers of people that have made their wishes known to the government, the government, in the face of all this, continues to impose its wishes upon the people.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the legal opinions offered by constitutional language experts - lawyers, rather - namely, Messrs. Dale Gibson and Kerr Twaddle, that it was unlikely the ruling on the statutes would be detrimental, in spite of all this the government persists in self-destructing and by so doing contributes to the detriment of the people of Manitoba — (Interjection) — I'll yield the floor to the Honourable Member for Wolseley if she ever has the intestinal fortitude to stand up and speak. The action that this government has taken is humiliating and denegrating so, Mr. Premier, for the sake of unity and self-respect, pull the bill or accept the subamendment of the Member for Fort Garry.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the years in our multicultural society, we have worked with and respected people of French expression and those same people today are coming to us and are embarrassed by what is going on. I have a friend who came up to me in Simpson Sears the other day, a man who has been my friend - my two sons played hockey with his boys for years, for four years at least - and this man said - of French expression - "What do we need this for? What are they trying to do to us? The Franco-Manitoban Society does not speak for me; I don't need this. This is an aggravation to me; it's an embarrassment to me. I've gone along all these years very well without this, so why are they doing this? What is happening to our province? Why can't we live as we were? Why does this have to be?" George isn't the only one. There are many other people of French expression that feel the same way. We had them at our hearings here two weeks ago in dealing with Bill 115. Several people of French expression came before us and said, we don't need it, it's an embarrassment to us, please do something, let it go away. Bury it. You know so many of the French have intermarried and assimilated into the mosaic that we call Manitoba and they say, why do we have to have our language legislated. If we want our children to speak

French or if we want our children to speak German or Ukrainian or Icelandic or Chinese, we'll find a way to do so. We don't have to be told what language we can or will speak. The working language of the Province of Manitoba is English and unless it is legislated out of existence it will remain so.

Mr. Speaker, the federal bilingualism policy is something else again, the resolution pushing for French language rights in Manitoba, the political solution by Ottawa of improving French language rights and against the legislation from being tested in the courts.

I'd just like to speak, Mr. Speaker, on the minimal package that the government has come down with for the SFM. The package that is being offered to the Society Franco-Manitoban by the Provincial Government is clearly indicated in the legal opinion given to the SFM in a recent meeting by their high priced constitutional lawyer, Joseph Magne. Mr. Magne advised the Society Franco-Manitoban to repudiate the Provincial Government's current proposal which, in his estimation, is a watered-down declaration of the official status of English and French and provides for a legislative statute on French language government services.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House that we are debating at this very time is that a Standing Committee . . .

A MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: . . . of the Rules Committee be instructed to examine the question of extended ringing of the division bells and report back with recommendations to the House at its next Session and that until the report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House is received and considered, a time limit of two hours on the ringing of bells during all divisions be established as an interim measure.

Mr. Speaker, we have listened to the honourable member now for somewhat over half-an-hour. I do not believe he has even once mentioned anything on division bells. If he has, I have missed it. He has spoken on the resolution finally which we have been trying to get members of the opposition to speak on for some two weeks and it's nice to hear him speak on the resolution, but he is out of order in that he's speaking, not with the relevance to the motion that is before this House at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. JOHNSTON: To the same point of order, Sir, the House seemed to be going along very well under your guidance, and you are the judge of what members say in this House. We would respect that. It is too bad that we have jack-in-the-boxes jumping up when the House is going well, Sir, and you are in control. It is really too bad we have that situation, Sir, and I would

say that the House was calm; we don't need that kind of trouble.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to the same point.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the Member for Inkster is wrong. He said the Member for Assiniboia spoke for over half an hour. The hour today is 16 minutes after 8 o'clock, Mr. Speaker. I say the Member for Inkster is totally wrong and his point of order should be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank those members who have spoken. I would ask the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to be as relevant as previous speakers have been.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we will just carry on. The reason that we are here is because of the bells, and this is all leading up to why we are — (Interjection) — but any time the Member for Inkster is ready to stand up on his feet and speak to the motion, I would gladly relinquish my position for him— anytime that he is ready to stand up - after I am finished.

Mr. Speaker, the Franco-Manitoban Society decided to go against the paid advice of their constitutional lawyer. In Mr. Magne's opinion, he states that the government package removes the obligation imposed by Section 23 for this Legislature to enact laws in both languages. It excluded school boards and municipalities which Magne believes were included in the original Section 23.

Mr. Speaker, the package dilutes Section 23, mandatory bilingual requirements only; as a result, about 160 - and I am not going to go through them all either - quasi-judicial institutions such as the Securities Commission, the Law Society, the Public Utilities Board, the Labour Board, the Dental Association and many others will no longer be required to be bilingual as they would have been under Section 23. Mr. Magne points out that it's a pretty poor trade off.

Mr. Speaker, again I say, the Government of Manitoba has not been listening to the electorate, and the members opposite are not voicing an opinion. So few, so very few - I think you can count them maybe on one hand - the number that have spoken on this issue. You had the opportunity every day that the bells rang. Every day that the bells rang the Member for Niakwa stood in his place and he offered you the opportunity to speak. You were never ever denied the right to speak because of the bells, you chose to sit on your fannies and not get up and speak, and when you chose not to speak, we walked out. — (Interjection) — You bet you.

Mr. Speaker, no one knows what this group of people opposite even think. No one gets up to speak. The only one that speaks for them is the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the House Leader. He's the only one who speaks for them. The rest of them sit back in their chairs and chirp like a bunch of chickens. So get up and tell us how you feel, get up and talk, get up and tell us.

So what do the members opposite have to say to their constituents, I wonder, or do they even know that

they have constituents? Do they ever go to their constituents to ask what is going on and how their constituents feel? I'm afraid they don't, but if they don't pretty soon they're going to be in real trouble.

Today there was an offer made by our Leader to your Leader to hold a free vote; take off the whip. I wonder, I really wonder how many of you across there will stand up and vote by your conscience. How many will vote by their conscience . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. NORDMAN: . . . So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the members opposite to again give serious consideration to the amendment of the Member for Fort Garry. Let's deal with the resolution and stifle the acrimony and bitterness that has been generated by this action.

Mr. Speaker, I have a personal admiration for Eric Wells, historian, broadcaster, and as far as I'm concerned, a great Canadian. In a speech for the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in November, he had these words of wisdom and I think they are significant to what is going on in this House. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record just a few of the words that maybe some of you hadn't heard before.

Mr. Wells goes on to say that he was given the assignment to speak at the annual meeting of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities back in November. He goes on to say, "When this assignment was given to me sometime ago, I was expected to relate this topic to the official languages debate then taking place in Manitoba. In the beginning I believed that somehow by this time the early excesses would have subsided and that we would have secured the subject on a higher plateau of social assessment where differences of opinion would be exercised within the realm of mutual appreciation and hopefully common sense, but not so. The landscape is dismal and the confusion reigns.

"The parliamentary intrusion at this time into the affairs of Manitoba," he's speaking of the message given by the three leaders. "while ignoring the dimension of language isolation, as it may exist elsewhere in much larger numbers, was a severe setback to racial discussion. Indeed it was irresponsible and only matched by the performance of the press. We count on the press, of course, to ventilate the issues arising in the public forum and without the press there is no public forum." I'm not going to read it all, Mr. Speaker, just some of these paragraphs that relate.

"I paid some attention to the press throughout Manitoba's language ordeal beginning last May when the initial news was announced by the Manitoba Government that an arrangement had been made to keep the province out of the courts. The first news was greeted with ecstasy from coast to coast with a vast array of editorials and columns hailing this as the greatest leap-forward since Confederation.

"There was some expression of disappointment when the Attorney-General explained that two official languages didn't add up to bilingualism, but still there was ample evidence that the press, like Parliament, was in support of whatever had been agreed to in those mysterious sessions between the governments and the Franco-Manitobain Soci  t  . These meetings were

dealing with Manitoba's tomorrow, but with public participation, and obviously with the press unable to represent the public because there was no forum."

Let's go on to the next page, "Throughout the summer the emphasis of Manitoba's problem was focused on the restoration of the rights of French-speaking Manitobans, which had been restored by the Lyon Government in 1980. The Globe and Mail, for one, repeatedly avoided mentioning this corrective measure in its reports, and many other newspapers ignored it as well. Generally, the press set the Manitoba scene in high melodrama with emphasis on the suppression of minorities' rights. It was in this crippled arena of inflamed tribalism that Manitobans were exposed as the victims of the national nightmare. We got the lectures from those happy twins of the Ottawa Valley, the francos and the anglos with curious formulas on what a Canadian should be; 30 percent anti-American, 50 percent anti-British, and 20 percent bugger all.

"Such contrived recipes certainly do not reflect the west but we should not discount the mischievous forces at work in our country to undermine our confidence in ourselves. A most glaring example is to be found in the term 'minority rights'. Somehow, between governments and the press, the basic proposition of two official languages for Manitoba was camouflaged under this delusion. Minority rights were foisted on gullible groups as the very essence of the language proposal."

Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, "Manitoba is not a province of bigotry as proclaimed by the press and many of the briefs presented at the hearings proved that to the public. On either side of the language proposal it was far more perceptive of the social requirements than the bureaucracy. In contrast with the Pavlovian behaviour of the press and their secret deals favoured by governments, the plebiscites mounted by our municipalities was the refreshment of Grassroots democracy during my survey.

"In defiance of their government and the press, the people of Manitoba expressed themselves, and I trust it is not too late for those in power to realize that such robust democracy is our heritage in this province."

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wells says, "I recall the words of Samuel Freedman, former Chief Justice of our Appeal Court. 'We are the splendid mongrels of Confederation, and it is within that dimension we will make our greatest contribution to the glory of Canada.'"

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to speak representing my constituents. It's a pleasure that most members of this House believe is an honour and a duty to perform, but obviously the government of this day is one that does not believe in representing their constituents' feelings or even representing them in the Legislature to the best of their ability.

Mr. Speaker, the jibes across the House about bell ringing - and I assure you, Sir, I will stay very close to that subject - have been coming across the House to us, and I would say that I guess I could be accused of being a person who puts as many jibes across the House as any. If I give it I, Sir, am quite willing to take it if I have to and, at any time, if I'm brought to order by yourself, I will accept it and I will apologize for breaking up the House if you so believe. Mr. Speaker, when you get jibes from a side of the House that isn't speaking, that's a different thing. I believe that I can possibly give some because I am getting on my feet and I'm speaking in this House, but it seems rather hard to accept it from honourable members who have the privilege and honour to be elected to this Chamber and to give jibes across the House and then not get up on their feet and speak. That is a very disappointing thing, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: They're the silent majority.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Then, we have the sarcastic remarks, and, Sir, I can be very sarcastic, but the sarcastic remarks that are trying to, I believe, attract your attention, that a member is writing a speech. I assure you we can't all be great graduates and great writers and great orators. There are members in this House, and you, Sir, have been here nearly as long as I have and you and I know, and, Mr. Fox, the Member for Concordia knows when he was in the Chair, and the Member for Virten knows when he was in the Chair, there are members that felt more comfortable writing out their speech ahead of time so they could present it in the House; but the kind of sarcasm we get on the fact that somebody reads a speech is one of the reasons the bells are ringing in this House. One of the reasons why the bells are ringing in this House is because when the Member for Inkster uses a point of order to try and correct him, ruin his train of thought, is just another way of trying to disturb honourable members when they're speaking in this Legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I give it, I'm willing to take it, but I feel that I have a little more right giving it when I have the internal fortitude or the respect of my constituents to get up and speak in this Legislature. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster is suggesting something about my constituents or the people that live in Sturgeon Creek; I can assure the gentleman that I'm quite willing and will be running in Sturgeon Creek again, and I will be able to tell them that I spoke on this issue, and I will be able to tell them that I'm going to outline why I believe the bells shouldn't ring. He wants to do it from his chair with his knees waving most of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the bells, the first time they rang was when the new House Leader of the government came into this Session and, quite frankly, really the history of it is that Mr. Trudeau wound Mr. Pawley around his little finger and Mr. Pawley is being used as a pawn by Mr. Trudeau. He is basically going to ruin the NDP Party in Manitoba. He said, there's a softie over there in Manitoba and I can get to him, and he just jumped into it.

Then, we have a new House Leader that the Premier is using the same way Mr. Trudeau used Mr. Pawley.

The New House Leader has come into this House, Sir, and the first time the bells rang they refused in this House to speak when a member stood up and said "Stand, Sir." The member said stand, but if anybody else in this House would like to speak they are welcome to do so. Under those conditions, Sir, you as Speaker would recognize somebody that got up and spoke. They chose, Sir, not to speak but to say, "we will not allow the matter to stand," which left my colleague no other choice but to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the next day the same procedure went through again, and what were we talking about that day? We were talking about a bill, Bill 115 that had been presented to this House on the basis of the principle of extending language services to the people of the Province of Manitoba. But when you started to examine the bill the principle was not the extension of language services, Sir, the principle was a brand new bureaucracy in this House; a language ombudsman, a committee of advisors of 13 or more, Sir. So, this side of the House said, you know, this is going to take some examination. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member stood up again, my colleague, and said "Stand. If anybody else would like to speak they are quite welcome to." They chose not to give leave to let the matter stand, Sir, so my colleague had no other choice.

Then, the next day we informed - and the House Leader uses it as an excuse that he was told 15 minutes before the House went in, but he wasn't in the caucus room, the Member for St. Boniface was told - that our Leader would speak on Friday. We felt the preparation for that bill was such that we wanted to take it till Friday, we were waiting for information, our Leader would speak on Friday; and when the honourable member stood up and said "stand" after that information was given to the government side of the House, they said: "We will not give leave to have it stand." How silly can they be? Our Leader spoke on Friday, but the House Leader was always coming around. He'd gone down to my Leader's office when he couldn't get satisfaction from our House Leader; he was running around in the halls talking to all the press. But what was he saying to us? What was he saying to us all of those four days? Well, if you just give us one speaker, but we couldn't just give him one speaker, Sir, we had to have a speaker that told him what our policy or what our decision would be on the principle of that bill, that's what he was saying to us.

You know, never in my life, Sir, in this House; I was here with Sid Green as House Leader; I was here with Warner Jorgenson as House Leader; my colleague that sits beside me, the Member for St. Norbert. I can remember Mr. Green, when he was House Leader for the NDP, he'd walk in and he'd say to Mr. Jorgenson - Warner he'd say, how many speakers have you got on this? Warner said well I'm not quite sure, I'll have to check with the members who want to speak. And never in their wildest dreams would they suggest or would they even come close to insulting the constituents of a member by insinuating that they couldn't speak unless we told him what the situation was going to be.

He's going to bring up the one time Mr. Jorgenson pulled closure in the committee, on one line of the committee that the Member for St. Johns had spent four days on and had the same answer 15 times - one line of the committee. Of course, if any of you knew

the Member for St. Johns, who was the worst wheedling twister that ever lived . . . but that was where it was.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member on the other side - not the Member for St. Johns that's sitting there right now - my apologies, Sir. My apologies to the current Member for St. Johns; it's the previous Member for St. Johns I was referring to. That's the reason the bells rang for those four days on the bill and he refused to call the resolution during that time and it was on the Order Paper. Now if that's not being heavy-handed, dictatorial, Sir, when the government insists that they will not allow the bill to stand and when there's other business before the House, he refuses to call it.

Quite frankly, the members on our side had said that our leader would speak on Friday; our leader did. As far as we were concerned, we were not about to accept that kind of pushing around in this House. Mr. Speaker, our constituents demand more respect than that. My constituents would not expect me to bow down to that kind of treatment because it's an insult to them. It was an insult to all of their constituents that they would not speak on the bill until closure was called, until they knew we only had till 2:00 p.m.- and when they knew that they said we'll take up their time now. That's one of the reasons for the bells ringing.

Mr. Speaker, we then have the situation where we have an amendment that was on the resolution by the House Leader. It was ruled out of order. It was your decision, Sir, to rule it out of order and we presented another amendment to this House. There are, I believe, 14 speakers - it might be 12 - but 12 members on this side of the House who want to speak on that amendment. Quite frankly, my constituents want me to speak on that amendment. They want me to speak on that amendment because 82 percent of them in the plebiscite disagreed with the position of this government and they felt threatened with another amendment. Because they felt threatened with another amendment, the House Leader then decides to call closure. As House Leader who was a Clerk in this Legislature, who knows full well that this Legislature is here for the benefit of the members to represent their constituencies, he was charged, Sir, to be a servant of this House and as a servant of this House had the duty to see that the members had the rights of the democratic system in this Legislature; and he isn't a House Leader for more than three weeks or two weeks and he calls closure on the members.

Mr. Speaker, the members on the other side again - except I believe for the Member for Inkster and I believe the Premier has spoken on the amendment — (Interjection) — Well, fine if you did. Will all those on the other side please put up their hand that spoke. I would love to see it. Mr. Speaker, would those who had the decency to represent their constituents and spoke on the amendment of the resolution please put up their hands? You see, Mr. Speaker? The opportunity was there but the House Leader kept calling closure. He was given the job to move us in and out of this House. I can remember the first day he called closure, this Premier reached over and shook him by the hand and said, my, you did a very fine job. Mind you, the Premier is leading this poor, innocent person who thinks he has some brains right down the garden path to slaughter.

The previous member that handled this, the Attorney-General, is gone, accomplished what he wanted to do

and long gone. And they said where will we find this dunce - really that is what they found, Sir - that they could lead to slaughter on this issue and the member has fallen into that trap. But the thing is that he was a Clerk and servant of this House and I'm sure it was his ambition to one day be a House Leader in the Legislature and he isn't a House Leader for more than two weeks or so at the most, then he calls closure.

As I said, the First Minister was the one who is leading this fellow to the slaughter and he's accepted it because he wanted so badly to be involved. Mr. Speaker, the First Minister — (Interjection) — the big fellow - maybe in size or in stature, but he's a little man really. The government side plus the First Minister has made a very very great thing out of the fact that the democratic system must carry on. The democratic system, as far as they are concerned, which is proven, is closure. It's closure, that's the democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, they say that we have forgotten that we are opposition. They said we have forgotten that we lost the election. Well, Mr. Speaker, the only difference between the totalitarian system and the democratic system is that there is an opposition. The opposition's duty is to make the government accountable for their actions and when the government goes against 80 percent of the people of the province - and now I am getting away from the Member for St. Johns and I can tell you that the Member for St. Johns is in deep trouble - he tried to escape this debate but it went on too long, he got backed in too late; that's about it. So, Mr. Speaker, the opposition has to bring the government to account.

Now 80 percent of the people in this province have decided that the government wrong is on the change of a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the Province of Manitoba, Sir. So you see, Mr. Speaker, we have a duty to represent the people. The government is not.

The First Minister stands up last night and he said, "I don't want it to go to the Supreme Court. I want a Made-in-Manitoba solution." Mr. Speaker, he had a Made-in-Manitoba solution. The Appeal Court of Manitoba said Mr. Bilodeau was wrong; the solution was right here.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, no. And then, Mr. Speaker, after the Appeal Court of Manitoba says this, the Premier says, "Well, it shouldn't go to the Supreme Court."

We are part of Canada, Mr. Speaker. The Supreme Court is there to have somebody take something to the Supreme Court when they so desire, and when the Appeal Court of Manitoba rules against Mr. Bilodeau and all of a sudden Mr. Bilodeau receives the right to go to the Supreme Court, Sir, these gentlemen back off and say, "Let's make a deal." It sounds like a television program.

"Let's make a deal" - that is democracy, Mr. Speaker? And we wonder why the bells ring, Mr. Speaker. This

Premier who sat at lunch with Mr. Trudeau, and you could just hear the conversation: "Well, Mr. Prime Minister, we are very short of transfer funds in the Province of Manitoba." And you could just hear Mr. Trudeau say, "And yes, Mr. Premier, what are you going to do on the French language issue?"

"Mr. Prime Minister, we need some more transfer funds for the health needs issue." And the Prime Minister had said, "Yes, Mr. Premier, but what are you going to do on the French issue?"

So, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister twisted this Premier who didn't have the ability to handle it. The Prime Minister saw a way to basically get what he wanted. He saw a way to get what he wanted, plus ruin the NDP Party of Manitoba at the same time - he was going to get two things out of negotiating with this fellow who was led down the garden path - and Mr. Trudeau just handled this little amateur so well it wasn't even funny.

Then it comes back, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General is put in charge, and he walks in with all his legal professorship, Sir, and he says to the backbenchers over there, "I've got it all straightened out, don't worry. I've got it all in hand." And he soon found out, after they were dragged kicking and screaming to the people of Manitoba, he soon found out that the people of Manitoba wouldn't do it. Then the Premier looked around the room and said, "Who is the little dumb-bell I've got to put in charge of this that will go down the garden path?"

"I've got this rules expert, this person, Sir, who doesn't use common sense, who doesn't know the people of Manitoba, Sir. He doesn't know the people of Manitoba." By the way, you'd think the Premier would have at least put a Minister of Municipal Affairs in place that knew something about the municipalites of Manitoba - but that wasn't done - but he became the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he became the House Leader all at once; a person who comes from that seat right over there as Assistant Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and he puts on closure, as I said.

But, you see, the Premier said to him, "You've got your little toys, the rule book, and you will put us through this House using closure any time you have to, shutting up the opposition any time you have to. And as I said, Sir, earlier about the jack-in-the-box from Inkster, I have seen times in this House when things have been going smoothly and it has been a terrible Session for you as far as this particular Legislature is concerned with the constitutional resolution in front of us, it hasn't been easy.

But when it was going well, Sir, one of us would be speaking over here, and that House Leader, who is trained with his little rule book, stands up usually on a point of order, and tries to shut us up. He was yelling from his seat tonight. "Relevance, relevance," was what he was saying when one of the members in this House was speaking and, Mr. Speaker, when a member speaks in this House he is speaking because his constituents sent him here to speak. That is why the bells are ringing, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say that today we had the very very - I guess you would call it - unfortunate incident of the confusion that came back and forth across the House about the free vote. But, regardless of what went on during that time, the minute that the Premier

felt that he could do something to create a vote, to cut off debate in this House, he grabbed at it. It was just another form of closure.

A MEMBER: That's right, another form of closure.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: When it — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I hear the Member from The Pas, I'll say to him when it wasn't taken up quickly the House Leader, Sir, got up . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, maybe - ORDER - thank you. Sorry, Sir, but I wish he would be quiet. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: So do I.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when a vote wasn't going to happen today, what did the House Leader get up and do today? He got up and started to negotiate in this House, on the floor, Sir, and the bottom line of his negotiations was, if you will extend the time of the rules and if you will tell me when you'll vote, then I will be kind enough to be nice to you fellows on the other side.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that this House Leader, who does not know this province and is proving to have been a disgrace to the position that he held in this House at one time, will not dictate to this side of the House, Sir. Yes, I'll smile on that one. You will not dictate to this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Industry and Cultural Affairs gets quite upset when I make a reference to the people on the other side of the House that have not been in Manitoba all that long. Sir, I don't get upset that people have come to live in this province. We need people. No, Mr. Speaker, it's not even generations, Sir, that bothers me that much. What bothers me is they don't take the time to understand the people of this province, to get to understand the makeup of the people of this province. When they disregard 80 percent of the people of this province, when they haven't done their homework and they make their comments in a smart-aleck, flippant way which I believe is an insult to the proud people of this province, then I'm concerned about those people.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about those people who were hired as a servant of this House and after he has the authority to be a House Leader or run this House, within two weeks he calls closure. So, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, Sir, that is the reason the bells are ringing in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the legal implications that have been put before these members on the other side regarding the resolution - I can't go into detail like the Member for Charleswood can and I would have thought the lawyers on the other side could, but when you're a lawyer that can't write a will I guess it's pretty hard to understand the Constitution. So, Mr. Speaker, when you are a lawyer such as the Member for St. James, who, when his clients used to say to him, my gosh, I don't want to carry this any further, he'd say, oh yes you are. You know, that's the type of lawyer he was.

When you have that kind of legal advice on the other side, we really have those problems, Sir.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the bells have been ringing for the time that we said they would ring and we came back in the House every day, hoping very sincerely that the member would have the courage to let us speak. All we asked was the respect that the democratic system in Canada, in the Province of Manitoba work, that the people who elected me would have the feeling that I would be allowed to speak in this House. It's been taken away from me by closure and they can say, oh you can speak but only until 2 a.m. in the morning. That's what they said to me - you will speak under the threat of closure.

Mr. Speaker, that is just not going to be and the legal arguments that have been put forward - do you know, Sir, the legal arguments that were put forward this afternoon by the Member for Charleswood regarding the Constitution, to the Minister of Education or the consequences that this could have on certain parts of the educational system and the numbers of people that could be in a French class - do you know, Sir, that there will be nothing on record in this House from the Minister of Education as to whether she believes that's right or wrong, true or false or whatever, Sir.

Do you know that if that happens we will not be able to look up the record and find out if our Minister of Education even took an interest in the subject. We will not be able to look up the record to find out if the Minister of Labour was concerned regarding the consequences to the people who work in this province when it has to do with this resolution. We will not be able to look up in Hansard when those subjects come up maybe 50 years from now and say that the Minister of Labour spoke on this subject.

The House Leader is able to pick up his records and tell us what happened in the Magna Carta, what decision was made in 1870 or 1864 - I forget the dates he used. But do you know that we will not be able to look in Hansard and find out what the Ministers of the Crown in the Province of Manitoba had to say about this resolution, Sir. We will not have any record of what they thought. And, Mr. Speaker, we're changing the Constitution of the Province of Manitoba.

Sir, in 1870 we had 50 percent English and about 50 percent French in this province. During the time between 1870 and 1890 we had an influx of people, Sir, that's when the Germans and Mennonite community started to come to this province; and many Selkirk Settlers from different areas of the British Isles came here; people immigrated here from Ontario during that time; the Icelandic community came up the Red River to Gimli and we have many Icelandic people to the south of us in the United States; the Ukrainian immigrants started to come across into this province and, during those years, from 1870-1890, we even had many Chinese people that were working on the railroad who immigrated here. Mr. Speaker, a government in the Province of Manitoba passed legislation saying English would be the official language of this province. Sir, it was proven to be illegal and wrong in 1979, and that legislation had to be rescinded.

During all of that time our mosaic in Manitoba has grown to a situation where we had many more different cultures within this province, and now this government

wants to pass legislation that's the same as 1890 only want to add one more language to it. Mr. Speaker, what are we doing to the people of other ethnic mother tongues in this province when the English and French say that we should be the only official language.

Something that might interest the Member for Rupertsland, Sir. In the 1976 census that was taken - and this is put out by the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, I will identify it, Sir, it's a public document - Mr. Speaker, it's the 1976 census with the 81 override of constituency boundaries, and I'm not going to talk constituencies, Sir. In this book it says: Mother tongue - English, French, German, Ukrainian, Native, other, and not stated. In 1981, Sir, do you know what the book says? It says Mother tongue - English, French, and others. Did you know, Sir, that the Member for Rupertsland is in the category of "others" in this province now? Did you know, Sir, that the Minister of Industry is classified as "others" now? Did you know, Sir, that my colleague over here from Niakwa is classed as "others" now? Did you know, Sir - (Interjection) - Well I hear "Me, too" These others now. My Leader is "others" now. Mr. Speaker, I didn't put these out, this comes from the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics.

So, Mr. Speaker, now we have a situation where in 1984 we have a situation where this government now wants to pass legislation that is the same as 1890, only add one more language to it. That's an insult, it's an insult to put the Member for St. Johns into the classification of "others" in this province. I will tell you, Sir, it will be an insult to put my new grandchild into the classification of "others" in this province; his name will be Matlashewski, my daughter's name is Matlashewski, and you're going to class my grandchild as "others." That's a damned insult and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves all of you.

Mr. Speaker, we will let the bells ring for freedom of the people of this Manitoba and all the people in this province will be free.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

Order please. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the outset, I'd like to say how well the bells of this Legislature have served the people of Manitoba to this point in time. Without them we would have been faced with a disaster situation and we are still on the brink of it, and here we are discussing now a double-closure motion to limit the bell ringing from members on this side of the House to a limit of two hours.

In speaking to this motion, Mr. Speaker, to change the House rules, I want to point out how desperate this government really is to avoid facing the reality of their own shortcomings.

I think it's important to review what has happened. We were sitting here up until August 18th last year - we've been here so long it's kind of hard to remember what year. We started here in December of 1982 and we took a recess on August 18th, I believe it was of 1983; but how did we arrive at that recess? We had a lot of bills that we weren't happy with that we were debating. One of the problem areas, of course, is the

situation we're faced with right now is debating the amendment to our Constitution. In order to expediate some of the actions of the House, members of this side agreed to meet with members of the other side, and the House Leader of the Day and our Opposition House Leader, met on several occasions to work out a negotiation whereby we could agree to take a recess to get rid of the bills that were on the Order Paper and just leave the Constitutional Amendment to be subjected to hearings which would take place after August. But really what was the agreement all about, and I think it ties in very well with the motion that we are debating at the present time?

I have a copy of the agreement which was dated August 12, 1983, 2:30 p.m., and the agreement had seven points on it. The first point was: "Finish all House business except proposed amendment to Section 23 by approximately August 19th and adjourn the House." Well, if my memory serves me correctly, I believe we adjourned on August 18th. The other six points: "(2) Hold public hearings of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections," and the target dates were September 6-24 inclusive. Well, I think those dates were ironed out to take place approximately in that space of time, I believe they did go a little longer than that. "(3) The committee to meet at eight locations," and I believe it was something like eight, I'm not sure if it exactly eight locations. "(4) The committee procedure" - and there's some six points here that the committee dealt with to iron the various procedures that they would follow. "(5) The committee reports to the House after the completion of hearings. (6) Rules of the House apply with provision for a two-week maximum on bell ringing."

Now this was an agreement that was signed by the Government House Leader, Mr. Penner, and our Opposition House Leader, Mr. Ransom, and this agreement to be signed was at the insistence of the Attorney-General, as I understand it. He was the one that wanted to ensure that No. 6, Rules of the House apply with provision for a two-week on maximum on bell ringing, and this is the agreement that we had signed and we had agreed to give up debate on a number of many contentious bills. So here we are now with a motion to limit the bell ringing to two hours, reduced from the two-week period.

But the people of Manitoba and certainly the people from my constituency understand why the bells are ringing. I get phone calls, I get letters and when I have the opportunity to be at home on the weekend I meet with a lot of people and I talk to them about the situation. They fully understand what's going on. They realize that the government is in trouble. They also realize that the only method we've had to stall this off is to ring the bells, so when the members opposite say we're just filibustering and not debating, Mr. Speaker, the bells are ringing because the government wish to invoke closure on us. They don't want to hear us debate.

After the House took a recess back on the 18th of August in 1983, as I mentioned on the agreement, a number of hearings were to be held throughout the province and these hearings, I think, went very well for the most part. People throughout the province had an opportunity to come out and express their feelings toward the constitutional amendment. Just to read from Hansard of Thursday, January 5, on Page 674, it says, "Your committee met for further deliberations on

Monday, November 21 and Thursday, December 22, 1983 and has agreed to report as follows:

"The committee heard submissions from 305 delegations and received an additional 99 written submissions. The committee has now completed its task and has consulted with those Manitobans who expressed a desire to be heard. Your committee is impressed with the interest shown and an analysis of the subject matter demonstrated in many of the submissions. While there were a great many more briefs which supported the government proposal in principle than opposed it, a large number of the briefs noticed specific areas of concern."

Mr. Speaker, I question that part of the report where it says "a great many more briefs supported the government position." I don't think that's accurate because a lot of these briefs were submitted by members of the SFM - and I recall a committee hearing that we had on Bill 90 dealing with the Cattlemen's Association where there were some 14 briefs by representatives of the Cattlemen's Association - members opposite said, "Well, you know, that only represents one brief. They're in a conflict of interest and we really can't accept those as different briefs; they're all representing the same interests." In the case of these hearings I'm not sure how many briefs were submitted by members of the SFM but I'm certain there were a great number because they attended most of the hearings throughout the province and in many cases I believe they had more than one submission. In any case, even counting the submissions by the SFM I'm not certain that there was that many more briefs supporting the government position on the constitutional amendment.

After the hearings were completed the House resumed on January 5, 1984 and, as I recall, the new Government House Leader indicated that he has a whole new package. They've rehashed this whole constitutional amendment; they've taken into consideration the debate that had taken place in the House. They considered the submissions that were presented to the Standing Committee and here we have a whole new package. We've taken into consideration all of these items so that we'll start from scratch with this new deal and it certainly looks as if the government are happy with it and it looks like the opposition will be happy with it.

I will agree there was a number of improvements made to the new package that the Government House Leader referred to but certainly there are aspects to it that we cannot accept. The majority of Manitobans cannot accept and here we are now with the motion for a closure or double closure, and it's really hard to just really stay on the motion because it's difficult to zero in on just the fact that we've got a closure motion before us from time-to-time and now we have this double closure motion to limit the bell ringing to two hours.

Many reports from members opposite say that we have been filibustering the debate and we have been walking out of the House, refusing to debate the constitutional amendment. Mr. Speaker, not once have I heard the members opposite indicate really that we have been ringing the bells because the closure motion has been brought in, preventing us from speaking on the amendment, because once the closure motion is

voted and is carried then it is only a matter of hours until the debate is completed and then the damage is done; the resolution would be sent off to Ottawa and this is what we are fighting.

If the closure motion had never ever been brought in in the first place - I believe it has been brought in seven or eight times - and when you figure up the number of debating hours that would have been totalled from those seven or eight closure motions, this would have provided many hours of debate on the constitutional amendment. I'm certain we would have been able to have a full debate on the situation and we could have brought in the amendments that we had in mind to try and if the government isn't prepared to back off on this resolution and scrap it, at least we can make it better so that it's more acceptable to us and to the people of this province.

But the government said, no way. We're going to do it our way and that is put closure on it and you'll be given some eight hours to wrap up what you have to say on it and then it's off to Ottawa with the new constitutional amendment.

They obviously don't want to do this. They want to break the agreement now, the agreement they had insisted on last August and so here we find ourselves in this debate which is really not necessary at this time on this particular motion. They want to change the rules of the game when we've already started the game. Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that this is really a very desperate government. I can't help but agree with the MLA for Charleswood when he said that we don't really have a government opposite, we have a bunch of incompetents. Certainly, I believe that sums up the situation very well.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a very important issue with this constitutional amendment and it is the only issue before us at the present time. There are no other items of business on the Order Paper, just the constitutional amendment. We've never had this kind of a situation before; we've never had the opportunity to bring in a constitutional amendment previously. I think it's something that shouldn't be undertaken lightly; it should be undertaken with the opportunity for full debate, an opportunity to listen to what the people have to say because after all, it's the Province of Manitoba it is affecting. It's not just affecting the 57 people that are in this Legislature. It is a very important item of business and it's one that should not be taken lightly.

We have indicated on a number of occasions and it has been proven by press reports, it has been proven by various meetings or rallies that have been held to date that the vast majority of Manitobans are absolutely opposed to what the government is doing. The referendums that were held last fall, some 16 of them, indicated that, I think, taking the 16 and averaging them out, it was in excess of 75 percent of the people that were absolutely opposed to what the government is doing. This is a constitutional amendment that affects all of the people of the province. So, as I said earlier, it's something that should not be taken lightly; it shouldn't be rushed into. There's certainly no reason to haste, we do not have to work under a timetable as indicated by Roger Bilodeau.

You know, the members opposite are saying that the vast majority of people of Manitoba don't understand

what we're trying to do, but how many times have the members opposite taken the opportunity to get up and explain what they mean? Why don't they take advantage of every opportunity that they have available and really tell us why the people of Manitoba are not fully aware of what is being proposed in their package. They sit there; they don't take the opportunity to debate; they want to slap closure on.

Mr. Speaker, this government is in a state where they would like to wrap this thing up, sweep it under the carpet and get on with something else. They want to get it behind them. They are afraid of this mess they've got themselves into and they want to speed it up. That's why they can't stand the buzzers ringing, they want to limit it now to two hours so that they can eventually see the light at the end of the tunnel as far as their work is concerned. I say that members opposite have never taken the opportunity to get up and explain why they feel the people of Manitoba don't understand what this constitutional amendment is about.

You know, I have to put into the record the speech given by the Member for Burrows on Friday, February 26th, and I'd like to quote from Page 19 of Hansard - I won't quote all his speech, but I think there are some points. The Member for Burrows, I think, is a man of understanding; he's a university professor; he appreciates the opportunity to serve in this Legislature.

Just to quote what he says: "We need a responsible government, not only for the present but for all times to come. What do I mean by a responsible government? What is meant by responsibility in government? Responsibility means it is a government that is accountable. It means accountability, accountability in the sense of being answerable to someone or to somebody. Responsibility in government means answerability, accountability, with a susceptibility to rational explanation of all its actions and decisions in the sense that there is an honest and sincere attempt to get all the factual information, to consider all the alternative courses of action and the consequences after serious and long deliberation; only then shall it make the choice and implement the action. That will be a responsible government." This is quoting from a speech given by the Member for Burrows.

He goes on to say, "Responsibility in government also means that we should not be in a hurry in doing anything that later we cannot undo. Just as in private life, it is also true in public life - haste makes waste - but reasonable caution is not the same as lack of action. As a government we have embraced the philosophy of activism in government. Activism in government means that we take initiative; we take initiative to pursue dishonourable social objectives; we take initiatives even in changing established institutions and practices if it will be for the betterment of humankind.

"Activism in government also means that we shall always do what is appropriate and honest and moral and virtuous and for the good of all the people of this province, not just for the good of particular individuals or particular corporations or particularistic interest, but activism in government requires power and unhampered discretion. Without power, no government can be effective to carry out its purposes, but plus we have said there is in the inherent risk of power, and that is the tendency to succumb to egotism and corruption, but because we have a commitment to an ethics of

public morality, we know that the exercise of power will not be irresponsible. As Woodrow Wilson has stated a long time ago, 'There is no danger in power, only a power is responsible.'"

To go on quoting from the speech by the Member for Burrows back in February of 1982: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to wind up now by stating what I have said; I'd like to conclude by summarizing what I have said. First, I said before any government can be responsive, such a government must be representative in the sense that it is the mirror image of the people that it is supposed to serve.

"Second, not only must a government be responsive and representative, such a government must also be rationally competent and service fulfilling to meet all the needs of the people. Finally, not only must the government be responsive and representative, not only must the government be representative, but such a government must also be responsible; but it can only be responsible if it has a solid commitment to an ethics of public morality. It is public morality that makes powerful people responsible; it is public morality that makes government responsible."

This is part of his speech quoting from the MLA for Burrows. I think he's an honourable individual. Now if he is going to adhere to his own philosophy, then he is going to have a very difficult time in supporting this constitutional amendment package being put in force by the government. But as my colleague the Member for La Verendrye says - Mr. Santos has an out today because the Premier has given their members a free hand to vote as they wish. I think that's a very important breakthrough because no doubt there's a lot of people on that side that would like to vote their own way but they feel they have to support the government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Somebody's been fooling you.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I'm not worried about myself, Mr. Premier. I'm worried about you though because you have been leading the people of this province down a very dangerous course and you know it. When you go to your own constituency and you get crowded out by people that are objecting to what you are trying to do, then I think that you should reassess your opposition on this whole constitutional amendment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned that the members opposite refuse to accept the fact that the majority of Manitobans are opposed to what the government is trying to do. The 16 referendums that were held last fall resoundly defeated the government's proposal to proceed on this issue. Even at the Premier's own constituency meeting last night the straw poll that was taken there indicated something like 90 percent were opposed to what - 88.6 I think to be exact.

HON. H. PAWLEY: That is junk.

MR. D. GOURLAY: The Premier says it's junk but it's factual and he has to live with that.

A MEMBER: Howard, watch your language.

A MEMBER: Wander around and talk to the people Howard.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I wasn't at the meeting but I heard the CJOB radio report of the meeting and it said that a poll was taken and it indicated that there was 115 people were contacted . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. D. GOURLAY: . . . and there were only 13 that agreed with what you were doing. Now I had people phone me this morning. I was in my office early this morning and there was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I am having some difficulty in hearing the Honourable Member for Swan River.

A MEMBER: Good move, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was having difficulty in hearing myself.

The Premier says that that's a bunch of trash that a straw poll was taken at Selkirk last night but the fact is, it ties in very closely with the results of the 22 or so odd referendums that were held last fall, where the opposition was somewhere I think on the average of about 75 percent but most of the municipalities were about 88 to 93 percent opposed.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the NDP, they know very well that there's a lot of opposition out there against what they are doing. They try to cause an issue by saying well really the people don't understand; that there's been a lot of mistruths spread around but the people of this province are no dummies. As the MLA for Charleswood said when he was speaking this afternoon, the people can smell that there's a problem in this whole package, and they're right. The people also appreciate the fact that the bells are ringing. The bells are music to the people of Manitoba. Certainly as I said earlier, the bells have served this province well in the past few weeks.

It's been said before but I think it's worth repeating, organizations that wish to change their Constitution usually require a two-thirds majority to do so. As I understand it, I believe I heard it mentioned in the House here yesterday and members opposite didn't question it, that even the NDPs to amend their Constitution, have to have a two-thirds majority. But that doesn't worry the Premier in trying to amend our Constitution. He knows very well that he hasn't got a majority supporting this measure but he wants to ram it through in any case.

Other organizations - it has been pointed out as well - if they want to change their constitution, they either do it by giving a notice that at their next annual meeting there will be some proposals brought forward to change the constitution. So that's right. Normally a government that wants to change something as important as a constitutional amendment, certainly would put that on

their election campaign. But you know back in 1981, how many people knew that this government was going to bring in a constitutional amendment?

A MEMBER: Nobody.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I don't remember ever seeing it and I think somewhere - I just happen to have a bulletin here - "A Clear Choice for Manitobans" - it's a big thick bunch of garbage . . .

A MEMBER: Signed by the Premier.

MR. D. GOURLAY: . . . but nowhere can you find in this brochure does it say, if we are elected the first thing we want to do whether the people are in favour or not is to amend the Constitution and make this province bilingual. Nowhere does it say that.

Mr. Speaker, why does this government want to ram this resolution through against the wishes of the people?

A MEMBER: That's what the people are asking.

MR. D. GOURLAY: This is what the people are asking, that's right. Why are they refusing to debate the issue? As I mentioned earlier they claim that there's a lot of misunderstanding and the people really don't appreciate what the government is trying to do, yet they do not want to get up and tell us what kind of information is lacking, what is it that the people don't understand?

You know the Attorney-General, he was speaking on his debate - I just forget, one of the amendments I believe - and he said they have done a lot of things wrong. If he had to do it over again, he would do it quite a bit differently. He said though that this is going to go away, the people will forget about it very quickly. What is important and what the people will remember is the credibility of the government, their credibility in creating jobs and solving the economic woes of this province, but the government hasn't got a very good track record on that either and certainly this bilingual question, or the constitutional amendment, is something that is not going to go away very easily. There are some pretty deep wounds that have been created in parts of the province not far from Winnipeg where the concentrated Francophone areas are.

I have a constituency that has got a very low percentage of Francophone people in the constituency and those that are there, of course, feel very badly, they feel that they didn't want to have any part of this amendment. They are not members of the SFM; they do not agree with the procedure that has been followed, and so they are wondering why all this turmoil has been created in this province, the province that they like to live.

Certainly, I think it was pointed out yesterday by my colleague, the Member for La Verendrye, where he said the issue is not so much the Francophones against the Anglophones, it's more the other ethnic people that are raising up and being heard on this issue. I know that is true in my constituency where it's the German people and their German ethnic background, and the Ukrainian-Canadians and other ethnic people that are really upset with this issue. They are the ones that are being very vocal; they are the ones that are phoning;

they are the ones that are writing to say that you have got to keep those bells ringing, we don't want any part of this.

It's interesting, one of the things they keep asking is, "Why has the government done this? What is in it for the government?" You know, Mr. Speaker, I think this government is drunk with its own stupor. It reminds me of the situation of Jimmy Jones. I think they have the Jimmy Jones' syndrome where here we have a leader, he knows the rest of his people are of different thoughts, but he wants them all to take this poison and to self-destruct. I think that the best way that sums up this whole sorry mess is that our Premier and the Attorney-General and the Government House Leader certainly have the Jimmy Jones' syndrome.

When I have been going home on the weekends recently, and even before this Session started on January 5th, I'd go into the coffee shops, and before Christmas there were a number of Christmas gatherings, and I couldn't help but be contacted by some of the NDP supporters who are friends of mine. They would come up and talk to me, and they said, "You know, you should be laughing these days because you are sure going to get elected in as government next election." I said, "Well, what's the issue?" They said, "Well, our NDP Government is self-destructing and there is no way that they can get re-elected again." I said, "Well, you know, it just so happens I think the Premier and his Cabinet are coming into the Swan Valley next week, why don't you deliver that message to them?"

A number of people indicated to me that they were going to do that. I am sure that when the Premier and members of his Cabinet were in Swan River, and members of the NDP Party, that they were going to tell the Premier what they thought of his constitutional amendment. I am sure they did because I have gotten back to some of those people and they said, yes, there was a chap by the name of Mr. Hanson at Barrows.

He said that he moved to that community a number of years ago when there were few people that supported the CCF. He said he was a CCFer, he came in from Saskatchewan, and he liked that party and he wanted to change the community of Barrows around where they would win that poll to support the CCF at that time and then later the NDP. Well, he says he worked hard for some 32 years and only the last few elections has he been successful in changing that poll around to where they have strongly supported the NDP. As a matter of fact, in the last election the Conservatives only got 9 votes in Barrows, and I believe there were 100-and-some NDP.

He says that is the last time that he is going to vote NDP. He is sick up to the ears with what the government is doing. He told me that he went to the meeting in Mafeking and indicated his displeasure to the Premier and members of the Cabinet. I believe the individual. I think he is sincere; he is heartbroken that the party that he has worked so hard for over the years he can no longer support. Certainly, I think that I meet that with mixed blessings. I welcome the support, perhaps, that I may get from some of those people, but I think it's a disaster when people that have been so dedicated to their own cause have been betrayed by this leader and by this government on such an issue as to force through this constitutional amendment on the people of Manitoba.

The government members say they have the silent majority behind them and yet they go on to say that we are political opportunists and the only reason we are opposing this is because we can seek out and gain a lot of political support by opposing this and ringing the bells. They are right, because this is what the people are telling us, they don't want this constitutional amendment. They want us to stop it regardless of what we have to do. They understand why the bells are ringing and they understand closure; they understand that we are not being allowed to fully debate this issue, because why would we come in and vote on the closure motion because we know that within eight hours the thing would be done and gone and we would not have another chance to really express or register our strong opposition to what this government is trying to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but vote against this double closure that we are now faced with at the present time.

I have a couple more minutes, Mr. Speaker? I would just like to make reference to the big rally that was held at the Convention Centre last week. I think the people say that we are political opportunists, but when you take where there is a rally with some 2500 people - and I don't know if there were 2500 people there or not but there was a heck of a big crowd. There may have been 2,000; there may have been 3,000, but it was an excellent rally. Who were the people that were talking there? They weren't all Conservatives. There were some Conservatives, but we had a real breakdown of the various political parties in this province.

So what is this government trying to prove by saying that the people of this province do not understand why they are putting through this amendment? The people very well understand what is happening and they are afraid of it. They want us to ring the bells and, Mr. Speaker, I will be voting against this limiting of the two hour duration of bell ringing in the future because this bell ringing has served the people well in the immediate past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure and my honour to get up once again and to speak on this issue in particular.

We are talking about the defense of 770 years of the democratic process as it has evolved under the British parliamentary system. We on this side hold that process and that democratic system at the highest possible levels. We wonder when we hear members of the opposition like the Member for Arthur, who questions the faith in democracy that Manitobans have, by saying that bells are freedom. The Member for La Verendrye stated, I think the bells are ringing has served the people of Manitoba in a democratic process. How can one ever serve a democratic process by thwarting parliament, by castrating parliament, but that is exactly their tactic and that is exactly what they have attempted to do. The Member for Swan River repeated that again, that they've served Manitobans. These gentlemen across the way unfortunately do not have the faith in the British parliamentary system; they do not have faith in representative democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like quickly to keep to the point, as the two previous speakers from this side have, to

debate the resolution that is before us on the proposed motion of the honourable House Leader in dealing with bell ringing.

I would like to quote some editorials recently that have come forward since we have been back in this House, and I read from the Winnipeg Sun of January 19th under a title of "Paranoia is senseless. For the third day in a row the people of Manitoba have been treated to the grim spectacle of a Legislature failing to legislate. The entrenchment of a principle is not the entrenchment of a practical reality and to disrupt the legislative process over what amounts to a groundless political paranoia is senseless. Ladies and gentlemen, get back to work." That is the Winnipeg Sun.

On the same day, alongside a caricature of Tories howling at the moon, under the title in the Winnipeg Free Press of "The Tories duck debate" the Free Press editorialist writes: "The Conservatives' little game of moving adjournment, asking for a vote and then refusing to appear for the vote they sought is a wholly deliberate and conscientious abuse of the legislative rules. It is the way of preventing the House from sitting and conducting the affairs of the province. There comes a point definable only as a matter of political judgment when those who fail to appear can no longer prevent the vote from happening. It does not stand to reason that a minority of members though available to take part in a debate, should be able by running away, to dispend (sic) indefinitely the work of the House."

One week later, under the Free Press editorialist: "Who abuses the House? Whatever the cries of bogus outrage from the Conservative benches, the imposition of closure of the government's French language package serves everybody's interest. It will, bearing the ultimate obstruction of the opposition, permit the government to get the issue out of the way within a reasonable time." It finishes up, "But surely, if anything in recent weeks overstepped the bounds of reasonableness it was the Tory strategy of paralyzing the work of the Legislature . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: ". . . by proposing motions that is paralyzing the work of the Legislature, by proposing motions, then refusing to vote on them and if anyone has dishonoured that little room which is the Legislative Chamber, it is the Tories who seized every opportunity to empty it, abandoned and powerless."

On the 30th of January under another title in the Winnipeg Free Press editorial: "Abusive bell ringing. Every elected body needs some obstructionist devices which allow the opposition to slow down the actions of an autodemocratic or impervious government, but Conservatives and New Democrats alike must recognize by now that bell ringing is an abomination and a threat to the democratic process." They conclude that editorial by saying - referring to the Conservatives - "They should understand that there are some things more important than making immediate political points. One of them is the integrity of the Chamber they service."

Following up one month later after an editorial in the Free Press titled, "Afraid of the dark," it stated that an opposition argument that has a basis of fact and that leads logically from there to a conclusion deserves

a hearing and can require an adjustment to the government's policy. Mr. Filmon's whimpering cannot be taken seriously. He should be told firmly to be quiet and go back to sleep.

Exactly one month later, the Brandon Sun calls him the invisible man. "Mr. Lyon and most of the caucus have decided to hold up the democratic process in Manitoba and let an ugly hysteria build up among voters in this province."

On the 7th of this month, in the Globe and Mail in an editorial they state: "The Manitoba Conservative Opposition is causing the bells to ring in the service of obstruction, pure and simple. A decent respect for the rights of Parliament would put the Conservatives in their seats for the vote."

Today in the Winnipeg Free Press in an editorial under the title of "Bluster and hypocrisy" which members opposite will ignore once again . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. D. SCOTT: "Whatever is achieved in speeding the passage of the government's French language package, the resolution to limit bell ringing at least puts the issue of parliamentary obstructionism squarely before the Legislature. In the process, it reveals for everyone who cares to listen, the depth of the Conservative Party's hypocrisy on the issue. The method the government is using to change the Constitution, to offer some extremely modest protection to the existing freedoms of the province's French-speaking citizens and to save the province money and trouble by validating laws that were only passed in English, is precisely the method set out by the Canadian Constitution. That method involves the passing of a resolution by the Legislature of Manitoba and the two Houses of the Federal Parliament. It is precisely the method which was agreed upon by Sterling Lyon when he was Manitoba's Conservative Premier."

They conclude: "The kindest explanation of the behaviour of the Tories in the Manitoba Legislature at the moment is that they are so inflamed by the prospects of creating political mischief that they do not understand what they are doing. A former leader of their party, Mr. Sidney Spivak, in response to their tactics last week of bell ringing said, 'They had an opportunity here to do a number of things. They can certainly present an argument against the position as far as the resolution is concerned. That's what an opposition is here to do, but it did not have to be done in this atmosphere and they did not have to create or heighten the atmosphere or intensify it by its actions. There is no need for this.'"

Then he finished up later, in the interview, he stated, "The role of the opposition is to present every position that is falsely presented if they oppose it but recognizing democracy is to work in our parliamentary system, at that point having expressed that, a vote takes place and a majority of the House rules."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for addressing us and being able to bring these points forward to us to show the ultimate hypocrisy of the Conservative's position on this issue of trying to frustrate and to castrate the parliamentary process.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if there may be some disposition on the part of members to call it 10 o'clock?

Well, I'll carry on, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, we on this side would be inclined to grant leave if the honourable member

does wish to speak tonight. There is not a great deal of time . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The time being 10 o'clock this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.(Friday)