



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. 178 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 8 FEBRUARY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUUK, 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

Wednesday, 8 February, 1984.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 25 students of Grade 9 standing from the Gordon Bell High School under the direction of a Mr. Huber. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

There are also 15 students of Grade 3 standing from the Robertson School under the direction of Mrs. Snifeld. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows. On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. It is reported today that in a recent interview the Premier has indicated that he would be willing to trash the term "official languages" in the constitutional proposal that is before us in the Legislature. I'm wondering whether or not the Premier can confirm whether or not he is willing to do that and whether he can let members on this side of the House, and indeed the public of Manitoba, know that that is his new position on the constitutional proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'd like the Leader of the Opposition to repeat his question. I'm not sure whether I heard the first few words in respect to the question that he posed.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is that it's reported in an interview today that the Premier gave recently that he would be willing to trash the term "official languages." I interpret "trash" as being remove the term "official languages" from the constitutional proposal that is before us today. Can he confirm that for the people of Manitoba and this side of the Legislature?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall any such interview. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition

would like to give me particulars of that interview, so I could review what the Leader of the Opposition is indicating what I said by way of the interview. I don't recall any such interview and I am not sure the context by which the Leader of the Opposition is making reference to.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the interview is an article by Jean Pierre Proulx of *Le Devoir*. Mr. Proulx was in the Legislature all of last week, I believe, and the interview took place on or about Friday with the Premier. It is reported on the front page of today's *Le Devoir* and the translation that I have of it indicates that the Premier is prepared to remove the term "official languages" from the amendment to the Constitution which is currently before us. If he has been incorrectly represented, then perhaps he can clarify that. If not, I believe that members of this side of the House and indeed the people of Manitoba would be very interested to hear his position on it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be interested in seeing a copy of *Le Devoir* and obtain translation of same, because I certainly recall no such content in any interview that I gave to the editor of *Le Devoir*. I would like to obtain a copy of the article in question.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'll just quote very briefly the one sentence that capsulizes it and then be happy to share it with the Premier. We have copies, but it says, "The Premier of Manitoba believes that the province should respect the covenant of 1870 according to which French and English were placed on an equal level, but he doesn't necessarily hold to the term "official" if there are other ways to arrive at the same result."

Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have given the Premier other ways to arrive at the same result, that is, to hold Section 23 as is, to remove Section 23.1, will he then be supporting our amendment which is currently before the Legislature?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if indeed the translation that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to is correct, then it's certainly inconsistent with the first question he posed that I was prepared to trash.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, just for further clarification, the headline of the story is, "Pawley Admits He Is Ready to Trash the Word 'Official'."

So my question then is, will the Premier clarify for the people on this side of the House, and indeed the people of Manitoba, whether or not he is prepared to drop the word "official" and to proceed with the remainder of the constitutional resolution, that is, by removing 23.1 and allowing the validation of statutes to take place and allowing the matter to be done with?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the 23, the Bill 2 that was passed in 1980 made very clear reference to the

two official languages. The proposal that is before us today makes reference to the two official languages. I don't know whether there's any other way of properly describing or explaining that. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that you can't call something by a different name than what it is.

If the honourable member is wanting to make some suggestions, fine and dandy. I do not know of any different way, Mr. Speaker, by which English and French can be described, but that they are according to Canadian legislation, according to the legislation that was passed by the Lyon administration in the Province of Manitoba, they were referred to as official languages for the purpose of the legislation in question.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In his speech on Wednesday, February 1st, and in the translation of the interview with the Premier that my Leader has just referred to, the Premier has suggested that the law of 1980, which was passed by our government, and supported by the NDP then in opposition, Bill No. 2 somehow resulted in the Bilodeau case. Would the First Minister explain how Bill No. 2 of 1980 resulted in the Bilodeau case?

A MEMBER: That would be hard to explain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, insofar as the 1980 legislation, yes, clearly we would not be in this Chamber today debating this issued if the Lyon administration had dealt with this matter as they ought to have dealt with this matter in 1980. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker.

If we had had entrenchment in respect to the validation of statutes in 1980 in The Manitoba Act, for what reason would we be back in this Chamber; for what reason would there have been further challenges to the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker? And if we fail to do their job properly now, and if we repeat the kind of half-hearted route, which unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we should have criticized in 1980 if we'd had adequate information at that time, then we would not be back in this Chamber today. Yes, their half-hearted and half-baked approach in 1980 precipitated the situation that we're in today rather than avoid the situation that we are involved in today.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister not acknowledge that the Bilodeau case arises out of an interpretation of Section 23 of The Manitoba Act and has nothing whatsoever to do with the 1980 bill? In fact, the Bilodeau case, Mr. Bilodeau lost his case in the Manitoba Court of Appeal by an unanimous decision.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Georges Forest case in 1979 very clearly established the validity of The Manitoba Act. The 1980 legislation that was passed in this House attempted to provide for the translation of statutes in both languages. Mr. Speaker, what we are

confronted with now, and I would trust that the honourable members would be - and I know I am fully aware of this at this point - is a challenge based upon the fact that 4,500 statutes are in jeopardy, and the requirement for the translation of those 4,500 statutes is a possible outcome of any Supreme Court decision.

What we are attempting to do is to validate a reasonable number of statutes, 400 statutes in the Province of Manitoba, so to avoid what indeed the Member for St. Norbert, if I am correct, indicated would be a cost of some \$18 million to \$20 million to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

I have no doubt in my mind that if there had been foresight on the part of the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba when they dealt with this matter, if they had foreseen the development of further court cases, if they had foreseen that which they ought to have reasonably foreseen they would have, as the leadership and as a Government of that Day, undertaken appropriate steps in order to ensure that there would be entrenchment to validate certain numbers of statutes so Manitobans would know where they stand and they would know to what line we would proceed and beyond what line we would not proceed. Yes, certainly, the 1980 legislation was inadequate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier then, in view of his statement, is he guaranteeing Manitobans and members on this side of the House that his new proposal will ensure that there will be no further court challenges on this issue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what I am satisfied with is that there will be no substantive court challenges in the same way there will be if we fail to act. Mr. Speaker, what will happen — (Interjection) — if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to await my response to the question he posed to me - if we do not succeed in ensuring that the resolution is passed in this Chamber is that the Bilodeau case will proceed onto the Supreme Court. There will be other court cases proceeding to the Supreme Court. There are others that undoubtedly will proceed to the Supreme Court of Canada. There will be constant challenges in respect to the laws of the Province of Manitoba. There will be continued buildup of court costs and other costs. There will be constant uncertainty as to the laws of this province, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt - and this is a point that obviously honourable members have missed for the last eight months - that we must ensure that the job is done properly, competently, and not in a half-baked manner as it was in 1980.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, if indeed that is the concern of the Premier, will he then agree with our amendment and approve those sections of the proposal that seek to confirm the validity of Manitoba's laws by constitutional amendment and get on with the business of government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to receive from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, before

I respond to his question, is whether his leader at the national level, Mr. Mulroney, would support his proposal in the House of Commons?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

May I remind members that this is question period. If members wish to debate the matter, maybe they would like to do so outside of the Chamber.

Grassroots Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister.

Given his critical remarks of the Grassroots Chairman, Grant Russell, does he support federal pressure and harassment tactics against Mr. Russell, in an attempt to force him from his leadership role in opposing the province's bilingual proposals? In other words, Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister support the attempt to silence Mr. Russell?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question does not refer to a matter within the administrative competence of the government and hence is out of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order, I'm referring to remarks made by the First Minister. I would like to raise a point of order.

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

MR. R. DOERN: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not in view of remarks made by the First Minister in which he was critical of the actions of the leader of the Grassroots movement in which he supported the harassment tactics being imposed by the Federal Government, where the fact that the First Minister made such a statement . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a point of order?

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question whether in view — (Interjection) — Well, you better hear my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. DOERN: My point of order is: is it in order to ask a question of the First Minister based on his remarks in support of the Federal Government to silence Mr. Russell who is leading a movement against this government? Is a question like that not in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member knows that questions cannot be directed to the Chair. The honourable member did

not have a point of order. Does he have another question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the First Minister whether he subscribes to the view, which he apparently does, that civil servants whether on active service or on medical disability, that they can support the government in its actions at any time but cannot oppose it or criticize it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

May I remind the Honourable Member for Elmwood that his questioning should seek information from the government and not ask for an opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the First Minister. Just a few days ago, several days ago in this Chamber, in a very public way, he questioned the integrity and the appropriateness of one Mr. Grant Russell to be involved in the opposition to the government's language proposals. Has the Minister reconsidered those remarks and would he consider apologizing to Mr. Russell?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Russell is entitled to any view that he wishes to express. He has expressed those views as part of the democratic process. My only musing was to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Russell is well enough to work on many hours a day as apparently he has been able to - I sense 16, 17 hours a day - at the same time drawing disability cheques from the Federal Government and has been for some time, I wonder if indeed the federal job that he has is really so much more taxing that he would not be able to perform his duties at the federal level rather than to draw disability cheques from the Federal Government.

MR. H. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, directed to the First Minister. Will the First Minister not concede that it is particularly because of those kind of tactics employed by this government and this First Minister that those who have gathered and signed petitions have been reluctant to leave them with this First Minister and with this government to avoid that kind of public harassment that the First Minister displayed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Would the honourable member like to rephrase his question to seek information rather than an opinion?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to rephrase the question. The First Minister has, on several occasions, indicated his disappointment that petitions, coupons, and other indicators of disapproval of this government's action were not left in his hands, letters, etc.; I'm simply asking him if the Minister will not now

concede in the manner and the way in which one, Mr. Grant Russell, was attacked publicly in this House, whether or not he does not now understand why petitioners, coupon senders, letter writers, are reluctant to leave their names with this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the convoluted logic of the Honourable House Leader, and it's very very convoluted. When people sign petitions, when people sign coupons with the expectation that they be delivered, whether it be to the Lieutenant-Governor or to the Premier, they do so with the expectation that those petitions will be delivered, those coupons will be delivered, so they will be expressing name by name, address by address, their opposition, that they are not hesitant or fearful of standing up and saying for why they oppose, and as individuals they oppose.

I find it very very strange indeed, the Member for Elmwood saw fit to leave some empty envelopes in my office, not containing names and addresses, claiming that they reflected a great host of Manitobans.

The gentleman that the House Leader made reference to delivered a number of petitions to Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, 5,500 of them, having been collected by Mr. Kelly and brought into the Lieutenant-Governor's office, not left with the Lieutenant-Governor, but removed from the Lieutenant-Governor's office.

What are they afraid of? Are they afraid of the Lieutenant-Governor, the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, that they don't want to leave the petitions with Her Majesty's representative in the Province of Manitoba? Let's forget the Premier, they wouldn't even leave the petitions with the Lieutenant-Governor, the representative of Her Majesty the Queen in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister acknowledge or concede that perhaps that's why there is a growing silent majority in the province on this issue?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a growing silent majority, and I'm glad that the Honourable House Leader has finally acknowledged there's a growing silent majority, because Manitobans want to see their legislators get on with the other tasks that are confronting Manitobans. Manitobans want their legislators to get on with the issues of jobs and the economy and health and education in the Province of Manitoba. Manitobans are saying - and I'm glad to hear the House Leader acknowledge that there is a growing silent majority. They've had enough of constant bell ringing, constant filibustering, constant obstruction in this House. Manitobans are saying, "Let's get on, both opposition and government, with the job that confronts Manitobans, jobs for the sons and daughters of Manitobans, an improved economic base for this province, an improved quality of education and health for Manitobans, the question of human rights." That's what Manitobans are telling legislators.

Yes, I agree with the House Leader, there is a growing silent majority that feel that and want the government and opposition to get on with the real tasks in this province.

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. H. ENNS: A final supplementary question to the First Minister. Will the First Minister instruct his Government House Leader to withdraw, tear up the closure motion and allow us to get on with the only business that's before us, namely, the constitutional amendment, and help him put that constitutional amendment into the shape that will indeed be acceptable to the people of Manitoba? You haven't allowed us to do that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me make it very very clear on the record. Our House Leader has tried day after day after day to initiate negotiations with the House Leader for the opposition and, figuratively speaking, every time he's made that attempt, the door has been slammed in his face. This side of the Chamber is interested in negotiations, this side of the Chamber is interested in discussions; it is that side, Mr. Speaker, that is not interested in negotiations. It is that side of the Chamber that has slammed the door - slammed the door figuratively speaking - in the face of the House Leader every time that the House Leader has made an opportunity to initiate its discussions.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Government House Leader. I wish to ask the Honourable Government House Leader that if the opposition is today - and I'm doing it right now, make a solemn commitment to him that we are prepared to debate the constitutional amendment before us, will he withdraw the motion of closure?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, if I could get a solemn commitment that this issue would be addressed by this Legislature, I would not only applaud it, I would receive it and accept it on the basis of trust in the spirit of co-operation on which it would be based, but I have never received that.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked members opposite, since the appointment of the current Opposition House Leader, I have dealt primarily with him, for discussions relating to the substance of the proposal before this Legislature. They have expressed concerns. I have said, "Let's sit down and talk about it." Instead, we've had blanket amendments removing whole sections; we've had amendments that haven't addressed the concerns that members' own speeches talked about. We have said let's enter into those discussions.

Those approaches were rebuffed in December, early in December, publicly in mid-December, late in

December, and at least half-a-dozen times in the month of January.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the time allocation motion before this House, I have repeatedly said to the Opposition House Leader and to some of his colleagues that it is not a motion that I would like to move in this House; it is not a motion that members on this side wish, was at all necessary.

Mr. Speaker, members on this side were told by members opposite in speeches which are on the record - and in heckling which is on the record because much of that is picked up - that we should bring in closure, that it would be the only way that a time allocation could be achieved on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't accept that. I went to the Opposition House Leader, I talked to some of his colleagues and I said, "Let's set a time limit, not a deadline for the whole thing, but a time limit over which we'll deal with the resolution, then we'll address the committee hearings, then we'll address third reading, but let's be reasonable about it and set some targets allowing all of your members an opportunity to speak, but not allowing amendment after amendment after amendment - six, eight months, a year of debate? Is that what members want after eight months? Mr. Speaker, that's what I asked them and each time I received an honest, sincere response from the Opposition House Leader, and each time he said to me he would discuss it with his colleagues. Mr. Speaker, each he came back to me and said no.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what more do members opposite expect me to do? Mr. Speaker, I have tried to deal with questions of substance and I have tried to deal with questions of process. In every instance those attempts have been sincere, and my discussions with the Opposition House Leader have been sincere, and I have the utmost confidence that his sincerity was based on his integrity. I have no doubt about that, but each time, Sir, he came back with a message from his caucus that was "no." It was a complete rebuff.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the House and more directly to my Premier, he has never slammed the door in my face. He is too much of a gentleman to do that, but figuratively his caucus has slammed it in both his face and in mine.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions but I do have a point of order. It is a matter of order in this Chamber when actions of an individual member or a group, as in this instance, his action or position is deliberately being misrepresented in this House.

The position of Her Majesty's Official Opposition is clear. We have wanted to debate the resolution and I'm putting that on the record with you, Sir, today. We want to debate the resolution and we will debate the resolution until such time as we can properly construct a resolution that is worthy and acceptable to the people of Manitoba to be sent to Ottawa.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. H. ENNS: We don't want the Premier talking to Le Devoir or outside of the province and suggesting solutions. We want those solutions made in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. All what the Government House Leader has to do is withdraw the threat of closure. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you, Sir, had we done that, this debate would have concluded by now.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you it is a matter of point of order when the Government House Leader suggests that the Official Opposition has not been prepared to debate the resolution before us. We were prepared to debate the resolution from Day One and are prepared today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The honourable member did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that the Honourable Opposition House Leader didn't mean to use the words, because I'm sure he is not making the allegation that I in any way deliberately attempted to mislead the House. I would draw to your attention, Sir, Page 109 of Beauchesne, in which any suggestion that misrepresentation or misleading the House by deliberate intent is clearly unparliamentary.

I think the Honourable Opposition House Leader knows that I have taken the position that debate should proceed in a reasonable fashion and that the government and the people of Manitoba should know that it's coming to a conclusion and that is what members opposite have refused to provide. If I in any way have suggested otherwise, Mr. Speaker, that has not been deliberate.

The deliberate statements I have made have been that opposition members have refused to deal with this matter and to debate this matter in the context of coming to a decision. I've talked about obstruction and filibusters. Mr. Speaker, I want that on the record and I would like, Sir, the Honourable Member for Lakeside to withdraw any suggestion, which is certainly unparliamentary, that any misrepresentation or misleading statements in this House have not occurred and have not been deliberate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside to the same point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the misrepresentation that I alluded to - and I have no difficulty withdrawing the word "deliberate," if that satisfies the Honourable Government House Leader - but the misrepresentation that I was alluding to was his statement that he made just a few moments ago in rising to this question about withdrawing of the closure motion, when he suggested to us in the House that in conferring with me, the door was closed or slammed in his face with respect to further debate on the constitutional amendment. I, Sir, say that that is misrepresentation. Because the reason that further debate on the constitutional amendment didn't take place is because he always insisted on putting the hooker on - well, you can debate it for so long. Tell me, till next week - Thursday, till Friday, till Tuesday? That, Sir, surely, from a reasonable point of view, is

closure by the backdoor. For him to suggest that we were not prepared to debate is a misrepresentation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

I recognize the differences of opinion between members do not constitute a point of order. If there in fact was any representation that was deliberate and has not been withdrawn, I will check Hansard to see what it says there.

Flyer Industries Limited

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Technology regarding Flyer Industries.

He said yesterday there was negotiations going on with a group regarding the purchase of Flyer Industries and it has been reported, Sir, by the people, some people that were negotiating, that they received a runaround or words to that effect. I wonder if the Minister could explain to us why that group believed they are getting the runaround from the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm sorry but I can't comment on why those individuals feel they are receiving a runaround. As I indicated yesterday, there has been some negotiations or some discussions - more correctly put - with the board of directors and some interested parties. I indicated that there has not been any involvement by this government or this Minister directly in any of those discussions. I would await any recommendations from the board of directors with respect to any potential offers.

I would say though, Mr. Speaker, the information I received from the board is that their last correspondence with those individuals through respective counsels was to the so-called interested parties on January 3rd. My information is also that the interested parties have never replied to the correspondence that was advanced by the solicitor for Flyer Industries of January 3rd.

I might also add, prior to that, in earlier discussions somewhere around November, December, the legal representative of Flyer Industries indicated that the discussions, relative to any potential purchase, should be held in confidence, given the nature of those discussions and the specific information that might be shared in discussions on offer. I regret that some parties have decided not to respect that confidence.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would just clarify the statement: "There has been no correspondence between that group and the Board of Directors or the Chairman of the Board of Flyer Industries since January 3rd." Would the Minister clarify that statement or confirm it?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Yes, I indicated that according to the information that was provided to me by the

Chairman of Flyer Board that they did correspond through solicitors last on January 3rd to the interested party through their solicitors, and there's never been any reply to that latest correspondence.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if there are any other - or better put it this way - how many different groups is the government or the Board of Directors of Flyer negotiating with regarding the purchase of Flyer?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of any other discussions that are taking place with any other interested parties at the present time. There certainly has been no negotiations, no discussion by the government with any interested parties.

I understand the Board of Directors have had discussions with one group of interested people.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has reported to have said that they are concerned about the problems with Flyer buses in several American cities. I wonder if the Minister could provide this House with a list of the cities that are having trouble with Flyer buses, a complete list.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to provide more detailed information with respect to the present difficulties of Flyer Industries at a later date, once I am able to meet with the Chairman of the Board; though I would add that there are some difficulties, as has been reported, with a number of Flyer contracts, some that relate directly to the production directly related to Flyer and in one case related to a sub-contractor.

I also note, Mr. Speaker, though it does not appear in any of the reports here in the city that there has also been, as a result of the press reports out of Vancouver regarding the problems there, a number of reports of a positive nature by both riders and operators of the buses in Vancouver. So it's one that there are some difficulties but there are also others that are very pleased with the job that Flyer has done.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that he should check with his Premier because it seems that it's the Premier's statements that get people into trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, now that there has been a report that the suppliers are going to be delivering the parts required for production of the Flyer Industries buses, can the Minister indicate when the people that were temporarily laid off will be hired again to work at Flyer Industries?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I'd first say that there is no contradiction between what my Premier or what I said, there's no question. We are concerned about the present problems that are being noticed with respect to some of Flyer's orders and we certainly intend to work with the Board of Directors, the Chief Executive Officer, and the Department of Crown Investments to ensure that those problems are corrected, some of which are of an unfortunately long-standing nature relative to Flyer Industries.

With regard to the question as to when the lay-offs might be reversed, I'll take that question as notice and provide the information as soon as I have it.

Jobs Fund - Capital

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Jobs Fund. Can the Minister advise the House whether there are any unallocated funds remaining, any unallocated budgetary authority remaining in the Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

Tabling of Contract - Mr. David Sanders

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs. On Friday I again asked the Minister to table the contract of the former Deputy Minister with the Government of Manitoba, referring to Mr. Sanders, and her answer was, "I would if I had it with me but I don't have it with me today."

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: does the Minister have the contract with her today and would she table it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I did have it with me yesterday, I will check. I think it's still in my book and if I do have it there I will send it over to the member.

National Farmers Union

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, the question is: has the Minister of Agriculture received a request from the National Farmers Union, the Manitoba group, to provide funds for a study which they wish to carry out in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have received requests from many groups and specifically from the National Farmers Union. I have received many requests for various projects.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Has he provided any funds for work that the Manitoba Farmers Union, or the National Farmers Union, Manitoba branch, have requested? Has he provided any funds?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, he says, "not at this time." Is his department working on a proposal with the Farmers Union to provide funds and will he be providing them in the near future?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I should advise the honourable member that many groups come to government and make submissions, and the Farmers Union would only be one of those groups. If we have options that are there, we would be considering them; and I'm sure we are doing the same for any group that makes a submission to us.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, is he going to be providing funds for the Farmers Union of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when any decisions are made with the provision of funds for any group, I'm sure the honourable member will know as well as the group involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions having expired, I have a statement for the House.

SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: On Monday, February 6th, the Honourable Government House Leader rose in his place to raise a matter of privilege regarding the ringing of division bells. After listening to the advice of several members I took the matter under advisement.

Beauchesne's Citation 84.(1) requires that two conditions be satisfied in order for the House to debate a matter of privilege:

(1) whether the matter is raised at the first available opportunity, and

(2) whether a prima facie case of breach of privilege has been raised.

Taking them in order: Condition (1) requires that the Honourable Government House Leader be satisfied on Monday morning that the House itself has the power and responsibility to change its own rules and that the Speaker would be exceeding his authority in intervening.

When discussing the privileges of Parliament, Beauchesne says in Citation 4: "Few of these are of greater importance than the right to regulate the internal proceedings of the House, or more specifically, to establish binding rules of procedure."

And in Citation 10: "Changes in the Standing Orders from time to time also give ample opportunity for the House to adjust the interpretation of its precedents and tradition in the light of changing circumstances."

Taking these with our rules and the Rules Committee, the precedents of this House, Beauchesne and the House of Commons procedures, and Westminster proceedings, it is clear that any initiative for instituting a limitation on the ringing of division bells must be the responsibility of the House itself.

The Honourable Government House Leader's remarks make it clear that he accepts this condition, this situation, and the House must accept that he recognizes this fact as of Monday morning. Therefore,

I accept that the raising of the matter of privilege on Monday afternoon fulfilled the first condition. Before leaving this point, I should stress that the motion is in order in itself, in seeking to amend the rules even though our practice has been to refer questions of the rules to the Rules Committee.

Beauchesne's Citation 9 says in part, "There is no procedural reason why any private Member or Minister of the Crown could not introduce a motion to alter the rules and, on occasion, such as the introduction of the closure, this has been done."

I do not accept the argument that the motion is out of order because it presents two distinct paragraphs. The motion refers to the same topic, once in the short term and once in the long term.

On the second condition, the Honourable Government House Leader fails to distinguish between matters which may obstruct the government and those which may obstruct the House. He says in part, "denies the right of government to see its legislation proceed to enactment." There is no right of government that would see its proposed legislation enacted. There are numerous examples of government bills introduced into the House and not proceeding into legislation. The right of the House to conduct its own affairs is quite a different matter and that is the concern of the motion.

Appendix 2 in our Rule Book defines breaches of House privilege, in part, as, "Wilful disobedience to orders and rules of Parliament in the exercise of its constitutional functions;" since our rules and precedents have not been disobeyed, it is difficult to argue that a matter of privilege exists on these grounds. It goes on to say, "insults and obstructions during debate are breaches of the privileges of the House." Thus, the use of the rules cannot be considered as a matter of privilege, but the abuse of rules may be. Beauchesne says of Privilege in Citation 16: "The privileges of Parliament are rights which are 'absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers.'"

Sir Erskine May, writing on the generality of privilege, in which he includes contempt, says on Page 136: "It may be stated generally that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency directly or indirectly to produce such results, may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence."

Beauchesne makes it clear that whether or not a breach of privilege exists can only be decided by the House, and that the function of the Chair is to recognize any prima facie evidence that may exist. Since it is clear that, at first sight, there has been considerable bell ringing, the House should not be prevented from deciding whether this constitutes a breach of privilege. Therefore, I find that the second condition has been satisfied and that the motion is in order.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I must challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained. Those in favour,

please say aye; those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion, the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule No. 63, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, the Member for St. Boniface, that this question be now put.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. Since it has been ruled that such a motion would be in order, the motion is: It is moved by the Honourable Government House Leader, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health;

THAT the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House be instructed to examine the question of extended ringing of the division bells and to report back with recommendations to this House at its next Session; and

THAT until a 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 the bells during all divisions be established as an interim measure.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I moved a motion that the question be put.

MR. SPEAKER: Now that the resolution is properly before the House . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: All right. Okay. You're putting the question?

MR. SPEAKER: . . . it is in order for the Honourable Minister to put his motion. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Okay. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule No. 63, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, the Member for St. Boniface, that this question be now put.

A MEMBER: Without any debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, what we are witnessing now of course is a bizarre extension of to what end this government is willing to go to curtail any meaningful debate in this Chamber.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on the government members opposite that it will be the intention of the opposition to debate this new twist, this new abuse of power by this government, in the strongest possible way.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. H. ENNS: No, I am debating the motion, Mr. Speaker. I was rising on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has not yet been put to the House.

It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that pursuant to Rule 63.(1), that the question be now put.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the honourable members opposite will still their voices long enough to listen to the motion.

The purpose of the motion is to ensure that the question that is before us, the question of bell ringing, the resolution that is before us will be debated upon and no other resolution, no amendment, pursuant to that motion that the question be now put. It is clear by the rules that there is no amendments possible to that motion.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, no!

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, I hear a chorus of "oh noes," Mr. Speaker.

Are honourable members saying they're not prepared to face up, first of all, to a reference to a Rules Committee to deal with bell ringing? If that's what their ohs and their ahs and their frustrations are saying they're opposed to this matter going to a committee of this House between Sessions, or whenever, to deal with a question of extensive bell ringing, then I don't understand them, Mr. Speaker, because they're here elected to represent the people and to deal with legislation, not to have fun and games in their caucus room while bells ring.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of the resolution that was moved by the Honourable House Leader, says that for the rest of this Session, that bell ringing be limited to two hours. Mr. Speaker, do we need amendments? Do we need to debate that proposal extensively?

A MEMBER: We sure do.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, honourable members have rang bells at an unprecedented rate in the institution of Parliament.

A MEMBER: . . . never had to stop an out-of-control government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is possible for honourable members now to recognize that it is the only responsible thing to do, after all this frustration, after the self-admitted stalling tactics of the opposition - admitted not only in this House but admitted on public television - surely now it is responsible for us as government to say, all right, you've had your fun and games, it's been fun to you, it's been frustration to us and the people of Manitoba, that government isn't able to put programs on the table, have it debated and

voted on. It is completely destructive of the parliamentary tradition. No kind of parliament, no kind of democratic government can operate in that kind of fashion.

Mr. Speaker, when divisive, arbitrary, authoritarian parties of the past have sought to destroy democracy, they've used those kinds of techniques; destroy parliament, destroy democracy by frustrating its institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we have moved responsibly now to deal with this question. Other jurisdictions had the foresight, after the bell ringing in Ottawa, to have dealt with that matter properly and they have limitations in sister provinces of bell ringing.

We had the assurance last summer that, well, you know, we're not going to ring bells extensively. You go out and talk to the people. They frustrated us, Mr. Speaker, by bell ringing, for being able to go out to the people, and let the record be clear about that. We had a motion before this House to allow us to go out and meet the people of Manitoba. They rang the bells and prevented us from going out to speak to the people of Manitoba to get an understanding of that question.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: They did that, Mr. Speaker, deliberately because their whole tactic . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . their whole line of tactics in respect to this question that we had before us, was political opportunism. Frustrate, delay, confuse, distort and the government will be in trouble. That has been their tactic. The House Leader of the Opposition has openly admitted that they've stalled and they've tried to prevent this government from moving effectively in respect to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, they know that when a matter goes to the Supreme Court it doesn't end there - it went there in 1979 - it had to come back in this Chamber the next year in 1980, and yet they're continuing to say that it should be left to the Supreme Court. They know it has to be dealt with in this Chamber, and yet, Mr. Speaker, they won't face up to positive discussion and debate in this Chamber. They just want to stall, delay, frustrate, confuse and distort this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we think that the people of Manitoba know what their tactics are. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Manitoba know now. I think the people of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, know from an opposition now who has openly admitted what their tactics were. The people of Manitoba know what the problem is. The problem is that an opposition party in Manitoba will not face up to the realities of dealing in a responsible way with a matter that has to be dealt with in this Chamber. It cannot be left to others. They are refusing to deal with it. We had hoped that with new leadership, it would be a new way, a new interest, that hasn't changed.

The Honourable Member for Charleswood still has the strings on the puppet, Mr. Speaker, and when he says the bells will ring, and when he goes out and speaks in Manitoba and says the bells will ring for

democracy, he's talking like the people did in other parts of the world when they tried to destroy the parliamentary system.

Mr. Speaker, the mask is off the opposition. The people of Manitoba know what the problem is now and the people of Manitoba expect us, as government, to change the rules, get on with the work of the government and they expect the opposition to abide by those rules, to respect reasonable limits, to act as if they believe in parliamentary democracy.

In the last long many months they have acted in a way in which one has to question whether they really believe in parliamentary democracy. But, Mr. Speaker, that is what's been at stake in the last several months. The answer is clear that they do not respect those traditions.

I am saying now, you have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker. This House has an opportunity to make a decision for reasonable debate and reasonable decision-making. Thus it is that this motion that I put, that the question be put, does not limit debate on the resolution, but make sure that the principles of that resolution is dealt with. No obfuscation, no six-month hoists, no attempts to obfuscate, cloud, distort the issue of responsible decision-making.

So, Mr. Speaker, far from the cries of anguish on the other side, there should have been an acceptance while this government is moving properly, responsibly, to have that clear-cut issue of bell ringing debated in this House and decided once and for all, at least once for the question that's before us, and then making sure that the Rules Committee deals with this question in a responsible manner, because, we, Mr. Speaker, are not prepared on the question we had before us or any other question that we brought here, whether it be on Autopac, whether it be on any other question, to have an opposition frustrate the will of government to make a decision.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is for that reason that this motion is put, not to frustrate debate, but to make sure that debate is focused and is responsible.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no reluctance in asking honourable members opposite to face up to their responsibility, to be parliamentarians, to not run away, not when the Speaker says, "Call in the Members," for the members to run away and hide in their caucus room, but stay in this Chamber and vote. They can vote against if they will, but exercise their responsibility as Members of the Legislative Assembly, do what they're supposed to be doing, speak, debate and vote, and not run away and hide and try to break the parliamentary system.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot, of course, reflect on your earlier ruling regarding this whole matter, which now is being handled in an omnibus way, and I don't intend to, but that doesn't stop me from asking the greater question: where has this Government House Leader led us to on this whole matter? Does he recognize the mine field that he has now created on this issue? Is this the kind of question - is this sensitive language issue, this constitutional issue, the first constitutional change that is being made to the Constitution of Manitoba, is that to be brought in in

this way, with arrogance, with power, and sheer numbers? The Premier of this province, the First Minister, knows it ought not to be done this way.

Look at the constitution of your own party, the New Democratic Party of Manitoba, and they wouldn't allow you to do it that way, to change a jot or tittle of your constitution the way you are trying to change the Constitution of Manitoba. Your party rules and regulations say that at least two-thirds are required to make a constitutional change within the New Democratic Party, as, Mr. Speaker, indeed it says the same about the Conservative Party. It says the same about most organizations, Mr. Speaker.

In some other private organizations there are other means of focussing on the importance of constitutional change. Many business organizations say, for instance, that a constitutional change is not possible and cannot be raised at one annual meeting. It can only be entered in as notice and then be considered a year later at the next annual meeting, a year later at the next annual meeting, because, Mr. Speaker, it is widely understood in private and in public practice that when one deals with the structure - we call it our Constitution, we call it The Manitoba Act, that governs all of us - that that is distinctly different than from the kind of bills that we pass and we accept passage, whether we in the opposition like it or not, but we accept their passage as being the normal course of democratic parliament in action when a government brings in, with its majority, any certain number of bills.

Mr. Speaker, this government prides itself on having in the last Session passed a record number of bills. I don't know the number - (Interjection) - 160, 180. It was over a hundred bills. I think it was over 150 bills, Mr. Speaker, but I didn't like all of those bills. The Conservative Party didn't like all of those bills, but those bills all passed through this Chamber, because you are the government, and you have the numbers.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are dealing with here. That is not what we're dealing with here. What we're dealing with here is the question of constitutional change, and we're dealing with it in a manner that is unprecedented, Mr. Speaker, anywhere where normal decency prevails with respect to societies that govern themselves under what we call a parliamentary democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the most recent history that we have of that is indeed that great constitutional debate that we had in all of Canada that a wilful and determined Prime Minister, Prime Minister Trudeau, had indicated early on, as early as 13, 14 years ago, when he had just begun his prime ministership of this country, served notice on all Canadians that constitutional reform, that the repatriation of The British North American Act, that a made-in-Canada Constitution was one of his first and foremost objectives as long as he was going to be entrusted with the job of being Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that Prime Minister Trudeau was every bit as determined, indeed far more determined than this Premier, than this government is in terms of their determination, in terms of their dedication to bring about constitutional reform to Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I don't often hold up Prime Minister Trudeau as my role model with respect to how I should conduct myself in politics, but on this particular

issue I wish, and I hold up Prime Minister Trudeau and that Federal Government, on the one issue that they at least understood that dealing with constitutions required a different approach. What did Prime Minister Trudeau and the Federal Government do, Mr. Speaker? They had the numbers in the House of Commons, they had them there. They had also in their book the tools of closure to be applied, as indeed it was applied in the great Pipeline Debate of 1956, which by the way, of course, saw the demise of that government that applied it, and saw that government defeated and brought in that great era of John Diefenbaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau dared not, Mr. Trudeau would not, Mr. Trudeau would not offend the Canadian public by attempting to use sheer numbers, his majority, in bringing about such a major change to the fabric, to the constitutional structure of this country.

So what did he do, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I remind you Mr. Trudeau is sometimes known for being arrogant. He is sometimes known for wilfully having things his way. For instance, in the matter of Senate appointments, or indeed in the matter of appointments of Lieutenant-Governors, or indeed in any other way, Mr. Trudeau is not shy to use the power that he currently has as Prime Minister of this country. But Mr. Trudeau, despite all of that arrogance and power that he has, would not do what this Manitoba New Democratic Party is doing to its people. They would not do that and they did not do it. They began a series of constitutional conferences that were held across this land and they were held in every part of this land.

A MEMBER: The Government of Manitoba got mixed up with a bad crowd.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, our province figured in a large way at one of those constitutional conferences that was held right here in Winnipeg, where all the 10 Premiers of the 10 provinces, along with the federal authorities, met to discuss the importance and to try to come to a coming-together to some understanding, to a consensus with respect to any changes that were to be made in Canada's Constitution. That's how a government that is sometimes described as wilful, sometimes described as arrogant, sometimes described as pushing over all opposition to have their way, that is the way that government approached constitutional change, Mr. Speaker.

I am not suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am entirely happy with that result. I think the role that my former leader, the Member for Charleswood, played throughout that great constitutional debate, the warnings that he uttered about the difficulties that Canada would find itself into when it moves off from a parliamentary system of government into rights enshrined in stone in the Charter of Rights but, Mr. Speaker, that was a very unpopular position to take.

I am satisfied the passage of time - indeed the time that has already passed - is vindicating more and more the concerns that were expressed by our then Premier of the Province of Manitoba, but nonetheless they sat and they conferenced, and they met and they conferenced more and they met more. That debate, in its highest and most intense form, covered a period of two or three years, and we are facing closure every

day in this House. We have only seen this proposal for a month, not eight months as honourable members like to suggest.

This is not the proposal that was laid in this Chamber last May or June. That proposal was changed and thrown out, was amended in September; that was thrown out; and in walks the Member for Springfield, the new Government House Leader, and says, honourable members, I have a brand new package to propose to you, brand new proposals with respect to constitutional changes here in Manitoba. That, Mr. Speaker, I will remind you, Sir - and I know that you don't need any reminding, Sir, but you are witness to that - that was laid on the people of Manitoba and the members of this House as little as a month ago. In fact, it was just about a month ago, January 4th, I believe; we are today February 7th or 8th, a month ago. Mr. Speaker, is a month an inordinately long time to deal with the first constitutional amendment to our Manitoba Act? I cannot believe that reasonable people would take that attitude.

Mr. Speaker, the admissions of the Minister of Natural Resources suggest that this is the only way this matter can be dealt with. The heavy hand, the heavy hammer of sheer weight of government numbers is the only way to resolve the issue before us. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is of course patent nonsense. There are reasonable ways open to the government to get us out of this impasse; the most reasonable being, for them to drop the package and walk away from it.

Mr. Speaker, who, in 1980, said that Francophone rights were being denied in any particular way? Who said, in 1980, that whatever action was going on at that time that French rights were being trodden on? Nobody, Mr. Speaker. Why are we faced now all of a sudden with the charges coming from honourable members opposite that unless we do this, unless we do that, Francophone rights are going to be set back? That's just not true, Mr. Speaker. Every once in awhile you have to clear all the smoke and other matters that obstruct one's clear vision of the issue.

There was not a language issue in Manitoba in 1980. It wasn't there in 1981, Mr. Speaker. Surely this government and this group opposite, seeking the election in 1981, if they would have identified that it was a burning question in the minds of that silent majority that this Premier speaks of, that somebody had to address the language issue, that the language issue could not go on unresolved, surely they would have blazoned it on their election literature; they would have held that out as a promise to the people of Manitoba: Elect us, and we will solve the language problems of Manitobans. Not a word, Mr. Speaker. We see their literature; we often quote it in this Chamber: "A Clear Choice for Manitoba." Why wasn't it there, Mr. Speaker? Because the issue wasn't there; there was no issue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let not honourable members opposite say that this is the only way to deal with this issue, to deal with this impasse. The clearest choice for this government, the clearest choice in the interests of the people of Manitoba is for them to drop the package.

A MEMBER: They're not listening now.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, with eyes closed, with minds closed, with backs turned towards the issue, and I don't mind them turning their back on me, but they're turning their backs on the people of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba are going to mind. The Premier will find out tonight in Selkirk that he can't turn his back on his constituents.

A MEMBER: If he shows up.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, if they don't want to offer and take up that first bit of advice that I have just given them, the advice that hundreds of thousands of Manitobans are asking them to accept, drop the issue, stop the divisiveness. Let's get back and be friendly with each other in this House and in Manitoba but, Mr. Speaker, failing that advice, and having brought with a great amount of energy on our part to a point from where they started to where they are now, let us at least help them make this into a package that is acceptable, if not to all Manitobans. I don't question the problem that that is perhaps an unobtainable goal in Manitoba, because after all there are Manitobans, and I respect their views, that simply say what's wrong with a unilingual English-speaking Manitoba? That's an argument that I can understand but I don't advance it, Mr. Speaker. But then let them withdraw this utter nonsense, this hiding behind the blue book of rules of weights and numbers, and come and debate the issue.

We have not been allowed to debate this issue, Mr. Speaker. Closure has now been invoked on us 11 times in a row and it is being invoked on us right now. Because, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen, let there be no doubt about it, this is closure that we are now talking about again. We are now operating under closure.

MR. D. GOURLAY: It's double closure.

MR. H. ENNS: We are now operating under double closure, as the Member for Swan River says.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious from some of the contributions that we have made in this Chamber, contributions that were just made recently in the Chamber from the Member for St. Norbert, and asking the serious questions about the impact of passage of the current amendment before us with its possible implications to other Manitoba statutes, we're not getting the answers. Those are the kind of answers that should normally flow in a debate on such an important issue. We have asked for the additional legal constitutional advice. Mr. Speaker, we're not being provided with that.

Mr. Speaker, history will record unfortunately this year, this Orwellian year of 1984, along with those other years that are often mentioned in this Legislature: 1870, the year of our birth as a province; 1890, as a year where a government, a Liberal Government I remind all - not a Progressive Conservative Government - arbitrarily took away guaranteed Francophone rights in this province. This year, 1984, will be a year that will kind of be appended to those two dates as being watershed years, in terms of the development, in terms of stresses and strains on our society and our citizens, much in the same way that 1890 was.

Mr. Speaker, there is no justification, absolutely no justification for the course that the government is now

imposing on us in this Chamber. The government has steadfastly refused to allow the debate to resume, no matter what they say, Mr. Speaker. For the Government House Leader to say that normal debate is, when he comes to see me and says, okay, Harry, we'll debate this issue but only until next week, or only until Thursday, only until Friday morning at 10 o'clock, we'll put the question, or insists on putting that kind of a hooker clause to the question of whether or not we can debate.

Manitobans - and I want those persons, particularly those persons that have taken the time to having come and visited us in the public galleries over the long extended debate that has taken place - you have to understand. That is the reason why the bells were rung; that is the reason why we walked out of here, because the only condition under which we were allowed to debate Manitoba's first constitutional amendment was provided that we agreed at the same time the date and the hour that we would cut off the debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's closure and that's an unheard of condition to be imposed on Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in dealing with such an important matter as our constitutional change.

Mr. Speaker, it's not too late to prevail upon the government, not too late ever to prevail upon a government that some reason, some thinking will take place and, if isn't with the members of the front bench, then it better start taking place with some of the members of the back bench. It better start taking place with some of those members that are hearing from their constituents in growing and growing numbers, Mr. Speaker. These are people that are giving you a message. These are people that don't necessarily dislike you. These are people, in many instances, that have voted and supported you and would like to do so again, but I've never seen a group of people that are making it that hard. I've never seen a group of so-called politicians making it that hard for loyal party supporters to come to your support and, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing that daily in the membership cards that are being returned to me. Yes, to me personally. Active, 1984 paid up NDP membership cards are being turned into my office and not in my office alone.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DOWNEY: Let it be recorded, the Member for Dauphin is laughing.

MR. H. ENNS: If I can't appeal — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to touch on every possible way that I can appeal to opposite members. I'm trying to give them the best advice that I can give them as a member of the opposition. The first advice of course is to drop the package, recognize the damage that you have done on this issue. This is not the kind of situation that you can prevail on in this issue. You may pass this resolution. You may pass whatever legislation you want, but you will be lacking in the spirit that is necessary to bring about the kind of understanding that you . . .

A MEMBER: That's right.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . I think, misguidedly hope for, Mr. Speaker.

Constitutions, in my judgment, can only be made or amended by consensus. Lacking consensus, constitutional changes should not be attempted. And I'll repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I said in an earlier speech on the same subject matter, that it is not too late to withdraw from your position. It is not too late for you to recognize. Go to those meetings that are being called. Go to your constituents and embalm the depth and soul of Manitobans about how they feel about this issue and then come to your senses.

For goodness sakes, come to your senses, because, Mr. Speaker, the damage that is being inflicted by this government on so many Manitobans in such an unnecessary way, for no good reason, is unforgivable; and it is that what will be remembered by this government and that is what will linger long after this issue passes from us.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps my best contribution would be for the next 10 minutes or whatever I have in speaking time to simply stand in silence . . .

A MEMBER: And pray.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . and worry about honourable members opposite.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: You might lose the floor.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, you'd put in a closure motion to take him out of his speaking chance . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: The Honourable Member for Dauphin says I might lose the floor. Well, that could well be, I could expect anything from this government, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure the honourable member, blood was spilled so that I could stand here and stand in my place as a free democrat in a parliamentary system and have my day and speak my piece.

Well, Mr. Speaker, regrettably, not too many honourable members seem to have that ingrained in their being. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to you that in attempting to find some understanding why a government would blunder into something like this, would make and act with such a heightened degree of insensitivity on this question, I raise the question and I raise it with some intrepidity because I don't want it to be misunderstood. I raise it not, certainly, in any personal way. But, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, my deskmate, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, in response to a speech made on this subject earlier on by the Attorney-General when the Attorney-General accused the opposition for having hidden the steps and actions and the policy decisions that the Lyon Government made with respect to extending Francophone services, the Attorney-General wanted to make a big case out of it; that we were hiding the actions taken that the Orders-in-Council passed; the Cabinet memos that were sent to the various government departments providing for and calling for common sense, reasonable extension of French Language Services, which no fair-minded Manitoban objects to, which certainly the Progressive Conservative Party doesn't object to.

The Attorney-General made a point of citing our action in how we handled that, because we didn't hold press conferences or because we didn't shout it from the street corner or from Portage and Main at every passing citizen, suggesting that we were doing something that was wrong.

Mr. Speaker, what, of course, we were doing and what we were demonstrating and what was said, so much more capably than I can say it, by the Member for Turtle Mountain is that we understood Manitoba. We have, and I say this not unkindly I want to assure honourable members opposite, by virtue of the fact that our roots, by and large, on this side of the House are far deeper than are many on that side of the House. It's a charge that I don't make in any disrespectful way of any member's right to be in this Chamber. — (Interjection) — Of course, I know they all have a right to be in the Chamber. They were all elected here just like I.

But the fact of the matter is that we have an inordinately large number of persons on that side whose roots go back to not more than five or six or ten years in the history of Manitoba, whether it's from Ontario, whether it's from Wisconsin, whether it's from Chicago, whether it's from - you name it - and I'm not making this as a charge on their rights and on their character and their capabilities of carrying out their responsibilities as an MLA, but I'm seeking for some understanding why they don't understand this question.

They don't understand this question as most Manitobans understand it. It is not bigotry; it is not being a redneck; it is an understanding of the people that make up this province that made the Lyon Government's approach to extend French language services the correct one, the reasonable one, and the one that most importantly of all worked and was accepted by the people of Manitoba, that didn't cause the kind of disunity, the kind of divisiveness, the kind of hatred that is now being spread through Manitoba and that, ladies and gentlemen, is your responsibility and this First Minister's responsibility.

The First Minister has demonstrated some political acumen on this question. He has in the first instance said to himself, or his advisors have said to him, the one thing you want to do, Howard, or Mr. Premier, is, don't get too close to this issue. This issue could be harmful to you, so stay away from it. First of all, let Rolly Penner, let the Attorney-General handle it. Then when the Attorney-General got himself surrounded in a you-know-what, it was then shifted over to the new Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member for Springfield, but the Premier carefully stayed away from the issue, stayed in the background, Mr. Speaker. Rarely did he debate the issue in the House. He didn't attend any of the public meetings, informational meetings, where this issue was being talked about throughout the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: And the Attorney-General left the province.

MR. H. ENNS: Indeed he did just the opposite, wrote pacifying letters to constituents of my colleague, the Member for Swan River, that meant to suggest that they were really not going down a path that they surely were.

Mr. Speaker, for the First Minister now, at this late hour in this debate, to stand up and slap his desk, or get involved in the debate is too little and too late; too little and too late. Manitoba has had no leadership on this question from our Premier. Manitoba has had no guidance on this question from our Premier on this question, and for him now to suggest that it is only the Conservative Party that is opposing him, and the vast majority, the silent majority of people in Manitoba support him in his language issue, then surely, Mr. Speaker, he should take up my offer that I gave him just the other day. What better position could you have in getting rid of two birds with one stone, getting rid of the opposition and being returned in overwhelming numbers by the people of Manitoba, that he says and he's stated so in this House, support him on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is precisely these kinds of issues, these kinds of situations, that give legitimate and credible grounds for calling a general election. These are the kinds of issues that from time to time arise - good lord, and they've caused it to rise - that are and can and ought to only be settled by the most important court in the land, namely, the one million Manitobans that mark their ballots and decide who shall govern and decide what policies shall be carried in this Chamber.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beseech honourable members opposite again, for those who may be listening - I think the Member for The Pas may be listening. The Member for The Pas is not really a bad fellow, he's not really a bad fellow. The Member for The Pas also knows that what he is doing is not conducive to the kind of harmony that is needed on this very important question in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I got him to nod acknowledgment of that.

You know, Mr. Speaker, even if you are totally committed and if you believe that what your government is doing is right, I'll grant you that's your right, you can believe that. But surely you are not blind, you are not that cut off from ordinary Manitobans, that you can see - you know, sometimes you can be 100 percent right and it's still wrong to proceed with something - and that's the kind of situation you're in because it's 100 percent to proceed. There are certain terms and certain conditions that you cannot proceed with.

Mr. Speaker, no, it is not opportunism. It is not opportunism, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what it is in the final analysis is democracy at its very best. It is ironic that this government that is imposing closure, this government that is doing every anti-democratic thing in this Chamber, accuses the Official Opposition who have the good fortune, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the good grace, because it doesn't always happen that things coincide at the same time. We believe with everything in our fibre that makes up our bodies that we are right in our position on this issue. We also have the good fortune that we know that a vast majority of Manitobans hold that view as well.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it is a question of democracy and action on our part, and it is a question of democracy in its poorest on the part of honourable members opposite.

Honourable members opposite would do well if they but accept any one of the courses that I've outlined to them. Drop the package; drop the bill. It's not the right time to be doing this. It's questionable whether

it's ever the right time to be doing this. It's a question in terms of the bungling and the handling of this issue, whether or not for those who might wish to do it, whether under this set of circumstances it can be done. That's my first advice, my first advice to you.

The second advice is withdraw these heavy-handed tactics of closure on us . . .

A MEMBER: It's double closure.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . double closure on us today and allow us to debate the resolution. Let us help you in making this package more acceptable.

We have made it far more acceptable than it was, when it was originally dropped into this House. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members don't have to take my word for it, but in the words of the honourable member who is now responsible for piloting this legislation through this Chamber, the Honourable Government House Leader, when he introduced the package that is now before us, he hailed that as a significantly improved package - a package that had taken in many of the concerns of thousands of Manitobans; that this government had listened to many of the representations that had been made on this matter and that he was now pleased to bring in that kind of a bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we know of course it's not a question of trying to take credit for it, but the improvement that even now exists from what was before us in May and what is before us today is largely there because of the determined efforts on the part of the opposition that kept this House debating till August 20th last year, then allowed for a recess to take place with the understanding that the debate would resume.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Imagine what we'd of had with that first package, Harry!

MR. H. ENNS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that's my second piece of advice to you. Now let's keep that in mind. I won't be offended if you want to write down this advice, so that you can take it back to your conference room and caucus it.

The first piece of advice is drop the whole matter, drop the matter. The second piece of advice is take the gun away from my temple that says I must debate it, I only have 40 minutes to do it and I can only make one speech to do it. Take that gun away and let me help you make this into an acceptable package. Let me help you make this into a package that most Manitobans will accept when it goes down to Ottawa. That's the second piece of advice, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know you, Sir, to be a fair-minded man. You have not spoken on this issue yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I want to hear from you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when you resume your chair. You have not been known to be silent in this Chamber, Mr. Deputy Speaker. You have given us many fine contributions with respect to the evolution of women or other such matters in this Chamber. Surely, Mr. Speaker, on this fundamental, important issue of the Constitution of Manitoba, you, and like so many of the honourable members opposite, will not sit silent in your chairs. How many of you have spoken on this issue?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: None.

MR. H. ENNS: How many of you have spoken on this issue? Why, Mr. Speaker? Because they invoked closure on themselves. They invoked closure on themselves, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, advice No. 2, allow us to help you improve the package, take away the gun of closure and allow us to help you improve the package.

Advice No. 3, Mr. Deputy Speaker — (Interjection) — write it down - recognize that if you are going to discard the good advice I have given you on Items 1 and 2 and that you are wilfully determined to pursue the course you are on, if that indeed is your determination, and I don't argue with their right to have that determination. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of being on the government side and I acknowledge that Executive Council, supported by sufficient numbers in this Chamber, have every authority, moral or otherwise, to pursue a policy that they feel strongly about and to see it to its fruition in this Chamber.

But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, bearing in mind that this issue was not even whispered about, did not appear on a single piece of NDP election material in 1981, they do not have a mandate for what they are doing and under those circumstances, follow No. 3 advice, call a general election.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. ENNS: Call a general election and let the people of Manitoba decide this issue for you. Let the people of Manitoba decide this issue for all of us, Mr. Speaker. That is the advice I give to honourable members opposite; that is the advice. Surely if they were thinking, they would follow it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: Come on get up, let's hear it debated. Let's see one of you guys . . .

A MEMBER: They won't debate. They don't want to debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the issue of closure but I think it's important that we take a look back a little further than just today. I guess, Mr. Speaker, as this issue continues on and hardens in public opinion, that I find it easier to stand and speak in my place, not more difficult, as members of the government find difficulty in standing to speak to protect the actions of what they're doing.

I think each and every one of the members of the Progressive Conservative Party now have not only the issue of the changing of a Constitution before them, Mr. Speaker, which has been demonstrated time and time again as incorrect and wrong, what they are trying to impose on the people of Manitoba by a constitutional change is wrong. The methodology and the way in which they have proceeded to change it, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

Now the third issue that is before us, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the removal of our rights and our freedoms that we were sent here to speak and represent the people of our constituencies is being taken away from us not only by the week but by the day and by the hour. We are now debating the matter of freedom and the removal of freedom to demonstrate by debate why we don't want to see happen what is being done to this province.

It's not just one issue and as I go through my comments I will make reference to the bell ringing and to the motion that I saw placed by the Minister of Natural Resources and it was a frenzy, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It was a frenzy following question period today when the Government House Leader rose and the Minister of Natural Resources rose after the Speaker had made the ruling that they were frantic to get on the floor of this House another motion to stop the members of the opposition from debating what is probably one of the biggest debates, the toughest issues that the people of Manitoba will have ever faced and will have, hopefully, ever faced in the near future in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what happened in 1981, the members of the government benches say that we are still sorry that we lost the election. I think we are definitely sorry we lost the 1981 election; not any more sorry than those people, and they weren't people who voted Conservative but the people who voted for the New Democratic Party and gave them the trust of the office of governing in Manitoba. It is being demonstrated daily by - as my colleague from Lakeside had indicated - the numbers of memberships that are being turned in to the Progressive Conservative offices, to the headquarters and to each one of us as members, and yes, Mr. Speaker, from your constituency as well, many many people coming forward and turning in their memberships.

In 1981, Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party was given the trust to govern the Province of Manitoba and make such changes to the laws of this province, to make such changes to policies of this province which would benefit, in the minds of the public that voted for them, in a better way than we were doing. There was no discussion of a constitutional change within the province. In fact, the Premier which I was proud to serve with, the Member for Charleswood, Sterling Lyon, was criticized for his involvement in constitutional debate in Canada. I again put on the record in this Chamber that I am extremely pleased and proud and happy that he was in that particular place protecting the rights and privileges of the people of Manitoba when it came to constitutional debate.

Yes, we saw the New Democratic Party elected to govern the Province of Manitoba but we did not have them elected or the people did not vote for them, Mr. Speaker, to become a dictatorship and that is what we are seeing imposed in the Province of Manitoba under the New Democratic Party, is a dictatorship-type government.

People say, the members of the government say, what about the bell ringing? You are anarchists and you are stopping the operations of government. That is so far from the truth, Mr. Speaker, because what we are doing as a loyal opposition is using the tactics that are available to us to stop a bad government from ruining the future of this province. Now if that is wrong, let

them stand in their place and defend it. It's not bell ringing, Mr. Speaker. It is freedom bells in the defence of the people of Manitoba. It is a mechanism and it is a tool, and it is now being taken away by a dictatorship, nothing less than a dictatorship, and I am not going to stand for it and neither are the people of Manitoba.

MR. H. HARAPIAK: Sit down.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Sit down, they holler. The Member for The Pas says sit down. I won't sit down and I won't take the kind of abuse that freedom has been given in this Assembly by these people who want to take away rights. It's not a matter of giving the French people rights, giving French language rights; it's taking freedom away what these people are doing, and we won't tolerate it nor will the electorate, Mr. Speaker, tolerate it. It is a removal of freedom that they are demonstrating, not the provision of freedom for people.

Why don't they wake up to it? Because the people, that silent majority that this Premier talks about, that silent majority aren't going to be silent much longer, because if they think for one minute that that silent majority, after this issue is bulldozed through by dictators, bulldozed past us, that it's going to go away, they will have to face it on every public platform in the next two years and every law and every act that they pass will be passed with a lack of trust of the people of Manitoba. That's how plain it is getting to be. That's how deep this thing is getting to be in the Province of Manitoba. That's what the people think of it. The trust of the New Democratic Party in government is gone.

I will, Mr. Speaker, try to carry on and point out again what I think and why this issue has deepened to the extent it has, and some of the alternative options that this government had when it came to making a constitutional change. It just came about in the last few years since this government came into office that they had the ability to change our Constitution the way in which they are able to do so. Probably before a constitutional change and I'm sure, Mr. Deputy Sepaker, you would not disagree with me, that the whole process of constitutional change should be debated and should be established.

The manner in which a Constitution, or a future change of our Constitution should be resolved by the Assembly, should be resolved by the people of Manitoba before such a major change along the lines that this government is trying to change the language of this province would be made. The process . . .

A MEMBER:: Why don't you speak on the motion?

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . I am speaking about the dictatorship and the closure motions that you put in twice in the last two weeks. That's dictatorship. Yes, it is referring to the rule changes which would eliminate the bell ringing which is the only technical thing that the opposition have left to stop you from running roughshod because the minute the bells quit ringing on a closure motion, the constitutional changes in Ottawa, and you tell me that it isn't. You tell me that your dictatorship hasn't by closure after this debate is through, tomorrow would be sitting in Ottawa after the closure motion on the resolution is passed, would be in Ottawa.

A MEMBER: Debate the bell ringing.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I will debate the bell ringing, and it is a matter of you again - we're talking about freedom - it's a freedom we had to stop a government from doing something that is wrong. It is a freedom, it is a mechanism we have. I'll tell you. You go to the people on bell ringing on this issue, call an election on it. Let's put it to rest.

A MEMBER:: You know what the people think of bell ringing.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I sure do know what the people think of bell ringing. They tell us to ring the freedom bells as long as we have to, to stop you from changing the Constitution which will last forever.

A MEMBER: Why am I getting calls from your constituents?

MR. J. DOWNEY: You haven't had one call from my constituency. Again he is misleading this Assembly. Who are they? Names. Name them. If I have to worry about bell ringing, Mr. Speaker, then that will be the day in this Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I will campaign on bell ringing for the rights and freedoms of my constituents and all the members on this side of the Assembly.

We are talking about why we are in this situation, because we have had a government that could have, by debate, talked us into the ground; they could have beat us by debate; they could have spun us out. But no, no, they proceeded to use the dictatorial task. It's liking having an election, Mr. Speaker, where you say we'll put the names of the New Democratic people running and that is who you will vote for. We will have elections but there will only be one name on it and it will be the New Democratic members. It could be changed. What if they were changing our elections so that we had to have an election every 10 years rather than every five years or four? What if they were changing that? Would they use the same tactics?

A MEMBER: Yes, they would.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I believe they would use the same tactics because they don't like debating whether or not we should have an election every five years or eight years, but because of some reason someone went to court over a government change, when it shouldn't or should change, they would do it in this manner.

A MEMBER: That requires two-thirds of the provinces.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, there he is referring to two-thirds of the provinces and again goes back to the point which I made. Before a constitutional change should be made, the majority of the people of the province should agree with it, and a different mechanism than just a majority in this Assembly passing it by closure to put it on to Ottawa . . .

HON. A. ANSTETT: Why did you agree to the amending formula in '81? Why did your government impose that

amending formula on the people of Manitoba? That's your amending formula.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader will have an opportunity to speak, I would hope he would do so. He hasn't been able to defend anything he's done in this whole process without moving a closure motion.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not happy the situation has developed to the point that it has, but what this is doing in the longer term is assuring the people of Manitoba that after the next election they won't have to worry about the New Democratic Party for many many years. I don't mind standing here, and I would say this to each and every one of them whether they think they're in a safe seat or not, I don't think there's what you would call a safe New Democratic seat left in the Province of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — I will challenge him to come and run in my seat then if he says it's not safe. I will get to the actions that take place in Parliament.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the comments are made about the destruction of Parliament. I believe that a dictatorship such as we're seeing in this Chamber by the New Democratic Party are those people who are contributing to the destruction of the Parliament of this province, and it is being demonstrated daily when my House Leader, when my Leader, when our people keep saying, Call the resolution so we can debate it. Let us debate it. We can't debate it unless it's on the floor.

It is the government's responsibility to call the business of the day, but it isn't called. The closure motion is called, Mr. Speaker, limiting the debate to 2 o'clock this morning, and by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the resolution will be sitting in Ottawa. That's not, Mr. Speaker, the way to change the Constitution of a province, which has such long-term implications for the continued divisiveness within each community in this province. It is wrong, it is wrong and wrong. It's not the destruction of Parliament, it's the saving of Manitoba, and we are not destroying Parliament. It is the tactics, it is the pressure, it's the gun to the head that this government are using in trying to impose again on the people something that against the majority's wishes and we will continue, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to do what is right in the best interests of freedom, in the best interests of this Parliament and in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, and I will not back off.

A MEMBER: Right on, Jimmy, let him have it again.

MR. J. DOWNEY: What were some of the options that this government had as far as the passage or the assurance of continued use of the French language in the Province of Manitoba? Well, I think the easiest and most acceptable policies and programs were those that they took over from the Sterling Lyon Government. What could have been easier than to adopt them, to expand upon them, to say to the people of Manitoba, we thought those policies were good and right, and that they were doing the job that had to be done, and we are trying to continue on with them? I can tell you, it would have been a lot easier for the people, for all the people, it would have been easier for the Parliament, and it would

have been a lot tougher for us as an opposition to criticize what they were doing, a lot more difficult. We wouldn't have been in to the kind of harangue that we're into over this whole issue.

We've offered suggestions, they've agreed they've come 170 degrees on this particular issue; it's the other 10 percent that we want to come. They have agreed that the validation of the laws was a major step by the agreement validated by the opposition to such a point that it caused the Government House Leader to have a great weekend of feeling that the Tories had, for some reason, given in; but all it was was a common-sense suggestion, which would have validated the laws of this province and removed any concerns that a court case would invalidate or cause the panic that they are so concerned about if the laws weren't valid in Manitoba. That's been suggested, it's not a matter of having any great difference on that.

We are seeing a government, a dictatorship, that are dealing with the priority of No. 58 on a list of 61. One has to say that if that is the case, let us wait for quite a number of months; let's let that whole issue cool off; let's not try and bulldoze it through by a dictatorship and the closure motions that we've seen - the second one - try to now eliminate the bell ringing, which is one of the only mechanisms that we have to continue to make our case, not only on the Conservative's part, but for a lot of New Democratic people in the province, and a lot of non-partisan people say what they are doing is wrong and that's the thing to use.

The government with No. 58 being this language issue on a list of 61, I think will have a hard time justifying to the people that this is the only reason that they called us back in, to debate. In fact, the more it is talked about, the more foolish the man who said it looks, and that, of course, is the man who is supposed to be spearheading the issue.

We are seeing daily a government in turmoil. The unfortunate part of it is they've now placed the province and the people of the province in a turmoil as well and it's deplorable. It is to the point where we saw yesterday in this Assembly, individuals speaking out - the only place they feel that they could get to this government - it wasn't right. It wasn't correct to do so in this Chamber, but that's to the point to which the people of Manitoba have become frustrated, Mr. Speaker. They are totally frustrated and they know, they have a feeling that what is happening here is totally wrong and are trying to, in whatever way possible, demonstrate to a hard-hided backhanded dictatorship that what they are doing is wrong. I would hope with all hope that they would concede to the requests of the opposition and of the public to withdraw or to call a provincial election.

The turmoil is something that no one wants to see. The divisiveness within the community of Manitoba is something that no one wants to see, and the people they are supposedly doing all this for, feel badly that it has developed and escalated to the point that it has. They don't believe in my estimation - I'm sure they don't believe - that the long-term outcome of this will be of any benefit at all. In fact, there will be a major backlash to it. I don't think anyone from either part of the province, or whatever background you're from, wants to see the continuation of the kinds of things that have been created by this government. So it will take at least a generation or two to put behind the

kinds of crevices that have been placed within the Province of Manitoba. The tearing apart of our social fabric and the willingness to work together has certainly been hurt in a major way.

The opposition have said day after day that we want to debate this, that we wanted to continue to put our thoughts forward, we wanted to hear from the government who are so hidebound and so determined that they are going to push something through against the wishes of 80 percent of the people. They go so far, Mr. Speaker. As the Government House Leader indicated earlier this week that they expected in the latter part of last week - were flying a balloon, flying a kite, suggesting that, yes, they would even go so far as to expect the Speaker to get involved in the debate which should be resolved by the people. And as we've seen happen, the decision made by you today has again brought debate into this Chamber, has brought the issue of bell ringing forward which we're now debating; discussing the rightness and wrongness of again another mechanism of closure to restrict or limit the debate on the closure and the changing of our Constitution in a way in which the majority of Manitobans don't want to see happen. Yes, that was part of the government's plan, a part of their overall attitude to the way this impasse could be broken.

The changing of rules in the middle of such a major issue in this province, I don't believe is acceptable in - whether it's in written law - but more particularly in the way in which the make-up of people in this province have normally been able to get along. And I'm not very happy that the Deputy Premier, the Member for St. Boniface, referred to this whole thing as a game that a referee or someone had to step in. It's far more serious than a game, Mr. Speaker, it has long-term consequences. It's no game; it's very serious. It's the very system with which we work and the respect we have for the whole parliamentary structure, and it isn't and shouldn't be referred to as a referee in a game at all.

The rule changes that we're being asked to make at a time when the feelings of the people of Manitoba are so entrenched against what they're doing hardly allows us room to allow for a rule change which would show weakness on our part in representing them. We can't in any way allow the government by that kind of a tactic to change, to give an advantage to them by their own doings.

The closure on the rule change, which is not acceptable to us and I'm sure is not acceptable to the people of Manitoba, could easily be the issue again on language in this whole blockage, could easier have been solved by what has been said many times by many people who understand the parliamentary legislative system, by when an impasse, such as this has developed within the system, that the question should be put to the general electorate, that it's not lightly that we're suggesting to the government that they do that.

We know very well, as they know, that the public would solve it for us, that the government would get the answers from that silent majority that the Premier refers to, that he feels the silent majority is with him. I have talked to some of the silent majority and they resent what he has said, because everything that they have done, whether it be through the Union of Municipalities, through the rural councillors who have

made representation to the government's hearings after they were forced into it by the opposition, they represent people. They represent that so-called silent majority and they resent what the First Minister of this province said yesterday. They resent it wholeheartedly that the Premier is very much misguided by his thoughts, so there is a silent majority.

As I say, by convention, by the system, the people should be the ones that are asked to resolve this on such a major issue. I believe that the majority of Manitobans would be very fair in their assessment if they were given the time, given the opportunity through an election campaign, to assess really the whole issue. I think the government may again take more seriously the words that we have laid on the record.

If the government were to withdraw, as has been suggested, the whole package and allow a mechanism for constitutional change to be developed, one which is fair and equitable and has the support of this Assembly, one that has the support of the majority of the people of Manitoba, then I think it would be a good move. It would definitely allow some of the hurt to heal that has been created throughout the different communities in Manitoba.

MR. D. SCOTT: The hurt to heal?

MR. J. DOWNEY: That's right. The hurt to heal because there is a lot of hurt and division out there that the Member for Inkster doesn't really understand, but I'm sure the Member for . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He doesn't understand. He's only been here eight years. He doesn't know anything about Manitobans; he's only been here awhile.

MR. J. DOWNEY: I understand. That would give them not only the opportunity to heal some of the wounds that they have created, but as well it may give them an opportunity to go to the people and say, in the next two years, let us proceed on the path that we wanted to go on, but we'll work with you and it may help them politically. It may help them politically and it doesn't have to be a political issue.

This whole business of language debate should not be a political issue, it should be what the law says is right. It should be carried out and it is this Legislative Assembly to provide for just and fair treatment. That's what we have been doing under demonstrated policies by our government, but something that has turned into turmoil under this misguided, misled group of people who don't understand what the people of Manitoba want.

Again it's been demonstrated time and time again. They can continue to proceed to force, to change the rules, to force changes that will muzzle the opposition. They can ignore the people, ignore the 40,000 names on petitions, ignore the requests that have gone to the Lieutenant-Governor; ignore the Grassroots movement; ignore the 200 people that were at the Premier's constituency the other night, or the several hundred that were in River East that wanted to talk to him about the issue.

The Member for Riel, who received a petition with some 1,280-some names, then says to them it may be

dropped. Yet the Premier says that's incorrect, that I was really debating at a low level to suggest that that was ever printed in the paper. That's to the point to which this Premier has got himself in trouble. We haven't heard from the Member for Riel. If that's incorrect, why doesn't she stand in her place?

Again, the Member for St. Johns hasn't. They are telling their constituents that they trust what the power is doing in their caucus and Cabinet. They trust them. The misplaced Government House Leader that floated in here as an assistant Clerk - and I have all the respect in the world for assistant Clerks, I'm not saying that there's anything wrong with them, they have a duty to perform - but it's those that find themselves into other capacities in this Chamber that sometimes get themselves into situations that have caused a lot of people and the province a lot of embarrassment and difficulties.

Don't take for granted, don't stand behind those people if they're taking you down the garden path and that's what they're doing. Stand in your place and let us get an understanding of how you feel.

The Member for Burrows, my goodness, who has stood in his place more and defended the democratic system and his conscience - he talks us about his conscience, telling him what he should do. I sat here and I was struck by the sincerity of that member. Mr. Speaker, he was so sincere about maintaining and representing the people of the province and fair play, but we haven't heard a thing from him. Has the back bench of the government been muzzled? The question has to be put, don't they understand what is happening? The question has to be put, do they understand what the government is doing or have they been muzzled or why haven't we heard from them?

MR. H. ENNS: We want Conrad, we want Conrad, we want Conrad.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Why haven't we heard from them? Did they say, we will put our coats up over our heads and we will walk backwards into the storm of public opposition. Is that what they are saying? That they don't really want to come back after the next election anyway?

The former Speaker of this Assembly, my goodness, I would have thought he would have stood in his place and told us about how he supports what the government does. I haven't heard what he has to say. The Member for Dauphin - I have heard the Member for Ste. Rose make a comment - but they haven't spoken on the closure. They haven't said to the people of Manitoba that the way in which they want to continue to govern will be to force everything through this Chamber, not by persuasion of debate, not by common sense, but by using the rules and changing the rules to satisfy the needs and the wishes of a desire.

That takes me to another topic and it's very much related, because we have been accused of red-baiting. We have been told that we of the Conservative Party, bring forward these issues, tie them to the communists, tie them to the dictatorship governments of the world, but they keep saying they're just red-baiting. That's all wrong, that's not right. Look, we're a New Democratic Party. Is a New Democratic Party a party that when

they run out of things to say, they don't use guns, they use their majority to muzzle the debate that can take place in the only place that we have to defend our people and they muzzle us? They muzzle us through the changing of the rules, remove the only thing we have, the freedom bells that really defend the people of Manitoba from having . . .

MR. SPEAKER, J. Walding: Order please.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . by closure, a constitutional change take place at 2 o'clock the day that that closure motion were to be passed by this Assembly, and at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning, it is sitting in the House of Commons. Sitting in the House of Commons. That's how quick this takes place. If the people of Manitoba don't understand it, then they should listen to this, because if we were to support or to have the closure motion passed today at 3 o'clock, this afternoon after question period, Mr. Speaker, by 2 o'clock in the morning, it wouldn't be in our hands any longer. There would be a constitutional change passed by the Parliament of Canada that could never be changed again by anyone. — (Interjection) — Yes, I shouldn't say, maybe couldn't. Well, I doubt if it could be. Who would have the will to do it?

That's the magnitude of the concerns that we are bringing forward, and yet the Member for Burrows, the Member for Riel, all those backbenchers - and I don't even think I've heard the Minister of Education say a word on this.

MR. H. ENNS: No, we have not heard the Minister of Education on this.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Can you tell me why we haven't heard from the Minister of Education, something that will go down in the history books, a major constitutional change, the content, the process, and how they bulldozed it through, the dictatorship, the New Democratic Party dictatorship, put it through the Manitoba Legislature in 1984, and the Minister of Education has not stood in her place and defended her government's action?

I've had some teachers come forward to me and say, "Are we equipped to continue on with our jobs after this change takes place?" I think it incumbent upon the Minister of Education to stand and tell the people who work within her department and under her jurisdiction what she thinks about this particular proposal, but she hasn't.

A MEMBER: Right. We want Maureen.

MR. J. DOWNEY: She says, "I'm prepared to put my coat up over my back and walk into the wind of political opposition and pass it and get it behind, because I'm really not that anxious to get re-elected anyway."

You know, it just tears the heart out of everyone of us that were elected to represent our constituents and do it fairly and properly in a legislative system.

MR. H. ENNS: Have we heard from the Minister of Labour?

MR. J. DOWNEY: I have not heard from the Minister of Labour. I haven't heard from hardly any of those

people who are prepared to use the heavy hand of a dictatorship to pass law and to pass constitutional change.

If it were only a legislative change, and don't take lightly what I'm saying about a legislative change, because a legislative change is a major process of this Assembly. It is law, it's what the people have to respect and which governs our day-to-day lives on a joint basis or those in a group society such as we live. But a constitutional change, which leaves forever the powers of this Assembly, that leaves forever the powers of the people of Manitoba and because we represent people who tell us to continue to protect them from what is wrong, we are again being thwarted from our opportunities of telling them because we are again restricted to debate to a certain period of time.

Unacceptable to the point where the calls for an election aren't light, it's not only the opposition that are calling for an election. It's people like D.L. Campbell who's made comments such, it's the harshest actions he's ever seen by any government. D.L. Campbell is probably the most . . .

MR. H. ENNS: This is supposed to be a caring government.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . respected legislative people, former legislative people, not only in Manitoba, not only in Canada, but the whole of the Commonwealth. Who knows better the system in which we live? Cabinet Ministers of his in a Liberal administration, the former New Democratic Cabinet Minister, who is pleading with this government, pleading with them, who probably respects this Assembly and understands it as well as the former Leader of the Conservative Party. You see, it's not a partisan thing at all. It is the protection of the system. It is the protection of the people of Manitoba and that's what we're defending.

Yes, we believe that there shouldn't be any changes to the 1870 laws which were put in place. We demonstrated support for them when the Forest case was adjudicated in 1979 and we carried out the laws of the lands. We, Mr. Speaker, believe that we are right. We don't believe that it's any God-given right. We believe that it's common-sense right to continue to do what we're doing.

I'm again going to challenge the Minister of Education to rise in her place when I sit down, because I think it's incumbent upon them in their capacity as Ministers of the Crown in the Province of Manitoba to stand and make the case for what they're doing, because this won't go away. They will go to many meetings in the future and will have to defend what they're doing. They won't be able to talk about grant and aid for special programs. They'll have to defend the wrong they are doing.

I again will go over the three things that I believe they can do, three things. They can withdraw the total proposal and give the public a chance to, first of all, work with them to provide a mechanism for constitutional change which is acceptable to the people of Manitoba. A constitutional change should not be done without two-thirds of the people of Manitoba or a larger majority than a sheer majority in this Legislature passing it. That would give them some credibility and

it would give them some political opportunities to reheat the wounds and it would help Manitobans.

They could, as I said, drop the whole issue. If they continue by force, as they are doing, they will destroy the future co-operativeness of this Assembly as long as they are in here as a government, and the whole legislative workings that are here, because the respect will not only be gone by us but by the people of Manitoba.

I believe that by convention in the normal process of a legislative breakdown on an issue so important as constitutional change that they should call a general election and let the people decide who is right and who is wrong.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Order please.

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

I once again enter the debate which stems from a resolution, a constitutional amendment which is before us; one which the opposition, of course, has indicated from the outset that they would not be supporting in its present form, and therefore really - I believe some two weeks ago - brought forward an amendment to that resolution, hoping that the government would see the error of its ways and would accept an amendment to that, their resolution, which we believe would be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba and would, I might add, be acceptable to the people of Manitoba. That, of course, is the crux of the whole situation that is before us today.

The reason that this debate is continuing is that the path that the government has embarked on is not acceptable to the vast majority of the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, in my 11 years in politics I have never had the number of phone calls, I have never had the number of approaches by people on the street, people that I do not know, people of my constituency, who are calling, who are stopping me on the street, who are meeting me in the coffee shops, saying don't allow the government to get away with what they are doing.

MR. H. ENNS: They are telling the same thing to Elijah.

MR. R. BANMAN: They are, Mr. Speaker, I am sure - unless the members opposite are hiding their heads in the sand . . .

A MEMBER: They are.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . telling them the same thing. I cannot remember, Mr. Speaker, of constituents phoning me, of seeing the number of New Democratic memberships cards turned in to even members of the Conservative Party. It has gotten to be a very interesting exercise.

A MEMBER: Come on, prove it.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's even down to the point where some members of caucus feel that maybe what we should do is start a pool to see who can collect the most NDP membership cards.

But what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is a deliberate attempt by a government who knows they are on the wrong course to force something through to try and move out of an area of embarrassment to them, which is creating large political problems for them, in a fashion which they believe is the quickest and most expedient to try and get the resolution solved. But what we are seeing happen, as evidenced by the motion made by the Minister of Natural Resources today, that they are totally inept at doing that. They cannot move this House along.

They have once again shown that instead of dealing with the main resolution and trying to arrive at a compromise, they have tried now again today to throw some more roadblocks in the path of the opposition in dealing with this important matter. That is what really I guess a number of us would call double closure. We have had closure on the resolution and we now have had a closure, in effect, on the point of personal privilege which really is going to again restrict, Mr. Speaker, the type of debate on the resolution, in other words, the bell ringing. We are down to three areas now that they have blocked the opposition and every time, so far, Mr. Speaker, have not been able to really deal with it.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Your predictions about this are just like your predictions on the Budget.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has, as I mentioned, in all my years, never been an issue that has so aroused the people of Manitoba of all political persuasions as this one has. Let me deal with what I said some eight months ago. I said that this particular package and the course that this government was embarked on would be the most divisive thing that this province has seen in many many years. Mr. Speaker, I stick by those words; that has become a reality and a fact.

The interesting thing is that it is not only as some people on either side of the equation would have us believe that it is the people who are not happy at any particular point with any Francophone or any services provided for the French fact, or the other side of the French fact which says that there are never enough services provided. It isn't those people that are being concerned now and it isn't the Anglophone community that is concerned. Mr. Speaker, it is the German community; it is the Ukrainian community that is upset. There are people who are frustrated from all walks of life. This is not an Anglophone-Francophone clash at all, and the tragedy of this whole debate is that the government did not have a pulse of this issue when they brought that in. That is the greatest condemnation of this government; they really did not understand the people.

Let me point out what has happened. We have got a situation today where there is such concern about acrimony and hostile feelings developing on all sides of this issue that you have a situation where this government, who thought they were going to be the allies of the SFM and of the Francophone community and do this, is faced now with the problem that many of those particular people that were involved are not

even showing up at committee hearings. Mr. Speaker, they are not even being vocal.

When is the last time you heard from Manitoba 23? When is the last time you saw a rally, Mr. Speaker, on the pro side of this issue? Mr. Speaker, I know because I represent an area of this total mix, because they are all concerned of the divisiveness of this particular resolution before us. That's why it hasn't happened, and that's why, I suggest to the government, if they are looking for a lot of support on this issue, it will not be forthcoming because people do not want to have any more wedges of divisiveness thrown in their path and the majority of people, including the Francophone community, would like to see this thing go away.

Along that line, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record an editorial comment from one of the rural newspapers and it's termed, "Political Disaster." Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial comment really reflects, to a large extent, the true feelings of the vast majority of people in Manitoba.

"Each passing day only seems to heighten the depth of the political quagmire into which the New Democratic Government is sinking. In the past days, particularly, it is becoming apparent just how deeply resentful many Manitobans are over the Pawley Government's apparent unrelenting resolve to push through its constitutional changes affecting the use of French language."

I might interject at this point, Mr. Speaker, many people and the question that's asked of me the most when I talk to people in the shopping malls and the coffee shops or on the telephone, is why? What has the Premier been promised or why is the government doing this? Why? I have to truthfully say, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know why. I really don't know why. I don't know what's motivating him in doing this, because it's not the people of Manitoba that are doing it.

Further the article says, "It must be obvious to all, but the most thick-headed in government, the passage of the legislation will almost certainly banish the New Democrats to political wilderness in the next election, probably held in the next year.

"It is evident that it's even being suggested the hatred generated by the controversial legislation will not subside until as yet unborn generations come of age. How much better that it were not so, that the government, had it shown more understanding and straight political savvy, had chosen a course vastly different from the one it is presently on

"Premier Pawley, a shadowy figure these days, conspicuously absent from some of the hottest debates, should have ignored all the legal advice, the legal experts, whose academic advice must have looked sound in theory, but whose political judgment was woeful and shortsighted.

"Many Manitobans, neither rednecks nor bigots, can readily comprehend that the French language and its inheerents were dealt an injustice by the Manitoba Government nearly 100 years ago."

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Radisson who has been very vocal on this issue, except in the Legislature, as I guess many of the members opposite have, unfortunately is in this position of having blinkers on when he comes to deal with this issue and that is the greatest problem that we, as legislators, face in this building. When one does not understand and does not want to read what the public is really saying, I suggest

to the member opposite, that is what is going to be one of his shortcomings and one of the bigger shortcomings of the government and one of the reasons it is in the predicament it is right now.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial goes on to say, "It may well be that a win for Roger Bilodeau in the highest court could eventually have led to an Order of Decree that all Manitoba laws be translated into French. Such an awesome task might take 20 years to accomplish, but at least the legal aspects of our province's constitutional crisis would have been resolved and the energies of all could have been directed to more productive aspirations.

"Moreover a Supreme Court victory for Bilodeau would very probably have prevented the divisiveness and bitterness now evident among Manitobans, feelings that threaten the spirit of co-operation and linguistic tolerances that have developed over the decades, as our present multi-ethnic society make-up evolve.

"For their part many Francophones must be asking themselves whether any victory they ultimately gain for the controversy will be worth the loss of good will, whether the benefits will be translated into even greater economic clout, many claim, has been denied them from the past language policy.

"In the end the very minority group this government is trying to appease, may wind up the big loser. The government unfortunately may eventually be held to blame by those on both sides of the volatile issue."

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I believe the writer of that editorial article really sums up very well what I believe has happened and one of the biggest problems that we are facing here today.

Just the other day the Member for Radisson was questioned about whether or not somebody had been appointed within the Workmen's Compensation Board to deal with people who wanted to have their cases or wanted to be dealt with in the French language. He confirmed that someone had been hired and appointed to do that. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to members opposite that if indeed that is the case, is something that if we have that type of . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: That's how you listen.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Radisson wants to speak, he can speak after me, but I doubt if he will.

HON. G. LECUYER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister for the Environment on a point of order?

HON. G. LECUYER: How could the member across have heard that when the job bulletin is still open? How could somebody have been hired as he just states?

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister for that information. It was not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the principle of hiring somebody and the government is hiring somebody to handle that. There hasn't been anybody on this side

that has raised any objections to that. Mr. Speaker, the question was raised by the Member for Elmwood, I believe.

HON. G. LECUYER: Same side.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the member says it's from the same side. As far as I've heard the last, unless the Member for Radisson wants to tell me, have the New Democrats kicked out the Member for Elmwood? He's still a New Democrat. So before you start pointing the finger at anybody else, you better have a pretty good look at yourselves before you start that. Mr. Speaker, there wasn't anybody on this side that raised any objection to the hiring of somebody to provide French language services within the Workmen's Compensation Board.

The question one has to ask is: was that required? Is this legislation required to do something like that? The answer of course comes back - no, it isn't required. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Radisson has had people sitting in the translation booth for the last three days because he did serve notice that he wanted to speak and I think for some three days the translation booth was manned.

HON. G. LECUYER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment on a point of order?

HON. G. LECUYER: Well that's another wrong assumption from the member from the other side. There hasn't been anybody sitting in the translation booth for the whole of this week, so why should he say such a thing in the House?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, if he wants me to get the specific dates, if he's down to splitting hairs, I'll get that for him. But for three days in a row there were people sitting there because he had served notice to the Hansard people he wanted to speak, and I have no objection to that. Nobody has argued that he can't do that. That is his right. Nobody got up and asked what are the people doing in the translation booth? They were there. There was no question about the cost of it or whether he had the right or not. But, Mr. Speaker, that was accomplished without this resolution. He didn't need the resolution to do that.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that the issue before us is one which I believe should have been dealt with by the government in a systematic manner that was established back in 1980. It was moved along and there were several changes made to the implementation of that back in 1982 by the then House Leader, the Attorney-General. Again, there was no public outcry, there was no acrimony, there was no divisiveness, there was no problem from the opposition in dealing with that particular subject because, Mr. Speaker, the people accepted it, the majority did, and that doesn't mean to say that everybody did. There are always people that won't be happy with certain things that any government does, but not when it comes to 80, 90 percent being involved in the type of animosities and the type of hostilities that we see developing over the next while.

Mr. Speaker, we are being asked here to deal with a motion which will, if we move it along, ultimately limit the bell ringing within this Chamber to two hours. Mr. Speaker, the use of the ringing of the bells in our democratic system is one which I believe is not of major concern to me. I say that, knowing full well, probably, that we are going to be government the next time around and the tables could be turned on us.

I want to say that I, as well as all my colleagues, are concerned about public reaction to excessive bell ringing. We are all concerned about that, as members opposite me, but the bell ringing can be a two-edged sword because if we abuse and the government is able to say that the opposition is really not doing the will of the majority of people and is using the bell ringing on frivolous matters and is really stalling and thwarting the best interests of the government in passing legislation or going ahead and developing their own policies and putting those policies through here, I want to say to members opposite that I think, unlike some of the statements we have heard from across the way, I think the bell ringing has served the people of Manitoba and the democratic system in this particular instance extremely well. My goodness, when you have 80 to 85 percent of the people against a certain issue, and the bell ringing on a closure motion on a constitutional resolution is one way in which the people's voices can be heard, then democracy is being served, Mr. Speaker. I think that democracy, unlike what the members opposite would have us believe that it is thwarting democracy, I would really believe that democracy is being well served.

This resolution before us, as so many members have said before on this side - unfortunately we haven't heard too many people speaking on this particular matter on the other side - but I believe that in this particular instance the bell ringing and the use of the bells has been in the best interests of the people of Manitoba and really has strengthened the democratic fabric of this province.

I believe further, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will have to finally come to grips with this issue. He has, unfortunately - my Leader asked him a few questions today and really we couldn't find out if he had really said what the Montreal newspaper had attributed to him. He really wouldn't come out and say well yes, this is what I am ready to do or this is what we are ready to do, and I am . . .

MR. D. GOURLAY: He can't remember what he said.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, my colleague from Swan River said it really sounded like he couldn't really remember what he said. Of course, with the pressure he is under these days, maybe that is a pretty conceivable sort of a thing to happen.

I say I want to just dwell a little further on a few other things. We have seen, over the last while, an effort by the Minister of Cultural Affairs. He, back I believe in June, got up and spoke on the then resolution and in a very well-prepared speech laid out the reasons why he was supporting it. Interestingly enough, we haven't heard anything from him since then, but I think one of the initial things that happened and one of the initial responses from a lot of leaders within the ethnic

communities and within other groups - some saying that yes, it was a good thing and it was really going to help a lot of the minority groups - really came out and said that because of a fear of something that I believe causes us great difficulty in government from whatever political stripe.

Once you start giving people grants to run their organizations and groups become reliant on that, they have a great difficulty in criticizing it. I say that from both sides of the government. People who are receiving funds from the government lose a certain amount of independency because if you are going to give any ethnic group \$100,000 a year and they plan all their programming around it, they know full well if they suddenly are on the wrong side of the fence the next Cabinet, when they are passing an Order-in-Council, they could very easily say, hey, these guys aren't being too friendly and we should maybe have a look at this grant.

Now, rightly or wrongly, Mr. Speaker, what has happened is that we have made a lot of groups - the Minister of Fitness is sitting here - dependent on government. Whether it be sports groups or cultural groups or ethnic groups, they are, to a large extent, reliant on government and it does take a large part of their autonomy away. I know many of us don't want to talk about that in this Chamber, but it indeed is a fact and you can sit down and talk to some of the people and they will, quite candidly, in the quiet of their home or in their organization, mention that yeah, that is a concern, you can't really come out and criticize government, whether you're getting it from the Secretary of State or you're getting it from a NDP Government or a Social Credit Government, wherever it is. People are reluctant to say anything about it and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that part of the motivation in the beginning on this issue was the fact that some of these people really were concerned about what was going to happen to them in the future, if there wasn't some attempt made to at least indicate some tacit support of what the government was doing. I'm sure there was some solicitation on the government's behalf, maybe through some intermediary or something, to receive that and that's fair ball and I don't blame those people at all for doing that.

However, Mr. Speaker, once the issue had got down to the average person on the street and not the executive directors or the board members and the people really started to understand and started to see what the average person was saying, I believe that a lot of these people backed off. That's what has happened to the government right now. They are really sitting there, hoping for some support from some quarter, and that support is not coming. It's not coming from anywhere and that's got to be a serious dilemma they've put themselves into.

As I mentioned earlier, I think the amendment put forward by the Member for Fort Garry is one which the government should have a serious look at. When that amendment was introduced on a Friday, I believe, it was really heralded as being an amendment which, as the House Leader then put it, was a major reversal on the part of the Tory Opposition. It gave us some credibility, he said, and I believe that with the feeling out there the way it is right now, that the best interests of all Manitobans, including the Francophone

community, would be best served if the government just sent their House Leader across here to talk to ours and say, heh, let's deal with this matter. Let's take that resolution, let's take that amended resolution and let's go ahead and pass that. We could be out of here in a day. All you have to do is vote for that amended resolution. We'll move on and the resolution goes to Ottawa and it meets the two basic criteria that the Attorney-General started bargaining with and that was what? To reduce the number of statutes to be translated from 4,000 to 400 and it also validates the laws, and that is basically what the Attorney-General started out dealing with. I say to members opposite, that is a consensus we can all arrive at and that all the people of Manitoba will agree with. They will all agree with that. They will agree with that.

MR. H. GRAHAM: 80 percent, 80 percent.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that we see involved in what we are undertaking here on the impasse that has been arrived at and the corners that everybody has been put into, is one which I, for one, am not happy with and I'm not too naive to believe that it will not cause problems for everybody involved. I say to members opposite that if you really want to put this behind you and you really want to do the people of Manitoba a service and rectify some of the ill-will and some of the divisiveness that has been caused by the action till now, vote for this resolution. We can send it off to Ottawa and we'll have a consensus in Manitoba. My Leader has already indicated that should the government accept the amendment, we would be voting for the resolution. We're ready to move that along, but we cannot pass the resolution in its original form. We cannot. Our people will not allow us to and I cannot, in good conscience, Mr. Speaker, go against the wishes of the majority of our constituents.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: I want to just briefly reiterate . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the battle started in 1980 by the then Conservative Government, continued on for a year or so by this government, was the right one. It was being accepted by the majority of people and then suddenly we had a change of heart, and as I indicated earlier, the majority of people are asking why. Isn't it interesting that now, after the Attorney-General has been replaced - I know it's not right to refer to the absence of members - but where is . . .

A MEMBER: We'll do it anyway.

MR. R. BANMAN: No, I'm just going to say where is he? Isn't that a sort of a typical . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Where are you?

A MEMBER: Where is the author of all of this?

MR. R. BANMAN: Isn't it typical for someone of that, I believe, political persuasion to really stir the agitation within a volatile situation like this and then take off. I find that incredible. I find that incredible. Someone who was involved in this thing from Day One, and now to see the course of action that he's taking with regard to this. This is something that I think is inconsistent and also not again in the best interests of this House, and especially not in the best interests of the New Democratic Party, but of course, it couldn't happen to a nicer bunch of people anyway.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I say to members opposite, if you are concerned about this, let's hear from you. Let's hear from you. Let's hear some debate on the resolution. Let's hear the Member for Riel get up and say why she is supporting the government on this issue. I'm sure her constituents would like to know. Let's hear the Member for Burrows get up and say what he really believes, why he's doing this.

MR. H. ENNS: And I want to hear from my Minister of Education.

MR. R. BANMAN: Let's hear from the people. Let's hear from the Minister of Education to see what kind of plan she has in place to deal with the many requests that are going to come in for additional immersion programs if this is passed, and we all know that's going to happen. As mentioned by the Member for Arther, there is a growing concern among the teaching profession that there will not be enough people in place to handle this. What kind of plans has the government got to bring more teachers, to retrain teachers to deal with the situation that's going to develop?

Mr. Speaker, I plead with the government to go ahead and stop this acrimony; stop this impasse that's evolved in this House; vote for the amendment by the Member for Fort Garry. Let's move it along. I'm sure we can get on with other things. Members opposite like to get their Estimates finished and their Budget drawn up and things like that, terrific. Let's do it for the sake of the people of Manitoba, let's do it, let's pass it the way it's been amended by the Member for Fort Garry; get this over with and hope we can heal some of the wounds and some of the divisive things that have happened in the last eight months and once again, that we stand together as Manitobans who can relate with their neighbour on a basis of friendliness, on a basis of understanding, and on a basis of love for their fellow Manitoban. Let's deal with the resolution and we can all get on to doing the things we should be doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think that you have been very accommodating, very patient, and I certainly do not rise to protest. I think it's been obvious that the three speeches we heard from the members of the opposition have been three speeches on a completely different motion. The last speaker closed by saying, well let's vote for this motion - he forgot that we were not even talking about this motion - let's vote for this motion and then everything will be all right.

Now it's obvious what the members of the opposition want to do. If I was a betting man, I'd give any odds, Mr. Speaker, that every single one of them will speak, and speak the limit on this motion, it's quite obvious. In fact, it's quite obvious that I hope that they - and I'm not going to protest if they want to speak about the moon and the sun and anything else, that's fine - if they want to delay the debates in this House there's not much point.

I will even try to be helpful to them because there was an appeal from across there, trying to get this whole con game of the Minister of Education, we want to hear from you, the member from here, to help you waste some of the time. So I'll go along with this appeal. I'll try to discuss the motion in front of us and I'll try not to yell or bang desks or read and quote all kinds of letters. I'll even go along and agree with many of the things that the members from across are saying, but on the last thing, I think you'll see why I support this motion, Mr. Speaker.

The situation is, first we talked about 80 percent, your people want that, what are you doing, why don't you vote? Well there's two different ways and they're both accepted by different people and it's up to the people themselves, the MLA's themselves, to choose or decide why and how they are representing the members of their constituencies.

Some members feel that they are pulse takers and they should find out how many people are for one side of an issue and how many are against, and then they should always represent the majority of their constituents, and I'm not saying this sarcastically or in a spirit of criticism. I'm saying that this is a method that is accepted by some.

Others feel that they are there because the people have confidence in them and they feel they will have to do certain things that they might not like, having all the facts in front of them, having the information, and try to be fair and honest and they feel they might have to vote even if it doesn't go along with the majority of their constituents and both methods are accepted. It is sometime in the long run, you hope, when you know that something is not popular with your constituents, that when all the returns are in and so on, the people will realize that you are doing what you think is right and you're following the dictate of your conscience.

I dare say that if you're too often voting, you're out of step with the majority. You won't be re-elected. That's a chance that you must take and that is something, a decision that you must make yourself. There is no doubt about that.

Now the situation is, you know we're told if you were only reasonable, just agree, just vote in favour of what we say and everything is fine. Well we can say exactly the same thing. We could be out of here today, just agree with what we're saying. So you see, we are a member of the government and the opposition and we do not agree on this. Why don't we decide that right now? We know it's obvious that we've reached an impasse, that you can talk until you're blue in the face. We can do the same thing. We're not going to convert each other. We think we're right and we're saying that we think, we'll agree. We'll go along with thinking that you're right. We'll give you credit for that, for the sincerity. But we've reached an impasse if that is the case.

We do not deem that the referendum meant anything. You had people opposing and some people that want more of the service, such as Forest who campaigned in favour of the referendum. Besides as a group, we do not want to govern by referendum. We don't need to be elected for that. You just talked about referendum and that's it. We do not believe in that. We feel that we have a responsibility. — (Interjection) — Frank, will you keep quiet and read your Bible for awhile, or go to sleep? Let me finish because I'm not going to speak for 45 minutes and then you can tell me how much guts you've got and so on and we'll play games together.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this is the situation that we have. Now we have talked about this. We are told you'll be finished in no time. We are ready to have a discussion on this but we'll say after a certain time. You know we were talking about the Jets negotiating and after awhile they said enough is enough. You've got till 12:00 noon and then you tell us, accept or reject. We're saying the same thing. If you want to discuss it, we could have discussed it for a long time. If you think that's bad, if you think that's crushing democracy, let's look at the rules that these people in this House made. We speak on an important thing like a Throne Speech or the Budget which covers the waterfront eight days and everybody speaks and we can adjourn it and that's fine.

Now we've had months and here we've been how many weeks on one subject? Look at the repetition at the things we hear. There's nothing new and we're told we're fighting democracy. Okay. Why don't we put everything on the table? You have what you think. You have something going. You have some people with you, fine. We are not going to let go on this. We've tried to co-operate. We've tried to do everything we can to get you to work. It's obvious that you will not give any more, neither will we and the public of Manitoba will know that. We are not breaking any laws. Don't call us dictators. We are using the rules of this House and the rules of a democratic Parliament to bring in; that is what we are doing. We are using rules that are not used every day. We are using rules that could be dangerous - we are ready to accept the responsibility - but we are using rules that are there when there is an impasse and to make sure that democracy will triumph and that a duly elected government that has a majority will decide the schedule of the House and will bring in any legislation that we get.

Can you see what you are doing? Can you see that any time that an opposition doesn't like something, they can say we will ring the bells and they could leave forever and then yell - like some are saying - let's have an election. Is that the system that we want? As I said earlier, I am supporting this motion because this motion is fighting for democracy. This is not a question. This motion has nothing to do with French services; it has nothing to do with referendum; it has nothing to do with that at all. It is a motion that is saying, all right, somebody discovered after a hundred years that you can beat the government no matter what kind of majority. You can be three on one side, you can beat the government because you need only support of three

to have a recorded vote and you can ring the bells. We are saying that was never meant to be in a democracy that the minority, no matter how much they think they are right and no matter how much they are right, there will be a day of reckoning if we are that wrong. There will be a day of reckoning. Now, if we have to change the system, let's change the system. Your best friend, some people - no, I am going to refrain from that. I am not going to be mean on this thing.

But Mr. Green himself, who certainly has been supportive of you on this thing, is saying, well, that has to come to a vote. Mr. Spivak is saying the same thing, and all of you are saying, and you know that privately you challenge us. Some of them challenge us and some have practically begged us to bring the closure motion to get you out of this impasse. — (Interjection) — Gary, you know I am telling the truth. You know it.

This is what it is. This motion is talking about freedom of democracy. Freedom, you know, what do you call freedom? Freedom - I am going to go on the street and show that I have guts like Frank. I'll take a rock and throw it in the window and say I am free to throw this rock. Is that freedom? Freedom is the freedom to be heard. You will be given all the chances, you were given all the chances and you go ahead, but freedom is to say that eventually a duly elected government has the right to call for a vote.

So what are we asking? What are we asking now? Not if it's what?

A MEMBER: You were a bad government; you were for four years.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Now, all right, you can see the danger of that. Let's say that not only this is a bad government but this is the worst government in the history of Manitoba in the eyes of these people there. Let's say that you really believe that. You want to be in a position not through an election but through the side by saying I want to take my bat and ball and go home, this is a bad government. What makes you think that when you come here that the next opposition will not do the same thing? We can have an election every month; that would be a lot of fun. It would create jobs anyway.

Now we have an impasse, there is a dilemma, and we are trying to bring an end to this by saying what? We'll go to the Rules Committee. You even tried to block that, you didn't want to go to the Rules Committee; this time you want to go through a routine thing. It should have been a long time ago. This is a group of intelligent people that are together that are trying to run the affairs of a province. You are all free enterprise, can you see free enterprise running like the way you have been running this lately, of running out and saying, no, I don't want to play ball?

Now, this is it. We call the Rules Committee to block this, let's have a certain time, and now we are saying some people have 10 minutes to ring the bells, we are saying two hours. Now, what is so wrong? You are talking double closure. We will do everything and anything that is legally right to bring this to an end. You are right; we don't apologize for that. We will suffer the consequences and the people of Manitoba want that. Many of your supporters want that. Many of your

supporters are saying okay, you have made your point, this has gone far enough, because those people are real believers in democracy. I am not arguing the services in French. It wasn't something that I instigated, and I have some complaints about that but that's not the point. We are now fighting to keep democracy alive.

Can you just see, if you can, in opposition, paralyze the work of this House no matter how great you are and how dumb we are, how saintly you are and how devilish we are, can you see what's going to happen? Let the public decide. It's not up to Frank Johnston or somebody else to decide. It's up to the public, and there will be an election and you use it next election. Set it up and use it next election and tell it, but now don't stop the work of this House the way you have been doing now. There is no end to that at all and there is an impasse and the impasse we will not agree with what you are saying; you will not agree with us. We don't want to force you; you don't want to force us. We want to go on record as bringing a vote, as continuing the work that this House is supposed to do and then we'll answer the consequences, we'll answer the thing.

Now, is that asking for too much? Is there anybody out there that feels that you cannot support this resolution? You cannot support that when there is an impasse we go to the Rules Committee, there is something sinister in that? There is something sinister that a committee - you have sat in committees before - that is named for that will not discuss the business of trying to have better rules where people will agree? And it is sinister to have all the people here and ask for a vote and somebody said, well, let's have a recorded vote and the Speaker said call in the Speaker and they all go out. Call in the Speaker and they go out. Now we are saying okay, you have got two hours to go to the washroom and smoke your cigarette. Isn't that long enough? Even those long cigars, you can smoke that in a couple of hours. You can do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is an appeal to safeguard democracy. Forget it, let's argue. Let's argue the French thing; let's argue that on the question on the resolution. It's obvious now that there is an impasse, you know, people don't always agree. In fact, in government and in the House they seldom agree, and it is the role of the opposition to point out, to make it difficult for the government to make sure that the government covers all the angles. You are doing that; that's fine, no objection, but there has to be a limit. You can't go on forever and ever and ever and paralyze the work of the House. Somebody talked about some guys waiting for three hours. We have had all kinds of people, what did it cost? What does it cost everyday to go - the shenanigans - to have that? How much does it cost in dollars if you want to compare about the person that wasn't there? How much? I think those are things to remember.

So I do appeal to you to dispatch to vote for this resolution, and we are ready. I think I can very confidently say to you that we are ready to discuss that, providing we know that there has to be a limit sometime and, when you agree to that, I am sure that we are ready to provide enough days.

Maybe we should do that; maybe we should say on a certain time it comes to a vote. If you want to adjourn it, you adjourn it and so on, but it comes to a vote a

certain time, like you think is very fair in the Throne Speech and like you think is very fair in the Budget Speech. So this is what we're saying, and we are appealing for that, because you are going to be responsible for this, if you destroy the democratic system that we have, and that is exactly what you're doing, and you know it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm most disappointed in the honourable member that just spoke, a man that's been in this House for I dare say more - there's only two members that have been in this Legislature as long as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, himself and the Honourable Member for Charleswood - and stand up and make that kind of a tear-jerking speech in this House . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'll explain the reason why. Mr. Speaker, he says about rules and about using the rules. Here we have a government or a caucus, of which he's a party of, changing the rules in the middle of the debate.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What rules?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: The rules that we've been operating under in this House, by this resolution that your House Leader put before the House and the guy that likes to join these flag ceremonies behind you there, the Attorney-General, moved then that the question be put.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Attorney-General is not here.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Now that, I'm sure, I can plead with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, isn't that a strange motion that came from the member behind you? How many times in your lifetime here have you seen that motion put?

Let me tell you the other thing, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members hadn't raised the matter of closure, this debate would have been over 10 days ago. It would have been over; we'd run out of speakers. We would have been absolutely - as many amendments as we could possibly provide to this House for debate would all have been debated, Mr. Speaker . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: So you maintain it's only stubbornness then.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: . . . and the debate would have . . . Now who's he trying to kid me, the Honourable Minister of Health, who is abusing the rules of the House and who's abusing the privileges of Parliament? They don't even understand what closure is all about and that is the other reason, Mr. Speaker, why they're such a bad government. They're a bad bad government.

They don't understand even how the rule of closure applies in this House, because I'll say it again, Mr. Speaker, if they had not applied the closure motion, the debate on this issue would have been over long ago. Absolutely. Unless of course, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite were prepared to rise to their feet because on the few occasions they've spoke on this issue, it has to come when the closure motion is on. The last time I think we had three speakers over there, but here they are, they won't speak today on this issue. They don't have no suggestions to offer, they don't have no amendments to offer, they don't have any ways to solve this problem; all they do is change the rules, change the rules in the middle of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I've been here since 1966. This is the first time I ever saw the rules changed in the middle of the debate and that is strange, but what's the reason? The reason, Mr. Speaker, is because it's a bad government. It's a bad bad government who don't understand the rule books, who don't understand Parliament, who in many cases don't know what they're talking about. That's the tragedy for poor old Manitoba. I'm surprised at the Minister of Health, a man that's been in this House for all those years, would rise in his place today, Mr. Speaker, and try and put that kind of sentiments on the record, because I think he knows better, Mr. Speaker, because he's a very learned man. He's a very able debater, but on this occasion today, he did not do himself justice, nor did he do Parliament justice, nor democracy by the arguments that he raised because they're too shallow.

I agree with the Honourable Minister of Health. We certainly are at an impasse on this issue, Mr. Speaker, but he says we are ready. You're ready for what? He says we're ready. What are you ready for? Are you ready to accept our amendment, or are they ready to change some more rules? Are they ready to bring in more closure motions? Are they ready to mislead the people of this province? Are you ready for an election? What's this business you're ready for? What is this business that the Minister of Health is ready for, Mr. Speaker? More closure or more turmoil in this province? More people going home at night with heavy hearts, saddened by the performance of this government, who are tearing the heart out of this poor old province and its people because they don't understand, Mr. Speaker, what's going on amongst the hearts and the minds and the wishes of the people of this province and that's the tragedy. These left wingers over here, Mr. Speaker, these so-called socialists are tearing the heart - not only of our people, but our province.

What's it all about, Mr. Speaker? The man that started this issue, the Attorney-General, who I've asked here dozens and dozens of times, where was this deal cooked up? Who was there? Well, we know where the Attorney-General is. I said in my speech here about three weeks ago, I said he got sent to the salt mines in Siberia or someplace, but we hear now it's not Siberia. He's been recycled to some other place. He is long gone. The Attorney-General is not here, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless they're still ploughing ahead this government, even those 80 percent of the people in this province are telling them to stop, halt it, let's call an election. They're still ploughing ahead, Mr. Speaker, with more muzzling, such as the motion that the Minister of Natural Resources and we're going to get more

closure motions and the Minister of Health is going to stand up in place again next week and mislead us on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I say again, for the benefit of you, Sir, and members opposite, if you had not brought the closure motion in, this debate would have been over early last week, all over, but they still want to pour the coal to us, Mr. Speaker, they want to fight democracy. They want to fight the people. They won't call an election and then they stand up today and put this motion, which says put the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, all the years I've been in politics, my people tell me when any government or any politician gets in trouble, you go to the people. You go to the people, Mr. Speaker. When in trouble in the political arena, you go to the people and let the people settle the issue.

A MEMBER: Jerry doesn't even talk to them in Flin Flon.

MR. W. McKENZIE: Yes. Mr. Speaker, this horde of socialists over here . . .

A MEMBER: What's going on in Flin Flon?

MR. W. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, these socialists got no guts. They wouldn't go to the people on this issue. No, they wouldn't go to them. They got no courage, Mr. Speaker. They got no support. They know they have no support. They have no debaters over there, Mr. Speaker. They have no understanding, Mr. Speaker. They wouldn't dare call an election on this issue and they know they're wrong.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. W. McKENZIE: And that's why we're ringing the bells and that's why we're fighting here till I can't breathe. When you get a bad bad government that's got a bad issue before the people and the people don't want them to carry out that mandate, what do you do, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, you fight with every tool that you have at your disposal, and that's what we're doing. We're using the freedom bells, Mr. Speaker, to try and head off this bad bad government for making a bad deal unless they'll accept our amendment.

I know the Member for St. Boniface, maybe if he's ready to take a look at the amendments that we're proposing, let's start there and then the build on the Constitution another year, but I tell you we wouldn't do it the same way next time. You would come in with a Green Paper, Sir, then you'd come with a White Paper, and you'd treat the people of this province the way they deserve to be treated on issues like that. You wouldn't have a meeting in a shed someplace with the Attorney-General, where nobody knows who was there, nobody knows if there's any minutes, nobody knows who was the secretary, nobody knows what took place, and they want to come here, Mr. Speaker, and amend the Constitution of our province, and the other tragedy, they don't know how many laws in this province that's going to be enshrined in the Constitution.

Would the Minister of Health, in his wildest imagination, Mr. Speaker, dare carry out that kind of a mandate? Enshrine laws that you don't even know which laws you're going to enshrine?

A MEMBER: That's right. That's what they're doing.

MR. W. McKENZIE: That's got to be a sick government. That's got to be a bad government. That's got to be an irresponsible government. That's got to be a government that doesn't care. That's got to be a government that doesn't understand what the people of this province are all about, Mr. Speaker, and they should be turfed out of office at the earliest possible date.

I feel sorry for the Minister of Health, who rose in his place today, and he did make a very compassionate speech, but, Mr. Speaker, he's got it all wrong. He's got it all wrong. Some of the members on this side, until you get it right, we're not going to let it leave this place. Until you get it right, we're not going to back off. We're not going to give up; we're going to hopefully get it out of here in the right form so the people in this province stand up 100 years or 1,000 years from now and say, "You guys in 1984, you legislators and you ladies, you done a good job for Manitoba. You done a good job for the people."

That's what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker, but we're not doing it. We're not doing it. It is most unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, if this is democracy N.D.P. style in this province, or democracy Howard Pawley style - double closure motions, a Minister of Natural Resources rising up in his place and says, "Put the question, put the question, put the question; don't let anybody talk, put the question." That's the new type of left-wing socialist democracy that we can expect in this province and of this government. They don't even trust us to debate, he says, "Put the question," the Minister of Natural Resources.

I resent that. I know the Minister of Health never ever saw that practice used all the years he's been here. I've never seen it before, but that's how desperate they are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, these are dangerous people that we have over here, they are dangerous dangerous people that will go to those tactics, double closure, and then the Minister of Natural Resources rising in his place today and saying put the question, put the question, don't give the members over there a chance to even talk, just put the question. That's the new Pawley, the NDP type of democracy of this province.

Mr. Speaker, what do they tell the people? "A Clear Choice." What kind of a clear choice do we have on this issue, Mr. Speaker? Put the question. Is there any choice at all?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when this matter next comes before the House, the honourable member will have 28 minutes remaining.

This House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).