



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-864B

VOL. XXXI No. 181B - 8:00 p.m., MONDAY, 13 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	Virден	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 13 February, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Government House Leader and the motion thereto proposed by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Honourable Member for Niakwa has five minutes remaining.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the closing at 5:30, I had just about wound up my remarks, but I hadn't quite wound them up because I had quite a bit to say. I had an appointment at an opening of a school, which is kind of a unique situation these days, out at River Park South. I was there for the opening of the school with the Deputy Minister of Education and all of the people out in that area, a fine area. It happens to be part of my constituency, and I'm looking for great things in that particular area, Mr. Speaker.

Welcome to all of the people who have just arrived this evening. You missed a real good presentation from about five minutes to 5:00 till 5:30, but you're going to catch the last five minutes — (Interjection) — oh it was about - well that's right. There was quite a bit of interference, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure that will be taken into consideration when you are looking at the limit that I can speak.

Just as we were leaving, Mr. Speaker, I was accused of getting down into the gutter by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. Mr. Speaker, I resent those remarks. He has taken liberties before, and I have never fought back. As I mentioned earlier, the white gloves are off. The bells are the sound of war, and I will not — (Interjection) — I think he's here to defend himself, because I'm not going to stoop to his level, Mr. Speaker. I will not get down into the gutter with him and fight with him down in the gutter. I'll fight with him on the plain. I'll fight with him when it comes time to debate but, Mr. Speaker, he has backed down. He will not debate.

I heard the Honourable Member for Thompson calling one of my associates the gutless wonder. Mr. Speaker, this was a remark that I attribute to the Honourable Member for Thompson. I am not going to suggest that the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources is in the same category, but yes, I guess I will suggest that he is, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba won't forget, they won't forget what is happening, what the government of the Province of Manitoba is doing to all of the people of the Province of Manitoba, not just to the opposition. There is no regard, no association at all.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is very very limited. Mr. Speaker, do I have leave? I think that it's been granted, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure, but I think it's been granted because these people are very very considerate. — (Interjection) — It's not been granted? Mr. Speaker,

this group is out to self-destruct and I'm not going to lift a finger to stop them, not one bit will I help to stop their self-destructing. They have been on a course of self-destruct ever since they were elected. They're like the lemmings running over the cliff into the ocean. Mr. Speaker, they don't seem to understand. They have changed Ministers to try and come through with a more acceptable offer. What they have done is that they are drowning in 10 feet of water instead of 20 feet of water, Mr. Speaker. They haven't corrected a thing. Mr. Speaker, I hope that they will reach for the life preservers and help save the people of the Province of Manitoba because we are going down under this government and I implore you, please, please, debate the issues. Let's get it onto the floor so that we can all advise our constituents what's going on so that they will know that we are representing them on this side as well as on that side.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my time is up. They have not granted leave and I would expect that they wouldn't grant leave because it's not to their best interest.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your kind consideration and I hope that I have an opportunity to debate the resolution or the amendment to the resolution which I stayed away from because I understand the terms of reference when we have to get up and debate. But I hope that I will have the opportunity to further debate the amendment to the resolution and Bill 115 when it gets into committee so that we can represent our people well. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell members opposite that I was shocked when they didn't grant leave to my honourable colleague, the MLA for Niakwa. Mr. Speaker, you might have noticed the most vocal one in saying, no leave, was the Minister of Highways. But then he of late has become an expert in no leave because he didn't get to leave for Hawaii because of his colleagues who have insisted on this debate being prolonged to untoward lengths of time and harassment of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I spoke on this issue I said I got up with no particular pleasure to speak, because the last time I addressed this subject matter we were under the invocation of closure for the first time since 1929. I can assure honourable members opposite that tonight I take even less pleasure in entering into this debate because this debate is under double closure, Mr. Speaker. It seems as if every opportunity we get to speak on this bill this government of new found dictators is imposing more and more restrictions on the people of Manitoba and on Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, to thwart the opposition from guiding them away from the destruction that surely faces them on this issue and on the manner on which they have approached this issue, Mr. Speaker.

I'm pleased to see that the Attorney-General is back. Sir, he has missed some very interesting days in this Legislature. He's missed some historical days in this Legislature, but I'm pleased to see him back because it is because of the record of the Attorney-General that this government is now in the problem and the quandary that they are presently in with the people of Manitoba. The Attorney-General blundered this party and this government into this issue. The Attorney-General sold his caucus a false bill of goods when he presented them with this fait accompli that he had negotiated with the SFM, with the Government of Canada, and with Monsieur Bilodeau and his lawyer.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the clear evidence of two problems that emerged when this Attorney-General, this eternal fountain of wisdom in the New Democratic Caucus, came to them, came to this — (Interjection) — Did he call me an ignoramus for calling him a fountain of wisdom? Well, I apologize, Sir. You indeed are not a fountain of wisdom, you are probably one of the most ignorant legislators this province has ever seen and I thank you for correcting me for attempting to put a compliment to the Attorney-General on the record.

I was also surprised to see the Attorney-General back so soon. I thought he would take a diversion via Moscow to attend the funeral tomorrow so that he would not be here until later on in the week.

A MEMBER: I heard he's going to contest the leadership.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, over in Russia - the comment has been made that maybe he would have contested the leadership over there. Well, he might of, but I don't think he made it to the short list. He'd be close, mind you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were two problems with the way the Attorney-General presented this fait accompli issue back in April of last year to this government. Those problems have been evidenced every single day in this House, and that's why we are now debating a resolution on bell ringing, Mr. Speaker. The one problem was that no one, not even the Premier, understood what the Attorney-General was proposing. Today the Premier still doesn't understand what the Attorney-General has done to him, done to his party and is trying to do to this province. But the Premier - I give him credit - understood enough of what the Attorney-General had done to remove him from the issue. That is some semblance of understanding the Premier's gaining from this debate that has engaged this government for the last eight months.

There wasn't one soul in the Cabinet or the backbench with the exception of the MLA for Elmwood who understood what the Attorney-General was going to do to the New Democratic Party and the people of Manitoba. There is no question that there was no one, Premier included, the lawyer who calls himself the Finance Minister now, the lawyer who calls himself the Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for Redneck - all of those lawyers over there did not understand what the Attorney-General was attempting to do to this province, Mr. Speaker.

None of them collectively, except the MLA for Elmwood, had the integrity to stand up and ask

questions as to what was the implication and what was this constitutional amendment going to do to the province. There was no such integrity from the MLA from Transcona, none. There was none that dared to stand up to the Attorney-General at a time of crisis for this party. There was none that considered themselves worthy enough to debate in caucus with the Attorney-General. They were mesmerized by the Attorney-General. They accepted what he said as de facto correct. They didn't investigate what he said, and they are paying the price today for trusting the Attorney-General. You placed your trust in a man that you should not have trusted.

This issue has torn your party to shreds. It has divided the province, and it will continue to do so. The man you can thank for that is the Attorney-General and, collectively, 31 of you over there have to accept the responsibility for not standing up, speaking your mind and investigating this issue when you had the opportunity last April. You were afraid to do it then, and I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, it appears they are afraid to do it even now. In the midst of overwhelming opposition to the government, the back bench will remain ominously silent on this, I believe, because none of them still have gained the integrity or the constitutional fortitude to stand up for what is right on this issue, to represent the people of Manitoba, to tell the Attorney-General and the Premier that they are wrong. There is no integrity over there in that back bench that will allow that to happen. They have not even had the integrity to speak on this issue. They have been strangely silent on this issue. They won't tell the constituents what they feel of it because they know their constituents are against them and are waiting for the opportunity to defeat them in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal in the next few minutes with some misconceptions that this government has put out on this issue. The first misconception given to us by the Attorney-General is that this constitutional resolution - I'm sorry to see the Zorro zealot of the language issue leave, but however we'll have to do without him. Mr. Speaker, the first misconception given by the Attorney-General was this constitutional amendment was designed to thwart the Bilodeau case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the honourable member that he should not comment on the presence or absence of other members of the House.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that very deserved observation. I should not say that they are all abandoning the ship right now and I apologize for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, this issue was to thwart the Bilodeau case. That was a false impression left to the people of Manitoba. Two Manitoba courts had already thwarted Bilodeau in his court case and the Supreme Court was about to do the same had the case been left before the Supreme Court.

The second misconception: this constitutional amendment is not before the people of Manitoba to restore French language rights. No, Mr. Speaker. That was done in 1980. What this constitutional amendment and accompanying bills is doing is expanding French

language rights in the Province of Manitoba. The people understand the issue. I wish the government understood what they were doing. It's not restoration. As the members of the eastern media would say, it is to expand language rights.

The third misconception that the CBC has on this in particular - and one Lesley Hughes commented on this about 10 days ago - she said that the constitutional amendment should be passed so that we could get into second reading and public hearings and committee hearings on it. Her understanding of the issue was so shallow that she did not realize that once closure was invoked on this, at 2:00 a.m. it is passed, fait accompli and on its way to Ottawa on the next plane out of Winnipeg. That's a misconception and a misunderstanding of this issue, perpetrated by the Attorney-General, the Government House Leader and others on the government side of the House.

The Premier constantly says, the fourth misconception on this issue, that people just don't understand what they're doing. Well, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the New Democratic Caucus that people do indeed understand what you are trying to do to the people of Manitoba and what you're trying to do to the heritage of this province. They understand in such a way that daily we get encouragement to keep the bells ringing. They know the bells are ringing for freedom in the Province of Manitoba. They know that the bells are ringing to stop a bad government from undertaking bad legislation and irreversible constitutional amendments, Mr. Speaker. The people of Manitoba understand this issue better than the MLA for Wolseley, whose understanding of this issue is nil, better than the Member for The Pas, better than the Member for Riel, better than the Member for Thompson. The people of Manitoba understand it all very very well. If only some of the New Democratic backbenchers would have the understanding of the issue, and then back it up with some constitutional fortitude to resist the Attorney-General, but no, we haven't any brave souls on that side of the House.

The fifth misconception constantly referred to by the Premier on this issue, Mr. Speaker, is that this issue, by debating it in length as we have been doing, is depriving the opportunity that the government would have to deal with other business. Mr. Speaker, that is the most blatant untruth that the Premier issues.

There is no other business before this Session of the Legislature. That was the nature of our agreement, some five months ago we signed, which dealt with all matters before the House, passed them to leave only one issue and one issue only before the House, and that is exactly what we're dealing with. There is no other business to be put before the House, and I wish that they would indicate that to Mr. Dick Martin who on television tonight was repeating the untruths of the Premier in saying that prolonged debate on this issue is holding up needed legislation on jobs, etc., that he seems to know about. There is no other legislation, Mr. Speaker. There is no other business before this House.

The sixth misconception that the Premier and some of his mouthpieces on that side of the House have said is that this issue is now over eight months old. That's wrong, Mr. Speaker. This issue has only been before the House for a little over five weeks, because the original issue, the one tabled by the Attorney-General,

has been gutted by the government. We are dealing with an entirely different and new issue now, a new constitutional amendment and accompanying legislation. We have only had five weeks of debate on this. Closure was invoked after one day of debate on the bill. There hasn't been a long time spent on this issue in this House.

The seventh misconception placed on the record constantly by the new Government House Leader, the new falling star in the NDP, he says that we have not debated this agreement. Well, Mr. Speaker, he is partially correct when he says we haven't debated it, because every time he's called it he's slapped on closure. We refuse to debate the constitutional amendment under the threat of closure and the hammer hanging over our head of closure. This issue deserves more than eight-and-one-half hours of debate under closure. But members opposite will perpetuate the untruth, the big lie, in saying that we haven't debated it. That is the seventh misconception.

The eighth misconception was put on the record and, Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize in advance for referring to the fact that the Government House Leader is not here. But, Mr. Speaker, he put the eighth misconception that I'm going to identify tonight. It's probably the eighth out of 108, when at his public meeting in Oakbank, two weeks ago Sunday night, he told the people of Oakbank that the SFM was a creation of the Weir Government in 1969 to be the negotiating body for Francophone Manitobans with any provincial government. He left the clear impression that in 1969 the Progressive Conservative Government, with Walter Weir as Premier, created the SFM to be the spokesarm for the Franco-Manitoban community. He did that to try to save his hide from being peeled off his back by 600 irate constituents. He told a blatant untruth to those people that night, Mr. Speaker.

In questioning two days later, by our House Leader, he weaseled his way out of it. He tried to misconstrue the facts. And we know how concerned the government was about that statement he made, because my colleague back here, the MLA for River East, was busy in the library Monday morning first thing researching the 1969 SFM Act to find out how badly his Government House Leader had misled his people in his constituency that night, the Sunday night before. They were frantic to try to bail him out of a problem of misleading 600 constituents at a public meeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you simply, when a man will stoop so low as at a public meeting to put a blatant untruth out to 600 constituents, I ask you simply, when can anybody trust the Government House Leader and anything he says? He is not a truthful person. He does not tell the truth.

You over there are wondering why relations in this House have broken down. We cannot deal with a man that does not tell the truth. The new Government House Leader, the MLA for Springfield, is the greatest twister of the truth that has ever hit this House. He cannot be trusted in his public utterances. When cornered he will tell untruths to his own constituents to try to save his wretched hide. We cannot trust the man. The people of Manitoba are finding out they cannot trust the man. They're finding out every day they cannot trust this government and what they say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal now with the process of the constitutional amendment and the reason why

we're into this bell ringing. I want to ask honourable members opposite to consider what we're dealing with in this constitutional amendment. This, ladies and gentlemen, is the first constitutional amendment that has been before this Legislature. What we are doing is we are entering into a historical debate here. This is the first one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you and other parliamentarians like yourself know that this Chamber operates on precedent, that the methods of operation in the past serve as the pattern for operation in the future. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen in the ND Party Government, consider the precedent that you are setting in the passage of the constitutional amendment.

What kind of a precedent are we setting?

No. 1, after one day of debate you threw closure on the accompanying legislation. After one day of debate on a bill that was tabled the 9th of January, one day of debate and you threw closure on. Do you want that as precedent for succeeding governments to use in passing language legislation, and new legislation? Consider the precedent.

No. 2, a precedent that was never before established in the history of this province, you limited public presentations to 40 minutes for both questions and presentation. Never done before in the history of public presentations on legislation in the history of this province. That is a precedent that you are setting in this debate for future governments to use. Do you feel comfortable with that kind of a precedent? They're strangely silent I might add, Mr. Speaker, as to how comfortable they feel.

No. 3, you closed off the public hearings which were only called five days before. You closed them off at 10:55 p.m. with 15 names still on the list, and I will admit those people were not there, but you could have held those hearings another day to allow them the opportunity to come. But no, you closed off public presentations on that bill after putting a limit on the time for both presentation and questions. Is that the precedent you want to set for legislation that the people of Manitoba had seen at that time for a little over two-and-a-half weeks, to advertise public hearings for five days and then close them down with 15 people yet to be heard? Is that the precedent that you want to set for future governments? You have done it.

No. 4 precedent, you have used closure repeatedly on a constitutional amendment. Do you want constitutional amendments to be passed in the future under closure? Is that what you wish? Because that's the precedent you are setting. It is a bad precedent, it is wrong, it is unparliamentary, it is undemocratic, but yet you are setting it. You the government of elected officials that promised to listen to the people of Manitoba are invoking closure to pass the first constitutional amendment.

Precedent No. 5, for the first time in the history of this province House Leaders have had to sign a written agreement to elicit. Never has an opposition had to sign a written agreement with a Government House Leader to establish the method by which we would proceed with this debate. That has never had to happen in the history of this province, a written agreement between House Leaders, so that the Government House Leader could not twist the facts at a later date and change the course of action. We had to have a written

agreement. That is incredible to think about. But even a written agreement with this gang in government is not good enough, because this debate tonight is about breaking that written agreement signed by the Attorney-General. They are breaking the first written agreement on House procedures. Incredible, Mr. Speaker!

The sixth precedent that they are setting in this constitutional amendment is that they cannot answer, Mr. Speaker, what their constitutional amendment will do. The MLA for St. Norbert has asked on a number of occasions what further statutes are entrenched forever by the reference to them contained in Section 23.1. No one in the government can answer it, no one can tell us how many statutes are affected and what those references are and whether they are important, unimportant, whether they need to be reviewed because some of them have been there for 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 years. Do we want to entrench references that may have been on the books for as long as 100 years? Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of precedent that they are setting in passing this constitutional amendment, and they are doing it by closure without giving us the answers to very simple clear questions. They can't answer the question, Mr. Speaker, so they invoke closure. When closure doesn't work, they invoke a matter of privilege to limit the bell ringing to two hours so then they can invoke closure and get this issue behind them without having to answer important questions on the substance of the constitutional amendment. This is some kind of a government, Mr. Speaker.

No. 7 precedent - they are, as is evidenced by this debate, as I have already referenced to earlier on, willing to break the only written and signed agreement between House Leaders on a method to wind down the House. Incredible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have here in the eighth precedent is this matter of privilege which is something that could have been decided by the Rules Committee without a matter of privilege being before the House. The Government House Leader could have called the Rules Committee to discuss the issue of bell ringing at any time. He did not need a matter of privilege. The real purpose is to break their word again, only this time not breaking their word to the people of Manitoba, they've done that so often it's routine, but this time breaking their word in a written agreement with the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this sorry situation that this government is in and the method by which they have gotten here has not passed unnoticed by the people of Manitoba, and it is a sorry situation. It's even sorer when you hear people like the Minister of Agriculture saying that the only mistake they made was in last July and August, not ramming through with closure the original constitutional amendment. That's what he says when you ask him what's gone wrong here. He said, our mistake was we didn't ram it through in July or August and you know what he was talking about, Mr. Speaker? He was talking about ramming through by closure an amendment that they now have said is wrong because they've changed it. What kind of a desperate gang of legislators are we looking at over here? You are indeed desperate. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for The Pas says, I'm unbelievable. Let me assure you, the people of Manitoba consider this

government to be unbelievable, to be beyond belief and that stems from two things.

First of all, they don't believe what you're doing. They can't believe any government would do what you're doing. Secondly, they do find you unbelievable, i.e., they cannot believe what you say as evidenced by the Government House Leader at his meeting in Oakbank where he deliberately misled the constituents of his electoral division. You're right. The Member for The Pas is right. This is unbelievable. What the government is doing is unbelievable and they are not believable. They cannot be believed because they do not tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a sad commentary on the government and it's not any longer simply the issue of the extension of French language rights that's before the House. What is now before the House is the process by which they are bringing this constitutional amendment to the people of Manitoba; the process by which they are having to use closure. I haven't even spoken to the amendment proposed by the MLA for Fort Garry. Many on the government side of the House have not said it. We have the Premier in an interview to *Le Devoir*, a Montreal daily newspaper saying, well, he maybe would be considering pulling the official language reference, but will he admit to the people of Manitoba in this House under questioning that he said that?

A MEMBER: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No, he wants to hide that little piece of information. He doesn't want to tell Manitobans the truth of what he really told the people in Montreal. What kind of a made-in-Manitoba solution is it where the Montreal citizens, through *Le Devoir*, can get a position out of this First Minister that the people of Manitoba can't even get from him? Any time he spoke on this issue he has never addressed the substance of the issue and that stems back, Mr. Speaker, to what I said earlier. The Attorney-General introduced this issue and no one understood it. The first one not to understand it was the Premier and he still doesn't understand it. That's why there's no public statements in Manitoba from the Premier. He talks about freedom and he talks about all the other buzz words that they've tried to illicit, time allocation and those sort of things, but he doesn't deal with the substance of this amendment because, Sir, he does not understand it. He is a lawyer without legal underpinnings. He is a lawyer that does not understand law because he does not understand what the Attorney-General is foisting on the people of Manitoba, the bland leading the bland, driven by the Attorney-General who is now hiding behind the scenes setting up the new falling star to take the heat. It's incredible, Mr. Speaker.

A MEMBER: Falling stars burn up.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And the falling star is close to burning out. By the look of the Attorney-General he almost burned out wherever he was, tremendous tan you've got there, sir. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate the Premier has indeed

A MEMBER: Just wait until he gets to the dangling participles, Rolly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'll skip what I was going to say about the Premier. He's really quite a nice boy, a little misguided but a nice boy.

I simply ask the government, how are the people of Manitoba expected to have confidence in the ND Government that is currently in power when you are forcing a constitutional amendment through by closure? You are breaking your agreement with the opposition on bell ringing and the process by which this matter is dealt with. What confidence are the people of Manitoba going to have in this government? Can they believe anything you tell them that you are going to do when you're breaking every agreement you've made on this issue? When the House Leader and others make untruthful statements, how are the people of Manitoba to have confidence in you as government? I suggest with a great deal of difficulty.

I wonder what Dick Martin, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, has said to the new Government House Leader when this new Government House Leader brought in the matter of privilege some several days ago breaking an agreement. I think organized labour would be pretty disturbed with this government breaking written signed agreements. Does this mean that now any agreement that this government signs with anybody in the Province of Manitoba is subject to be broken if things aren't going the way the government wants them to go? I wonder if Dick Martin has seriously thought about agreements he holds with this government. An interesting point to ponder, but then again Dick Martin will have the opportunity to raise this whole issue at the NDP Convention this weekend.

MR. H. ENNS: I would imagine, I would imagine, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Speaker, we're here debating this whole issue on bell ringing. I want to tell members opposite. — (Interjection) — yes, my colleague is right, they're not debating the issue, we're debating the issue. I want to tell members opposite that bell ringing is something that is in the rules, it is used but seldom, and it is used at the risk of those people who are walking out and leaving the bells ringing. Oppositions undertake bell ringing at the risk of losing public support.

Mr. Speaker, oppositions do not ring the bells unless the issue is very important, and their position on the issue is very correct. We have both those qualities backing us up in our bell ringing. We are correct on the issue. The people are with us on the issue. The government is wrong. They have no mandate to bring this constitutional amendment in. They have no right to invoke closure on the first constitutional amendment. The government is wrong, and we're right.

After we have exhausted all of the parliamentary tools that are available to us to stop a bad government from bringing in bad legislation, the one last thing that's left, Sir, is ringing the bells. That is something you do only after careful consideration and weighing of public support and weighing of the principle of the issue.

There does not need to be a change in the rules. What there needs to be is a change in the government,

because this government has broken every rule and every semblance of trust they were given by the people in their election in 1981. They have broken faith with the people and they deserve not to be government anymore.

This issue should be resolved by a general election in the Province of Manitoba. That is how governments should resolve constitutional amendments for which they cannot receive support from the people of Manitoba or the opposition. They should take the issue to the people of Manitoba, and let the people of Manitoba decide whether this constitutional amendment is good or bad. But this gutless gang won't do that, Mr. Speaker, because in the backbench there isn't one of them that will exercise his right on the free vote, because not one of them over the next two years can make over \$60,000 any place else. That's the problem, Mr. Speaker, in the Premier's alleged free vote. For the next two years, that gang of unemployables back there could not make \$60,000 any place else in the Province of Manitoba or any place in Canada.

So if you ask me if any of them are going to exercise their right to a free vote as granted by the First Minister, they won't, Mr. Speaker. They will not represent their constituents, because if they do the government falls, and they are out of a job which pays them over \$30,000 a year. They cannot get a job to pay that anyplace else. — (Interjection) — The Member for The Pas says, he can. Maybe he can. Then he should be able to represent his people of The Pas and vote against this constitutional amendment — (Interjection) — yes, yes. The member says he consulted with his people.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to wait with a great deal of diligence and anticipation to the last deadline this government has set for themselves. We had the deadline of December 31st, January 15th, January 31st, but the real deadline is February 17th. That, Sir, is the real deadline, because that's when their annual meeting commences in Brandon.

Now I note with a great deal of interest, Mr. Speaker, that to date there is not one single resolution on the French language issue at the convention, an issue that has immobilized this government for eight months. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, eight months is one-sixth of the time any government has in a normal four-year term, one-sixth of their time on one issue, and it is not brought up in one single resolution by the party in general.

Yet, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of resolutions on abortion. It almost seems to me as if the big trade-off has occurred in Cabinet, language for life. The Attorney-General has promised language rights to the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Health has promised abortion rights to the Attorney-General. The old trade-off is happening in the NDP back room, language for life. That's the kind of principle that we are seeing demonstrated by the Minister of Health. His principle on language is sacrificing his principle on abortions. That's what is happening, Mr. Speaker. That's what will happen at the New Democratic Convention this weekend. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to question oneself whether 1984 has really arrived in the New Democratic Party.

Because there is no resolution on the French language issue, are we safe in assuming that the Attorney-General, the purveyor of Big Brother, has secretly

passed in the New Democratic Party Constitution that thought crime will be punished by banishment from the party, and thought crime in this case being bringing up the language issue at the convention, because I find it passing strange, Mr. Speaker, that there is not one free soul in the elected delegate ranks of the New Democratic Party that has had the constitutional fortitude to bring the language issue before the floor for debate at a general meeting of the party.

Are there no more free-thinking people in the New Democratic Party? Have all of those free-thinking people torn up their cards and left the party? Are there no people over there that stand on the principle of debating an issue that has been before this government for eight months? Where are, Sir . . .

A MEMBER: Are we the only holders of these cards?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, another one of the cards that have come in, torn up in disgust by a disgruntled New Democratic Party member. Are all the people with free thought and individual expression gone from the New Democratic Party? Have the rest been silenced by the party machinery? Is anyone ready to challenge the will of these elected elitists who are sitting over here, these elected elitists and their out-of-province, imported, hired guns that have silenced all the delegates at this New Democratic Convention?

You know, at one point in time I said to myself, this issue will be brought up before the New Democratic Party Convention, because there is one man of principle over there in the person of the MLA of Burrows, because the MLA for Burrows in his first address to this House spoke on principle. He said no government should ever pass anything in haste, any measure which cannot be reversed. He said that haste makes waste. Has the MLA for Burrows become one of those silenced mummies that are now part and parcel of the New Democratic Party, some of those people that can no longer express free thought? Has 1984 arrived in the ranks of the New Democratic Party? I say, Sir, that it has. Thought crime, word crime is all part and parcel of Big Brother's control over the entrails of the New Democratic Party.

There are no free people within the New Democratic Party anymore. They have been silenced by Big Brother. They have been told to keep quiet by Big Brother. Democracy, Sir, is dead in the New Democratic Party.

Is there no one over there, is there no soul so free that he would dare to raise this issue at the party convention? I ask you, I beseech you, please, for the future of this province, for the future of generations yet unborn, defeat the Morgentaler amendment and debate the French language one. That's all we ask you. Are there no individuals over there that respect democracy, that respect what the New Democratic Party used to stand for, a party that would represent the people? Are all of those free thinking individuals gone? Have they all turned in their party cards? Sir, I beseech you for another minute to wind down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in closing I simply wish to ask all members of the New Democratic Party

who are here with us today to carefully consider representing your constituencies and the people of Manitoba in the free vote that your Premier has promised; otherwise, call an election.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

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

Well, Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order only because closure motion has been imposed so often lately, it seems to be incumbent upon me to remind all members in this Chamber, including the Member for Burrows, that he should feel free to speak in this Chamber. There is nobody stopping him from speaking in this Chamber. We would like to hear from a New Democrat speaking in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

There are to be no expressions of approval or disapproval from the gallery.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I did want to see the Member for Burrows get up on his feet and explain to us in this House tonight just some of his principles that he has been speaking about for the last several months. I was hoping tonight he would have the nerve and the guts to get up and speak before this House tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of this House, you know, should have really expected that the Minister of Natural Resources would get into the act, as he so often does, and to further amend the matter of privilege that the Member for Springfield brought before the House. The Honourable Member for St. James' motion is that this question be now put.

Mr. Speaker, what this Minister has done is to put a closure on us endeavouring to put a halt to our debate, the debating time we have on this most important issue that has been brought before this House by the Government of the Day. They have once again, Mr. Speaker put, as the saying goes, put that gun to our head and are forcing the issue through. Mr. Speaker, this is why we on this side of the House are ringing the bells protesting the action of this government.

I think it appropriate at this time, Mr. Speaker, to read into the records of this House a letter to the editor in this today's Winnipeg Sun. This letter is written by Eileen Roberts of Winnipeg.

"I guess on Thursday, February 2, at the Convention Centre, a lot of us came out of the woodwork.

"I know there are many more people who feel the same way we do. I hope that all that the rest of the silent majority stop worrying and fretting and come out to the meetings, whenever possible. We weren't bigots or racists, we were just plain Canadians, of all ethnic backgrounds . . ."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley on a point of order.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

In terms of unparliamentary language, the Member for Portage referred to the Member for Burrows as not having the guts to enter the debate. I've checked in Beuchesne and that is an unparliamentary phrase and I would like him to withdraw it please.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order.

I realize that all of us don't have a list of the members in front of us and probably the Member for Portage mistook the constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear all of the honourable member's remarks. Would he mind repeating them.

MR. H. GRAHAM: I said, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage did not have a list of the constituencies and maybe he mistook the constituency when he mentioned the words that he used.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Although I do not know the context in which that expression was used in the debates of May 27th, 1959, it does appear that that expression does appear in Beuchesne as an unparliamentary expression.

Perhaps the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie would like to reword his comment.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw that quote that I made, but I'll replace it with intestinal fortitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to complete this here little letter to the editor. The people attending were all ". . . Canadians, of all ethnic backgrounds afraid for our future and the future of our children.

"Why did Jacques Forest find us frightening? We weren't frightening, we were united. Trudeau has always harped about unity and how great it is. Well, we were all united on Thursday night. We don't need Trudeau's brand of unity, which is really frightening. We need our own Canadian unity. Mr. Forest had no reason to be frightened if he is a true Canadian. I was so happy to hear Russ Doern, Sterling Lyon, Herb Schulz and all the rest who truly believe in the democracy. Please keep the bells ringing until Howard Pawley realizes we won't submit to blackmail. I really resent the news media continually referring to Russ Doern as a maverick just because he refuses to be an NDP puppet."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite proper to have that recorded in the minutes of this House. Mr. Speaker, that is why we are ringing the bells from time to time.

The other day, the Minister of Health stated that we are breaking the rules of this Assembly, and that they are using the rules of the House as laid down. Well, Mr. Speaker, that bunch on that side of the House change the rules just as they please. That is one more reason for the bells to be ringing.

Mr. Speaker, it was last Wednesday, I believe it was, in the daytime - I'm not sure, maybe that would be

about the 8th of February - the Premier of our province finally got up the nerve to call a public meeting and explain to his constituents what he really believed in. Mr. Speaker, you've probably read this paper. There are the headlines right there, and there's a picture right in the front page of the Free Press. Mr. Harder, who wished to speak to that group that night, was forcibly pushed away from the microphone and denied the opportunity to speak. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we demand that the bells be ringing from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for members on this side of the House to accept the fact that the government members of this province are forcing ahead legislation contained in Bill 115. Government members who, I hope, are now true Canadians, Mr. Speaker, true Manitobans, men and women who will have to live for the rest of their lives with the results of the legislation that they are forcing through this House regarding the forcing of total bilingualism on the people of Manitoba, forcing ahead with closure on a bill that has created so much hatred today towards the NDP Government not only by the Conservative Party, not only by the people of Manitoba, but by many of the members of their own party, the NDP Party, members who vowed they will not support them again.

I have talked to several people in Portage la Prairie who I personally know voted for the New Democratic Party in the last election. They have told me, Sir, that they will not be supporting that party in the next election coming around. They have vowed that they will not support that party again. The reason they are giving me is the fact, No. 1, the French issue; No. 2, the fact that they are denying the rights of the Manitobans by their legislation that they've been forcing through this House.

Mr. Speaker, this party, the ND Party of Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba, is going to find themselves in trouble when it comes to the next election. I suggest to you, Sir, that the ND Party - this will be the downfall of the socialists, NDP Party in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, this leads me to believe that there is truth in the report that the Prime Minister of our country, Pierre Elliott Trudeau - I say, the shrewdest politician that ever led a party, a government in the history of this country of ours - had plans to make Canada a bilingual nation, and that he singled out the Province of Manitoba with its weak Premier and the caucus to initiate the well-planned program that he had in place for Manitoba.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there is a man by - well, the Honourable Serge Joyal, the Secretary of State of Canada, made a statement in one of his speeches. I think that it's just a crime to think that a man elected to his position would make a statement such as this. You know, Mr. Speaker, the quote is: "You know, the idea, the challenge, the ambition of making Canada a French country both inside and outside of Quebec, an idea some people considered a bit crazy, is something a little bit beyond the ordinary imagination," it said. "You have to have intense conviction. You have to have an ideal in sight to turn around." The journalists asked Mr. Joyal, "What are you going to do as Secretary of State?" He replied, "Strengthen the status of the French in Canada."

Mr. Speaker, as one on this side of the House, I have certainly nothing against the French people. I am proud

to say that I'm sorry that I can't speak their language, but we all will through our educational programs have the opportunity to improve our positions. Mr. Speaker, those are some of the statements that are being made by our elected representatives in the Federal Government.

In my opinion, Sir, it is the opinion of the majority of the people of the Province of Manitoba today that the mess that we have before us today all ties together with the plan that Mr. Trudeau has in mind for our nation. The Federal Government of Canada is using our weak Premier and his caucus as the goats. This NDP Government has picked up the bait and swallowed it line, hook and sinker, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, they are moving ahead with their plan against the wishes of 78 percent to 82 percent of the people of the province. Many of that percentage are French-speaking people. That is what is so puzzling to so many people today. They are wondering just what is in it for Mr. Pawley. Has he been promised a Senate or some high position when he's defeated as the Premier of our province? They are asking themselves, did Prime Minister Trudeau get to the Premier of our province with a deal?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member should not impute motives to other members of the House.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the Premier is not here, just to hear what we all have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: For the honourable member's benefit, it is the Chair who is objecting to his remarks, not the Premier.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I didn't catch what you said.

MR. SPEAKER: It is the Chair who is objecting to the honourable member's statements, not the Premier. The honourable member should not impute motives to another member of this House.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is why the bells so often have been ringing in this Assembly. Yes, they are referred to so often as the bells of freedom, and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, they will continue to be ringing until this government comes to their senses and realizes that the position that they are putting the people of Manitoba in today will be regretted by them and I'm sure by all. Well, Mr. Speaker, this government of ours is doing all this, forcing ahead, proceeding with closure, against such odds that it will be the end forever of the socialist NDP Government of Manitoba.

The Premier has, I'm sure, received thousands of letters, thousands of names on petitions asking him to come to his senses and withdraw the package completely so he will get and have at least some respect from the people of Manitoba. I urge him to pull the whole thing from the Order Paper. Mr. Speaker, there are ever so many enemy letters, petitions signed by

hundreds of people, and they're here, we have them all on file.

There's one here, a letter, Sir, from the Reeve of Portage la Prairie, Syd Lye, and it's a letter addressed to the Premier of our province:

"Mr. Pawley,

"My council has passed the resolution instructing me to write to you to express our opposition to any changes in Section 23 of The Manitoba Act.

"Last summer, when we were advised there may be changes in this legislation, my council were undecided as to what our stand should be, not knowing what the wishes of the ratepayers were. After considerable discussion it was decided to hold a plebiscite on this matter along with the municipal election. However, after the nominations were in, a large number of councillors and trustees were re-elected by acclamation. We were also concerned that we may not have too good a response for the plebiscite. However, in the final analysis, the response was better than we anticipated. Out of approximately 1,675 ballots cast, 85 percent opposed any change.

"We therefore believe, Mr. Pawley, that we are representing our ratepayers and to justify our trust we must oppose any change in The Manitoba Act."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this letter goes on to reprimand the government for their actions that they are taking. It's quite a lengthy letter and I see no reason to read it in full.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that there have been threats made upon the First Minister of our province and several members of his Cabinet, but there is one man in particular - I realize he's not sitting in the Assembly here this evening - but that is the Member for Springfield, the man who is largely responsible for piloting this unbelievable bit of legislation through this House. — (Interjection) — Oh, he is in the House, yes. He's hiding back in the shadow, that's right. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the member who Mr. Pawley has assigned to the job to see that this legislation be passed in the House against all odds, it has turned out to be political suicide for him, Sir. I suggest that if the Premier can't control him himself that his people from his own constituency will notify him when the next election comes along, that he will certainly not be representing them in the constituency after the next election.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure must have realized that Mr. Penner was certainly going to make trouble for him if he continued to have him act as his House Leader. So, Mr. Speaker, he went ahead and appointed two new members to his Cabinet and removed the Attorney-General from that high post as the House Leader, and what did he do? I'm sure today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier realizes the mistake that he made when he appointed the Member for Springfield to the post as the House Leader.

A MEMBER: Harapiak, for House Leader.

MR. L. HYDE: You want Harapiak, well, that would be all right too. I suppose he couldn't be much . . . However, Mr. Speaker, at least I suggest to you, Sir, that after the next election that the Member for Springfield will not be around, he'll be known to many of his constituents as "one-term Andy, the little dictator."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I remind the honourable member again, as I have done before, that other members should be referred to in this House by their constituency or by the position that they hold. I would ask the present member who has the floor and others to please remember that.

The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll be more careful from now on in.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was just last week in question period, I think it was Thursday or Friday of last week, the Government House Leader stated that the government was given a mandate to legislate this resolution through the House. Where on earth does he see in any of this new material here - we have it here, Mr. Speaker, heavens, there are pages of it here, my goodness! - nowhere in all of this here junk letter and material, I would say, does it mention where they get a mandate to press this issue through this House at this time. Nowhere Sir, here is this, "Clear Choice for Manitobans," the policies of Manitoba's New Democratic Party. Heavens, and it's all signed by our Premier, Howard Pawley. Well, if you leaf through it, there's no place in this little booklet that states where they get a mandate to force bilingualism onto our province and to the people of Manitoba.

There's another little paper here, this is put out by Attorney-General Roland Penner. It says: "Working together for the future of Manitoba." My goodness!

A MEMBER: Some future.

MR. L. HYDE: In 1981, Mr. Speaker, when the big campaign was on and the people of Manitoba elected the NDP Government to office, there was just nowhere in their material did they say, you elect us and we will make your province a province with two official languages. No, they did not. Now, Mr. Speaker, the government wants we as opposition to lay back and let them pass Bill 115 without even putting up a fight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we will. We'll fight this to the bitter end. We will not let them pass this bill until we have used, Mr. Speaker, every possible means available to us through the democratic system that still prevails in this country of ours, even to letting those bells ring for hours and days if we have to. What more do we have to do, along with the people of the province, to convince this government that they are wrong, Sir, to continue to press this unwanted, costly, ridiculous legislation through this Assembly?

Mr. Speaker, there were two large demonstrations held, one on January 26th right here in this building. There was anywhere from 800 to 1,000 people supposed to have been recorded as being part of that demonstration. They crowded into rooms and hallways throughout this building, hoping to get an opportunity to plead with the Premier of our province to listen to them, men and women, young people, young students, displaying signs, "Will I be able to get a job?" Mr. Speaker, it was sad to see.

I can refer to one father. He had two of his daughters and a son in the crowd that night. They were, I would estimate, maybe 14, 16 years of age, the two girls, and they were the two that I saw carrying this sign, "Will

I be able to get a job?' Mr. Speaker, this is all so frightening to me and to so many of the people, some of whom voted for the government, and today, Sir, are saying, never again will I vote for a government that I cannot trust.

Then last Thursday when the grand rally was held in our Winnipeg Convention Centre, a rally which was organized by the Grassroots of Manitoba - they held this rally, protesting against the official bilingualism. You know, at this grand rally, there was, they claim, up to 3,000 people there, 2,500 to 3,000 people. The guests speakers, Russell Doern, Sterling Lyon, Sidney Green, Herb Schulz, D.L. Campbell - incidentally, Mr. Campbell, probably one of the highest respected and regarded citizens in the Province of Manitoba, he was there at the age of, I think, 89 years of age, speaking to that rally, pleading with the people there that night to continue to press the government, asking them to withdraw this here package that they have before us.

There was Bobby Bend, Pat Maltman and the organizer, a man who is giving his all to the cause, Mr. Grant Russell. Mr. Speaker, they say, keep the bells ringing to keep freedom alive in Manitoba. They attended that rally, Mr. Speaker, to protest against the closure, entrenchment and extension of French language services.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, I said we would do everything within our power to hold off entrenching and legislating French language services. My Leader, the Member for Tuxedo, moved a six-month hoist on debate to give members on both sides of this House the opportunity just to cool down, as the saying goes, to cool their heels, and reassess, Mr. Speaker, just the position that they are proposing for the people of Manitoba.

I want to just read a couple of paragraphs here. The headline, "Filmon urges six months delay on French bills." This is from the Free Press, January 22, 1984. "Opposition Leader, Gary Filmon, attempted yesterday to get the government to hold off legislating French language services, claiming, 'The acrimony it has created must be given time to die down.' He moved a six-month hoist on debate on the bill at the end of a one-hour-long speech, condemning legislation for fuzzy definitions and the government for creating poisonous and divisive attitudes. 'The lack of clarity was an invitation of litigation,' he said.

"'This bill cannot be accepted without major amendments, and certainly not at the present time. It will cause relationships between English and French to further inflame' He said, 'A cooling-off period is needed because of the acrimony the NDP language package has aroused. We need that healing influence before further venturing into uncharted waters,' Mr. Filmon said. He criticized the government for trying to force through legislation under duress which is not intended to go into effect until January 1st of 1987."

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that they would listen to our Leader? No. They voted that hoist down. They voted it down.

A MEMBER: Leave him alone, you guys.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: . . . got a strong-arm comrade there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. HYDE: My colleague, the Member for Lakeside, has suggested we should appeal once again on trying to get the Member for Burrows to get up from his seat, stand up in this House and once again, Sir, explain the principles that you so firmly put before this House sometime last fall. We wish, Mr. Speaker, that he would make that move and he, along with the Premier, would save face if he would just get up and explain his position tonight.

Mr. Speaker, the government is not willing to listen to the people. They are bulling ahead with their eyes closed and not giving a tinker's damn, if they were to stop to think of it, for the thoughts of the people. They're not listening to what experienced people from other parts of our country have had and are having in regard to French and English bilingualism. No, the government believes they have that mandate to go ahead with what the people of other ethnic groups are not wanting.

Last fall, Mr. Speaker, at the convention of the Union of Municipalities, several resolutions were passed. There was one that I think, well, I'm sure has been brought before the House before this time, but needs to be repeated, and this is No. 8. It was moved first by Reeve Halabura and seconded by Mr. Thiessen. — (Interjection) — Halabura. I thought I was not too far wrong.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities is not opposed to bilingualism, but is opposed to Manitoba being declared a bilingual province. We fear that the implications of such a decision would adversely affect all residents of Manitoba, the cost factor in relation to the number of people it would serve. The speaking of a mother tongue by residents of the Province of Manitoba has never been opposed in the past 100 years.

It is our desire that language rights remain as they are, and that the Provincial Government should hold a provincial referendum and allow all the people of the province to declare and voice their opinion on the matter of becoming a bilingual province.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was carried, and I'm proud to say that my own municipality allowed the people to express their feelings on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a Manitoba we all should be proud of, regardless of what the elected members of the NDP Party think, or how they think they could improve it. We have a population of over one million people made up of almost every ethnic origin of the world. You know, how fortunate can we be. We're very fortunate to have that background.

We have, over the last 100 years, worked together to build our nation to where we are respected by the rest of the world. Sir, our ancestors, our early settlers worked hard to build this province. This country withstood hardships I'm sure our generation could not or would not tolerate. We have grown up from one generation to the next, intermarried, and have respected our different languages, our different cultures, and from all of this we have become a very strong nation. Today, this Pawley Government is going to destroy that.

During the last few years, things have changed considerably, Mr. Speaker. We have unrest amongst

us, we have mistrust appearing amongst us, why, Mr. Speaker? Because a majority voted in a government led by a man named Pierre Elliott Trudeau, who was encouraged by others that rights were being denied the French-speaking people of Canada, and that Canada should be and would be a French-speaking nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, our Premier was convinced that it would be well for him to continue to press that Manitoba be made a totally bilingual province to ensure French language rights in the province and legislate expanded government services in French. Sir, this is happening, much against the wishes by far of the majority of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just refer to the census taken by Manitoba, 1,013,705 people. The French total in the province is 74,050. In my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, I thought there would have been more, but the mother tongue, English, French, German, Ukrainian, native Indian and others not stated. Well, in the constituency of Portage la Prairie in 1976, we had 650 French-speaking people. Today, Mr. Speaker, that figure is dwindling - not by much, but in the neighbourhood of 100. Today in 1981, for Portage la Prairie, we have 560 French-speaking people. That's down 100 in those few short years. — (Interjection) — With all this opposition, this government is going to proceed to force this unforgivable move by closure. I say, Mr. Speaker, it's a shame that this government is making this move under the leadership of Howard Pawley, when we have prominent past politicians ready and willing to speak against their actions. They are not ready to take note of that.

We have, Mr. Speaker, strong support coming forward from the grassroot level of the NDP government, where members are tearing up their membership cards in protest to what their Leader and his government House Leader are doing. You'd think that they would come to their senses and withdraw the entire package. It is just unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, that they are still ready to proceed.

Sir, with the provincial NDP Annual Convention coming up later in this week, with headlines in the Saturday Free Press reading, "NDP Convention Resolutions Fail . . ." — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a shame that I can't read that headline - ". . . Fail to Endorse the French Proposals."

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

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, tout le monde est née libre et égal en dignité et en droit. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

Kozhda lyudyna rodytsya vilnoyu i rivnoyu v hidnosti i pravakh. The same thing I have said before, in Ukrainian.

I speak, Mr. Speaker, and approach the issue of bell ringing on the broader and more fundamental issue of the preservation and survival of our democratic constitutional representative system of government.

This is a most precious heritage that we have. It evolved out of the shared experience of mankind with the father of the Conservative Party. It was stated as

a partnership in all science, in all arts, in all virtue, in all its perfection, because it is a partnership not only among the living, but also among the living and among the dead, and among those who are yet to be born. This is a passage from Edmund Burke's book called "The Reflection on the French Revolution," written in 1790.

Mr. Speaker, it is a precious heritage because our constitutional system of government provides a non-violent, peaceful and orderly resolution of social conflicts in society. It is my concern for this parliamentary and constitutional system that I rise on this occasion.

What is the secret why this system of government has survived throughout all the centuries, why we still enjoy the heritage from our forefathers who have founded this nation? The secret lies in the willingness to observe the basis of representative and constitutional government. That fundamental basis is a doctrine of the rule of the majority. The rule of the majority means that the minority is obligated to abide by the decision of the majority, but the majority is also obligated to listen to the views of the minority before the final decision is made.

The reason is there is a necessity for reasoned deliberations, discussions and debates, among all conflicting ideas and issues in a peaceful, orderly, non-violent way. That can only happen if we know how to observe the rules of parliamentary procedures. When in the heat of passionate partisanship, either the majority or the minority swayed by their passionate beliefs when they argue the points, not on the basis of their concern for the general public good, but with a view of short-range tactical maneuver for the next election, then there is the danger that they will breach the rules and violate parliamentary procedure for their own purposes.

There is a common saying that all rules are made to be broken. There are some people, if you give them an inch, they will take a yard. But the saying is not necessarily true, because it is repeated most of the time. The true and correct principle is that rules are made because they are intended to be observed. There is no point in making any rules at all if rules are made to be broken.

It is a breach of this partnership if we breach the rules of procedure, because we are endangering this orderly, peaceful, non-violent resolution of conflict in our society.

If we are the true trustees of the people, then we should be striving to be trustworthy, and if we are trustworthy, then we should say what we mean and mean what we say. We should be able to give mutual trust and confidence among all the members of this august Assembly, because it is out of the abundance of our hearts that we speak. If there is no good treasure in our hearts, what will come out from our mouth are the bad and slanderous words that we often hear in this Legislative Assembly.

For a good tree, there is nothing but the good fruit, and the bad tree bears nothing but the bad fruit.

MR. H. ENNS: That's why none of you are speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. C. SANTOS: Therefore, whenever we speak, we should speak the truth as we know it. Let us not be

hasty to measure our colleagues, because by the measure we give, that is the measure we get.

With respect to bell ringing, all I'm trying to emphasize and I'm pleading that we should all follow the rules of parliamentary procedure, that bell ringing is intended to call the members in to vote, not pick up their marbles and go home. We shall have to account for every word we say and for every word we utter because, by our words, we shall be justified and by our words we shall be condemned.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the honourable member has some time remaining. I wonder if he would entertain a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: No question, Mr. Speaker. Unless it's related to my speech.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it would be very much related to his speech. It was a simple question about where the Honourable Member for Burrows stands on this question before us. Is he for French language entrenchment or . . .

MR. C. SANTOS: . . . bell ringing, which I have confined myself, Mr. Speaker, because that's the motion on the floor. I am in favour of the motion.

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, there have been many on this side who have asked the question: why is it that members of the government are unwilling to speak on this issue? Well, I think it was the Honourable Member for Burrows who just spoke, who explained why they wouldn't speak. I believe if you read his remarks, he said, it was from the abundance of their heart and it had to be truth and honesty, and now we know why members on the other side cannot speak on this issue. Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the Member for Burrows has pointed out to this Assembly why it is that the other side is silent on this debate that is before us.

The Honourable Member for . . . - I forget where it is, it's not that important - wants to vote. I would suggest to the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, that if the honourable member wants to vote, he should stay in his seat, because that is the only place from which he can vote in this Assembly. So, I have seen the honourable member straying all over this Chamber, outside in the halls and everything, but he spends - I know, Mr. Speaker, I apologize, I should not make any mention of the time that any member spends in this Assembly, so I refrain from making any mention of that.

Mr. Speaker, on the past weekend and for two days last week I was not in this Assembly; I was out in my

constituency talking to people from all over the province about this particular issue that is before the Assembly and the whole issue of bell ringing and the way that parliamentary democracy is being trampled by the will of the majority, as the Honourable Member for Burrows so correctly pointed out, it's the will and the majority trampling the minority. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, or Neepawa, says he never said that. Well, I've noticed the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has a hearing aid that seems to pick up things that he wants it to hear and sometimes can't hear things that he should be hearing. That is what you call selective hearing.

I would say from the remarks that the honourable member has made in this Assembly about the kind words that are being said by all his constituents on this issue, that he does have a selective hearing problem when he talks to his constituents on this issue, because I have talked with constituents from his constituency who do not express the views that the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose says that they express. So, I have to assume, Mr. Speaker, that either the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose has selective hearing or else he has a complete disregard for the truth. I'll leave the choice up to him.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I received, in my mail, the first letter from a constituent of mine which did not support the position that we, on this of the House, have taken in this debate. It is the very first letter. I have received many other letters from the constituency in total agreement with the position that we have taken on this debate. But this letter I received today, Mr. Speaker, it's the first one from my constituency that deals with a point of view that is not the one that I happen to espouse in this House. So for that reason, I have taken particular notice of this letter and I think, while I have not asked the person whether I have her permission to use it in the House, I will quote from the letter and I will not identify her name although I will be prepared to table the letter when I am finished if any member wants that. But I have not asked her for permission to use her name so I will refrain from doing it.

This is addressed to Mr. Harry Graham, MLA, Legislative Building, Winnipeg.

"Dear Sir,

"Your constituents were under the impression that you would be representing them in the Assembly, not hiding in the hallways of the Legislature."

Mr. Speaker, I want to stop at that point because I think there is probably a case of mistaken identity. We have had numerous occasions on this side of the House to be very leery in our offices and in our other rooms because at any hour of the day or night the Honourable Government House Leader is liable to stick his nose in the door, unannounced and not knocking, or not even asking if he could come. So if there's anybody who is doing any skulking and hiding in the hallways, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Honourable Government House Leader and not members of this Assembly. So on that first point, I think it's important that I inform this constituent that it is the Honourable Government House Leader who does the skulking and the hiding in the halls and not the members on this side of the House.

I will go on, Mr. Speaker, in the next sentence, she says: "I am deeply concerned by the attempts of your

party to destroy the parliamentary procedure upon which our government has always been based." Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give the person who wrote this letter the benefit of the doubt. I think when she mentions the word "government," she means the Legislative Assembly and she is not referring to the present government of this province.

But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who is it in this Assembly that is destroying the parliamentary procedure? When you find an agreement has been reached by the House Leader on the government side and the Opposition House Leader, and that agreement has been signed and tabled in this Assembly and who is it that broke that agreement? Again, Mr. Speaker, it was the Honourable Government House Leader. — (Interjection) — Not a chance, he says, not a chance did he ever break that agreement.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, I believe, honestly believes that he didn't break it, and that shows you, Mr. Speaker, his lack of comprehension and his lack of sincerity and honesty, his total lack of concern. Because if there was any doubt about who broke it, who was it, Mr. Speaker, that brought in, two weeks after the issue was raised in the House, who was it that brought in a point of privilege and moved that two hours on bell ringing would apply for the remainder of this Session? Who was it did that, Mr. Speaker? I don't think it was my Leader, I don't think it was my House Leader, I don't think it was the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek; I happen to think it was the Honourable Government House Leader, the Member for Springfield.

Of course, that doesn't break an agreement. An agreement said two weeks. Two weeks was what was set in that agreement, not by this side of the House, but by the government themselves. Mr. Speaker, we weren't the ones that asked for two weeks. And so the Honourable Government House Leader said well, if they didn't ask for it, we'll change it to two hours. And he says, "We didn't break an agreement. We didn't break an agreement." There is a man who doesn't the difference between honesty and dishonesty, if he says he didn't break an agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not really surprising. That is not really surprising.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with basically a matter of procedure in this House, and that procedure involves an issue, an issue that has been before this House now, or some members of this House have known about it for approximately 15 months. I think it was a year ago last December that our Leader at that time received a letter, I believe the former Attorney-General received a letter from the present Attorney-General of this province. At that time he advised the opposition of the attempts by the government to sit down with the SFM and discuss the problem arising from the Bilodeau case which had gone to court in Manitoba, lost in that court, was appealed to the Court of Appeal and again Mr. Bilodeau lost, and he was then taken to the Supreme Court.

At no time in that letter did the Attorney-General ask for advice from this side of the House. It was purely an informational letter and I would think that if we had tried to sit down with the government at that time and the SFM, we'd have been told, I'm sorry, your presence isn't wanted. That's an assumption. — (Interjection) — The honourable member says, not a chance. At that

point in time he was not in the Cabinet. He can say whatever he wants, because his credibility, we know what it is in this province, he can make any statements he wants.

But Mr. Speaker, I suspect at that time that we would have been a very unwelcome party because we were certainly not asked to participate. And yet the First Minister of this province stands up and says that we refused to be co-operative, we refused to take part. Mr. Speaker, we were never asked. We were never asked. So we find that the problem that the Government House Leader has is one that also seems to spill over to the office of the First Minister of this province, one of lack of credibility and seemingly unconcerned for the truth.

That has to be a very sorry case for the people of Manitoba. When you have a government that is not concerned with integrity, with honesty, is not concerned with proceeding in an orderly manner in debate in the Assembly, then, Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that all the danger signs are there for a serious disruption of the parliamentary system. I don't believe that this government can single-handedly destroy the democratic process, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, they can, and they are proceeding at the present time to destroy the parliamentary system. That, Mr. Speaker, is an indictment that I lay at their feet because they are the ones that have destroyed decorum in this Chamber and the rules of parliamentary debate.

We had a little inkling of it, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks of the Honourable Member for Burrows when he said that the majority must always have its way. But at the same time, I say to the Honourable Member for Burrows, that when the majority does have its way, it has to do it with compassion and concern for the minority. To do anything less is dictatorial and destructive to the democratic system and also to the parliamentary system.

I heard the First Minister the other day, pleading for suggestions for change in this resolution. I want to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how those changes can occur. We are presently debating. It is going to be the intention of the government to change that resolution after debate has been completed, is that the intention of the government? Because they have changed it three or four times now, and they may change it again. I want to ask the Honourable Government House Leader if there are any further changes to this Legislation, will the members of the Assembly have an opportunity to debate those changes? Will we have an opportunity, or is the government going to do what it has set out from the very beginning doing, and that is bringing forward proposals without consultation, changing them at their own will, but also, Mr. Speaker, and I have to give them some credit, making changes only after an alert, active, and aggressive opposition has prodded them into it.

We know well, Mr. Speaker, last June, 17th of June to be exact, when the Honourable Attorney-General, in response to questions from our Leader at that time, said there would be no public hearings. He was persuaded to change that viewpoint and for that I give him credit.

First of all, he said there will only be informational hearings, and then he put out his famous little pamphlet, "Constitutionally Speaking," and held a series of four meetings around the province.

Well, the government should have known at that time, Mr. Speaker, that all was not well on the constituency front because the Attorney-General at that time got the first inkling that maybe the people of Manitoba did not want what he, in his collective wisdom, felt was good for them.

We proceeded from that, Mr. Speaker, to a few days of debate in this Assembly, and I say only a few days of debate because I think there were three, maybe four speakers, and that was about all, and the subject matter of the resolution was referred to a committee.

That committee went out, Mr. Speaker, from the first week in September, to the first week in October, and I think we heard over 400, received over 400 briefs from the people of Manitoba. I would say that many of those that presented a brief represented maybe 1,000

to 5,000, 10,000 people, so you had an expression of opinion from the public at that time that the government would have been well advised to listen to.

We had four municipal organizations, Mr. Speaker, that to a degree supported the government. The remainder of the municipal corporations in this province, who made presentation to that committee, did not support the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time being 10:00 p.m., when this motion is next before the House the honourable member will have 18 minutes remaining.

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