



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 121 - 10:00 a.m., SATURDAY, 30 JULY, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, 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, 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	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNESSE, 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

Saturday, 30 July, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Western equine encephalitis

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Deputy Premier, who is the Minister to whom questions can be directed this morning relative to the aerial spraying program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Environment is in the building. He will be in shortly. I could take the question as notice at the moment, if the member opposite so wishes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Premier then, can the government confirm the - I see the Minister of the Environment is now coming into the Chamber, Mr. Speaker - I'll direct my question to the Minister of the Environment as the Minister answerable for the Emergency Measures operation and the spraying program in the encephalitis situation.

Can the government confirm diagnosis of western equine encephalitis in a horse in the Wawanesa district?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just held a meeting with the central task team this morning. That particular issue was addressed. I am informed that, no, we cannot confirm a case of western equine encephalitis in a horse. There is a clinical case that shows symptomology of it. However, we cannot confirm that in fact the virus is active in that particular animal. There are over 130 cases in humans, under investigation, but again we cannot confirm any cases in either horses or humans.

As the member is well aware in 1981, I believe, they had over 800 cases in humans under investigation, of which 25, or thereabouts, turned out to be confirmed cases of western equine encephalitis. So the difficulty is that there are symptoms out there but there are no confirmed cases by way of serology and that's what we need to be able to state, that the virus is at work.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise whether there are significant suspect horse cases, or significant horse suspects in the Wawanesa area, or in any part of southwestern Manitoba, that has not been designated as yet as a high-risk area, or is this the only suspect horse case to come from that part of the province?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, every suspect case at this stage is significant and also at the same time it must be noted, that every suspect case is not confirmed. There are no confirmed cases of western equine encephalitis in horses or humans as of yet in any area in the province. There are a number of cases under investigation.

One does not even wish to use the word "suspect" because the implications of it are significant. What we are saying is, there are cases that have been brought to our attention that are under a very thorough investigation to determine as to whether or not they are cases of western equine encephalitis in both humans and horses, but there are no confirmed cases. We hesitate to use the word "suspect" in that there may be a large number of other causes that may be suspect as well.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the care with which the Minister wishes to approach the semantics and the terminology but there has to be some barometers, so let me put it this way to the Minister.

That region of Manitoba has not been designated a high-risk area. Some concerns are now expressed and experienced by residents of that region because of media reports in the past 24 hours that said there had been a confirmed case in a horse in that region. I am asking the Minister whether there is significant warning and indication in that region to prompt any decision to include that area in the spraying program.

HON. J. COWAN: Those communities which are being sprayed are being sprayed on the basis of a number of criteria being met. The three basic criteria are, firstly, there is a large number of offending mosquitoes that are being trapped, the *Culex tarsalis*. The second is, there is virus present in sentinel flocks or in wild bird populations, and we have identified it. The third is, that the weather is biting weather; in other words, that we have the type of conditions which would cause for large influxes of mosquitoes in a biting state.

When we have those present, we then spray. In every area that we have identified those we have sprayed, or we are going to spray over the next number of days. In those areas that have not had those identifications, we are not spraying. Basically, that's the crux of the system.

We are out right now, and have been for the past number of weeks, monitoring sentinel flocks and also monitoring some co-operative flocks; in other words, flocks that were not put out specifically for the purpose of being a sentinel chicken flock, but flocks that may

in fact give us some indication as to viral activity in the wild bird population or in the bird population in the area. To date, we are spraying or have identified a spray program for those areas where we have found those conditions to exist.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment along the same line as my colleague for Fort Garry's line of questioning. When could the Minister of Environment recheck, or would the Minister of Environment recheck those criteria in the Towns of Wawanesa and Souris and in that particular region where, in fact, those reports have come from and give consideration to spraying those regions and towns in view of the press reports?

HON. J. COWAN: I will determine as to what checks have been made, and I will also suggest to the central task team that they undertake testing in those two communities specifically on the advice of members opposite on the concerns that have been expressed and will report back to the House, but certainly I will relay that information to the Central Task Team.

Of course, it is not my decision to make as to which communities shall be sprayed. It is a decision of the task team which has representation from the Department of Health on it who are primarily responsible for doing the monitoring for the viral activity, but I will certainly do that on behalf of the members opposite.

Farm Lands Ownership Act - amendments

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in view of the opposition of the House and the people of Manitoba put forward on Bill No. 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act, will the Minister of Agriculture be introducing amendments in this Session of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to members before, it would be my hope that we could pass Bill No. 3 so it could go to committee and hear the views of Manitobans. As I have indicated before, there will be amendments made and as soon as they're finalized, I hope to give them to the honourable members for their information.

MR. J. DOWNEY: When will they be ready so that we can see them, Mr. Speaker?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, normally amendments are brought into and presented at committee stage, but if the honourable members are hoping to have amendments and using that as a lever whether to pass the bill into committee stage or not, I hope they're not using that avenue as a stalling technique.

Mosquito fogging

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address my question to the Minister of Environment. Inasmuch as the government has decided to have sprayed some of the beaches along Lake Winnipeg, I'm wondering whether any consideration was given to spraying for mosquitoes along non-moving or slow-moving waterways which spawn great numbers of mosquitoes. I am thinking particularly of rivers like the La Salle or the Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: I think the aerial spray program is being confused with other ongoing programs which have been in place, are in place, and will continue to be in place after the aerial program has been disbanded. The aerial program itself is for communities where we have identified a high-risk situation in respect to western equine encephalitis being present by way of viral activity in the bird flocks, and high levels or epidemic levels of *Culex tarsalis* mosquitoes.

There are a whole number of other programs, including larviciding of slow-moving bodies of water, including spray programs, ground spray programs around those particular areas and other areas in the province that have been ongoing for some time and are continuing. I can find out specifics as to whether or not those particular bodies of water have been subjected to other spray programs, but the aerial spray program itself is confined to a radius around populated centres where we believe it is necessary to spray to prevent exposure to a potential western equine encephalitis epidemic. So I will check to see what other spray programs are ongoing along those particular rivers and report back, but because the aerial program is not being instituted along a particular site such as that, it does not mean that other forms of protection are not being implemented.

Bill No. 110 - deposit limitation

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. This government's attitude has been described by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce as anti-business. In view of the fact that the government has bungled and botched this relationship since the day it took office, Mr. Speaker, and has meddled with it and overlegislated it and overregulated it, is the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs now prepared to withdraw his nonsensical, impractical piece of legislation whereby he would limit deposits to not more than 5 percent?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, the Member for St. Norbert doesn't go with the real facts. It's a perception perhaps that the member holds but I'm sure that it's not equally shared by the members of the business community; just as a

member last night tried to lead Manitobans to believe that Winnipeg has a very high rate of CPI; he made some reference to during their administration, that they had one of the lowest. He failed to mention that last year Winnipeg also had the lowest CPI increase in Canada under an NDP administration.

With respect to Bill 110, those amendments, if there are any, will be presented at the time that the bill gets into committee. At that time, I will indicate what my intentions are, if any.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not have any concern for the large number of retailers and businesspeople in the Province of Manitoba who are extremely concerned with this piece of legislation and if the government intends to proceed with it, want to come to the Legislature to make representations to the committee?

Would the Minister not indicate now so that if he does intend to withdraw that section of the bill, all of these people will not be inconvenienced and have to come to the Legislature? Would he not give some consideration to the convenience of the large number of businesspeople who are opposing this piece of legislation?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The opposition is not the only one that has heard from the small community. Certainly the small business community has been in contact with our office. We have responded to their calls. We have provided information as to how they could make their concerns heard in committee and through letters, and we will take their concerns under consideration. Any amendments will be announced when the bill goes into committee.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, are the Minister and the government so stupid that they don't yet realize how dumb that amendment is?

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

Bilingualism in Manitoba

MR. G. MERCIER: A question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Natural Resources last night referred to an agreement with the Federal Government and the SFM with respect to the bilingualism amendment. Would the First Minister agree to table a copy of the agreement with those parties and any others that were involved in the agreement, or else copies of the legislation which encompass the terms of the agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that's a matter of discussion that is presently before the House. There is no signed agreement as such.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, would the First Minister advise whether there is either a signed agreement between this government and the parties, or else correspondence which encompasses the terms of an agreement with respect to this matter?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, there is no signed agreement. There is an agreement insofar as proceedings before the Supreme Court of Canada that there would be a recess, and that those proceedings would not proceed as a result of certain understandings that have been arrived at in respect to the parties that were involved in the action which is presently before the Supreme Court on a recessed basis.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if there is no signed agreement, is there correspondence which outlines the terms of this agreement? Surely that must be on record and if so, we're entitled to see a copy of it because we are debating this important subject.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, any questions pertaining to correspondence, etc., can be addressed to the Attorney-General.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Finance . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Health care system - cutbacks

MR. G. MERCIER: To the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Finance acknowledge in the light of his announcement the other day with respect to imposing limits on increases in grants to hospitals, schools, universities, etc., to between 0 and 5 percent, would he acknowledge that there is a possibility, with those types of restrictions, that there might either be a reduction in services, or increase in mill rates, or other costs to the public as a result of those restrictions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, every time you announce guidelines to agencies as governments do every year, oppositions can argue that it, in some way or another, is going to impact on programming.

When the Lyon Government cut back entirely on a dollar basis year-over-year to those various institutions, what was the answer of the then Attorney-General? He was saying, oh no, this can be lived with; that could be lived with for year one; it could be lived with for year two; it could be lived with in year three, but in the fourth year, they had a huge 16 to 18 percent increase to most institutions. They did the old Tory tango of three steps backward and one step forward, thinking that people would be fooled by that.

Mr. Speaker, we are telling institutions at a time when we don't have an awful lot of money, as everybody knows; that we are all going to have to be in this together. We are going to have to attempt to provide services within the means that we believe we may have available. If members opposite want us now to spend a great deal more than let them say so, but I am becoming increasingly annoyed on the one hand, over hearing the opposition complain about our deficits; and

on the other hand hearing them complain that we are not spending enough money.

Withdrawal of Bill No. 48

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the First Minister then. In view of the answer of the Minister of Finance that there is certainly a possibility of a reduction in services or an increase in mill rates or user fees; and in view of his answer that the government doesn't have . . .

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Don't lie about my answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . and in view of his answer that the government doesn't have a whole lot of money, Mr. Speaker; would the First Minister withdraw Bill No. 48, The Election Finances Act, which will require the public to pay 50 percent of their election expenses at the same time they are asking people to accept a reduction in services, increases in mill rates or increases in user charges?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I reject the misinformation from the Honourable Member for St. Norbert. This is not a government that is following the lead of the Conservative-like government in British Columbia that has increased some user fees by over 100 percent regarding medical services. This is not, Mr. Speaker, a government like the Conservative Government of Alberta that has imposed per-diem fees in respect to stays in hospitals. This is not the Conservative Government in New Brunswick that has imposed out-patient user fees in respect to the residents of the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. Speaker, I know what Conservative governments are doing throughout this country. This government is doing all that it can to govern in a way that is separate and apart from the reactionary, ultra-Conservative, inhuman policies that are being pursued in other parts of this country.

MR. G. MERCIER: I am going to try again to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I want the First Minister to justify to the people of Manitoba how he can impose reductions in services, increases in mill rates, increases in user fees and tuitions and, at the same time, ask the public of Manitoba to pay 50 percent of the NDP Party's election expenses.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not sure whether the Honourable Member for St. Norbert had a question or whether he was making a statement. If he does have a question, would he pose it as a question seeking information.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question. I don't know whether you ruled it out of order, but I would like to respond and provide a speech to the Member for St. Norbert about what is taking place under this government in contrast to what is

occurring in other parts of this country under Conservative-like governments.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance didn't make any reference to user fees, to mill rates. What the Minister of Finance indicated, that this government was going to be as prudent as was possible in respect to the management of its financial affairs but, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba are now witnessing on their TV screens every night what is happening in other parts of this country under Conservative administrations.

Mr. Speaker, honourable members say, don't worry about what's happening in other provinces. Manitobans can see very well what would be taking place in Manitoba under a Conservative administration by looking at the mirror of what is happening in other provinces under Conservative administrations in this country. Let's not fool anybody.

Health care system - cutbacks

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, in light of the announcement made by the Honourable Minister of Finance the other day regarding restraint - or I think it was described last night by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development as repriorization - can I ask the First Minister when rural communities such as the Town of Roblin could be assured they'll have medical service and doctors in place?

A MEMBER: Only if they have a New Democratic Government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I can't assure them, if there was a Conservative Government in this province, what would be the case.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can also assure the First Minister, when there was a Conservative Government we had doctors in the rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, seeing that the First Minister is not going to answer that question, can I ask him then if he'll consider sending his Minister of Health or at least some of the department out to Roblin and these rural communities today who haven't got doctors and can't get along under the present government's health regulations? Now, of course, with repriorization it's going to be worse. Can I ask if he could send some staff out to the rural communities and take a look at how serious it is?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform Manitobans that the New Democratic Party of the Province of Manitoba, unlike what is taking place under Conservative administrations in other parts of this country, is committed to the preservation of Medicare, universal; is committed to opposing the imposition of user fees; is committed to the preservation of that which the pioneers of this country and this province fought long and hard to accomplish and, I must acknowledge, against the Conservative Party forces of the day until the Conservative Party forces of the day were forced to bring in Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, this is a party and a government, unlike Conservative administrations elsewhere in this country, that is committed to the preservation of Medicare. Let there be no error on the part of the thinking of any honourable members across the way in that respect.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the First Minister then if he or his government are prepared to either legislate or regulate the medical colleges in this province so that the graduate doctors will, at least, stay in the province and towns like Roblin or Eriksdale and these rural communities for at least two or three years before they move out. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that type of policy has been successful in the Department of Agriculture. Can I ask him if the government is prepared to deal with the shortage of doctors in rural Manitoba in a similar manner?

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would be interested in knowing if we are receiving a unanimous recommendation from the Conservative opposition that we regulate in Manitoba the place of practice of the medical profession in Manitoba. I would be interested in receiving advice of whether the recommendation of the Honourable Member for Russell is a recommendation unanimously of members of the opposition in this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, for all his smoke and mirrors about British Columbia and other jurisdictions and his failure to recognize that the primary concern that we have in this House is this jurisdiction, can the First Minister deny that the dictum proclaimed by his Finance Minister earlier this week means that there will be cutbacks in health care services and in public institutions in 1984? Can he deny that?

His Minister of Economic Development couldn't deny it. In fact, she confirmed last night that there will be health care cutbacks in 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I have been informed that those questions were asked last night, and that honourable members received full answers. I would like to indeed apologize on behalf of Manitobans to the people of the Province of British Columbia who do not consider the actions of the Bennett Government to be smoke and mirrors.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the questions were not answered last night by the First Minister and I am putting the question to the First Minister. In the light of the smoke and mirrors that he's been practising in this debate this morning trying to take the attention off Manitoba and focus it on other provinces - and I'm reminding him that our concern is this province and I am asking him - can he deny that the 0 to 5 percent declamation by his Finance Minister earlier this week means cutbacks in health care services, cutbacks in hospitals, cutbacks in schools, cutbacks in universities, cutbacks in public programs.

The First Minister was not asked that last night because it wasn't possible for him to answer it last

night. It wasn't possible for him to be here last night. I am asking him today. I am asking the First Minister, can he deny that cutbacks are a-comin' in 1984.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the imposition of wise and prudent guidelines does not mean the cutting of health services within the Province of Manitoba. It does not mean that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member smiles because he is of the view that this government has no alternative but to follow the route of Conservative administrations in other parts of this country. We intend to follow a different path, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, can the First Minister tell this House how that posture and this statement jibes and squares with his nefarious, deceptive, dishonest promise in the election campaign to restore health services in Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to waste my time because it doesn't bother me one bit to hear the kind of dishonest descriptions that are being constantly referred to by honourable members across the way of members on this side because I accept the source of those comments.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to compare our health standards in the Province of Manitoba with any other jurisdiction, with any other province in Canada and I am not about to be like the chicken taking lectures from the fox when it comes to preservation of the chickens. In the same way, I am not about to take lectures from Conservatives when it comes to the preservation of universal Medicare, applicable to all Manitobans in this province.

Provincial funding guidelines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. Last year school divisions and municipalities pleaded with this government for support of the Federal Government's 6 and 5 guidelines. This government absolutely refused to go along with that, Sir. My question to the First Minister is this: has this government so destroyed the economy of this province, the revenue base of this government, that they now are prepared to go with a 0 and 5 program?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we look at what has happened in British Columbia where they were the first province to move in respect to 6 and 5-like legislation; a \$1.6 billion deficit projected for the forthcoming year. Mr. Speaker, it was this government that sat down with the public employees of this province. It was this government and I believe the only government - I believe the first government by way of example - that sat down with its own employees and reopened a legally binding contract that returned, to the Province of Manitoba and the entire provincial community, anywhere from \$600 to \$800 per public servant in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the only government to my knowledge in Canada that did that; that didn't proceed

by way of legislation, by way of intimidation, by way of threats.

I wish, I trust and I know, because I know the municipal people of this province, that they'll undertake that same sort of trust and discussion with their own municipal employees as we did at the provincial level in the future.

Economic recovery

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a further question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. During the election in 1981, the First Minister promised that he would be able to turn around the economy of this province. Since that time, of course, the government has bungled away any major opportunities for development in this province that were under way by the previous government. What will we see from this government by way of economic initiative that will extend beyond the cynical Jobs Fund programs?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in response to the honourable member's question, Manitobans are much more realistic than the members of the Conservative opposition in this Chamber. Manitobans know that this province is coming out of an international recession that has struck a severe blow in respect to all parts of the world community. Manitobans are wiser than members of the Conservative opposition because they know that each and every part of Canada has witnessed a severe economic blow.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a day travels by that I am not advised by some Manitoban, that has returned to this province from Alberta, that they'd gone out to Alberta during the Tory years; had been laid off in the Province of Alberta; have returned to the Province of Manitoba. Manitobans are much more sophisticated than honourable Conservative members across the way would like to consider Manitobans to be. But, Mr. Speaker, beyond that, this government is making important steps.

We have reduced the unemployment levels in this province from the traditional third level to the second-lowest level in Canada. Total investment in the Province of Manitoba is indicated to be the third best by the Conference Board of Canada for the year 1983; and economic indicators that were eight and nine and 10, one after another, during the Conservative years, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981, have moved upward to improve Manitoba's performance basis in respect to that which is happening in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it's not easy. It's not difficult. We are fighting the damage that has been inflicted upon Canada and upon other western nations because of ultra-Conservative tight-money, high-interest rate policies and honourable members may laugh. They may ridicule that all they wish, but until we join together as political forces in this country to say, no, no to any further tight-money, high-interest rate policies, there still will be the infliction of damage upon Canadians and those in the western world and there still will be the human and economic tragic waste of unemployment, Mr. Speaker.

This government is doing all that it can within its limited resources to fulfill the commitment that it made to Manitobans in 1981.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. I'm sure that the 17,000 additional people who are unemployed now, as compared to when this government took over, will have difficulty appreciating the improvements which he has brought about.

The First Minister has promised an economic development strategy, Sir, and, of course, has been criticized widely by various sectors of the economy in Manitoba, including the Manitoba Federation of Labour for not producing that economic strategy. My question to the First Minister is, has the economic strategy of this province now been reduced to the point where it is solely dependent upon the tax dollars being recirculated through the cynical Jobs Fund?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if indeed the Jobs Fund was cynical, then I don't know why each and every Conservative opposition member to an individual voted in support of what they have referred to as being cynical or having been a fraud. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, at the two-faced approach of honourable members across the way.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as economic strategy and development, let me assure the honourable members across the way that this government is working in respect to policies pertaining to the mining base of this province, the agricultural base, the oil industry which is demonstrating substantial improvement. We are working to improve the service industry of this province, the manufacturing industry of this province.

The Jobs Fund that honourable members love to scoff at, Mr. Speaker, has been acting as a stimulative device and not a non-stimulative device in respect to the economy of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, we have, against very very difficult odds but well in comparison with that which has occurred in other parts of this country, has mounted a major effort to combat unemployment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to make a short non-political announcement in regard to a birthday.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

Oil exploration

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister referred to efforts undertaken by his government in the area of oil exploration. Can the First Minister name one new initiative in the oil industry beyond committing to spend \$20 million of taxpayers' money on another Crown corporation?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy and Mines just can't wait to be given an opportunity to respond to that question of a general nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUUK: Mr. Speaker, when we took office on December 1st, we found that the previous administration had not done anything at all to negotiate any changes in pricing with respect to what's called a new oil reference price. It was the new oil reference price which has, in fact, provided a pretty significant increase to the return that oil companies make when in fact - it was Alberta and Saskatchewan doing their homework, Mr. Speaker, and they had completed that. I had one short month, Mr. Speaker, to negotiate the new oil reference pricing, because the previous administration had done nothing. They had done nothing at all, Mr. Speaker to deal with that.

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

Does the Honourable Member for Pembina should know that exhibits are not allowed in this House. He should put away that toy that he has.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, someone anonymously sent me this. I thought it was a letter bomb, but it turns out it is an innocent thing, little toy for my child, I presume.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not have a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUUK: We have, in fact, moved to - so we've changed our new oil reference price. If anyone, Mr. Speaker, reads the reports on things that have added to the oil development, the new oil reference pricing has. We are moving, Mr. Speaker, to ameliorate disputes that take place between the agricultural industry and the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, what we have talked about is long-term, stable development with respect to the oil industry. We did bring in legislation, Mr. Speaker, to extend royalties which the Conservatives brought in, for a four-year period - Mr. Speaker, we have a little boy in the House. Mr. Speaker, I think that boy has shaved his moustache and turned green. Mr. Speaker, he is obviously green with envy as the whole Conservative Party has been green with envy since November of 1981. They have not been able to accept the fact that we are the legitimate government of this province, put in power by the people of Manitoba. They somehow feel that they are the legitimate government, even though the people have told them otherwise, and they seem to be stooping to every possible trick to try and overturn the legitimate wishes of the people as demonstrated in November of 1981.

Mr. Speaker, the oil industry is developing well. It has a long-term future. I was pointing out that we did bring in legislation to extend royalties that I say were brought in by the Conservative administration, but which were running out, Mr. Speaker, and had run out. That legislation has been extended by us. I believe that we do have a long-term set of policies in place which will lead to good, stable, long-term development, and the oil activity in this province over the last two years which the Conservatives said would come to a complete standstill if the New Democratic Party was elected has, in fact, increased very tremendously, Mr. Speaker.

So they can't blame us for that, Mr. Speaker. They don't want to give us credit for that, Mr. Speaker. They only want to give us blame for that which doesn't happen, and they don't want to give us credit for any of the good things that are happening because, Mr. Speaker, they are totally a negative opposition, not a constructive opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: I want to make a short non-political announcement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it should go unnoticed that 109 years ago on July 29th, J.S. Woodsworth was born. This was mentioned yesterday on one of the radio stations, and I simply think it should be noted that the great Canadian politician who was the founder of the CCF and MP for Winnipeg North from 1921 to 1942 was born yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further non-political statements?

The Honourable Acting Government House Leader.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON MOTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, will you call the motion, and there are amendments on it, dealing with Section 23 of The Manitoba Act found on Page 12 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, and the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, why are we here debating this resolution this morning? Why are we asking the staff to be here on the long weekend, especially when the staff who are associated with this House have got an upcoming Parliamentary Conference and have great pressures placed upon them, both by the long Session and by the Conference that's upcoming. What has happened to the concern of the Minister of Finance who, following the sitting on Easter Monday, came into this House and complained about the fact that staff were having to come into the Chamber; complained about the costs associated with

bringing those members, with bringing those staff into this House? What has happened to the members opposite? What's going on here?

Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons why we're here this morning. One is, that the government opposite broke their word. The Government House Leader broke his word, Mr. Speaker. We had an agreement between the two House Leaders whereby the House would have sat yesterday morning. A committee would have sat yesterday afternoon, and we would have all gone home for the weekend. We would have all gone to the lake, just as the Government House Leader has done, Sir.

Instead, three or four days ago because they weren't happy that we weren't allowing them to ram through the resolutions that they wanted rammed through, they then went back on their word and said that this House would have to sit during the long weekend, and said there was no understanding and I thought for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that just perhaps I might have misunderstood what the Government House Leader intended. But I know now for certain that I didn't misunderstand what he said because he's not here; because he's at the lake; because he's carrying out his part of the bargain for himself; because he made his plans for the weekend; because he knew he'd agreed that this House would not be sitting this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, that's the second time that type of thing, that type of double-dealing has occurred, because I remember on the long weekend in April, on the Easter long weekend, when the Minister of Finance stood up in this House and complained about the cost of staff being here and saying that the members of the opposition insisted on sitting Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader had approached me then and asked about what we wanted to do on the Monday. I said I thought we should sit on the Monday and proceed and he said, I agree with that. When I put that in the House, he at least had the courage and he had the integrity to stand up then and agree that it was what he had said.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. B. RANSOM: Once again, we have the government breaking their word.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. If the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Member for Pembina wish to have their private debate, perhaps they would do so outside so that we can all hear the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: That's the immediate reason that we're here, Mr. Speaker. The second reason we're here, is that this government is trying to force through their resolutions dealing with the extension of French language rights on a fine Saturday morning on a long weekend in July and August.

There are constitutional amendments being proposed to this House that require careful consideration by the public. They require that the public have an opportunity to be fully heard and to understand, and that cannot be done by allowing this government to rush these

amendments through to a committee that will then sit and report back before the end of the Session.

Constitutional change should not be made on that basis, Mr. Speaker. The public do not know the nature of these amendments. Despite all the propaganda that this government has put out, they have never yet had the courage to print the actual amendments that they are going to make. Why won't they do that, Mr. Speaker? Why won't they print those amendments? Why won't they say that French and English are going to be the official languages of Manitoba? That's going into the Constitution. Why don't they go out and tell the public that, and perhaps the public is prepared to accept it, Mr. Speaker? But they will not come forward and place that on the table and go forward to the people and hear what they have to say.

What we have asked this government to do is refer this motion to an intersessional committee so that they may go out and travel across this province and allow people to make their views known. Constitutional change should not be made without some consensus. The public cannot achieve a consensus if they don't know what the amendments are, and this government is not providing them an opportunity to know what those amendments are.

They insisted that they go out with resolutions dealing with the Crow Rate, for instance, and said, we must have consensus; we cannot proceed without consensus. What happened to that, Mr. Speaker? Why are we here now on Saturday on a long weekend, trying to force through this resolution? Why? It isn't going to work. It's not good enough.

For the Acting Government House Leader to stand last night and try and say that he had some kind of agreement that we wouldn't criticize them, that we wouldn't hold them up, because we insisted on bringing in Speed-up, in order to try and help the government order their business in a way that they haven't been able to order their business ever since they've taken over.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what Speed-up is, or what it should be, what it allows the government to do when it's properly used. It allows this House to have three separate sittings a day, which means that the government has the opportunity to go through various stages of bills within a period of 24 hours. It gives one additional sitting because it's three instead of two. It waives the regular 10 o'clock adjournment hour at night, and allows members to put in more time debating.

It does not, if properly used, allow the government to do the kind of thing they are trying to do right now, to force through these resolutions. That was never the intention, Mr. Speaker. When the government now tries to say - when they cut off the cattle producers, for instance - they treated those cattlemen before that committee absolutely despicably, and then came back in this House and said, you wanted Speed-up. That's not part of Speed-up, Mr. Speaker. Those committees don't have an adjournment hour. Any committee can sit till 3 o'clock in the morning if it wants. That has nothing to do with Speed-up. Mr. Speaker, this government was handed a tool which could be appropriately used to get on with the business of government, and they choose to abuse it, Sir.

Yesterday, I offered this government the opportunity and said, we give leave to have the committee sit

yesterday afternoon and hear submissions on the seat belts; we'd have leave for the House to sit at the same time, and that the House could sit last night until 10 o'clock, then we'd adjourn and we would all go home for the weekend. No, they refused that, Mr. Speaker.

Instead they had the committee sit itself, and the House didn't sit yesterday afternoon. Then last night at 20 to 11, they move adjournment, Sir. The debate that's taking place here today could have taken place here yesterday afternoon, but because this government is so absolutely totally inept and bungling in their management of government business and the business of the House, Mr. Speaker, that's why we are here this morning. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, that this government expects to proceed this way.

Mr. Speaker, they must realize that they cannot force through a decision on this constitutional amendment without giving at least an adequate opportunity for the people to come up with a consensus. The Member for Ellice or whatever the constituency is — (Interjection) — no, it's the city mayoralty candidate - has expressed a public concern that he feels that there should be consensus on constitutional amendments.

Certainly, there must be other people over there who realize that constitutional amendments as basic as this one, Mr. Speaker, which are creating widespread fears and resentments about how this amendment will actually affect people in the decades to come, because there will be virtually no opportunity to change it, and because that is the case, Mr. Speaker, the government should not proceed to force it through to a decision. They must not do that, Sir.

We will use every means available to us to prevent the government from doing that. If they want it to go to committee, Mr. Speaker, it could have gone to committee by now. All that government needed to have done was accept the amendment that was put in by my colleague for Fort Garry and send it to an intersessional committee that could hear — (Interjection) — our committee, the member says, Mr. Speaker.

It is a committee of the Legislature, an intersessional committee of the Legislature that could hold hearings across this province. They could travel to various centres in this province. They could hear what people say. They could explain to people what this amendment is, because let them deny that there is resentment and fear among the people about what this amendment means. It is widespread and it is deep, Mr. Speaker, and they must not proceed with this. They must go out and listen to what the people have to say. What is wrong with that?

If what you say is true, then go out and convince the people that's it's true, and get the consensus. If you can't get consensus, then you should change what you're doing, because what you're doing in principle is wrong. You should not be making constitutional amendments in this way.

We should absolutely, categorically, not be here trying to make these decisions on the weekend to get this pushed through to meet the objectives, some kind of false objectives that that government has.

Mr. Speaker, I said before and I'll repeat it again, our plea to this government is to take this amendment to an intersessional committee. Let the people be heard. Don't force through this resolution. We will use whatever means are available to us to fight that, Mr. Speaker.

In order that we can come back and debate this fully, under conditions that are more conducive to reasoned and rational debate, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that this House do now adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday next.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

(And the division bells having stopped at 12:30 p.m.)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The division bells have been ringing this morning to summon members back into the Chamber to vote on a dilatory motion, that is, that the House do now adjourn. Since my reading of the Speed-up Motion is that adjournment at 12:30 is required, I have instructed that the bells be turned off. The motion that was before the House then becomes redundant.

The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. this afternoon.

MR. B. RANSOM: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the House that this House will sit at 2 o'clock this afternoon and Monday at 10 o'clock.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the motion is not just that the House adjourn. The motion was that the House adjourn until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: That is true.

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