



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. 120 - 8:00 p.m., FRIDAY, 29 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	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, 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	Rossmore	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

Friday, 29 July, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Presentations on Bill 60

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Deputy Premier.

In view of the fact that the committee, this afternoon's sitting, to hear briefs from the public of Manitoba on compulsory seat belts and mandatory helmet wearing was closed down by a very hard motion by the government majority after just slightly over half the briefs were heard by Manitobans wishing to speak against or for seat belts and helmets, could the Deputy Premier provide those citizens that have been deprived of their opportunity to voice their opinion on helmets and seat belts, advise on how they can be heard by this government which claims to be so open to the people of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that question has to do with the report from a committee, and that would be an appropriate time to raise an issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Tell that to the people who weren't heard . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Pembina is reminded that he should not ask questions of the proceedings of any committee which has not yet reported.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that individuals have called into this building this evening, expecting to be heard by the committee dealing with the bill on seat belts and helmets which was closed in a very high-handed way by the government majority this afternoon, can the Acting Premier assure those people, almost half of them wishing to make presentations to the government, will be heard by this government?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Pembina would like to rephrase his question

so as not to refer to proceedings of a committee which has not yet reported to the House.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: My question to the Deputy Premier is, will the people who are now unable to be heard on the seat belt bill be given an opportunity to voice their opinion to this government?

A final supplementary to the Deputy Premier, can the people of Manitoba who wish to make representation to this government on the bilingual amendment expect to be treated in the same high-handed, authoritarian way that citizens were treated this afternoon, wishing to present briefs on the seat belt and helmet legislation, or will, in fact, those Manitobans be heard by this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Pembina wants to draw into the debate that we had in committee, and I think it's rather unfair of him - him knowing, Mr. Speaker, that the Deputy Premier was not at the hearing and, therefore, would not be familiar with the proceedings.

The Member for Pembina should know that we had exhausted all of those wishing to present a brief, Mr. Speaker, an hour before adjournment time. We called for others who wanted to present briefs and there were no replies. There were two or three people in the audience in total at that time. Therefore, the committee's work with respect to the receiving of submissions on Bill 60 was complete and we adjourned early.

The Member for Pembina would like us to have an ongoing commitment for the next two or three weeks that others may come and present briefs on that bill. What the Member for Pembina should realize, and its a long-standing practice, Mr. Speaker, is that when we are in Speed-up, when the government is in Speed-up, it is often the case where we move from this room to Law Amendments Committee, from Law Amendments back into this Chamber, and that's the way the legislative process is carried on under Speed-up.

The members opposite wanted Speed-up. When we are speeding up, they are complaining, Mr. Speaker. They cannot have it both ways.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that not hearing Manitobans wishing to present briefs has nothing to do with Speed-up whatsoever, would the Acting First Minister give the assurance to this House tonight that Manitobans wishing to present briefs to the committee on the bilingual resolution will be not treated in the same callous and high-handed fashion as citizens of Manitoba were this afternoon and this evening by this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I presume the best way to test that hypothetical question is to get that bill into committee, or the resolution into committee, and then we will see that the people of Manitoba will be able to attend and present their views.

Provincial funding guidelines

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Deputy Premier, and I would ask her, in view of the statement by the Minister of Finance yesterday, that all increases to hospitals, universities and other provincially-funded institutions and agencies will rise by no more than 5 percent, possibly 0 percent in the next fiscal year, whether she can tell this House what that means for hospitals; whether hospitals have been advised that that is the case, and what that means in terms of hospital services, and what that means in terms of cutbacks of health care.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines that are issued are that they are guidelines. They are offered in an attempt to bring to all Manitobans a note of realism based on what the current economic situation is and the availability of revenues. The principles that we are following throughout, Mr. Speaker, are whether we are in good times or tough times, that both the advantages and the difficulties will be shared equally. They are guidelines in the preparation of budgets to alert people what the realistic framework of decisions is likely to be. Should we be able to track an improvement in the overall fiscal and economic conditions of the province and the country, we'd be only too happy to reconsider those guidelines, Mr. Speaker.

Health care system - cutbacks

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, measured against the rise in the Consumer Price Index and the fact that goods and services in the health care sector are demonstrably known to rise faster than those in any other component of the consumer price field, can the Minister confirm that this dictum announced by the government yesterday means that there will be cutbacks in health care services in Manitoba in 1984?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, what we have signalled to the people of Manitoba, to the agencies and all the people we fund directly or indirectly, is that we must co-operate throughout the province to see that we do live within our means.

As the members opposite have so often said, an excessive deficit can be too great for a province to bear. The policy that we have followed in the deficit financing of the province is that when the cyclical part of the economic cycle is at its bottom, that is an appropriate time for a government to go into deficit and help to complement that difficulty.

As we're now starting to see some gradual move out of that trough, it's appropriate for a government to rein back and keep a balance, if you like, between public and private spending. Within the ambit of public spending though, it will be our effort to see that, as I said before, both the burdens and the benefits are spread equitably throughout the entire system.

The health care system must always undergo careful review of how it is delivering service of internal priorities it sets. It must always be encouraged to seek for more efficient and more effective ways to deliver this service.

Mr. Speaker, guidelines that are issued to agencies are not fixed budget amounts. They are an initial signal of expectation which is related to the province's ability to fund.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no dispute over the desirable objective of co-operation in this field which is under discussion; nor is there any dispute over the fact that health care budgets and spending have to be carefully reviewed from time to time. That wasn't my question.

My question, which comes out of four years of irresponsible criticism by those members opposite when they were in opposition, and that comes out of the reality of today's Consumer Price Index and the degree to which the goods and services in the health care component are rising, my question, Sir, was, can the Deputy Premier confirm that the dictum articulated by the government yesterday means that there will be cutbacks - that horrible word which was hurled at us for four years by members opposite - there will be cutbacks in 1984 in the health care system in Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there will be realism and there will be an equitable fairness in the system. There will need to be some cutbacks if there are low priority services, and there may well be increases in high priority services; but, overall, the criteria that will be used by this government in determining priorities will be the relative need and the relative effectiveness of dollars spent. I think any responsible government can do no less, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, now that the Deputy Premier has confirmed, and it's on the record, that there will be cutbacks in the Manitoba health care system in 1984, can she tell this House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier has admitted it, and any member opposite who disputes that need only check the record and check her answer to me of one minute ago. There will be cutbacks in 1984 in the Manitoba health care system; we have established that. How does the Deputy Premier square that with the pledge of that government opposite when they were campaigning nefariously for election to "restore" the health care system in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seem to forget that there is a passage of time,

that we did fund the health care system at quite a significant increase for two years. Mr. Speaker, we have also, as we've been reviewing the different departmental spendings, identified areas that are of lower priority and also some new areas that need emphasis. It would be irresponsible of us to do other than that, Mr. Speaker. But the essential issue I think that must be recognized is that we are not just going to cut or raise things across the board in an automatic or mechanical way. We will be evaluating the various need levels, who will bear the impact if there are reductions of program here and improvements in program there, and what we will be attempting to do is to see that no one group, particularly no one vulnerable group such as the elderly, the ill, the very young, the disabled will have to bear an undue share of the hardship. We will be endeavouring to share the difficulty and to keep budgeting and spending on a very realistic and responsible level, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary. Based on questions that I asked of the Minister of Health on July 11th in this House based on a report from the Manitoba Organization of Nurses Association under the aegis of its President, Vera Chernecki, which charged that there is a health care crisis right now in Manitoba and that understaffing of hospitals has continued throughout the year despite an increase in the number of incidents endangering patients, and that's a direct quote from the reports on that claim by MONA; based on that and based on the fact that the Minister of Health said that he would have those charges of health care crisis and danger for patients investigated by the Manitoba Health Services Commission, can the Deputy Premier tell this House and tell the people of Manitoba how they are going to address that threat that already exists to patient care in Manitoba, as testified to by MONA, when they are intending to cut back health care in Manitoba in 1984?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I don't quite see how the member opposite makes such a simplistic and automatic leap. He cannot understand the concept of a guideline in preparing a budget with a final decision and an allocation of resource. If we can determine that there are severe lacks in the health care system, I give my word and I know my colleagues do as well, to see that there is internal reprioritization. It may well be that certain components of the system receive well in excess of a 5 percent increase, the contrary thing would be that some would receive less.

But in all cases, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that we're dealing with a much lower inflation rate now than when we came in two years ago when we were dealing well up in the double-digit inflationary area, and that the CPI, though relevant, there are subcomponents of that system that have to be looked at. We will deal realistically with the increased cost but we will be dealing in a selective way, according to priorities, and priorities of need, Mr. Speaker.

But it is important, and I think that the members opposite, in a sense, are rather surprising. They have been calling for a lower level of expenditure, but when they see a government that is prepared to adapt its spending to the need out there and to play a cyclical

balancing role in the economy, they can't recognize it for what it is. They have a domino theory, Mr. Speaker, that when you start to spend in one direction, you inevitably keep going without ever stopping, up to infinity. Over here what we're doing is exercising balanced judgment, identifying high priorities of need and then tailoring our budget accordingly.

Provincial funding guidelines

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Premier. Is it the intention, Mr. Speaker, of the government to limit increases in grants to the City of Winnipeg to 5 percent, or less, in 1984?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if I'm going to have to call for a dictionary and get the interpretation of what guideline is so that the members opposite understand. This is the stage in estimates development and in budgeting where you try to set global concepts as to what is going to be realistic. There is a provincial pie to be shared. The question of how much is there is the point we are signalling now. How it will be divided, Mr. Speaker, will depend on the analysis and the proposals that come forward from departments, but it would be less than responsible of us to let people think they were living in a 25 percent increase mode, or in a minus 25 percent. We have not said we're going to cut 25 percent of civil servants, just with a ruthless ideological base that is being practised out in B.C.; we said we're going to make a conscientious effort at identifying the need, but that the overall increase is going to be in the 0 to 5 percent range.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Consumer Price Index increase in the City of Winnipeg during the past year has put the City of Winnipeg in the second highest position, next only to St. Johns, of all major Canadian cities in Canada; whereas, under our government, the City of Winnipeg had the lowest consumer price index increase in all of Canada. Does the Deputy Premier expect, under the 5 percent or less guidelines of the Minister of Finance; does the Deputy Premier and the government expect the City of Winnipeg to reduce services or increase the mill rate?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I expect all Manitobans, the City of Winnipeg included, will co-operate to be realistic, that they will go through the same exercise the rest of us are in identifying high level need and in identifying low level need. If the CPI is impacting more harshly on those of low income, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that they would move to compensate people of low income more. If there are people with more basic and pressing needs that are in hardship, I would hope that they would prioritize their expenditures according to that. I do find it most amusing and rather disheartening that the members opposite, after having spent all of this past two years claiming that we were spending too much and that we had no grasp of the

economy, to suddenly flip over into the other side and to go after us for spending too little.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, we believe that the role of government is to balance out the cycles that are in the economy with their spending. It's called a counter-cyclical approach; and at the same time to work to strengthen the structural nature of the economy that underlies the entire provincial economy and, in the final analysis, does provide us with the basic wealth with which to fund all the other services. Health care and the City of Winnipeg needs will all receive fair attention and it would be precipitant of me to say, at this point in time, what the precise level of final allocation is to either group.

School taxes

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. In view of the fact that under the NDP, in the City of Winnipeg School Division, on an average assessed home of \$7,000, the mill rate has increased three times in a period of two years, the total increase that occurred under the Progressive Conservative Government for a period of four years; three times in just two years, Mr. Speaker. Would the Deputy Premier, on behalf of the NDP and this government, now admit to the people of Manitoba that when they said in the election of 1981, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans" document, and they accused our government of starving the city for funding, and they promised to ease the property tax burden, they were not telling the truth?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what we're getting is a measure of CPI and tax levels and so on, with no notion as to what the fair share or the fair burden in benefit questions are, nor of what the overall economic and fiscal conditions are of the province. Not all of those are within our control, Mr. Speaker, but what is within our control is to see that we deal realistically and fairly with the current situation, and that is what we're proceeding to do.

Provincial funding guidelines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier and ask her, when will the Provincial Government's new austerity program begin; now, on January 1st, or later?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure where my colleague has been in the past while if he thinks that we have not — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the affairs of Manitoba are visible and observable to my colleague, whether or not he's in caucus.

The attempt to bring our spending patterns and our budgeting in line, both with the ability of the province to support, and also with the needs of the economy when it's at a cyclical downturn, have been the considerations we've been making.

We have been moving into a much reduced level of increase in spending between last year and this year, along with the decline in the inflationary level. I don't know what indicators the members opposite paid attention to when they were looking at their budget, but I suspect they considered very much the same ones that we do except, perhaps, they didn't pay as much attention to who was benefiting and who was suffering with the measures that they applied.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat confused after that reply. I would like to ask the Deputy Premier if she could indicate whether the remainder of the government's promotional advertising program on bilingualism will be cancelled in view of the austerity program or whether it, too, will be subject to a zero to 5 percent increase and whether, in fact, the advertising and promotional budget on bilingualism just made it in under the wire before austerity was imposed?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think that my friend in the back row does not understand the nature of prioritization. He is not aware of the kind of judgments and reallocations that have been going on this past year, and I think to name a realistic guideline as an austerity package, without recognizing that there have been significant improvements, relative funding levels for schools and hospitals and, indeed, for the City of Winnipeg for the last two years, so that the base from which they're operating is already higher, is to show his ignorance of the estimates process and of the very careful and thorough reprioritization that has been going on for many many months, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would repeat my question and ask whether this promotional advertising program has been subject to restraint, or whether it made it into fact, and into implementation, prior to the imposition of restraint measures in Manitoba?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, estimates guidelines that go out in the month of July are for estimates submissions that come in in the fall months for inclusion in a budget that will be presented early next year, and that will govern the spending from April 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985.

The priorities for spending of the current year have been the subject of much debate, and the priority that we do see as important to attach to the information on the French Language Services is already established and I, therefore, think that the question is quite an irrelevant question to the actual estimates process that was being discussed.

Bilingualism - advertising

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, a final question. Can the Minister confirm that the advertising to promote bilingualism, through this pamphlet, cost at least \$28,000 for printing; \$27,000 for mailing, production

costs, and now, at least one ad in every weekly and ethnic newspaper in Manitoba, including the Winnipeg Sun and including the Free Press, which obviously cost thousands and thousands of dollars for newspaper space? Can the Minister confirm those costs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I think the member needs to check the meaning of the word "advertising" and he needs to assess his own sense of priority. If he thinks the granting of language rights, which have been denied to people for so long, have to be weighed in that kind of term. To our group it is a high priority item, to inform people accurately as to what the introduction of French language services actually means, and in that sense, it would be irresponsible of us, Mr. Speaker, not to spend money informing the people of what the program does actually entail.

Provincial funding guidelines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. In light of the new cutbacks, does the Minister intend to limit grants to school divisions to 5 percent or less?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think my answer is going to be much along the same lines as the answer of the Deputy Premier, that what school divisions, schools and universities are going to be asked - like everybody else in the province - is to do their share, to make sure that where they're spending the money and where they need the money is the most important areas. There isn't anybody as important as the school system is, and I defend it at every turn. I would still say that we, like everybody else, have to go through the same process and that there is not unlimited money.

We can proudly say that this government gave a more generous level of support to the education system last year than did any other province in Canada, and that education, I'm sure, will continue to receive a priority for this government because it involves the human development of our most important resource - our children.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, they are going to have to do their share, to look at their budgets, and to try and meet the guidelines and to tell us what the effects and the consequences of the guidelines will be so we can judge whether or not there will be serious problems for them in living within that limitation. Then we will make the decision.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: In light of the Minister's great concern for the education, quality of education, and in this wonderful, "A Clear Choice for Manitoba," that education was going to be a priority with this government; will the school divisions now have to decrease and cut back services, or will there be more increases in the mill rates for the people in Manitoba?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think that last year the level of funding we gave and the amount of direct support from the Provincial Government saved more than half the school divisions in the province from being in the serious financial difficulty they would have been in had we maintained the Education Support Program the way they had brought it in, and reduce the mill rate through the supplemental program in more than 30 divisions and offset completely in 44 divisions, the impact of only a 2.5 mill rate increase that came out of the Educational Support Program.

The school divisions are responsible for setting the expenditures and establishing the budgets for their school divisions. It is their decision on how much to spend. It is their decision on what programs to have and how much to spend, so they are responsible for limiting expenditures. It is important that they know there is not unlimited money and they should be looking seriously at their programs like everybody else in the province, including government and government departments and hospitals are going to have to do.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the education system and the people delivering education know that they are much better off in Manitoba than almost any other province in the country, and that guidelines of last year of 0 and 9 percent and guidelines this year of 0 and 5 percent, are a heck of a lot better than \$100 million cut off the top, arbitrarily, off the education system.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education, in spite of all the wonderful things that she's been talking about and the fact that they threw money at the divisions last year, but still the taxes had to be increased, and now she's saying, after raising their expectations, they are going to have to cut back on services or raise the mill rate. Is this the promise that the NDP made to ease the tax burden for Manitobans? Is this the way you treat the citizens of Manitoba and the children of Manitoba and the expectations that you made for parents and school trustees in our province?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, we did not raise expectations of school divisions. I think we've tried to be very realistic and when we met with them last year, we told them that there was going to be limited resources, not unlimited. The budgets, previous budgets of 15, 16 percent were not going to be acceptable. Boards reduced their expenditure levels last year voluntarily without any legal requirements by being responsible, as we knew they would be, about 4 or 5 percent. They got average increases of 12 percent. The average increase in school board budgets across the province last year was 12 percent. We also told them that the resource limitations and difficulties were going to be with us for awhile and that we did not foresee the opportunity to have larger amounts of increased expenditures for the next few years and there was the likelihood that there would be less money and although we would continue to give education a high priority, as we have demonstrated our first two years in office, there would not be as much money and school divisions also would have to review what they were doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. During the election in 1981, I attended a town hall meeting called by the Winnipeg Teachers Society, and at the meeting the now Minister of Labour made the commitment that education taxes would be removed from property. Can the Minister of Education advise the House when that promise will be fulfilled?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I think we've been talking in this House for some time about a major educational review that's under way, that is the first major review and complete review of education finance that has been undertaken in this province in about 20 years, and it involves all aspects of both raising money and distributing money. We've clearly indicated that we'll be looking at assessment; we'll be looking at disparities in assessment; we'll be looking at grants; we'll be looking at programs and we'll be looking at property tax and it would be irresponsible to deal with one issue by itself. We clearly have to look at raising money and distributing money as a total package. All those are being dealt with by Dr. Nicholl's Education Finance Review. When that is public and we are discussing it and making recommendations and making decisions, we will be dealing with all of those issues.

MR. B. RANSOM: The Minister says that it would be irresponsible to look at only that one issue. Can the Minister advise whether or not it was irresponsible for the now Minister of Labour to promise, at that time, that property educational taxes would be removed from property?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe such a question is out of order in this House.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

Nicholls Report

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question in the same vein to the same Minister. I think the Minister at one time had indicated whether or not it was the government's intention to table the Nicholls Report. Could she tell us now whether it's the government's intention to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, I might not have been as clear as I thought I was. I thought that I did indicate quite clearly that we did intend to table the Nicholls Report.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us, specifically, in what time frame that report will be tabled?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the last time that question was asked was not very long ago, and it was asked by the Member for Tuxedo. I indicated that I had just received the report; that it was a very

large and complex report; that it was going to take some time, not an unnecessary or an undue amount of time, to review it and give consideration to it. I do recognize that school divisions are bringing in their budgets and will be working on them in the fall, and we intend to do everything necessary to begin to put out for public discussion and make the decisions that have to be made in time for their next budgeting process.

MGEA Agreement

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour. In light of the government asking agencies of government, as well as school boards and the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission, to live within the guidelines of zero to 5 percent, and in light of the fact that will have significant impact on some of the labour negotiations which are now before these different organizations that are relying on government funds, to a large extent; will the Minister inform the House whether or not the government will be reopening the MGEA Agreement which calls for a substantially larger increase in this coming year than the zero to 5 percent guideline?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only refer the member back to the agreement. If he will notice the first three months are at no increase; the second three months, the six months in the next fiscal year, are negotiated 0 percent increase for the first three months, because it's a continuation of the current contract; the next three months include a 1.5 percent increase in dollars, on average salary, which amounts to \$370 overall for each employee, applied to their salaries. And there is a long term disability plan to a maximum of 1 percent of payroll that will be in place for 1984. I hardly think that exceeds 5 percent guidelines.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that when you add up the cost to the Manitoba taxpayer that the next year's MGEA Agreement will be double what the 5 percent guideline established, will the government be renegotiating that MGEA agreement?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Clearly we will not be renegotiating an already renegotiated agreement.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, has the Minister of Labour, in dealing with this question of zero to 5 percent increase, is that the suggested guideline now for labour negotiations for agencies of governments?

HON. M.B. DOLIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, if the member would look at the current average level of agreements coming in he will find that is just about where they already are. In fact, without legislating what level agreements would come in at, Manitoba has in fact through negotiation, through consultation, come in below where other provinces have.

It is a natural dissention of order that is taking place, not always to the benefit of workers, but we do find that it is on the decline and it is just about at that level at this point. I don't have the figures in front of me, but I remember at the Federal-Provincial Conference of Finance Ministers that I attended recently with our Minister of Finance, we found that Manitoba was in, in fact, if you want to call from your perspective, a better situation. We have actually done better, if you consider that decline to be good, than provinces that have legislated, in many cases.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON RESOLUTION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RE: OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion found on Page 12, the motion in respect to the resolution dealing with Section 23 of The Manitoba Act? It stands in the name of the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, the Honourable Member for Gladstone has 40 minutes.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to speak on this very important subject although, after the revelations we had this afternoon at committee, I wonder if there is any point in us debating this and urging the government, because apparently with very many things they make up their mind and have a token effort at hearing what the people say and then do what they wish. So, in light of that tokenism, my spirits are rather down and I don't feel that we're going to get anywhere with this, but I certainly would like to add my words of encouragement to the government to proceed with the intersessional hearings as requested by the amendment made by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry.

It is amazing to me that we even have to debate this to convince this government that they should go into intersessional hearings. Why does this government all of a sudden feel that the views of Manitobans are not important? It is amazing, for instance, the haste with which they go ahead and do some things. For instance, we are asked to ram through the bill, namely Bill 90, the amendment to The Cattle Producers Association Act; we're asked to vote on it no matter how many people spoke against it. They alienated, I'm sure, most of the cattle producers of Manitoba by doing so. It doesn't seem to matter; but no delay seems too long for some subjects.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, when it comes to the assessment review problems of this province, all

the time in the world. We'll have more hearings and more hearings, and we won't do anything about that. The same Minister, when we want him or are urging him to announce his Main Street Program says, he wants it to be perfect; he doesn't want to hurry; he won't be stampeded; he wants it perfect. Well, maybe he and the other members of this government think that the agreement with the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Federal Government is perfect. Maybe they think so. Well, if they think it is so perfect, why are they afraid to take it to the people? Why are they afraid of the people telling them what they think of this?

The Member for Springfield says that they are holding hearings. He makes a big deal out of the fact that they held meetings and they held hearings. Why did they hold those meetings and why are they planning on holding a hearing in this Session? It was at the urgings of this side of the House that forced them to do it. They had no intention of doing it when they introduced that resolution. But after my leader and others on this side and others of the public pleaded with them, well, they went out and they had these meetings - not hearings, meetings - where they were to tell the people exactly what was being done — (Interjection) — the few that were allowed to speak, right.

A few asked to question them, they answered them, more or less, but from the first announcement of this matter they refused to hold intersessional hearings so that they can go throughout the province and hear what the people have to say about this. Now this begs some explanation. Why is this government who listens to everyone, Mr. Speaker, they listen, they consult, they talk to people, why are they not willing to listen to the people on this issue?

This government, Mr. Speaker, is slowly - and it almost seems as if they're doing it on purpose - alienating every segment of society in Manitoba. They're alienating the farmers and many others of this province as well as the farmers by their imposition of Bill 3, The Farm Land Ownership Act, not farm land protection or anything that would be a sensible thing like that, it's farm land ownership, with the emphasis on ownership. They have alienated the cattle producers, as I've said, with Bill 90. They've given the renters of this province false hope with their rent regulations of last year. They've caused upheaval with the labour laws when it comes to the payment of babysitters. They're promising to force mandatory seat belts and helmet laws through this House. They've certainly proved that today. They're the people who imposed the payroll tax. We have tax on employment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they've come up with yet another divisive subject to further alienate members of Manitoba society, the entrenchment of language rights in the Constitution. Here we have a subject fundamental to every single person in this province and many people not yet born. Nothing should stand in the way of the people having their say on this matter, absolutely nothing. No amount of rhetoric will convince me that the constitutional resolution should not be presented in every major centre in this province, so that everyone from one end of the province to the other can hear how this will affect them and question the government and make their views known to them so that this government will understand the concerns and the fears of the people.

There is a concern on this side of the House with the government putting out at public expense - at who knows what cost? - newspaper ads, pamphlets to each householder. I got one of these colourful brochures in my mailbox yesterday morning. I noticed with some amusement that in front of the mailboxes at my apartment there is a ledge where people throw the mail that they don't want and there was quite a number of those pamphlets on that ledge. — (Interjection) — I guess they didn't read the Pawley advertisement, no.

Then they provided at the meetings, a brochure telling their side of the story - only the government side. They did not include a copy of the resolution; they didn't include a copy of the present Manitoba Act or any such vital information as this to let the people make a judgment of what was happening. The government is only telling one side of the question and it's their side. The people should at least have the chance to tell their side of the story.

Since this is a government which wants to listen to people, consult with people and have input from all segments of society, why then do we have any hesitation on their part when it comes to a suggestion of committee hearings intersessionally so that the views of the people can be known to this government? I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that there are a great many people making their views known to this government, but we do not hear them standing in the House telling how many phone calls they've had from people suggesting that they do not wish them to go ahead with this. We never hear that kind of news from them.

The Leader of the Opposition on Friday, May 20th, when replying to the announcement of the agreement between the Government of Manitoba and the Franco-Manitoban Society and the Government of Canada, urged this government to delay this matter and give it longer and less hurried study. I quote his remarks from Page 2978 of Hansard on the left-hand column: "Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion to make to the government with respect to how this agreement should be dealt with from this point forward. I believe as in the matter of the previous Constitution Act that this government, our government, worked on for a number of years, the public has the right to see and to understand and to comment upon any agreement of this kind of substantive nature before the agreement is put into effect, and it is all the more important after we see this agreement today, all the more important that what I mentioned the other day in questions to the First Minister.

"Mr. Speaker, we cannot have any Legislature in Manitoba inflicting on our province some form of locked-in constitutional change which the people may well reject. Therefore, Sir, it is imperative that we have, I would suggest, a suspension of all further action on this agreement at the present time until the agreement can be placed before a legislative committee authorized to sit between Sessions, that is between the end of the 1983 Session and the beginning of the 1984-85 Session - between Sessions - and report at the next Session of the Legislature on the advisability as to whether or not the Legislature should confirm this agreement by resolution under Section 43 of The Constitution Act.

"The instrumentality that I'm suggesting, Sir, would be this: That the government would introduce a

resolution attaching this agreement as Schedule A, the import of the resolution would be not to approve or disprove of the agreement but rather to refer the agreement to a standing committee of the House that would then proceed intersessionally to sit and to hear representations about the agreement and then and only then, would the committee make a recommendation that would come back to the House as to the advisability or otherwise of this agreement in its present form or in an amended form be proceeded with. The matter is so crucial, so important and so capable of social divisiveness in this province that I think any other course would be a dangerous course for the people of Manitoba to follow.

"Mr. Speaker, there is no rush for this agreement. The province can continue and the government can continue its steady and reasonable progress towards implementing Section 23, started by the previous government and carried on ably by the present government."

The NDP, Mr. Speaker, did not have a mandate to entrench this amendment in the Constitution. There was no mention of this issue, at least certainly not that I'm aware of during the election of 1981. No promise was made to the people of Manitoba to entrench language rights in the Constitution. Therefore, this government has no right to do so. They have no right to force this amendment through this House without the consent of the majority of Manitobans. Once again, the government is setting out to harm the very people it expects to help. What caused them to think that they could rewrite the history of Manitoba in an ill-founded agreement with a small minority group of Manitobans?

This group of Manitobans is not representative of all the Francophones in Manitoba. Did the government consult with the 97 percent or 96 percent of the other Manitobans? Did the Premier seek out their opinion before the agreement was made? No, he did not.

So as I said, Mr. Speaker, this government is taking inappropriate action when it has no mandate from the people of Manitoba to do this. This is a long-term move, not something which could be amended should circumstances change in a year or so. It is nothing we're doing on a short-term basis. Entrenchment is akin to saying that this will be forever. The thing that concerns me about this so much is that we're hurrying to solve a short-term problem without stopping to think - at least this government is not stopping to think - of the long-term results.

They say this will not affect municipalities, and yet they have designated certain municipalities that should be considered bilingual. I can't see the reasoning there. What criteria did they use to designate these municipalities? No one seems to know that. Did they consult with the officials of these municipalities? Did they ask them what they thought of this? Not that I'm aware of. I get, from time to time, Mr. Speaker, copies of letters to the Premier on this subject, and some of them have been from municipal offices that included resolutions that their municipality was not to be included in this. Is this Premier taking any notice of these resolutions sent to him by these people, the elected officials of the municipalities of Manitoba? We haven't heard that he is. The Premier often rises in the House when we're questioning him and he wrings his hands, and he says he talks to everyone, he listens to everyone,

but that's some solace when you realize that we're slowly realizing from day to day that he doesn't listen to anybody.

We urge you to let this resolution go to a legislative committee between Sessions. Let the committee hear the views of Manitobans from all across the province. Don't just hold one meeting in Winnipeg during the Session in the long hot summer days, hold meetings throughout the length and breadth of the province. Go to Brandon, to Melita, to Souris, to Glenboro, to Dauphin, to Thompson, go to all these places. — (Interjection) — Right, go to Woodlands. For instance, go to a town that is located in every constituency of the province. That might be one way to decide where you would go. Why don't they do this? Why, indeed, don't they - when they're always telling us that they're the party which listens to people, listens and listens? Mr. Speaker, they may very well listen, but they do not seem to hear.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, that was made by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, asked for meetings intersessionally. One of the members from the opposite side was shouting across the House to us in his usual rude manner the other day and suggested - actually he's the Member for Springfield - that perhaps we were trying to hold this up, to delay. I don't know why we would be doing that when we want intersessional hearings, but anyway he was accusing us of delaying, saying that we wanted to hold this over till the new year, so the government couldn't deal with it, and they apparently are under some duress from someone to proceed with this in this Session. — (Interjection) — My colleague says, perhaps Serge Joyal. That could very well be after reading some of the material that was put out that some of the things he said about this. So, in order to dispel the notion created by the Member for Springfield, I would like to propose a sub-amendment to the amendment.

Therefore, I move, seconded by the Member for Emerson

THAT the resolution be further amended by adding after the words "next Session of the Legislature" where they appear in the proposed amendment of Mr. Sherman, the words "and in any case not later than December 31, 1983."

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, as we expected, we have another indication by the opposition that they intend to set the course of pattern which our government must follow in order that we accommodate them in their indication as to how we must proceed with legislation in this House. Mr. Speaker, the honourable members know that this resolution, the resolution as unamended, came before this House by reason of the fact that we were in court again in the Supreme Court, a court that in the past had decided against the Government of Manitoba on language rights cases, a court that had said, no.

A MEMBER: Be truthful.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says, be truthful. I believe that I am telling the truth, and that is in some distinction from what the honourable member relates to this House from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the request of the Province of Manitoba to the Supreme Court, and that was a very serious request for time; time in which the Government of Manitoba could relate to the people of Manitoba the question of the further acknowledgement of French rights that the Supreme Court had recognized in an earlier decision. That's the situation, Mr. Speaker. We had requested the Supreme Court for that time. That time was not forthcoming, Mr. Speaker.

Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that's a signal not only to our counsel, but it's a signal to the Government of Manitoba. It is a signal surely to the opposition party in the Province of Manitoba that the Supreme Court that had previously ruled against the Manitoba position carefully articulated by our best legal counsel; that is clearly a signal that that court felt that a decision in respect to a further acknowledgement of French language rights in this province was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual for a court to grant an extension of time, particularly when it's a matter of serious constitutional consequence. But, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court did not give you and me and other members of this House an extension of time. We are working within a strict time limit to deal with the issue.

Mr. Speaker, we moved with reasonable dispatch. We have heard from the members opposite that we moved with undue haste. Mr. Speaker, we want to give the people of Manitoba an opportunity to present their views on this question. Mr. Speaker, we organized meetings to go out to talk to the people of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, ample opportunity was given at those meetings for an appreciation of the question that faced this government.

We have, in addition to that, sent out material to state the facts, facts which, Mr. Speaker, have been distorted. Why have they been distorted, Mr. Speaker? They have been distorted for political purpose. Mr. Speaker, the opposition party and any politician in Manitoba should not be attempting to distort the facts of a legal case for political purposes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Why are you then?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Pembina says, why are we then? Mr. Speaker, they and the charade that they have been performing in this House indicate through their obfuscation, for their delay, for their obstruction, the fact that they do not wish to consider in a reasonable, pragmatic way the problem that faces the Government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, when we present material by way of a leaflet, send it out to the people, some members criticize us. They say that's propaganda. We shouldn't be informing the people, and yet what did they do? Well, I wish I had a copy of that slick, little brochure that the opposition party once, then in government sent out, Mr. Speaker, after they had made an agreement. After everything was cut and dried, they sent that out to inform the people.

Mr. Speaker, we haven't operated that way.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, you have.

HON. A. MACKLING: We haven't. We have entered into an agreement which we have said is subject to the ratification by a vote of this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, we have said . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just like the seat belt committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the Honourable Member for Pembina that he will have the same opportunity to engage in debate as any member in this House.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I thank you for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: He needs a little prompting in his silliness.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, we, in distinction from the practice that was followed by that party when they were in government, want to hear from the people. We have organized those meetings; we heard from people; we have sent out information by way of the leaflet that was referred to; been subject to abuse for spending the kind of money we are to inform the people. But, Mr. Speaker, it's not just that we want to inform the people, we want to hear from the people; and what's the problem over there? What is the problem over there, Mr. Speaker, with moving this referral motion so that a committee of this House can hear the people?

MR. R. BANMAN: Like you did on seat belts.

HON. A. MACKLING: The honourable member says, like they did on seat belts. Mr. Speaker, I didn't sit on the committee, but I know that committee sat patiently. They heard members of the public, some former members of this Legislative Assembly, that addressed the committee for over an hour-and-a-half. That committee sat with great patience, great respect and responsibility, and they followed the practice, Mr. Speaker, that has been followed by all committees of the Legislature in the past. They listened, but they were prepared to listen to those delegations that were there and were prepared to speak, which is unique, Mr. Speaker, a unique system. We can't afford to say that representation can come any time and speak. There has to be presentation of people who are there, Mr. Speaker, and that is the practice that has been followed and it's been honoured, on both sides of the House; and for honourable members to say that somehow a committee that responsibly met cut people off that didn't come, is not only unkind, it's disgraceful that they make those kind of comments because they suffered from the same kind of representation in the past, large numbers of people that want to come.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, in respect to the committee that the motion refers to, a committee of the House,

that committee will be charged with the responsibility of hearing the people of Manitoba; that may take some time. The honourable members say it must report by December 31, 1983. I'm advised that there are 30 people waiting; there may be 300, and it may be many many weeks before that committee finally reports; but the honourable members don't want to even get the process under way. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why are they obstructing; why are they trying to frustrate a democratic process, a process that's being honoured in this House? Mr. Speaker, it's not simply that they're anti-democratic, as I my honourable colleague says, that perhaps, too. Basically they're not very democratic, but they have narrow political motives. What are those narrow political motives?

Mr. Speaker, they have a problem, as a party, on this issue. They have a problem because, nationally, they don't want to be exposed as taking a position that's negative on this question, so the word came down from on high, Mr. Speaker. The message that came from across the way in their speeches, probably most skillfully relayed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, and it's been relayed when members phoned the Honourable Member for Lakeside on the hot line show. Why the haste; why the hurry? The Honourable Member for Lakeside didn't say, well, the Supreme Court wouldn't let the Government of Manitoba, they wouldn't give them more time. He didn't say that; he didn't present the facts. Mr. Speaker, those are the facts though, that there is a time problem and it's not of our making. We asked the court — (Interjection) — The honourable members say, take it to court.

Mr. Speaker, they took cases to court and what happened? We had a court-imposed program — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the court made a decision . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: . . . and then the Government of Manitoba had to respond to that court decision. Those are the facts and that is what they say should be done now. I don't think that's the message that came down from on high. The message that came down to the Member for Lakeside, the Member for Turtle Mountain is, for goodness sake, for God's sake, delay it; don't make an anti-French decision in Manitoba; don't expose yourself to that bigotry, because if you do that we've got a problem nationally. We need votes in Quebec and you will destroy us; our new hope, Mr. Brian Mulroney, will be destroyed in Quebec. So that is the reason for the obfuscation; that's the reason for the delay; that's the reason for the obstruction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we want to place this matter before a committee of the Legislature and then, earlier on in the Session, the honourable members opposite, particularly the honourable member, the House Leader of the Conservative Party, kept saying to us, well why don't you get into Speed-up, get into Speed-up so we can move things along. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that when we talked about arrangements for going into Speed-up, well, Mr. Speaker, once we got into Speed-up everything would go very quickly. There would be some difficulty on several bills, on Bill 3, on Bill 48. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I listened very quietly to honourable members speaking over there. I will let those members conduct themselves in the manner in which they deem appropriate, I don't choose to operate that way. Mr. Speaker, the arrangement were indicated that, yes, we would have to fight on certain things, but we'd go late and you'll exercise your will and we will get out of here in a couple of weeks; we'll be out of here in a couple of weeks, be all gone. Mr. Speaker, something changed obviously, either something changed or the message that we got wasn't true, it wasn't true.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, honourable members will realize that we conduct ourselves in a reasonable manner, we are very reasonable people. We indicated weeks ago that we didn't think that a Speed-up process was necessary, you know, we would provide ample time for debate. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we indicated that, in order to expedite the process of the House, we didn't have to move closure; what we would do is indicate to honourable members that they're here to debate, they want to debate, let them debate, But what did they do, Mr. Speaker? They had another tactic, particularly to embarrass me, as the Deputy House Leader, when it was convenient, and what — (Interjection) — My honourable colleague says, impossible. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, there were times when I felt somewhat troubled, and somewhat frustrated by the manoeuvres of the House Leader of the Conservative Opposition, because I always felt that the opposition owed it to Parliament to make sure that this system worked reasonably well, but I didn't find that sense of co-operation.

We were induced to move into Speed-up, and now, under this Speed-up, we're dragging. Why are we moving at such a snail's pace, Mr. Speaker? Because the Conservative Party, troubled as it is on French language extension, and which they go around telling people it's entrenchment; they go around telling people, you know, that municipalities are going to be forced to have people on staff sitting around; all of which is totally untrue. Mr. Speaker, from the outset we indicated that any language service in a municipality would be on a voluntary basis. That's the spirit, that's the intent, that's the letter. Mr. Speaker, that isn't what honourable members are telling their constituents. They're telling their constituents that it's an entrenchment, the New Democratic Party Government are forcing bilingualism down the throats of every citizen in Manitoba. That's what they're saying, Mr. Speaker, that's what they're saying. They're saying it quietly.

Mr. Speaker, they are trying to frustrate what is a reasonable common sense approach to this long-standing difficult problem. Mr. Speaker, the accommodation we have entered into is a very reasonable one, very very limited services. I know if the Honourable Minister of Health were here he would decry the fact, and I wouldn't blame him, that I indicate that it is such a limited extension of services. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, history demands that we do better than what we are prepared to do. Mr. Speaker, we have to be pragmatic and reasonable. It is true that the look for development of a very significant French population in Manitoba did not occur.

We have to reflect the facts of history, and the status of the French base in Manitoba changed so, in keeping with the historic right, we are doing it in that reasonable pragmatic way, but that's not the way they are representing it, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to indicate that this is a massive change, that we're distorting the situation in Manitoba. We are not, Mr. Speaker; we are under the constraint of a proper legal action in the Supreme Court. We have a limited time frame in which to address the problem, and yet honourable members want to continue to frustrate us in bringing the issue before a committee of the Legislature. Mr. Speaker, that is a reprehensible course for them to follow, and, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Manitoba recognize that.

Honourable members make this amendment that this matter be referred to an intersessional committee. Well, they realized that wouldn't wash very well, Mr. Speaker, because that's too indefinite, that's too great a postponement. So now they come up with what they think really is the key - and it wasn't, I'm sure, the Member for Gladstone that masterminded this wording, it's the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, the strategist sitting there figuring now how are we going to manoeuvre the government into a position where it looks like our proposition is most reasonable. Mr. Speaker, we know that it's not only the Member for Turtle Mountain — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: I beg your pardon. Mr. Speaker, we know that it isn't the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that really makes the decisions in the Conservative caucus on these matters. It is the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Charleswood, who sits in his House and calls honourable members of this House — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable members obviously enjoy thinking about their Leader, and thinking about his early demise. They're all wondering as to who is outscoring each other in this race. We know that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has annointed the Member for Turtle Mountain. I want the honourable members who will have some concern about that to reflect on that, that he is the one to leave his crusade, to hold the fort here, frustrate the government, and demonstrate that he is the key man to lead the Conservative Party in Manitoba. That's the strategy. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has annointed the Member for Turtle Mountain in this task.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain has been making all these manoeuvres and all the other members are going along blithely with that. They're going along with the Leader — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. May I remind all members that they will have the same opportunity to speak as the Honourable Minister.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the honourable members can laugh, because I think that's a bit of a nervous laugh, though. They realize that in the very near future, and time is slipping away for that, Mr. Speaker, they have to be at each other's throats. They have to be trying to find out who was going to survive in that jungle, because we know what happens in the Conservative leadership races, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of bloodletting. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, those chortles may be a nervous tickle, but it may be that they're feeling the dull edge of the dull-witted Conservative knives that are sitting over there.

Let me say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are determined that the people of Manitoba have a right to speak out on this issue. Numbers of people are waiting to be heard on this issue. Honourable members over there are determined to frustrate the will of this government, and the wish of those members of the public, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to make representation on this issue.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will not be dissuaded. We have set our course of action; we believe that the people of Manitoba have a right to be present during the course of this Legislature and present their views on a matter that must be decided, prior to the end of December, because we are under that obligation by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is a heavy obligation for government. It may be, as I've indicated, that the process before the committee will be long and arduous, but we're prepared to wait. We are not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so anxious to get out and politic that we're prepared to take time off; we're prepared to sit here and take the necessary time. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to comment on the absence of some members opposite, despite the urgings that I have from members opposite to do that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is necessary that we take our time and deal very thoughtfully, pragmatically and, hopefully, reasonably on this matter. Mr. Deputy Speaker, reason cannot prevail where we have an opposition that is determined to block, frustrate and prevent the democratic process from working, because that is what it's coming down to. It is no longer, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a question of just political tactics. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the opposition party has now crossed the threshold, and they are now entering a stage where they are deliberately attempting to frustrate a democratically elected government to carry on with government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is even so much worse when what they are doing in their conduct, in their delay, is not on the resolution itself. Honourable members know that on this Order Paper are two matters dealing with the language rights, a resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that must be passed if we are to deal with the Supreme Court before December 31st; that must be debated in

this House, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Honourable members have ample opportunity to debate that resolution, they know that; they have ample opportunity to move amendments, to do all sorts of things, and I don't have to give them that advice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they have such clever people now who can pen amendments to resolutions.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, given the fact that they have all of that opportunity to debate, why are they trying to frustrate our government in placing the issue before a committee of the Legislature? I ask you; it is hard to understand that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they say, they are not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are not giving the people of Manitoba an opportunity to deal with that matter before this House deals with the resolution. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's inconceivable to me that they would filibuster and obstruct on a motion to refer to a committee, a committee that would be prepared to sit at this Session, a committee that already has a waiting list of people. I want honourable members, when they stand, to explain to me why they won't let this matter go before the committee at this Session so that people can come forward and present their views. It's simply incomprehensible, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Why is it, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Well they think this is just another way to delay, because they have ample opportunity, as they know, pursuant to the rules, to delay in other ways, but they want to delay every step of the way. Mr. Deputy Speaker, when they do that they reveal how completely irresponsible - and it goes much further than that. It is such an irresponsible attempted frustration of the parliamentary process that, as I say, it's an attack on the integrity of the parliamentary process itself.

We have heard, Mr. Deputy Speaker, honourable members' threats, and we saw what happened the other night. They said, no, we're not going to deal with it, we are not going to stand here and vote. We voted for Speedup, but no, we're not going to debate. We are not going to debate, we want the weekend off. There was some sort of arrangement, and we have to have the weekend off. Just forget about Speedup, we want to relax and enjoy ourselves, and we're not concerned about the time limit. So, in order to get a weekend off, we will let the bells ring.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, when he left this Chamber, Mr. Deputy Speaker, said, see you Tuesday; see you Tuesday. That's what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, and he hasn't been back, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Where is the Leader of the Opposition? Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was his kind greeting as he left, because that was their purpose and intent, Mr. Deputy Speaker, frustrate, in any way you can, the will of this House. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that kind of obstruction will not be acceptable to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the role of a vigorous, dynamic, responsible opposition is to oppose, but to oppose in a reasonable way. I say to them, I plead with them, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's unreasonable not to allow the people of Manitoba the right to come before a committee of this House during this Session and deal with this resolution. It is totally unreasonable, Mr Deputy Speaker.

I don't know whether or not they have discussed that with other people, but I think when we adjourn some time later on, either tonight or the small hours of the morning, that they should communicate with others in Ottawa and determine whether or not it is sound practice to leave the bells ring overnight. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have parliamentary traditions that have protected the course of parliamentary democracy in the western world for hundreds of years. Never in the history of Parliament did we have anything happen like what happened in Ottawa where, for political purposes, the whole basis of the parliamentary process was put in jeopardy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that same problem exists today. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we saw for narrow, obstructionist purposes that process being used in this House. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when an opposition party resorts to that kind of cruel, unthinking, callous attitude towards the rights and the privileges of Parliament, then, they are on a dangerous slope.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can understand on a question of deep principle an opposition party fighting. If I were sitting in the opposition and it was a question of principle, I would fight, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But on a procedural matter, in order that we get on, after being cajoled, pleaded, get into Speed-up, and then being told, no, we want the weekend off, we don't want to let this go to committee. That is, in essence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where this matter stands. No matter how much they squirm, that is exactly what they have done.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. P. EYLER: Order please. The Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. For this member to indicate that our side wanted the weekend off is simply false. There was mutual agreement between the House Leaders. Their House Leader has carried out his half of the agreement and has gone to the lake for the weekend.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. There is clearly a difference as to what the agreement constituted. A difference of opinion does not constitute a point of order.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I thank you for that clear ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, regardless of how the opposition party wants to interpret their conduct they, as I've indicated, taunted us that we weren't moving the business of the House. They kept urging us to move into Speed-up. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, in being questioned on the radio, said, well you know Speed-up isn't a bad thing. We get the business of the House finished; we can be out in a reasonable time and the business of an MLA is not just in the House. He went on to say, it's a mistake, MLAs should be out in their constituencies working, and that's what he wanted us to do, let's finish up the business of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, he knew what the business of the House was. We had those questions, those matters on the Order Paper when they invited us to go into Speed-up. They wanted us to use the

tools of Speed-up to get those things finished, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's the thrust and they said that publicly; but then, once we get into Speed-up, they start to delay. Why do they start to delay? Because, as the Honourable Member for Lakeside said, then they could say, why the haste, why the undue haste?

The matter of the resolution that we have to deal with before December 31st was on the Order Paper, so the haste that Speed-up provided was no longer acceptable to members of the opposition, so how can they have it both ways, Mr. Speaker? How can they be insisting and demanding that, for the efficient wind-up of the House we go into Speed-up, and then when we get there they say, no, we can't deal that way. You have to consider, and if there was some sort of an understanding with the House Leader that he is bound by that, our caucus can't make a decision that we go ahead with the business of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable House Leader of the Conservative Party, when he makes tentative decisions about matters, does not bind his caucus. When I have approached him on matters, he said, well, of course I would have to discuss this in caucus — (Interjection) — Yes, that's right, and one that he grunts to, uh, uh. Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of conduct we have seen from the opposition. Get us into Speed-up and then stall us and say they're incompetent, and when we indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we're not going to allow matters to stand, these whiz kids who are so proficient in respect to the rules, they say that's closure. When it's explained to them that it's not, Mr. Speaker, all we want them to do is debate. Well they wouldn't go along with that; that's too heavy handed; that's too unreasonable. All we wanted them to do was debate and we could have done that, Mr. Speaker, without the use of Speed-up at all.

We didn't need Speed-up; so we're in Speed-up at the invitation, at the urging, almost the pleading of the opposition, and when we get there — (Interjection) — Yes, they drove a pretty tough bargain; they coerced us into Speed-up. Now that we're in Speed-up they're throwing out the anchor. How come, Mr. Speaker?

It's so that they can say to Mr. Mulroney, yes, we are following instructions, sir; we are trying to block a decision on this; we know you don't want to be embarrassed, sir, by anything we say, so we'll just not make any speeches on this issue; we'll just say, no haste, it's a good question to deal with but it's going to take a lot longer and we really can't deal with it, sir. That's the line, that's what they've been told and that's what they're doing. — (Interjection) — There he is, Mr. Speaker. But we know that Mr. Mulroney doesn't appreciate that the tactic that's going on right now is not merely trying to delay the resolution, it's going much further than that. They're trying to delay the right of the people of Manitoba to come before a committee and that, Mr. Speaker, is just unthinkable, to attempt to frustrate . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the fact that so many of those "honourable" members are chattering nervously means that what I have said is correct. They are nervous; they are uncomfortable and, by reflex

action, they chatter. Their chatter doesn't dissuade me from the fact that I know that I have exposed - and we here have exposed - their strategy, get us into Speed-up and then delay and then say to the people of Manitoba, well, on this issue, we are statesmen, you know, we would move, over the course of time. It may take a long time, but we would move; we would move.

No reference to the Supreme Court action, no reference to the fact that we had lost in the Supreme Court before and the Supreme Court wasn't going to be very charitable to the Province of Manitoba, wouldn't even allow an adjournment, no reference to that; no attempt to present the real facts to the people of Manitoba. And now the audacity of the opposition to try and prevent us from allowing the people of Manitoba, once we've informed the people of the province, attempted to inform them on the issue, to allow them to come forward and speak. What are they afraid of, Mr. Deputy Speaker? Are they afraid to hear that people in Manitoba have different views on the question than they believe are out there? What are they afraid of?

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is time that this simple, procedural, referral motion was not continued to be frustrated by members in this House. We're merely asking that the people of Manitoba have an opportunity to appear before a committee at this Session; and I ask the members, I even plead with members, to exercise your conscience; is it reasonable for you to frustrate numbers of people who have already indicated their desire to appear before the committee? I don't think that's a reasonable course of conduct, and I say to you, if you persist, then you will pay the heavy political penalty that you would deserve.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House that I will be speaking under Rule 33, Section (2)(a), which permits me unlimited time.

Mr. Speaker, it is always a dangerous temptation to attempt to rebut some of the speeches that one hears immediately prior to being called upon to speak yourself, and thus get put off course from the comments that one has put some thought and some time to putting together. But, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, and I think particularly in this House, we should take time to note, when an honourable member stands up in this House and expresses the truth, a ringing truth - and I'd like to compliment the Minister of Natural Resources for doing that today. He stood up in this House and said, we have a Leader and he leads us. That's an amazing statement, and I'm proud to say and proud to confirm that is the fact. Our Leader has led us, since the day he became our Leader, and will continue to lead us until the December convention is called when he has, as he indicted, with grace and with integrity, that he will be retiring from that particular position.

Mr. Speaker, the other amazing truth that the Minister of Natural Resources told us, which is something that of course has become abundantly clear to us, is that on that side their House Leader is not bound to any caucus decisions that they may make and vice versa, I suppose. That, of course, Mr. Speaker, explains the chaos that we've operating under. Mr. Speaker, it simply has to be in parliamentary system that the two House

Leaders can enter into arrangements from time to time, and that those arrangements will be kept. Mr. Speaker, absence, in this case, although it's unparliamentary to refer to a member's absence, but I test the rule, because of the issue raised on this matter. The absence of the Government House Leader does better than anything I can say to attest to the fact that there was an obvious arrangement entered into by the two House Leaders with respect to the business of the House this weekend. That, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell, regrettably describes the fundamental reasons for some of the apparent mess, chaos, utter confusion that has all too frequently dominated the proceedings of this House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't emphasize too strongly the logical, the reasonable thoughts behind the sub-amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Mr. Speaker, we are agreeing and we are acknowledging to meet the deadline that the government has laid down for the people of Manitoba and for this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the reason why that sub-amendment was carefully thought out and proposed tonight, to do precisely what the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has been suggesting that perhaps they may be inclined to think that the amendment to the main motion, as proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, might be considered as an unnecessary delaying tactic, but it was an open-ended referral to the intersessionary committee. Mr. Speaker, what this sub-amendment does is it tightens it up. It commits us, in a responsible manner, to meet the deadline that the main motion calls for, Mr. Speaker.

No, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to, for a moment, add any credibility to the nonsense that the Honourable Minister talks about with respect to the pressure that his government is under by virtue of a potential decision by the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, allow me if a moment I gave it some consideration, some credibility, do you mean to tell me that any court in this land would even consider entering into a process of any kind if this sub-amendment was passed, if this process was started in Manitoba, if this intersessionary committee was meeting and dealing with this issue; you mean to tell me that when the Attorney-General comes back from his weekend at the lake, and he sends an emissary to the court and say, look, this is what we are doing in Manitoba, we are referring this matter to a legislative committee that has a deadline to report back to the House, to meet with the kind of problems that are perceived in the minds of the government, that a court in this land would entertain any action. Mr. Speaker, let's not talk about those self-induced deadlines that the Minister of Natural Resources talks about. It simply isn't there, Mr. Speaker, it simply isn't there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge honourable members opposite to consider carefully the sub-amendment before you. Mr. Speaker, if they don't understand it I can assure you that the vast vast majority of Manitobans will. Mr. Speaker, you mean to tell me that on an important constitutional change Manitobans wouldn't want their legislators to consult with them, meet with them, and to talk to them under conditions where fair hearings can be held, all views can be expressed? Mr. Speaker, there could be no doubt in my mind, having even experienced just briefly some of the public sentiment on a morning talk show, about where the sentiments

of the people of Manitoba lie. Mr. Speaker, I can report to you from the different members of our caucus that have not been neglecting their responsibilities and their duties throughout the Province of Manitoba, that have been attending the different fairs and functions throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, they bring back the same reports.

Mr. Speaker, you can't go shopping at Safeway or Dominion without somebody tugging at your arm — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: Dominion is out of business.

MR. H. ENNS: Well, not quite, they still have a few stores. Without somebody coming up to you and saying to you, as a member, for goodness sake take your time about this matter, be very careful what you're doing, and don't allow anybody to ram, push, shove, anything of this important nature through that House. So, Mr. Speaker, it's not the members of the opposition that are in any way concerned about public opinion in this matter; it's the government that should be becoming greatly concerned about this matter.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a process, more than the actual nature of the resolution before it shall. I want to express a few comments about why we are where we're at to begin with. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface last night in a speech that, I believe, he delivered with some passion and some genuine sincerity, notwithstanding his comments when he said, and he acknowledged that there was little politics to be gained by members of the government on this issue. I hold the contrary view that, initially, this government thought there were politics to be gained in this situation. I concur with the Member for St. Boniface that has long since dissipated in the manner and the way in which they've handled this issue, but, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that they honestly felt that there was politics in it for them, and that is why this motion, this resolution is before us. You know, Mr. Speaker, they had some reason to believe that. Partly because of the actions taken by the former Conservative administration. Mr. Speaker, when the Forest case was before the Supreme Court, and a decision was handed down, the reaction of the Conservative Government was prompt. There wasn't any foot-dragging on terms of recognizing that the Supreme Court of the land had spoken. We acknowledged that a number of things had to be done, and proceeded to do them.

Mr. Speaker, it was generally acknowledged and applauded in this House, by the then NDP opposition, by the then Member for St. Boniface, by members of the Francophone community. Oh, they might have said, well you can do it a little faster but, by and large, the reception in this House, which can so often be divisive, was one of general accord and unanimity in accepting the actions and the reaction that the Sterling Lyon Government took to the Supreme Court's decision on the Forest case.

More important, Mr. Speaker, far more important, was that the people of Manitoba accepted the decision, by and large, and subsequent decisions and announcements that were made by the then government.

Mr. Speaker, organizations like Alliance, in Quebec, acknowledged and appreciated what was happening in Manitoba, post the Forest case of 1979; and applauded the fact that in 1979 and 1980, 1981, by the then Progressive Conservative Government, and carried on by the New Democratic Party Government up to this point that, not only were the original conditions of confederation acknowledged and agreed to by governments of both political parties, Conservative and NDP, but the spirit of the decision was acknowledged and the extension of services in the French language was being effectively moved forward.

Mr. Speaker, that was done publicly; it was done by announcements in this House; it was done by news releases, many of them which the Attorney-General found some satisfaction in reading back to us in his address to this motion, pretending that perhaps in some way that ought to embarrass us but, of course, that was not the case at all. We reacted in a responsible manner, Mr. Speaker, in an open manner and, subsequently, brought the people of Manitoba along with us on that decision.

Mr. Speaker, as I already indicated, when governments changed and the present New Democratic Party took over the reins of responsibility of office, the same kind of progress continued. Mr. Speaker, it was met with the same kind of accord and support in this Chamber. When the present government announced plans to somewhat accelerate some of the services, whether it's the provision of expensive translating booths in this Chamber, which rarely will be used in this Chamber; and provision for instant translation to all of us, although all of us can understand the English language but, nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, there was no Conservative member that stood up and opposed that.

We acknowledged that even some of these matters that may not always be defensible in a purely practical or economical manner, in terms of the usage thereof, and could be perhaps questioned, that didn't happen, Mr. Speaker. It didn't happen in this Chamber; it didn't happen; and it didn't worry, it didn't excite the general population, Mr. Speaker, because it was being done in the spirit of the decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court. It was done because of the leadership shown by the Progressive Conservative Party under Sterling Lyon at that time. Therefore, it was easy and acceptable to the general public of Manitoba for the New Democrats to carry on that work that was begun in 1979 by Sterling Lyon and the Conservatives, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what went wrong when we were moving forward with a degree of harmony that Manitoba has seldom experienced on this very sensitive, potentially divisive issue? Mr. Speaker, we were succeeding in bringing about a better understanding, a better working relationship, and we were developing mechanical means to overcome some of the traditional concerns that the Francophone community had in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, we were doing that without raising alarm in the general public, without turning loose emotions that on an issue like this can too often go out of control and, indeed, border on the kind of reactions that none of us particularly like to foster in any part of our populations. But, Mr. Speaker, that was happening because it was done openly, publicly — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, I should not respond to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose who is talking about somebody

trying to hide something in this Chamber, because every one of those steps that I just described were publicly announced, either by my Premier of the Day in this Chamber, subsequent news releases, press conferences were held when those expansion of services were composed, when the French Secretariat was set up under the direction of Mr. Mercier, the Member for St. Norbert. Nothing was being hidden by anybody, Mr. Speaker. When \$100,000 or \$200,000 was allocated for the expansion of French services, there was nothing hidden about it, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I can quote from the memorable speech that my Leader made on the main motion, the longest speech, I think, that this House has ever seen, but also one of the finest speeches that the walls of this House has ever heard.

I can indicate to him where, despite the kind of, as I said earlier, the suggestion that perhaps the Attorney-General, in digging up some of these news releases or digging up some of these Orders-in-Council that established the French Secretariat, that established additional monies to be spent for expansion of French services. Mr. Speaker, the record is there. The public record is there, contrary to what the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose suggests. It was all done in an open, up front, in a public way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Premier's speech where he is obviously reading from a press release. "Premier Sterling Lyon has announced the establishment of a small section in the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources to improve the capacity of the Provincial Government to respond to requests from the public in the French language. Reporting to the Deputy Minister, this section will assist him in the following functions: liaison between the Franco-Manitoban community and the government departments; liaison with the government departments in channeling requests for specific services or information required by individuals or organizations; studying and recommending policies and priorities of services provided in the official minority language; French responsibility for matters related to French language and culture at the provincial, federal and international levels; advising the Provincial Government departments in the planning and operation of programs and services in French."

Mr. Speaker, those were the kinds of public statements; that was the kind of leadership that the Conservative Party was giving to the people of Manitoba in leading our populations toward a better understanding, a better working relationship between the two major groups. And then, as I said a little while ago, what happened? Mr. Speaker, choosing to ignore the example that was set out to them, this government entered into what can only be described as a secret agreement, secret certainly to the vast majority of Manitobans, entered into an agreement inspired by the Liberal Government of Ottawa under the leadership of Serge Joyal; entered into an agreement with the Franco-Manitoban Society, and I'm not going to say anything about the Franco-Manitoban Society, Mr. Speaker. There have been some that have suggested that they do not, indeed, speak for all Francophones in Manitoba. That would not surprise me, Mr. Speaker.

When Mr. Dick Martin speaks for labour in Manitoba, he only speaks for a relatively small minority of workers in Manitoba. The total percentage of organized labour

in unions, membership in the Manitoba Federation of Labour, is only around 26 percent, 27 percent of the total workforce in Manitoba; and then, by no stretch of the imagination, any time Mr. Dick Martin speaks as President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, on behalf of organized labour as president, does he always speak for all of that 26 percent of the membership within the Manitoba Federation of Labour. So that doesn't surprise me. Most organizations, most groupings of people in our society have their formal organizations and to what extent they are supported and to what extent they are not supported, one tends to, of course, measure; just as we on this side have no difficulty in measuring the strength and the reasonableness and the responsibility of advice given to us on agricultural matters when it comes from the Manitoba Farm Bureau as when it comes from the National Farmers Union, because the National Farmers Union speaks for 200 or 300 people in the Province of Manitoba, whereas the Manitoba Farm Bureau speaks for many thousands.

Mr. Speaker, leave that aside. This government entered into agreement, as I say, spurred on by their bed partners, the Liberal Government in Ottawa, by Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Serge Joyal, to enter into a secret agreement with the Franco-Manitoban Society and Mr. Bilodeau. And, Mr. Speaker, what's happened? We have now brought about, in Manitoba, the kind of situation where we have unleashed upon our population the kind of viciousness, crudeness and slander that is depicted by this cartoon in *La Liberté*. Mr. Speaker, not only is it racist of the vilest order, but it is totally wrong; it is totally wrong when you read the caption because the caption says, "Hear ye, hear ye Canadians. Know this well, for you are on the point of seeing appearing once again the lowest of the low in Manitoba, the same dirty game by the same political party." Mr. Speaker, let me put it on the record. It was not the Conservative Party that passed the legislation in 1890 that took away the rights of the Francophone community; it was a Liberal Party, so let the editors of the *La Liberté* get that straight.

Mr. Speaker, if you wanted to believe for a little while, and I wanted to believe and I'm prepared to believe the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface last night when he attributed much of the progress toward the improvement of Anglo-Franco relations in Manitoba, who did he attribute them to? The Honourable Duff Roblin and the Progressive Conservative Administration. So again, Mr. Speaker, this vicious piece of hate literature is fundamentally wrong in its facts, never mind in its depiction of picturing Conservatives as members of the Ku Klux Klan burning down the Franco-Manitoban Society's building.

Mr. Speaker, it is, as my colleague from Fort Garry says, it's actionable; it is slanderous. But, Mr. Speaker, politicians are fair game and we come to accept that, although I've also come to realize personally that if one turns on the media in a way that one oughtn't to, one is faced with a slander suit very quickly unless one apologizes in a very quick and abrupt and a genuine manner. So much for fairness with respect to the media treating us when they depict these cartoons, and so much for when we have cause for slanderous action, Mr. Speaker, so much.

A MEMBER: We have seen the enemy and he is over there.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the point that I wish to make is not the issue of the cartoon itself but the fact that it is now loose in our community. Why is it happening, Mr. Speaker, because they chose, this government believed - and I honestly believe that; they have now, I think, long since disabused themselves of that belief - but they believed initially that, gee, Sterling Lyon had no trouble when he accepted the decision of the Supreme Court and implications of that. We moved forward; we established a French secretariat; we established additional French services. They want us to believe that they could perhaps cement that voter appeal that they're looking for - in this case, the Francophone community - by a fast package agreement and not too much would be said about it.

Again, had they but taken a leaf out of some of the actions, whether it was my current leader, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, or a past leader that I had the privilege to serve and be a member of Cabinet, the Honourable Duff Roblin, they would not have fallen into this trap.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote at some length from an article that pertains to the issue that's under discussion, some of the comments, some of the views of the now Senator Duff Roblin who is that very same Premier that the Member for St. Boniface spoke so highly of just last night, held him up as an example of what could be done in terms of improving race relations in this province. Allow me to quote from this particular article which was featured in the Winnipeg Sun, July 29:

"Mr. Roblin acknowledges, in the first instance, that Canada and all political parties at the federal level support The Official Languages Act. He acknowledges, as we are only too much aware of, that unfortunately the administration of that bilingual policy hasn't always been carried out in a way that would minimize friction and misunderstanding; but having established his support of official bilingualism, Roblin goes on to look more carefully at how the issue has been handled in this province.

"In the Manitoba context," he says, "it would have been wiser to allow the Supreme Court of Canada to deal with the case of Mr. Bilodeau in order to set that issue at rest. The fear that the Supreme Court might invalidate all the laws of Manitoba since 1870 is an academic legalism that should have been put aside. It is not likely that the Supreme Court would lend itself to such a questionable conclusion."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from some of the finest constitutional legal minds that support that same conclusion that Senator Duff Roblin just comes to automatically as a practised, seasoned politician, now a hard-working senator, a nine-year Premier of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we had the Minister of Natural Resources telling us just a few moments ago that we are in this debate because the Supreme Court of Canada was going to abolish Manitoba, was going to abolish this Legislature, was going to abolish all laws in Manitoba. People could go and drive at 200 miles an hour through every red light. People could drink and drive with reckless abandon. Mr. Speaker, it is just inconceivable that a mature, responsible government would believe that any court in the land would do that. Mr. Roblin says it would never have been done; former Chief

Justice Samuel Freedman says it would never have been done, and the legal advice that this government should rely on, both Mr. Dale Gibson and Mr. Twaddle, suggest that it would never have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to find some more figurative of a way of assessing the chances of the Supreme Court acting in this case. It would be perhaps like if Mr. Scott, the Member for Inkster, were persuaded or could be persuaded by President Reagan to lead a battalion of special Green Beret troops, rangers, to help clean up the leftist guerillas in El Salvador. When that day happens, when the Member for Inkster is persuaded to lead a troop of Green Berets into El Salvador to get rid of those leftists and pinkos guerillas; when that day happens, Mr. Speaker, maybe Mr. Bilodeau would have a case in the Supreme Court, and then only maybe, because I happen to believe in the persuasive powers of President Reagan. It's entirely possible that he maybe could persuade the Honourable Member for Inkster.

Mr. Speaker, one shouldn't make light of it, but this is the whole problem. This whole situation is predicated on that fundamental error that this government has made. Mr. Speaker, I cannot totally attribute that to a simple mistake. As much as I would like to attribute to that government their mishandling of affairs, their lack of understanding of how government operates, but I cannot believe that a group of people can be that dumb. I simply cannot believe it.

I can believe, however, that they are prepared to use a given situation that the Bilodeau case presented them with to try to manufacture a situation where they could rush through, particularly if they thought initially that they could do it quietly, quickly and secretly, an agreement and thereby hope to cement a minority group's support electorally for all time coming. That is what the honourable members opposite thought they could do, Mr. Speaker. I am going to deal with a little bit more about this government and their concern about minority or special interest groups because, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention.

Mr. Speaker, I don't say that necessarily in a derogative way, but it's my genuine belief that this government knows that it has difficulty in gaining broad acceptability for most of their harebrained schemes. So they have deliberately set out on a course of action to appeal to special interest groups, to minority groups in different manners and different ways as a means of gaining for them an electoral basis, an electoral platform which they hope will keep them in office.

Well, Mr. Speaker, all's fair in politics, but I will demonstrate in a little while that it is also extremely dangerous and it gets them into some very tight corners. Because, of course, if you are constantly responding to, if you're constantly reacting to special interest groups or minority groups, you very often find yourself in deep trouble with the majority of the people that they are responsible for to provide good government.

Mr. Speaker, to carry on with the good advice that was there for them to follow had they but looked to the track record of one Honourable Duff Roblin or indeed the track record that we provided for them since the Bilodeau case in 1979, "Mr. Roblin concludes that the Supreme Court would not act in the manner that this government has suggested. Roblin bases this view on a belief that once the judicial process has begun,"

that is, coming back to the suggestion that the case should have been allowed to go to the Supreme Court, "Roblin bases this view on the belief that once the judicial process has begun, it should be left to follow its natural course. He thinks it was a mistake for the government to short-circuit the administration of justice."

After establishing this point, the Senator moves to the heart of the matter. "In the Manitoba context," he continues, "the language question carries the burden of a hundred years of history, and we all know that. Therefore, it's wise to prepare public opinion, especially when constitutional changes are involved. Public opinion is particularly important in this case for two reasons. It is, after all, the first effort to amend our Constitution, and it deals with a problem so difficult for Manitobans to agree upon. That means," he says, "that the debate should not be limited to a discussion between the MLAs, particularly where a constitutional change is not supported by a political mandate."

Mr. Speaker, by that he means, this government, this administration did not go to the people of Manitoba in 1981 and say that we want to expand and entrench further French language rights in the Constitution. They did not do that, Mr. Speaker. If they would have done that, then perhaps they would have had a political mandate to do that. Mr. Speaker, I have often acknowledged that back in 1969 when this Chamber - 1970, I should say - about this time, was engaged in one of the most acrimonious debates I had seen in this Chamber having to do with the establishment of government automobile insurance but, Mr. Speaker, it was never in my capacity or in my heart to criticize the New Democratic Party Government for introducing government automobile insurance in the province. I opposed it vigorously as did many of the private insurers involved, because their livelihoods were at stake. There was a deep philosophical division with respect to the program that was being offered by the government but, Mr. Speaker, the fact that they had always talked about that as a platform of theirs; the fact that that was prominently displayed on their election literature that this was their intention should the people entrust them with government, gave them the mandate to do what they did in 1970.

No such mandate was given to the New Democratic Party Government to do what they are trying to do with respect to the bilingual resolution before us. Mr. Speaker, I'll go one step further. It might be possible, there's another way that I could have supported this resolution. Mr. Speaker, if this was a non-partisan resolution, if they had the support of all members of the House, or at least the majority of support, if they had the support of the official opposition in proposing the steps that they were undertaking, or if they had taken a bit more time and talked to us about the agreement. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge they did send us a letter. A letter, I think, went to the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, to the Leader's office, a few weeks before, not much before, the announcement was made with respect to this agreement. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding, I could be wrong, I think the government was somewhat embarrassed when that announcement was made, because it was made by the feds, it was made by Prime Minister Trudeau, I believe, perhaps at a time not to the liking of this government.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to them, if the Honourable Premier of this province had sat down with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Attorney-General had sat down with the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, and if they had come to an agreement with the expansion of services that we collectively were prepared to agree to, then, Mr. Speaker, I would not hold it against the government to proceed in the manner in which they are now trying to do, because they would have at least had taken the politics out of the issue, brought a degree of non-partisan to the issue, and it could have been approved in that manner. Neither of these courses is available to this government, Mr. Speaker, they do not have the mandate, electorally, to proceed in the manner they are. They have not sought out, quite frankly, and certainly did not achieve any degree of support in the present manner of the agreement from a majority of members - when I say a majority I'm speaking of both sides of this House. Mr. Speaker, they will suffer the consequences for that.

Mr. Speaker, an experienced Premier indicates to them how important, on an issue such as this, broad agreement, broad support, public knowledge, is necessary. Mr. Speaker, the Senator goes on to recall how, in a matter that was, of course, one of the things that Manitobans should forever remember him for, is how he brought the education system out of the 19th Century into the 20th Century. The Senator remembers a swirling controversy over the consolidation of school divisions which rocked the province in the winter of 1959. His government had promised to group the little red schoolhouses which dotted the province in those days. Instead of hundreds of tiny school division the Roblin Tories were determined to streamline the process. Mr. Speaker, that was a promise made by the Roblin Tories when they went to the people in 1959 and they were determined to carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, how did they carry it out? They carried it out; his strategy was simple. He had a small group of Ministers, including the then Attorney-General, Sterling Lyon, travelling across the province educating the public about the effects of the proposed changes. They ran into plenty of opposition, and fielded dozens of questions at town meetings. After this public education had been accomplished, Roblin then put the question to the people in the form of local plebiscites. More than 90 percent of the local referenda supported the government. Mr. Speaker, this was on an issue that involved schools and education. I know it's an important issue, it's very dear to the hearts of people that live in small communities, to see their centre of education disappear and have to accept the fact that they will be consolidated in a larger community. A great deal of natural jealousies were created in this whole process but, Mr. Speaker, the then Conservative administration under Duff Roblin took the time to educate the public and, indeed, in that case took the time to hold a vote at the local level in the school division as they were even proposed. Mr. Speaker, the net result was, once the people had spoken on the issue, it disappeared like a snow fall in May.

Roblin thinks the bilingual question is much more important to Manitoba than his school division amalgamation program was. Yet, the process of public consultation pales by comparison. Mr. Speaker, compare what the Roblin Tories did to try to bring

about a major social change, in this instance, in education, to bring about the consolidation of hundreds of small tiny one-room school houses into larger consolidated schools. Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not the time to indicate why this, of course, was being done. It was being done because the quality of education couldn't be delivered in those tiny one-room schools. Rural Manitoba children were not given the same opportunities that their city cousins were getting in the larger units in the communities of Winnipeg or Brandon.

So, the Government of the Day went about the task of convincing Manitobans to give up their little schools and agree to amalgamation. Mr. Speaker, I well remember the massive effort that took. I only joined that team in 1966 as Minister of Agriculture. My school divisions in the Interlake at that time still had not been amalgamated. I must say we had to make a very difficult decision in the Interlake, as the Minister of Agriculture was here, it was a very difficult responsibility for me to make as a member of the Interlake, because we amalgamated the 186 school divisions of the Interlake into three by Order-in-Council. That took a lot of guts, that took a lot of leadership, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we were confident that could be done because of the spade work done by the Ministers of that day and public informational meetings; by the fact that it was working well already in most of the rest of the province.

Mr. Speaker, we didn't ram this down anybody's throat. There were some divisions that held out or refused amalgamation until very late on. I believe in 1968-69 there were still some divisions that had not accepted the amalgamation program. Mr. Speaker, that's when a reasonable government tries to bring about major social change; that's when a Conservative Government listens to people and is not that arrogant, that arrives at secret agreements, secret treaties with a group of people in Manitoba and then, after the fact, wants to begin the process of education and information giving, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Senator acknowledges that the government, of course, is now fighting a very defensive battle trying to educate the public long after the public has formed its impressions and opinions on the subject. No amount of newspaper advertising will alter the misconceptions which have arisen out of sloppy planning and mediocre public relations. The Senator, being the statesman that he is, acknowledges that the government is trying to do the right thing, but has clearly gone about it all wrong. Unfortunately for them in politics that's not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, would that this government had taken the time to consult with people like Senator Duff Roblin. Mr. Speaker, he was available to them. Senator Duff Roblin is a Senator for the Province of Manitoba; Senator Duff Roblin would have sat down with any emissary from this government, even though they're of different political description. He could have offered them some of the advice that he offered in this article in yesterday's Sun, and this government could have profited from that advice. More important, Mr. Speaker, far more important, the people of Manitoba would have profited from that advice because the people of Manitoba are always more important than any Government of the Day, and that's something that this government tends to forget from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier about the fact that this government has a tendency to cater to - I suppose I

could use that expression - various interest groups, minority groups; and it's my belief, and it's only a belief, I don't charge them with this but, as an outsider, viewing the actions of that party and trying to find some rationale, some reason for some of the legislation that appears in this Chamber from time to time, I believe it is a logical assumption that they honestly believe that by catering to the various special interest groups, wherever they can find them; the different minority groups, wherever they can find them, that, perhaps if they can get enough of them put together they will secure for them the kind of electoral base that this party is always nervous about having, and rightly so, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless they see it as a political means of securing office for them.

Mr. Speaker, how else could you explain the kind of special catering to, if you like, the Indian minority, and the Indian brothers and sisters that we have in this province. Mr. Speaker, there has to be a reason for building \$3.5 million arenas in communities the size that they are being built in. There has to be a reason why, after two-and-a-half, three years of study of the wild rice industry, and money being paid out to consultants to advise the government about the need for new regulations, a new act in the wild rice industry, and then indeed this government and this Minister of Natural Resource's willingness to proceed with that new piece of legislation, through first reading, through second reading in this House and into committee, only then to find that several Indian Bands raised some, what well may be, legitimate objections, and the bill is effectively withdrawn. We don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not that bill will proceed. It's my hope it will, certainly my willingness to allow this government and this Minister all the time they need to make any piece of legislation better.

They have a passion for drafting poor legislation, and any time that I can afford them additional time to improve on a piece of legislation I will do so, and I said so at committee. But, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but compare, for instance, the readiness and the willingness on the part of this government to hold back on The Wild Rice Act, for instance, simply because a few - I believe it was only two bands that spoke to the committee and suggested they had some concerns about it. Okay, there's no hurry, no rush, the fact that the wild rice industry has waited three years for it, we'll back off.

But, Mr. Speaker, on an issue that is of such fundamental importance as the bilingual resolution facing us, we are called irresponsible, we are called obstructionists by debating the issue for something, what? One-and-a-half weeks have we had it before us. I think it was introduced a week ago Tuesday, I think the Honourable Member for Fort Garry spoke to it last Monday. This referral resolution that's been before us, this referral resolution that we are debating right now, has been before us for about 10 days, Mr. Speaker, for 10 days, and the Acting House Leader talks about obstruction; the Acting House Leader talks about willful hindrance of government business.

Mr. Speaker, let me be allowed to give you another example of how this government caters to special groups and then gets itself in trouble. The Minister of Labour was bound and determined she was going to bring a Payment of Wages Act into this Session, and

it had a certain amount of sex appeal to the worker, to the labourer, and Dick Martin told her to do it. And, again, of course, they're catering to, they want to secure the electoral base of organized labour, and its understandable, it's acceptable, I know what you're doing. I'm just pointing out how you get into trouble when you cater to special interest groups, unless you carefully take the overall public interest into mind, and that really is our job.

Mr. Speaker, we all cater to special interest groups; we all lobby, from time to time, whether it's dairy farmers, sugar beet farmers, municipalities, City of Winnipeg and in different cases, they can all be described as a minority at one stage or another; cattle producers, marketing boards, you can name them. Individually, professional groups come to us and ask us to amend their legislation. Mr. Speaker, one of our most difficult, most responsible job, as legislators, is to make sure that, in trying to address ourselves to the specific needs of that special interest group, and if it's reasonable and it makes sense, to be able to accommodate them, but not at the expense of the public good. That's really the trick, that's the art of government.

The Minister of Labour found that out, she had to find out the hard way a little bit. She found out that it was one thing to say, yes, to Dick Martin and organized labour; of course, we'll bring in a Payment of Wages Act. Then find out, at committee stage, just what the ramifications of that kind of action was in the overall society, and she withdrew the bill. Mr. Speaker, I can't let the Minister of Labour off that easy. It's not that important but, again, it demonstrates the point that I'm trying to make. How did we get into that big babysitting kaffuffle in this House? I'll tell you why, because again this government was catering to, in this case, a very small special interest group, domestics, Mr. Speaker. There's no question in my mind that somewhere along the line, at some point, people, the domestics, the maids that work, particularly that work in the rich houses in Tuxedo or River Heights, attended an NDP meeting and said, we're being exploited, we're being abused and it's time we all got put on The Labour Act.

Well, of course, they sensed here was another special interest group, another little electoral base that they could secure and they brought in legislation that brought in all domestics, without properly defining it, under the full regulations of The Manitoba Labour Act. Mr. Speaker, we told them at the time they were doing it that they were going to get in trouble with it; perhaps we didn't tell them loud enough. We have been chastised for that in the media; we didn't speak up loud enough when that bill was passed. But sure enough, a year later, a woman in Winnipeg finds herself with paying upwards to \$1,000, \$900-and-some dollars in back payments because she had a falling out with her babysitter. Then all of a sudden it dawned on this government that the legislation that they passed was not in the overall public interest, that it interfered far too heavily in the hundred and one, indeed, thousand and one different arrangements that people enter into privately with favourite aunts, with cousins, with other teenagers that they may take into their homes and provide room and board for partial payment for babysitting and other services.

Then, Mr. Speaker, of course, again in this case, I think they had to tie down the Minister of Labour for a few days in her office while the Minister of Finance, who I suppose, was to purport a more fatherly image in this whole babysitting debate, stood up ponderously in the Chair of Finance and said, I am going to resolve the matter of babysitting in the Province of Manitoba. Again, Mr. Speaker, but a simple example of how this government gets themselves into trouble when they cater to these special minority groups.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, a serious purpose for providing these few lighter moments in my comments. The seriousness, of course, Mr. Speaker, it's my judgement that is why they entered into the agreement for the Franco-Manitoban Society. They believed, they honestly believed that they could quietly and just about secretly pull it off and in doing so, by enshrining - and, Mr. Speaker, I can understand the desire for the Franco-Manitoban Society in having these rights enshrined - if they would have managed to have pulled it off in the manner they were about to, undoubtedly they would have won for many of them at least - not by any means all - but many of them, acknowledgement editorially for some time to come.

Mr. Speaker, the difficulty, of course, is the question of the bilingual resolution before us is not a matter of resolving the problems of a babysitter. It is not even in the realm of such legislation as The Payment of Wages Act. It cuts to the core of the very essence of what puts people together in this province and makes people work in this province, and they are finding out much to their sorrow, the consequences of their action are far and above what they expected, and will have and can have the most serious consequences for the future of relations between different peoples of different backgrounds in the Province of Manitoba if they persist in this action.

Mr. Speaker, there is always some political flack to accept when a government has to be seen to retreat from a position initially taken, but if there ever was an issue that a government should reflect on, if ever there was an issue that a government should accept some advice on, advice from people like Senator Duff Roblin, advice by some of the leadership that was shown by the previous Conservative administration, advice that we are prepared to give them right now tonight in this Chamber by accepting the subamendment on this motion. Mr. Speaker, surely most of you can understand, most of you can go back to your constituents and say, look, we are going to deal with this matter intersessionally. We're not going to have to cut you off at public information hearings and give you five minutes to say your piece, or try to pack them with one side of supporters versus the other side of supporters as was the case of the International Inn. Mr. Speaker, this issue is far too important for that. The consequences are far too important for that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the opposition has shown its willingness to demonstrate very clearly that we do not present this motion as simply a stalling tactic, as an open-ended situation where the committee could meet forever and ever and never report. Mr. Speaker, we have tonight put a date on it, a date that conforms with the date that is requested by the government, December 31, 1983. What can be more reasonable, Mr. Speaker?

I ask the government to accept the motion before them. Let us get on with the remaining business of this House, but far more important, let us get on with stopping the fracture that this resolution might well develop, has already developed to some extent within our population before too much damage is done. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that we sat till the small hours this morning; given the fact that I intend to announce that we meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned
. . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I just wanted to confirm what I indicated in my preliminary remarks that this House will sit tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, likely sit at 2 o'clock and thereafter, but we'll see what progress we make at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning (Saturday).