



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. 69A - 2:00, TUESDAY, 17 MAY, 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, 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, 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	Viriden	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, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, 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

Tuesday, 17 May, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions
. . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the fiscal year 1983-84, the Province of Manitoba is financially assisting urban transit in the City of Winnipeg through two grant programs: The Urban Transit Operating Grant and the Urban Transit Capital Grant.

Under the Urban Transit Operating Grant Program, the province will make grants equal to 50 percent of the city's audited contribution towards the 1983 transit system deficit, up to a maximum provincial contribution of \$15.1 million based on the recent modest fare increases adopted by City Council. The 1983 provincial contribution is estimated at \$15,097,670, an increase of \$1.4 million or 10.5 percent above the 1982 provincial grant advances.

Under the Urban Transit Capital Grant Program, the province will pay 50 percent of the net cost of approved transit bus purchases and innovative urban transit demonstration projects. During 1983-84, the province will contribute up to \$1.6 million as its share of approved projects. Together, these two grant programs reflect the continued high priority which my government places on urban transit. In addition, these grant programs support the transit-oriented containment option found in Plan Winnipeg which has been endorsed by the province and the City of Winnipeg Council.

It is with respect to the Urban Transit Capital Grant Program that I wish to speak today, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to confirm the Provincial Government approval of two projects for funding under the Urban Transit Capital Grants Program, the Automatic Passenger Information System and the Downtown Bus Stop Information Demonstration Project. The total cost

of these two projects is just over \$1.3 million. After excluding \$105,000 in finance and administrative charges which are a city responsibility, the cost of the project amounts to \$620,625 for each, the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg.

The Automatic Passenger Information System will enable Winnipeg residents to telephone a number on their bus stop and receive computer-assisted information on the arrival time of the next two buses at the stop, along with a status report on the particular route, or the total system as required.

The basic intent of the Winnipeg Automatic Passenger Information System is to:

Increase transit ridership, especially during the off-peak hours (and thereby increase transit system revenues), and

Reduce auto travel and thereby reduce the amount of gasoline consumed for urban transportation.

Automatic Transit Passenger Information systems have been installed in Mississauga, Ottawa, Toronto and Kitchener-Waterloo under the trade name of Telerider. Based on experience in those cities, it is anticipated that a significant increase in off-peak ridership can be achieved at little or no increase in operating cost. The City of Winnipeg projects that up to \$950,000 in additional farebox revenues can be realized during the first 12 months of operation as a direct result of the installation of an Automatic Passenger Information System. This increase in transit usage is projected to result in an annual saving of approximately 3.6 million litres of gasoline and the removal of approximately 2 million auto vehicle trips from the Winnipeg street system each year.

The installation of an Automatic Transit Passenger Information System in Winnipeg is projected to generate revenues in excess of its initial capital investment within a one to two year period.

The Downtown Bus Information Demonstration Project is intended as a complementary service providing detailed schedule information at key downtown bus stops for passengers. If this initial demonstration in the downtown area proves successful, the Bus Stop Information Demonstration Project could be expanded to other high-usage bus stops, such as those around regional shopping centres, major transfer points and points of concentrated employment.

As stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, my government continues to place a high priority on urban transit and we are pleased to fund such innovative transit demonstration projects in co-operation with the City of Winnipeg which not only promote public transit use, but also offer the promise of covering their own costs through increased ridership.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, as one who has had the privilege of chairing the Works and Operations Committee at city council for some four years, that

committee being responsible for the operation of the public transit system, I, and we on this side, welcome any steps that are taken to improve public transit in the City of Winnipeg.

However, Mr. Speaker, throughout the statement by the Minister we note the heavy hand of the Provincial Government as page after page we see the word and hear the word "approved" - approved by the Provincial Government.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the government should recognize and appreciate that those people at the City of Winnipeg who operate and manage the public transit system in the City of Winnipeg are well qualified in that particular field and know best how to operate and improve the public transit system. This government is continuing a format that they followed under the previous NDP government whereby the Provincial Government retained a right of veto, and approval of projects involving the public transit system, and I would urge the government to allow the City of Winnipeg officials and management people in the transit system to make the decisions with respect to the urban transit system because they know best, Mr. Speaker, how to operate the public transit system, not the provincial government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 28 students of Grades 5 and 6 standing from the Victor Mager School. These students are under the direction of Miss Romanetz, and the school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

There are 18 students of Grade 11 standing from the Fort Richmond Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Huber. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

There are 40 students of Grades 3 to 8 standing from the Mariapolis School under the direction of Mrs. Pearson. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

On behalf of all of the members I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Care-A-Lot Day Care Centre

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

MR. G. MERCIER: My question is to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the imposition of a first contract by the Labour Board on the Care-A-Lot Day Care Centre in the City of Winnipeg.

My question to the Minister is this: How can she justify referring this matter to the Labour Board for imposition of a first contract which averages 16 percent on a non-profit volunteer Board of Directors day care centre, which has now resulted, Mr. Speaker, in a sign

being placed on the premises advising that because of the imposition of the 16 percent increase in wages, the day care centre will have to close as of this Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to have the opportunity to clarify one of the points that was made by the member opposite. That is the really erroneous statement that 16-plus percent was the average increase. In fact, the increase that he refers to only affected a couple of the workers who had not had an increase in their wages, as was agreed to previously before the union was ever even certified there. The average increase is closer to 10 percent. In fact, the range of increase ran from 7 percent to the 16.5 percent to which he refers.

The wages at the Care-A-Lot Day Care Centre under the first contract imposed by the Manitoba Labour Board, who I might add worked very hard to attempt to get the parties to settle this contract themselves using every provision under the law to do so, the unanimous decision brought down by the labour and management representatives of that group, plus the chairperson, included increases in wages from \$4 an hour to \$4.40 an hour up to \$6 an hour. For the supervisors' position, from \$6.10 to, after several years service and additional training, \$8.20 an hour.

A quick survey of other day care centres, who operate also in most cases with boards of directors such as was described for the Care-A-Lot Day Care Centre and who operate under the same ages as all of our day care centres, will show that whether they are unionized or not, salaries range from about the \$6 level, \$6.46, \$6.43 to approximately \$8.23 to \$8.61, still higher than the new wages imposed under this first contract.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that officials of the day care centre agree with the news report that the wage increases average 16 percent; in view of the fact that the parents of the children attending this day care centre, as most day care centres are all working people whether they're two-parent or single-parent families; and in view of the fact that the children are subsidized by the government, did the Minister expect, as the counsel for the union suggested, that the 16 percent increase in wages imposed by the Labour Board should be raised by the parents by having fund-raising drives, socials and other activities?

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am informed by staff that the budget submitted by the day care centre indicated that there may or may not be a deficit this year. Obviously, this year is not yet complete; but so far, I think it was even reported in the press that they are operating at a \$200 surplus, which granted is not a lot, but they are not in a deficit position this year so far.

The increase in wages was really no different than any other day care, as I have referred to earlier, has in their wages and, in fact, the wages being paid out are not as substantial as those in most other day cares or in many of the other day cares, certainly in those that I have mentioned to you, and I have been careful to mention both union and non-union day care centres.

The way in which a day care decides to supplement its budget for whatever purpose - sometimes they do it because they wish to have some renovations done; sometimes they wish to purchase new toys; sometimes they wish to add a program that they would not have decided to do earlier or they did not decide to do when they put together their budget; how they do this is their business.

The budget submitted to the Labour Board for consideration in this case included some very high-priced items that had to be taken into consideration, I suppose, by the board, and I would suggest that the wages of their staff ought to be a primary consideration instead of the fees for lawyers to fight the imposition of a contract.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Minister of Labour referred this matter to the Labour Board for imposition of a first contract; and in view of the fact that day care centres used by working parents throughout the Province of Manitoba were little able to afford increases of this magnitude and size; and in view of the fact that the CUPE union will, in all likelihood, attempt to form unions in every day care centre in Manitoba as a result of this precedent, would the Minister assure the House that she will not follow this precedent of referring each and every one of these cases to the Labour Board for imposition of a first contract and will she allow these matters to be settled by bargaining between the parties involved?

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the member opposite is aware that referral for first contract occurs when negotiations break down. This union was certified 11 months ago, June of 1982. They had attempted to negotiate a contract with management; they had reached an impasse; there was an attempt to get a resolution before referral; there was an attempt to get a resolution after referral; there were continued attempts to resolve the situation; that was not possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have a grandson in a day care centre; I have a daughter who is a day care worker; and I might add she is a day care worker who is non-unionized. She earns a slightly higher rate of pay than these people would be earning under this imposed first contract.

Referral for a first contract, no matter what the industry, no matter what the worker, occurs when negotiations break down, not before.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Community Services. In view of the fact that it is government action that has closed down this day care centre, what does the Minister intend to do to keep this day care centre open?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the honourable member that my staff is willing and able at any time to work with any of the 225 day care centres in the province. I am very pleased to observe, Mr. Speaker, that of the 225, by far the bulk of them, 99 percent, or whatever, do not have financial difficulties, seem to be able to manage with the program monies that we have provided.

Day care centres in rural Manitoba - relocations

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: I have a question to the Minister of Government Services.

In view of the fact that the Department of Government Service has advised the Day Care Board in Swan River to vacate the government-owned facility there, as it is to be sold, will the Minister agree to provide other facilities or arrangements to house the day care operations in Swan River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Community Services. Can he indicate whether he has issued any letters of instruction to vacate day care centres in other parts of rural Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is one facility in Southern Manitoba which, as I am advised, was indicated by the Fire Commissioner's Office as being unsafe and on that basis the staff recommended, unfortunately, that the centre be given notice to close down, but the safety of the children has to be paramount, obviously.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister perchance indicate for how long that day care centre has operated with an unblemished record of child care and in perfect safety of those children, that is now causing them, all of a sudden, to have to vacate on rather short notice, without having available their replacement staff, their replacement facility?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: You don't want to shut down abortion clinics, but you shut down day care centres, Rolly.

MR. H. ENNS: Rolly, this building is in violation of the fire regulations, this building right here.

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

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we always wish to be guided by the advice of the experts and if the Fire Commissioner's Office indicates that there's some unsafe condition, or that there's a hazard, we're certainly be very foolish if we ignored particular advice.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the matter has been under advisement for some time. It's not as though all of a sudden there's quick notice.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Labour, who's responsible for the Fire Commissioner's Office may have something to add to the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add some information to this discussion, since I just spoke to the Fire Commissioner before entering this House this afternoon. He was on his way to Morden for a meeting with the staff of the day care centre, along with staff from the Honourable Minister of Community Services office.

The problem with the day care there, of course, is that it is situated over a cannery and has only one exit. In case of any accident, the children would be in peril because one exit would be closed off. The situation though is being dealt with in, I think, a very humane manner, in that the Fire Commissioner has a resolution for opening a second exit that will allow the day care centre to operate temporarily in that same facility with two exits, while they negotiate the construction of a free-standing day care centre this next year.

Hodgson-Fisher Branch area re hopper cars

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether or not he could be of some assistance in getting some grain cars up to the Fisher Branch-Hodgson area. Has the Minister undertaken to speak to the Wheat Board and the railways about that matter?

MR. J. DOWNEY: He hasn't done a thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we did contact all parties, including the Wheat Board, Manitoba Pool Elevators, both at Fisher Branch and in Winnipeg, and the railway involved. The CNR, which has the line to Fisher Branch was, in fact, investigating whether or not they could put a train on there. At that time they had sent a crew out to see whether the spring thaw would allow the shipment of cars into that area.

I have to say that line has been a difficulty for myself and I'm sure for the honourable member, because it goes through both our ridings in the past, and the CNR had that line designated as a snow line where they would not send the railway trains up there in wintertime. This winter there was no snow and there was very limited service as well, but they've indicated that as soon as the line stabilizes, as of the spring thaw, that they will have service into the community.

Crow rate

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the fact that for some weeks now, we have been hearing action take place in the House of Commons dealing with the Crow rate change in Canada and the fact that we, as members of the Legislature, spent taxpayers' money proceeding throughout Manitoba to get a feeling from the farm community and farm leaders on how they felt about proposed changes, and now the Prime Minister is touring Western Canada, will the First Minister in the Province of Manitoba instruct his Minister of Highways to reconvene the Agricultural Committee so we can put our thoughts forward, Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian picture, as they're dealing with the change of Crow rate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure our Minister of Transportation requires no instruction, particularly from honourable members across the way that have been certainly less than enthusiastic about developing a clear position, to say the least, about the issue of the Crow. I would refer the remainder of the question to the Minister of Transportation to deal with the question of the timing of the recall of the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur is surely aware that the committee will be reporting to the Assembly. The committee meeting will be called fairly soon. I believe the members are aware that we too are anxiously waiting for developments at the federal level. We, as a few days ago, have come to know what the apparent near final package is going to be and are making some assessment of that, and we will be making recommendations to the committee for their consideration, based on the latest information flowing out of Ottawa.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House of Commons, as I understand it, the Liberal Government in Ottawa have placed closure on the bill - the Crow Rate change bill - and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister was in Winnipeg yesterday and that the Leader of Manitoba's Government, the NDP Premier, did not take the opportunity to put any thoughts forward on the Crow rate, does that mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of Manitoba is now aligned with the Prime Minister of Canada and fully supporting what he's doing to the farm community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Honourable Member for Arthur mustn't be following the proceedings very well in the House of Commons. If he was following the proceedings in the House of Commons, then he'd be quite conscious of the fact that it is his party in the House of Commons that appeared to have some slight difficulty in developing

their own position with respect to the Crow. Mr. Speaker, I could be indeed excused for thinking that the federal Conservatives in the House of Commons are not quite sure whether to support the Prime Minister or not in the Federal House of Commons. Mr. Speaker, there is no uncertainty insofar as the position of the New Democratic Party either in Manitoba or in Canada on this issue - unlike the Conservative Party.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister may or may not be aware that it has been the Conservative Party that has done more for the development of transportation in Western Canada without changing the Crow rate or the statutory rate.

Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister aware of the fact that this morning the Conservative Party in the House of Commons have, in fact, made their position very clear to the Liberal Government in Ottawa as to how they feel about the Crow rate change, and would he update himself on what is happening with the House of Commons and the Prime Minister of Canada, who he had a chance to meet with here in Winnipeg yesterday, and let the feeling of the Government of Manitoba be known? Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, he abandoned his responsibility.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I am pleased indeed if the Conservative Party in the House of Commons this morning has finally made clear its position in respect to the Crow. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate honourable members across the way for being members of a party that this very morning at long last has made its position clear in respect to the Crow.

Abortion clinic - Dr. Morgentaler

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. In view of the evidence presented to the Attorney-General on behalf of the League for Life in Manitoba to the effect that abortions are being performed at Dr. Morgentaler's Clinic, and their request to obtain the consent of the Attorney-General to an application or a civil action to obtain an injunction against Dr. Morgentaler, would the Attorney-General reconsider the position that he has taken on this matter in view of the evidence that is being supplied to him?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, there may have been "evidence" supplied to the Member for St. Norbert, but there certainly has been no evidence supplied to me by the League for Life, the Member for St. Norbert or, indeed, by anyone. If there is evidence it would, one would think, be presented in the first instance to the police who are in fact investigating the facility as they said they would and as I said they would.

If, in fact, the League for Life has evidence and they have not submitted it to the police, then one wonders about their position. If they have such evidence, then I say submit it to the police. The police, indeed, know

what to do with evidence, but let me make it clear, that if what is being suggested, if it is suggested by the former Attorney-General or anyone that a hearsay statement - because that's what Dr. Morgentaler's statement is - is evidence which can be used in a court of law to convict some doctor who allegedly is performing abortions, then they know less about the law than I thought they knew.

With respect to the second part of his question; namely, my refusal to grant what is called the Attorney-General's fiat or permission for a relator action, I think I can do no better than saying that there is a certain element of irony here. I've been pressed, as this House well knows and the people of Manitoba, by Dr. Morgentaler and his supporters effectively to stay proceedings. I have consistently refused. I have said, the law will take its course, as indeed it will. The criminal law will speak, and it will speak in the courts where all procedural safeguards to which anyone who is accused is entitled, will be available.

I've had hundreds of letters from supporters for the League for Life asking me to maintain that stand; that I should not stay proceedings. Now, the League for Life asks me to do the same thing; to effectively stay proceedings, to deny the rights which an accused has under the criminal law, to sidestep the criminal law and to permit an esoteric civil proceeding to stand between anyone accused of a crime and the right of that person to defend himself or herself as the case may be.

I am going to continue as I should, right down the middle. I will not stay proceedings; I will not grant immunity; nor will I allow the criminal law to be subverted by civil proceedings.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there has been any suggestion by the League for Life that criminal proceedings not be proceeded with.

In view of the fact that the Attorney-General, in his response to the solicitor for the League for Life, has indicated that if a criminal action is commenced - and I note the word "if," Mr. Speaker - would he assure this House that he did not really mean to use the word "if"; he meant to use the word "when," particularly when he was in receipt, not of hearsay evidence but a copy of an affidavit by the head nurse for the Morgentaler Clinic, who swore on oath that she had made appointments for seven women to attend at the clinic for the purposes of abortions on Saturday, May 7th.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I have just had confirmed what I suggested I suspected a moment ago; namely, that the former Attorney-General knows very very little about the law. I don't know if he ever practised criminal law; it is apparent that he didn't. Let me just in a moment - and I think it's important that people should know what must happen in order for there to be a successful prosecution under the abortion law. There must be an information that swears on reasonable and probable grounds that on a certain day, a doctor who would be named, or some other medical practitioner, did on that day procure the abortion of a named female person.

All of these elements must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt for a prosecution to succeed. An

affidavit by a nurse that appointments were made is not that kind of evidence. The fact that an appointment was made does not yet prove that an abortion was committed. It may be the case; I don't know; the member for St. Norbert doesn't know; the police do not know that appointments were made and abortions refused. We don't know that.

The police are questioning people. In due course they have said they will execute a search warrant. I suspect that they will. They will obtain — (Interjection) — Keep quite for awhile, it won't hurt you. They will obtain medical records. On the basis of those medical records, they will call upon persons who allegedly had such operations performed. They will interview them. If they succeed, as they might well, in obtaining statements, then there would be a prima facie case to put before a Crown Prosecutor; but if under the hectoring and political posturing of members of the opposition, the police were to rush in like a political police force, which you want to turn them into - I won't - if the police were to rush in prematurely, they could blow any possible case and, indeed, leave themselves open for a prosecution, for a malicious prosecution.

The police know their business. They don't need instruction from me; they don't need instruction from the Member from St. Norbert. Above all, they don't need instruction from that legal illiterate in the back row.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General can make all of the sleazy, whining comments he wants to make. But I know what it means to uphold the law, Mr. Speaker; something that he doesn't know.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by the Attorney-General that the Chief Justice of this province, Mr. Justice Monnin, should disqualify himself from hearing any case relating to this abortion because he allegedly signed a petition; in view of the personal viewpoint of the Attorney-General, which he has stated on many occasions, that he personally does not support the provisions of the existing Criminal Code, would he drop this double standard and disqualify himself from any involvement in this?

HON. R. PENNER: As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I had begun to suspect that the Member for St. Norbert was sadly a legal illiterate. I am now finding that he is functionally illiterate altogether because nowhere have I said, nor am I quoted as saying anywhere, that the Chief Justice of Manitoba should disqualify himself. I never made such a statement. I can say that categorically, and having said that categorically, I can again say categorically that apparently the Member for St. Norbert can't read.

What I said in fact, which was supportive of the Chief Justice, was that I believed that judges once appointed do not become political eunuchs and are entitled at their risk in the sense of what might happen down the road to make statements on policy issues if they wish. I supported the Chief Justice of Manitoba in that respect.

What I did say was that it may be the case, indeed as it may, that when a case involving this particular issue comes before the Court of Appeal that there would be an argument presented to him, if he should be sitting on that day, that he should disqualify himself, and I said that will be for him to decide.

You know, it's one thing, Mr. Speaker, to have questions put on the basis of valid premises, but to be faced with the erroneous statements and heated intemperate conclusions drawn from them is to suffer too much at the hands of someone who should read a little more law and a little more carefully the papers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him whether a Dr. Robert Scott of Alexandria, Ontario, has in fact performed the first abortions at the Morgentaler Clinic?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I think that it looks a bit like a trap. I think that it has not been determined that there has been an abortion in Manitoba, so it would be very difficult for me to answer. I read the newspaper. I get the same information as my honourable friend has.

I can tell my honourable friend that the College of Physicians and Surgeons are investigating the situation and I think that if and when, I think they're going to the doctor directly. Then we might know if, in fact, there has been an abortion performed in Manitoba when we get this information, and I understand that the City Police also are investigating.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information. Knowing of his concern for this question and knowing that he would have read about it in the media, I ask him whether he has through his office or through the Manitoba Health Services Commission caused an investigation of that reported statement by Dr. Morgentaler?

If that is not the case, if no such investigation has been undertaken by the Commission, has there been any communication with the Commission vis-a-vis payment and reimbursement and insurance for such medical procedures at the Morgentaler Clinic?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately or fortunately, not like the Member for St. Norbert or the Attorney-General, I'm not a lawyer and as you know, I'm quite independent and very neutral in this question so I have no problem — (Interjection) — yes, very neutral. I have no problem with the statement and the position of the Attorney-General. As the Minister of Health, I am responsible for standards. The Cabinet as such has recognized that we would not grant the hospital status to the clinic. That is the case.

I think the important thing, no matter who starts, who initiates any action, I think the important thing is

to make sure that there has been an abortion. This is what I heard the Attorney-General say. I think it could be quite embarrassing if we start anything and if the government, through the Attorney-General, should start anything and it was proven that there has not been any abortion at all.

So the thing is that we will, as far as - we each do our job - the Attorney-General is responsible to maintain the law and I'm satisfied with his answer. I am responsible, as the Minister of Health, to make sure that there is no illegal abortion being performed in a - well, that says it all - in a facility that has not been recognized or accredited, and also that any licence with the College of Physicians of Surgeons, that any doctors that are licensed to perform as a doctor here should not practise illegally. That, I am told, I've met with the College of Physicians and Surgeons - not with the special purpose of discussing that - we meet every month of so as my honourable friend knows, and that information was given that they are looking into it.

I also have received a copy of a complaint by a citizen who sent his complaint to the police, and the police, I understand, are investigating it. But my role as Minister of Health is to make sure of these standards, and no illegal abortion without the proper backup should be done.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, again I thank the Minister for his information. I concede his responsibility with respect to standards, but the College of Physicians and Surgeons has a responsibility with respect to ethics of practice. I would ask the Minister whether the College of Physicians and Surgeons' licensing of a practitioner, of Dr. Scott or of any practitioner in Manitoba, extends to medical procedures which are not recognized by the law, which are outside the law, which are in fact illegal, or whether I am correct in my assumption that College of Physicians and Surgeons licensing extends only to medical practitioners performing practices that are legal within the laws of the province and the nation?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my information is, of course, that they license any recognized doctor, qualified doctors to perform anything that is legal, not illegal. As I stated - I thought I did - the College of Physicians and Surgeons informed me that they are looking into the situation. They have been trying to get in touch with Dr. Scott to ask him a few pointed questions. I guess when they have further information, I could inform the House.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Would the Minister, in a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then concede that the College of Physicians and Surgeons obviously places much greater potential credence in Dr. Morgentaler's remarks than the Attorney-General does?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can categorically say no to that question. They feel exactly - in fact, they felt that maybe Dr. Morgentaler was trying to play games and get people all on the wrong track, so they're certainly not sure that anything, any abortion . . .

A MEMBER: And he certainly succeeded across the way.

Loan Guarantee Program

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday I took as notice a question from the Honourable Member for Pembina dealing with the review panel that the province has set up. I can advise him that we've had 23 inquiries of staff concerning financial difficulties and we've had, of those, 12 financial reviews completed.

One of those 23 problems have been settled without going to a review panel and the farmers' problems were able to be worked out. There are eight others where there are discussions with creditors and staff. Two panels were completed. There's actually been two panels completed and there is one panel that is being scheduled, I believe, for next week and there are several that are being held at the request of farmers where they're negotiating and staff are working with them.

I might add for the honourable member that the review process follows very well as a follow-up to our assistance and counselling that we have provided farmers under the Interest Rate Relief Program and certainly is an added measure to assist farmers in dealing with the financial crisis therein.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the honourable member that under the Loan Guarantee Program, I received a report this morning. As of the end of last week there were 187 applications totalling \$11.2 million. Ten have been declined for the same amount as I gave earlier. Approvals of 166, \$9.9 million; 11 pending for \$710,000, and there have been numerous others that have come in. The turnaround time presently is three days for the applications.

Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister also provide the answer to the question he took as notice as to whether incorporated family farms, whose principal shareholders choose not to sign a personal guarantee to the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, will be refused crop insurance coverage either this year or next year?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will remember that I answered the question and I'm having that whole matter reviewed. The answer that I gave him, and I looked at my notes that I read from the information that was provided to me by the corporation:

"The Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation's solicitor states the reason that we request the personal guarantee is that the corporation insures the individual producer rather than the corporation. Therefore, we want the individual producer's personal guarantee. The person giving the personal guarantee for a corporate debt is in the insured's file and will never be used unless the corporation goes into receivership or is placed in receivership."

We have had a few corporations go into receivership and that did not have the corporate debt form or prior to having a corporate debt form signed as an officer of the corporation. Therefore, the corporation only received settlement in accordance with the funds available.

The honourable member is also aware that this procedure was instituted, I believe, in August of 1980. I want to review this whole matter to see whether or not the corporation is going beyond normal practices in terms of having its premiums guaranteed for payment but I still have not received further response to this and we will be reviewing this whole matter.

Port of Churchill - upgrading

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. A. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Agriculture indicated that he would be contacting the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee and the Canadian Wheat Board to encourage them to change their decision on the accepting of some \$50 million to upgrade the Port of Churchill and the line to Churchill. Has he contacted the Canadian Wheat Board and what was their response, Mr. Speaker?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we did contact the Wheat Board and we also received advice. My colleague received advice from the Minister responsible indicating that the press reports dealing with the alleged \$50 million were, in fact, mere discussions, and discussions at the formative stage in Ottawa. There has been no formal commitment made vis-a-vis the press statements that we have encountered.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call adjourned debates on second reading in the following order: Bill 60, Bill 55, Bill 4, Bill 12, Bill 50.

And then, Sir, time permitting, I propose to call the second reading on Bill 20.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 60 - THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways Bill No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words on this important and controversial piece of proposed legislation, Bill 60.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, may I say that my current position with respect to this Act is one of difficulty. I recognize the valuable medical and physical advantages to be achieved from some of the measures proposed in the legislation with respect to safety restraints and safety devices for persons driving in, and riding in, automobiles and operating motorcycles. But I have difficulty, Sir, with the compulsory aspect and nature

of the legislation with the fact that the government apparently finds it desirable, if not indeed necessary, to mandate the compulsory use of these protective devices and with the fact that the government obviously finds it necessary to tie the three key components of this bill together.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the current Minister of Highways has similar difficulties with the nature of the bill and way that it has been constructed although far be it from me to impute improper interpretations of a piece of legislation by one member or another in this Chamber. I may hear from him in challenge to that suggestion. But I do suggest, Sir, knowing the Minister of Highways, knowing him to be a fair and a reasonable man and an extremely broadly experienced legislator in this province, I do believe that he probably has difficulties somewhat similar to mine. If they are not as intense in degree, they certainly, I suggest, may well be quite similar to mine in that the bill itself avoids taking the courageous approach to some protective safety measures that are desirable in our society and hides them; in fact, sugar coats them and attempts to convey their imposition into society hidden inside other arguments and other constraints. I refer to the section of the bill that would require small children to be protected by child restraints in motor vehicles.

The government apparently finds it impossible to address that measure head-on, separately and independently, and give it the individual support and the individual impetus that in my view it deserves. They want to invade certain areas of individual choice in the affairs of Manitobans; they want to be able to control and regulate the conduct of society in certain areas of vehicular traffic; and they want to deliver on, I think, what some of them perhaps feel is a pledge or a partial promise at least to some of their constituencies by introducing mandatory seat belt legislation and mandatory motorcycle helmet legislation. They do not believe they can get seat belt legislation and motorcycle helmet legislation through this Legislature or past the people of Manitoba by themselves, and in order to win that argument, in order to provide the mandatory measures having to do with automobile seat belts and motorcycle helmets, they have carefully constructed a piece of legislation that enables them to smuggle those measures in, Sir, with a very desirable piece of social protection, that component of the bill that provides for child restraints.

That's my difficulty with this legislation. I do not warm enthusiastically to a government requirement that mandates the use of motorcycle helmets or for that matter that mandates the use of seat belts in automobiles on a compulsory basis. I believe that that is an unwelcome and an unnecessary invasion of privacy and freedom of choice, and I regret very much the continuing drift in society and the continuing tendency by this government to reduce the range of individual choices available to men and women, to reduce the range of individual choices and individual decisions available to Manitobans, and to force society into a conformist mold.

I think for all the strong supporting arguments that can be offered in the seat belt debate and in the motorcycle helmet debate, and there certainly are strong supporting arguments that can be introduced, I think for all of those, there is the countervailing

argument that education is better than compulsion and that any and all legislative initiatives which tend to diminish the rights of men and women to make individual choices about their lives and about the conduct of their affairs within legal reason, any and all initiatives that tend to diminish that kind of freedom tends to threaten the ultimate survival of freedom and free choice itself. As a consequence, I find it extremely difficult to support, endorse and embrace measures of that kind.

I recognize the statistical arguments that have been mounted, the investigations that have been carried out and the documentation that has been provided from a great number of sources, professional, vocational and otherwise, which argue that mandatory seat belts save lives and protect people from serious injury, and that motorcycle helmets do likewise. But, Sir, there is also the argument that has been raised by the advocates of the other side, who can testify to documented situations in which the wearing of such devices have in fact cost people their lives rather than save their lives, have in fact caused accidents rather than prevented accidents, and I think that it is unjudicious of the Legislature to move in such a way as to make those devices mandatory and compulsory without very serious, deep and soul-searching examination of the subject and without considerably more attention being paid to all the investigation, all the exploratory work, all the arguments that are available on both sides of the question.

I have talked as recently as two weeks ago to drivers; in this case, a resident of a northern community of this province in the most recent case, who said to me that he would not be there in his car driving with me on that particular highway if he had a year-and-a-half ago been wearing a seat belt. We all know of situations of that kind and incidents of that kind. Now, that is not to say that arguments and statistics cannot be mounted in voluminous number from other jurisdictions which demonstrate that seat belts have saved lives and prevented accidents, but, Sir, what the two things say is that it's an open question, a continuing argument. There is no conclusive evidence as yet which would seem to justify this Legislature's moving in a compulsory way, moving in a way such as is proposed in this legislation, to mandate the compulsory use of such devices without further intensive exploration and examination of the subject.

That is the way I feel about the requirement to make the wearing of seat belts and motorcycle helmets mandatory as I study the legislation and work my way through it at this juncture. I am, Sir, however, prepared to listen to the arguments that support the legislation to consider the kinds of representations that will be made before Law Amendments Committee when this bill goes to committee, and to move very carefully in making my final free-choice decision with respect to this legislation, but that's the way I feel at the moment about seat belts and motorcycle helmets.

I believe that the motorcycle rider, motorcycle operator organization known as ABATE makes a very good argument and a very good case when it presses for much more extensive, much more sophisticated, much more scientific rider education. I believe, in terms of safety on the road in general, that the biggest initiative that we could take would be an initiative in the area of

ridding our roads and our streets and our highways of drinking drivers. Initiatives in the area of reducing the incidents of drinking among drivers, reducing the level of alcohol influence on the roads and in vehicular traffic, are the most urgently required initiatives in the area of life and safety on the road for Manitobans. So that rider education in the motorcycle field, as promoted through ABATE and intensive and, if necessary, expensive initiatives aimed at reducing the incidents of the use of alcohol by operators of vehicles, and particularly motor vehicles; initiatives aimed at driving the drinking driver off the road and keeping him and her off the road; initiatives aimed at eliminating that scourge of alcohol on our streets and highways are the initiatives that I would like to see this Legislature directing its attention to with respect to measures having to do with The Highway Traffic Act. It's there that I place my primary interest and ambition at the moment, Sir, rather than in the area of the compulsory mandating of the use of seat belts and motorcycle helmets.

But I do not have any argument with that component of the bill that deals with the mandatory use of child restraints in motor vehicles. I believe, Sir, that is a measure that is entirely and unequivocally justified and overdue and I would wish that the government had had the moral courage to move on a piece of legislation that would mandate child restraints by themselves and of themselves, that would introduce that measure by itself and of itself, rather than confusing and obscuring the issue by bringing in the seat belt and motorcycle helmet requirements at the same time and in the same piece of proposed legislation. That's where the difficulty arises for me in addressing this legislation. I suggest a similar difficulty arises for many other members of this Chamber, particularly on this side, and I would be surprised if that difficulty did not arise in the heart of the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I don't wish to draw red herrings across the trail of debate of this subject, but apart from the child restraint provisions in this bill, Sir, I do believe the interests of our society would be much better served if we were dealing here with an initiative by government, such as I suggested a few moments ago, that is aimed not an infringing upon the freedom of choice by mandating the wearing of automobile seat belts and motorcycle helmets, but would be aimed at curtailing the carnage that is committed on our streets and our highways every year by the drinking driver. If the legislation dealt with child restraints and if it, or an accompanying piece of legislation, dealt with curtailment of that carnage then, Sir, I would stand in my place and at this point, without having to give it further concern and further worry, wholeheartedly endorse the measure introduced by the Minister of Highways for consideration at this time.

I would hope, as we move through the consideration of this bill, towards committee stage, that the Minister and his colleagues would consider breaking out the individual key components of the bill - the three key components that I'd mentioned - and permitting us to deal with the child restraint proposal on its own merits. It deserves to be dealt with on its own merits.

I have and I'm sure a great many members of the Legislature have received in-depth documentation from professional and other groups testifying to the unarguable desirability of protecting small children in

motor vehicles with child restraints. The statistical evidence is clear and unequivocal. I have in front of me submissions from the Health Sciences Centre, from the Manitoba Medical Association, from the Task Force on Maternal and Child Health, that operated under the aegis of the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg; from specialists in this field, such as Dr. Richard Stanwick, who is the assistant professor of pediatrics and social and preventative medicine at Children's Hospital, and who deals every day of his life, together with his colleagues, with children who have been smashed and otherwise injured in highway accidents and their conclusions are clear, unarguable and totally acceptable to me.

I say that what they demonstrate and what they live with and what they have proven and what they are asking for is overdue; that is, protection for small children who do not have the maturity, do not have the opportunity to make the decisions for themselves. Small children are subjected to the decision-making powers of adults, of others, who control and run their lives for them. They do not have the freedom of choice; they do not have the natural physical resistance; they do not have the natural protection, physiological, muscular, reactionary, that is available to an older person when they're being transported in a vehicle, for example, that is forced to come to a sudden stop, or that is struck from behind, or otherwise involved in an accident. Therefore, they require and they deserve the decision to be made for them by adults, looking out for their best interests, that they shall be equipped with a device that protects them, i.e., child restraints, and I favour that, Sir, without argument.

But what this government has said is that they want to make choices and decisions for people who otherwise should have the right to make those choices and decisions for themselves. In grey areas where there's argument pro and con; namely, the areas having to do with automobile seat belts for adults and motorcycle helmets, they want to mandate the compulsory use of those devices against the particular inclinations, the particular experiences, and the particular feelings and emotions of the person who would be affected.

There are many people who are discomfited, Sir, by wearing automobile seat belts, who feel once strapped into an automobile by a seat belt that they will be trapped in an argument. That does nothing to enhance the emotional manner and method in which they approach their driving responsibilities. There are many motorcyclists who argue passionately that under certain conditions the use of motorcycle helmets is restrictive and is highly bothersome, in terms of the kind of heat that it builds up and generates; in terms of the difficulties it creates where hearing and vision are concerned; in terms of general discomfort again, the forced wearing of that kind of a device does nothing and will do nothing to reinforce and strengthen the alertness of the rider, of the operator of that vehicle. It will do nothing to reinforce the emotional and intellectual capability of the operator of that vehicle to observe the danger signals and to operate his or her vehicle safely in traffic.

What is at stake here, Sir, is the question of the maturity of individual Manitobans. I believe that deeply implicit in this kind of legislation is the view held by this government that Manitobans are not mature enough

to make those decisions for themselves to seek out the kind of training and education that is necessary to make good drivers of themselves, or to be able to make the decisions on their own as to the conditions that make them better drivers, better operators, more alert drivers and more alert operators than would otherwise be the case.

The government is saying to them, look, we know that you can't make that decision. You don't know what the conditions are that create the highest level of alertness and responsiveness, the highest level of reaction ability for you when you're operating a motorcycle or driving a motor vehicle. We will make that decision for you. I think, Sir, that is a very dangerous and a very insidious conclusion for any government to come to.

So I want to explore the proposal having to do with mandatory seat belts and mandatory motorcycle helmets contained in this legislation very carefully as we proceed through the study of this legislation before I make a decision as to which way I'm going to vote on this bill, but I tell you, Sir, and I tell members of this House at this juncture that I am uncomfortable with it. At this point in time, I do not support it because of those two components and because of the attitude towards the people of Manitoba and their intelligence and their right to freedom of choice that is implicit in those two components that have been drafted by the government in this proposed legislation.

But I will argue for and continue to support in every way that I can the concept of child restraints and the introduction of mandatory child restraints in vehicles. If I can persuade the government to provide an opportunity for us to introduce that kind of protective measure, that kind of safety measure by itself on its own merits, then I will be a happy and a gratified legislator indeed, Mr. Speaker, for I believe that is one of the two things we need to make life safer, to make our streets and our roads and our highways safer, and to reinforce the welfare and the well-being of our society, old and young, those two measure being child vehicle restraints, and a very intensive and imaginative program aimed at getting the drinking driver off the road and keeping him and her off the road. I mean, keeping them off the road for a long, long period of time, if not indeed, Sir, for good.

I have very little patience with the mixture of alcohol and gasoline, very little patience with the kinds of things that we have permitted to happen in our society through the use of alcohol by operators of motor vehicles. The terrible personal and family tragedies that have been caused by drinking drivers just create despair in the heart of any reasonable person. The innocence of the victims in most cases and the depth, therefore, of the tragedy, Sir, just breaks your heart. I think that we can and must seriously direct ourselves to that great problem.

I would ask the Minister of Highways to consider those two primary concerns of mine, and I would hope that as our study of this legislation proceeds that there will be an opportunity for me to vote in support of measures of that kind without being forced to tie my strong feelings on those two subjects into my discomfiture with legislation that would make seat belts and motorcycle helmets compulsory.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks with an appeal to the Minister of Highways to consider what

he is doing here. He is, of course, asking a little child to lead him. The government is asking a little child to lead them. The government is saying that we can't get seat belt legislation and motorcycle helmet legislation through, so we'll sugar-coat it with the child restraints and that will win the day. That is a cowardly approach to this legislation, Mr. Speaker, in my view. That is cowardly thinking and it produces coercive legislation that, in effect, is really specious legislation. It is a bill that is not what it seems to be.

Give us legislation that reduces the carnage on the roads where drinking drivers are concerned and give us legislation that mandates child vehicle restraints and protects small children, and you will find, Sir, a great deal of support, I'm sure, on this side of the Chamber, certainly a great deal of support from me. Continue to distort and disguise those kinds of measures and use them as a cover for an invasion of privacy, for a further erosion of freedom, for a reduction of the opportunity of free choice among our citizenry, and you will continue to arouse suspicions and opposition among legislators such as me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak on this bill. I am just rising to - I believe that you were going to call Bill No. 55 next — (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Bill 60 is before the House. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, you were about to call Bill 55 and I wonder, there is one of our members that were intending to speak not present at the moment. Would you revert to Bill No. 4, and then we'll call Bill No. 55 later on?

BILL NO. 55 - THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 55, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House for two or three days last week; I must have contacted the flu bug or something. My voice is not back to its original, so I don't know whether I will be able to maintain my voice through the comments that I want to make on this bill. So perhaps I should start

at the end and tell you what I intend to say, and if I don't get it all done, at least you know where I stand on them.

I will start by telling you, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to the proposals put forward in Bill No. 55, and I am quite strongly opposed to it, and I'm opposed to it for numerous reasons. I think it's only fair that I should tell members of the House the reasons why I am opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the bill, and I see the very first section that they're talking about, in this proposed amendment to The Legislative Assembly Act, it's dealing with an amendment that was put forward last year, I believe, in this very House by this Assembly, and we passed it unanimously. It affected your office, Mr. Speaker, so I find I have a little bit of difficulty talking about it, but I realize that it's impossible for you to talk about it, so I am going to talk about this issue, even though it reflects on the office of the Speaker. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is not a personal thing I'm talking about. It is about the office of the Speaker. So, I want to make that clear before I go on any further.

Mr. Speaker, it was a year ago that we increased the additional indemnity for the Speaker from \$6,000 to \$12,000 which everybody in this House agreed to at that particular time. We agreed to it, but I notice now that they are repealing another section of the Act which affected your office, and at the same time they are putting in restrictions on the increase that they gave you, because they are saying now for that services performed when the House is not in Session, there is a maximum of \$3,500 and such expenses not exceeding \$3,000 as may be approved by the provincial auditor. Well, the \$3,000 was the same as was there before, but they've put a \$3,500 thing on there, and I want to know why.

The Speaker is the spokesman for every member of this Assembly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I want him to be able to act for me when this House is not in Session. Yet, members are putting restrictions on his activity, and they are saying that he can only do up to \$3,500 worth when the House is not in Session, and I know because I held that office for four years, and I know that I was called in from time to time to look after things that were in the interests of other members of the Assembly. I know that the Honourable Member for Concordia knows something about it too.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to know why the Attorney-General brought this change in, and he didn't tell us when he introduced the bill for second reading? He had better tell us when it goes to committee, because I want some answers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know from experience that there were times when the office of the Speaker is not an everyday occurrence, but there are times when it is needed, and I think a lot depends on the actions of the Executive Council, too. I know on many occasions, the Executive Council used to foist duties off on my office. When there were visiting dignitaries they would ask the Speaker to look after them and entertain them, and the Executive Council was probably busy.

So, I did what I was asked to do. I did it in the interests of the Legislature of Manitoba, and I'm sure that other Speakers before me have done the same, and I'm sure the present Speaker has done.

Mr. Deputy Speaker — (Interjection) — I don't want to be detracted by the Honourable Member for Springfield, because let us talk about the facts that are in this particular bill. I want to know why they would put a \$3,500 limit on the actions of the Speaker when the House is not in Session? I would think, Mr. Speaker, that that is not in keeping with the best interests of the people of Manitoba, because we have already put in that legislation a safeguard so that the Speaker would not abuse any of those privileges because it says in there very specifically that it's expenses as approved by the provincial auditor. As approved by the provincial auditor.

So, I would think that when this bill goes to committee, we may want to ask some questions of the provincial auditor at that time, because there has to be some reason why the Attorney-General wants to put this kind of change in, and I want to know why? He certainly didn't tell us when he gave it second reading.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we come to the next change that is being put forward, and I have to say that in looking at the changes that are put forward here, I think this type of change in legislation is consistent with the philosophy of the present government; and I would have to say that this government is extremely good in one particular field, and that is the field of social tinkering.

MR. C. MANNES: I thought you were going to say deficit financing.

MR. H. GRAHAM: They love to tinker and make little subtle changes that look to be of no particular consequence, but they feel that they must change something. Whether or not the change is for the good is secondary. They love to tinker and this bill is another example of trying to tinker with things. Whether or not it's in the interests of the people of Manitoba, they couldn't care less. They say if it's in their interest, we'll do it, but they love to tinker.

We see where they're putting forward changes that are going to increase the travel allowance for members from 26 trips a year to 40 times. Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I've been in this House for quite a number of years; I've see quite a few changes put forward to the Legislative Assembly Act from time to time, and in all the debates I've heard I think the one who was most consistent in any debate that he took part in with respect to changes in the Legislative Assembly Act was the former Member for Inkster, Mr. Sidney Green, who surprisingly in many cases when it was not opposed to the idea of changing the Act at all, but he said something that was very important because it struck home to me; he said, anytime you want to change legislation that affects your own personal pocketbook, you bring it forward so that it takes effect after the next election - after the next election. I happen to believe that to be a very good philosophy, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Where does this bill affect the members' personal pocketbooks.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Okay, there's a social tinkerer talking, one of the best. He says, where does this affect his pocketbook? They love to tinker, they love to tinker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have told them that I am opposed to it. I don't believe that any member should get any increased travel allowance until after the next election. If you want change in more travel allowance available, fine, bring it forward, but have the date it goes into effect take place after the next election, but don't have it retroactive as this bill is, where it says that Sections 2, 3, and 4 are retroactive. Retroactive, when it comes to the matter of human greed, that sounds good, Mr. Speaker, it sounds excellent.

Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed - I have been a member in this Assembly for many years, payment for 26 trips and I travel a lot further than the Member for Springfield, about the same distance as the Honourable Member for The Pas, or the Member for Dauphin I mean, not as far as the Member for Thompson, but it's about half I guess, maybe not quite. I realized when I took the job, I realized when I ran for election in the area that I was representing, I knew the distance I was going to have to travel at that time, nothing has changed since and I was willing to serve at that time under those conditions, I'm still willing to serve at the same time. If you want to change it have the change take place after the next election.

Now we get to the issue of a constituency allowance. This is an interesting one - a constituency allowance. I believe, if I read the Act right, that the honourable member would get a constituency allowance even though he gets a Cabinet . . .

So when it comes to a constituency allowance, I know there is argument put forward from time to time. You need a constituency office. Well, some members would need three and a half-a-dozen secretaries; other members can seem to handle their whole constituency by themselves and do an excellent job.

MR. G. FILMON: Andy is going to need a constituency after the next election.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It depends a lot on the ability of the member and how many people he needs to pick up after him. I can understand why the Member for Springfield would want a constituency office and he'd want two or three people running around after him to clean up some of his problems.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. GRAHAM: That's understandable because, Mr. Speaker, I recall going to a meeting not too long ago, I believe it was an Agricultural Committee Meeting on the Crow at Anola, and I understand that the Member for Springfield was the chairman of that committee. One of the people that appeared before that committee was his constituency president. I believe there was another member who tried his best to draw out from that member if there hadn't been some person, some elected representative in that area that had helped him in any way. Finally the man answered, yes there was. They asked him to identify him and he said it was Jake Epp. So I understand why the Member for Springfield would want to have a constituency office and have somebody out there doing some of his homework for him.

However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to carry on with the changes that are put forward in this bill, I think there's

one thing that is rather significant. I've heard many arguments in politics, especially in the last two or three years when we've been facing high unemployment, where there have been great demands made on the public purse. Especially in the Federal House, there has been a great deal of criticism on government for insufficient money being put forward for research and development. You'll hear that argument in the federal level; you'll hear it in every provincial House. There is insufficient money being put forward for research and development. Here you find that the very small amount that had been in this Legislative Assembly Act for research and development is cut in half. It's being cut in half. Instead of being doubled, it is being cut in half.

So I would think that you are seeing another example of social tinkering. This government is always trying to do anything that, I think, would enhance their own position and do whatever it could to increase their own chances of re-election. If you can cut the research of the opposition in half, they say, that may make it a little easier. So they will cut the research funds that were allocated in The Legislative Assembly Act, cut it in half and it might help, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it won't.

It will not, because members, if they cannot get it here, will put it up out of their own pocket for research and development because research and development is necessary. It is a must in politics, and you compare the research offices of this provincial Assembly to any other provincial Assembly or the House of Commons in Ottawa and what we run here is a peanut gallery.

Mr. Speaker, the changes that are being proposed by the Attorney-General in this bill are changes that certainly do not impress me at all. I told you from the start that I am opposed to them. I have given you some of the reasons why I am opposed to them. They are certainly not the only reasons. There are other reasons but, because of the time that we have - I notice one of the changes, they want an extra printing privilege, a second mailing privilege. That doesn't really bother me that much. I don't mind how much material they mail out, what cost, printing privileges, it doesn't bother me how much they send out in printed material.

I found one thing in politics that has helped me an awful lot over many years, and that is that if you get the weekend off from this place and you have the opportunity of spending the weekend in your constituency, talking to your people, it doesn't really matter how much money you spend in printed materials. It's the personal contact that counts the most. It's the personal contact that gives you the true relationship between the elected person and the constituency that he represents.

So again this social tinkering that the members are trying to bring forward to The Legislative Assembly Act, to me, is a waste of time. It's a waste of the taxpayer's dollar, and I would like to know some of the your people, it doesn't really matter how much money you spend in printed materials. It's the personal contact that counts the most. It's the personal contact that gives you the true relationship between the elected person and the constituency that he represents.

So again this social tinkering that the members are trying to bring forward to The Legislative Assembly Act, to me, is a waste of time. It's a waste of the taxpayer's dollar, and I would like to know some of the

reasons why it is being brought forward at this time. If they want to put a rider on that this doesn't come into effect until after the next general election, I might be willing to buy it. But until I hear some argument put forward by that side of the House, if they're willing to talk in those terms, then maybe it's possible that we could arrive at some consensus in this House with respect to this bill.

At the present time, I have to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to the bill, and I will not be voting in support of it unless there are some changes indicated before second reading is completed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 4 - THE MANITOBA OIL AND GAS CORPORATION ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 4, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, standing in the name of the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this bill to hold it for the Member for Arthur.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in debate in this Chamber. I am not so pleased to have to participate in the debate on legislation and a program of this government that I do not believe is very high on the priority list of any Manitobans, particularly those people in Manitoba that will be affected other than the paying for of this particular proposal that the government is bringing forward.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a philosophical approach to the development of one of the resources in the Province of Manitoba which again, we have to reiterate, is about the only bright spot in the provincial economy. The proposal to enter into a Provincial Government or a state-owned oil company was one which I will refer to the document which has been referred to many times by many of my colleagues and by the members of the opposition which was presented to the public of Manitoba prior to the election of 1981. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give the New Democratic Party any credit for the winning of the election and them any credit for the particular part that was telling the people of Manitoba that they were going to spend some \$20 million in taxpayers' funds to develop a state-owned oil company.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, it is pretty much in my opinion, a straight philosophical debate; one in which we as a Progressive Conservative Party believe in the private sector developing our resources, whether they be our non-renewable resources such as the oils and gases of our province, or the development of our

renewable resources in the development of our agricultural industry. There can be a parallel drawn, Mr. Speaker, and one which, I think, is important to draw when we talk of the philosophical approach to how the best system for developing our province can be introduced and achieved.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not by laying a burden of additional taxation on the taxpayers of Manitoba to enter into a company that would be perceived to be doing what the private sector are now doing and doing very well. And at the same time, the taxpayers of Manitoba have an ability to reap the rewards through the taxation policies, to reap the rewards through the development and the job opportunities that the private sector is presenting to the public. All those things, Mr. Speaker, are happening without ManOil, without a state-owned oil company.

Mr. Speaker, we have condemned this government for breaking election promises. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, this is one election promise that I think the majority of Manitobans would agree with them breaking. If they would only take their head out of the sand and look at some of the facts that are now before them as presented by - and this is the first opportunity that any one of us have had to speak since the Quarterly Report had come out from the Department of Energy and Mines, and I want to compliment them. I want to compliment the Department of Mines and Energy for putting out their Quarterly Report on what is happening in the oil industry in Manitoba, but it's again back to the philosophical approach, Mr. Speaker.

We, in Manitoba, the majority of taxpayers, I do not believe want to have assessed onto them as taxpayers additional costs, whether it be through payroll taxes, whether it be through sales taxes, Mr. Speaker, whether it be through any other form of taxation, do they want additional costs so that this government, so that the New Democratic Party, can live up to what they believe in a philosophical approach as the best way to develop one of our valuable resources in Manitoba.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out not too long ago by my colleague for Turtle Mountain, that there has been the experience of a government owned-oil corporation in Saskatchewan, known as SaskOil, and how much money did it make? - not one dime. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it's a continued burden on the taxpayers of the people of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, we have a state-owned oil company in Canada known as Petrocan, Mr. Speaker, and what has it done to the taxpayers of Canada . . .

A MEMBER: Cost us money.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . other than given us a five-cent-a-litre increase in the cost of our fuel when we drive up to the pumps? And not by choice by the Canadian public.

I would challenge, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who believes that they want to be a participant or should feel they want to be a participant in the purchase of Petrocan that at each service station there be two pumps. There be one, Mr. Speaker, where you could drive up and buy your gas at five cents a litre less if you didn't want to participate in the purchase of Petrocan, a freedom of choice in the participation of

state-owned oil company, Petrocan. It would be very easy to do, and I would bet you, Mr. Speaker, that 99 percent of the people going to fill up with gas would make the decision not to participate in the purchase of Petrocan through the buying of gasoline at the pumps. If that's not true, I challenge any member to stand up opposite and try and tell me that it isn't and challenge the statement that I have just made. I would bet you that 99 percent of Canadians would go to the pump that didn't have the tax that we have to purchase Petrocan with.

That, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is freedom of choice and would tell the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba whether they want more state ownership in the gas and oil company in this country. Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't happen, and let the Provincial Government propose to set up their state oil company the same way and have a pump where they are going to charge. Well, it's going to work out, Mr. Speaker, the initial \$20 million that they're talking about, and this is the thin edge of the wedge, it's not \$20 million we're going to be talking about. It is a political tool because when I started my speech I indicated it's a philosophical approach to business, that they want to prove to the people of Manitoba that the socialist involvement in government, or government involvement in business, is their best way to develop Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way in which Manitobans want to see their gas and oil develop.

Mr. Speaker, if in the presentation of this bill and the tax, if they were to set up a set of pumps where a Manitoban could drive up and pay for his gasoline with the taxation on that gasoline for the development of a ManOil corporation, as well as the Petrocan company, and leave the rest of Manitobans have the freedom of choice of participating in the purchase or the ownership of that oil company, then that is how they should do it. Because that, Mr. Speaker, would prove or not prove to this government whether or not the people of Manitoba wanted to invest in an oil company.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the question, why, today, when we have the highest taxes in all of Manitoba or all of Canada, we've got a payroll tax, we've got some of the heaviest tax burdens in every area, would we, as a priority in this Legislature be debating ManOil, particularly, when we have got recently a report from the Department of Mines and Energy?

What has happened in the oil industry in the last year, but before I get into what has happened, let's go back to what they said earlier, what the purpose of ManOil would be in their introduction of their election promises: \$20 million four-year drilling program; this oil and gas corporation would explore for oil and gas in Manitoba with the help of joint ventures with SaskOil, Petrocan, co-operatives and Canadian-owned companies, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they can do that right now. They can put \$20 million into the road systems, into the development of the road systems, so that those people who are paying taxes, who are paying provincial taxes through highway licences on tractors, the oil trucks, through the taxes paid on the royalties, Mr. Speaker. They could reinvest that money and help in a joint way with the private companies, Mr. Speaker. That is how they could invest and be a part of the oil business.

Mr. Speaker, we go onto the next great statement in the document. "ManOil, a New Democratic

Government would establish ManOil," and I'm quoting from their great manifesto. "This oil and gas corporation would explore for oil and gas in Manitoba with the help of joint ventures. The Manitoba NDP believes in resource development, not resource giveaways." Not resource giveaways - where, Mr. Speaker, can they prove that there have been resource giveaways? I'll tell you where the resource giveaways have been, Mr. Speaker, the taxation of the people of the Province of Manitoba by the New Democratic Party, that's been the tax rip-offs and that's been the mis-allocation of resources by the people of Manitoba.

Well Mr. Speaker, let us look at what happened in the First Quarterly Report, and I'm going to quote a little bit from it, Mr. Speaker, because I do think it's important that we recognize the kind of information that is available. "The drilling activity in the province got off to a booming start in 1983." This, Mr. Speaker, didn't have anything to do with ManOil. There wasn't one nickel of the taxpayers' money involved in the development of this. In fact, Mr. Speaker - and I'll get to it in a few minutes - the taxpayers reap the benefits of that without spending a nickel. "The drilling activity in the province got off to a booming start in 1983. Compared with the same period in 1982, drilling activity surpassed the 1982 level by 142 percent." A 142 percent increase; 46 wells in 1983 vs. 19 wells in 1982. Approximately 30 percent of the wells were classified as exploratory wells; so the private sector are developing and are exploring and bringing in new areas for oil production. The province doesn't have to do it, Mr. Speaker.

Of the 40 wells that were drilled, 87 percent were completed as oil wells, Mr. Speaker, revenue immediately for the Province of Manitoba, without hiring additional staff, without hiring people to put on the public taxpayers' backs to work in the oil industry. The private sector is doing all that, Mr. Speaker, and you are benefiting because there is a tax benefit to you.

Thirty-eight new wells were put on production in the first quarter of 1983, 153 percent over the same period in 1982, Mr. Speaker. The production - again, a tremendous increase. Twenty-seven percent increase over the - I wish, one request I have of the Department of Energy, that they wouldn't put this in metric, but they would use both metric and imperial measure, so that I can understand precisely barrels per day, or feet that are drilled — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance makes some kind of a smart remark. It's an honest request, because I think the majority of Manitobans would still like to see the measurement in the imperial measure, and if people want to convert to the metric, than they should be allowed to read in both.

I think it's as fair to have it in metric and imperial, as it is fair to have it in French and English in this country, equally as fair, so we can understand precisely what is going on.

The increase in production was some 27 percent in January and February over the 1982 period, that was the '83 over 1982. But note this, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the areas that I am continually pleading this government to upgrade the roads and pay attention to the development, but in the Waskada field, the production from this field has increased approximately 250 percent - 250 percent increase in production in

that one oil field, Mr. Speaker - a tremendous increase in a resource development. Not with ManOil, Mr. Speaker, but with the private sector, who are paying a lot of money into that community.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the president of one company, one company only, told me that their development, their investment in the development of that Waskada oil field, in about a year-and-a-half, was \$16 million - in one year. Not \$20 million over four years, they invested in one year some \$16 million. That, Mr. Speaker, has a tremendous impact on the hotel business, on all the service industries, the housing units that had to be built in those communities are tremendous, and that all took place without ManOil. That took place through the private sector initiative and it's called - it's the development through profit motivation. You know, that's something, I guess - that again this government has a problem with, is the profit motivation, or the word "profit" - they automatically turn cold and they think because the word profit is talked about, it's bad, it's bad. Well, Mr. Speaker, let them ask the people of that southwest community, all of that community, whether they need ManOil, because those other companies and everybody involved in the development of business out there is making a profit.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you what the message will be, is stay out of it because you'll just screw up the good things that are happening in that southwest area, because of the private initiative. That's the message they'll get if they take the time, Mr. Speaker, to ask them the question.

Mr. Speaker, I referred to some of the returns that the province is getting, but the overall comparison in the months of January and February 1983, 1983 returns in the two months were some \$20.94 million in oil produced in those two months, compared to \$13.9 million in 1982. That's a 60 percent increase, Mr. Speaker, in value of oil produced - a tremendous revenue, not only for the people in that area, or for the companies that are developing, but further to that, to the provincial taxpayers; without again investing in a company that's going to be run by a lot of bureaucrats who really don't care whether the thing works or not, because they sign a no-cut contract with this government, with a 27.5 increase over three years, why do they have to worry about producing oil - a 30 month contract with 27.5 percent increase. They don't need to produce oil because they've got their job and they proved it, Mr. Speaker, in their past performance in the development of oil in the southwest. All the records show how dismal a failure they were in the development of oil in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is sitting there and he knows what these figures are. Why would he now want to spend money, when he could actually sit back and continue to collect it? Crown royalty and oil tax payments, due to the province for January of 1983, for one month were \$1.7 million, pretty near \$2 million for the Provincial Treasury in one month, and that was 37 percent increase over 1982.

Well, Mr. Speaker, with the continued development of that oil field and the continued increase in production, that figure will multiply in the hundreds of times and what they said they were going to do with ManOil, can be done without ManOil. They said they were going to help develop schools and hospitals and pay for all those

things that are grand and glorious and we all need. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is going to happen without ManOil and I plead with the government to abort that idea of bringing in a development of ManOil. Yes, Mr. Speaker, abort that idea. That's one place they will get support from the people of Manitoba on what they should be doing with ManOil.

Mr. Speaker, \$1.7 million for the month of January, as an increase of some 37 percent over 1982, the gross royalty payments to freehold mineral rights, to the owners, are estimated at \$1.2 million, as opposed to \$7 million for January and that money went to all those people out there, not to one or two, but to the people who have their freehold properties and they pay tremendous taxes. They pay tremendous taxes, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial and Federal Treasuries. That money does not sit in anyone's bank account. It is put back into the taxation system in this country and everyone is sharing it, Mr. Speaker.

So I plead, Mr. Speaker, with this government not to proceed with an Act strictly on a philosophical approach to the development of our oil industry and I would have to say if they are strong advocates, if they are such strong advocates of it, are they equally as strong an advocate of every municipality in Manitoba, getting into the development of our resources? Are they as anxious to see every municipality get into the development of the resources as they are? Are they going to allow that kind of thing to take place? If it's fair for the Provincial Government, Mr. Speaker, would it not be as equally fair for the municipalities?

Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I know that the municipalities are satisfied with the revenue that they're getting off the assessment of the oil wells that are on the properties now. Most of those municipalities, Mr. Speaker, are getting — (Interjection) — Well, I have to say the Member for Dauphin is just the kind of parrot that I thought he was. He has to continue to try and repeat after someone else to try and distract them. Well, I'll tell you that he is not distracting me, because . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Stick to your speech. You don't know what you're talking about.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . he won't be distracting anyone in this House after the next election because he will be sitting back in Dauphin. That's where he'll be sitting, and we will see to that, Mr. Speaker.

I will continue to make what I think are valid points. I will make valid points, because the report concludes by saying on Page 4 that "The Omega Hydrocarbons Limited, Waskada, Lower Amaranth Unit No. 1, was formed and a pilot water flood pressure maintenance project approved and put into operation in February.

If the Government of Manitoba has \$20 million to get into the ManOil business, into a state-owned oil company, why wouldn't they reconsider that expenditure of money to help recover some of the oil in the old oil wells in the Virden, and the Kirkella, and all those fields?

I think it is well-known and well-stated by the oil industry that we are getting back out of the ground a very small percentage of the actual production capability of those wells. If they have money to spend, why not spend it in the development of research and some

experimental projects, too, Mr. Speaker, to recover more of the oil, so they and the oil companies can work together to get a better supply out of the holes that are already drilled? That, I think, is probably one of the biggest areas that a government could get involved with provincial tax money and expenditures. I think it would not only be for the good of the oil companies, I think it would be good for the total nation and the other provinces that are having the same problems with recoveries from their wells. That, I believe, is where money could be spent, and that's in the research and development of recovery of oil from the old wells and changes from some of the traditional recovery mechanisms.

I go back to the Quarterly Report, "The Oil and Natural Gas Conservation Board passed orders designating 10 oil fields and 54 oil pools in the province. The new designations will allow for more meaningful groups of production data and facilitate easier technical study of all reserves or reservoirs in the province." That is important. It's important because it is information that people can use, you can count on, and you can budget on in the future. But if you start to get into the oil business and an oil company, you will have a desperate time controlling that company and keeping them interested in Manitoba.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do we need an oil company that will do the same kinds of things that Petrocan are now doing with tax dollars? Who do they account to, Mr. Speaker? They don't account to you as a taxpayer who pulls up to a service station pump and buys gasoline.

A MEMBER: Bryce Mackasey.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Bryce Mackasey is who they account to. Well, I think they don't have to say any more about that. But that's the kind of thing I don't want to see the provincial taxpayers put their money into, something that they cannot control, Mr. Speaker.

I want to refer again to the continuation of the offering of Crown leases for sale. The record sales in the province have proven that we, as a province, have a tremendous potential in the oil business. We have a multitude of companies, not many large companies I have to say, mostly small companies that are in large part pretty good citizens of the southwest, although there have been some difficulties of not respecting the landowner rights when it comes to getting the right of entry and the way in which they've done it. But that, Mr. Speaker, with Bill 5 and the way it is being worked out, I think, will prove that we have two industries that can work together.

I go back again to the philosophical approach to the development of our resources or the providing of service. You know, all the reasons in the world can be made and have been made why we should have a public-owned hydro-electric corporation for the Province of Manitoba. All the reasons in the world have been made and I think credit should be given to those politicians and those people who have taken the lead and they've crossed many political lines. D.L. Campbell, who was well-known through rural Manitoba for the Rural Electrification Program, which each and everyone of us from rural Manitoba has to remember when the lights came on as far as the Hydro system was

concerned. The introduction of our rural telephone system, again, was a good indication of where the public sector had to get involved to provide the kind of service that is needed or was needed for a communication link. Those are good examples of where it is a responsibility of the state to get involved and provide the kinds of essential services that each and everyone of us couldn't provide for ourselves.

But, Mr. Speaker, there isn't one stem of evidence that can substantiate or prove the need of a state-owned oil company in the Province of Manitoba, other than the strictly philosophical approach of the NDP Party who have in some way thought that there are exorbitant profits in the oil business.

I, Mr. Speaker, challenge them, before they spend one red cent of the taxpayers' money to develop that kind of corporation — (Interjection) — correct - to prove to us how much money Petrocan has made for the people of Canada. I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, that it has cost each and everyone of you thousands of dollars because of the need for the purchase of gasoline for the transportation that you do in your daily lives. It's cost you thousands of dollars. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if you hadn't have had it, you would have been buying your gasoline and oils a lot cheaper today than you are. At least, you would have been paying 5 cents a litre less because you wouldn't have had to pay for the purchase of Petrocan or Petrofina or all those other pets of the "pet government" in Ottawa, the Pierre Government in Ottawa, I should say, you wouldn't have to pay for their whims.

That is what we are doing. We're not developing any more oil; we're not developing any more gas. We are not buying it cheaper; we're paying more money for it. All I can see happening with the introduction of a provincial state-owned oil company is the same thing, but I again go back and ask them - the Minister of Highways is here - that if he wouldn't agree that if you are going to buy or participate in ManOil that you should have a pump that says pay 5 cents a litre more to buy ManOil, or buy your gas 5 cents a litre less and don't buy ManOil. Who would fill up at what pump? Give them the freedom of choice to participate in ManOil or not to participate in ManOil, and allow them to do it in that manner, Mr. Speaker. That would be the proof of the pudding, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I want to make one more comparison, because I do think that it is important to the long-term development of Manitoba and to our country. You know, I made reference in my opening remarks that a parallel or comparison could be drawn between the development of our non-renewable resources or petrochemicals as to our agricultural industry and our renewable energy, because really what we are talking about is resource development, the taking of that resource, the recovery of the resource; one through the mechanical working of soils and the introductions of fertilizers and all those things, the rains and the things that make it grow, and the other one is to go to the mechanical systems of drilling into the ground and extracting a commodity or a resource which we use.

You know, the philosophical approach that they're using, and has been always told to me why we needed a Petrocan, and if it's the same reason why we need a ManOil, is that because the state owning it gives us

an assured supply; the state because they're taking all those great profits are going to do other things with it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how many state farm programs work? How many state farm programs work to provide food for the countries that have those kinds of systems? How long would a state agriculture program work in the Province of Manitoba or in Canada? How long would it work?

Well, it wouldn't be very long until we bureaucrazed ourself right out of food. We would not have the kind of abundance of food supplies that we're now enjoying. I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that the same kind of thing would take place if you had nothing but a state-owned oil company in this country, a state-owned oil company would give you the same kind of long term benefits. No oil, no food, a shortage of each, because you've taken out the one key ingredient that makes it all happen and that's the private initiative, or the private motivation to develop, and the reward of profit that each one in their daily life strives for under the private enterprise system.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in the long term of the Province of Manitoba that we are spending or that this government are going to be spending money that's in our best interest. I do not feel any better when I drive down a highway whether I see ManOil, or whether I see Petrocan, or whether I see anything doing tied to the state, it doesn't make me feel any better, that I'm more secure or that because I can buy gasoline at Petrocan at 48 cents a litre; Petrocan is .48 cents a litre, the other oil companies that are selling oil are basically the same. So if the oil companies are ripping me off, so is Petrocan.

You know, it just doesn't wash, Mr. Speaker, of why we are here today debating a ManOil bill where the state is going to get involved in the production of oil, the development of oil in Manitoba, when by their own figures, their own documentation, the incomes are coming in, there's no money to be spent, it's just to sit back and take the revenues of the developing oil business and let the economy excel.

But there's one place that I do feel that they should spend some of their money - two places. I asked the Minister of Highways yesterday and I hope he's taken action on it. If we're going to see the continued flow of cash into the provincial coffers, if we're going to see the continued job opportunities that they're so anxious to see happen, and we all want to see employment opportunities increased, if they want to do that, then take their \$20 million and put it back in the Highways Budget so that we can get that resource to the marketplace, get that oil to the marketplace, and get the revenues into the provincial coffers.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't, then we will have - the Minister of Highways indicated yesterday, there is a possibility of a pipeline system being built. Well, I think that has great merit and great potential, but do you realize how long that would take to put in place? An oil collection system, a pipeline system from Waskada to Pearson to Lyleton, to the Coulter oil fields, some 60 miles I would estimate, across private landholdings, easements have to be made, across railroad tracks, across waterways, through the whole system of planning and design. Mr. Speaker, they can't even build a road in any part of the province, how are they going to be able to help build a pipeline?

What I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is we have to deal with this issue not on a philosophical base, but on a practical base. That I plead with the government to do, get involved in the recovery of the oil out of the wells. If you have to use money to do that, then do it. But the No. 1 priority at this particular time is the upgrading of the infrastructure, the highways, the roads that carry the product across the roadways and make sure, Mr. Speaker, that isn't neglected any longer because as it's continued to be allowed to deplete - as I showed in pictures to the Minister of Highways yesterday that on a section of road north of No. 1 Highway from Sinclair to Cromer, there are 20 some places on that road that are almost impassable. In fact, there is one that is impassable and that's the one we took a picture of. How do we expect the continued development, the continued pumping of oil out of the ground that has to go through trucks, in trucks, over the roads if they can't get over them?

Certainly they are diverting around other roadways, Mr. Speaker, I don't deny that, but do you know what is happening to those other roadways? They are now going the same way, the same kind of weight has to be carried and those roads are going into the same kind of disrepair as the one in which I have pointed out to him.

I know that the Minister of Highways needs more money from his treasury. The Minister of Finance is sitting here, he's sitting here supporting a bill to spend money on the development of a state oil company, but he won't spend money to the development of a road to haul the oil over that he's now getting. I cannot figure out the economic reasoning behind what he's thinking about. It's not sound judgment or sound use of taxpayers' money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to this Assembly, and to the constituents of my area, and put their thoughts on the record as well as mine that we do not need the state involvement in the oil industry in Manitoba, because the private sector through their own reports are proving they can do it and do it in a joint way through paying of taxation and paying of the kinds of inputs that the province can tax them on.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I won't go back and take a lot more credit for the government of which I was a member, but we do have to pay acknowledgment to my colleagues, who I was a part of, that we in fact made some fairly important changes in the taxation of the oil industry that helped get this all started. I agree that the increased prices of world oil as well were a part of it, but that goes back to the motivation of profit, or the people who were motivated to participate in the development of an oil industry and get profit as reward.

So I want to make it very clear in my position, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot support taxpayers' money to get into the state-owned business of oil development when, in fact, it is taking place better through the private sector.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines and the second reading of Bill No. 4.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs. Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Carroll, Corrin, Cowan, Ms. Dolin, Messrs. Evans, Eyler, Fox, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Malinowski, Pawley, Penner, Ms. Phillips, Messrs. Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

NAYS

Messrs. Banman, Blake, Brown, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Mrs. Hammond, Messrs. Hyde, Johnston, Kovnats, Lyon, Manness, McKenzie, Nordman, Mrs. Oleson, Messrs. Orchard, Ransom, Sherman, Steen.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 26; Nays, 22.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Before moving to Private Members' Hour, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 19 students of Grade 5 standing from the Reston Elementary School. They are under the direction of Mrs. Milliken. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Arthur.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here afternoon.

Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the delay in the vote - I did want to move the Supply Motion so that you wouldn't have to come back this evening and by leave, I would like to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development and Tourism that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, and seconded by the Honourable Minister of Economic Development, by leave . . .

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, are we in Private Members' Hour, or are we dealing with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is my understanding that, by leave, a motion was put to go into committee. If that motion is not by leave, then members will so indicate.

Order please, order please, leave has not been granted.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**ADJOURNED DEBATE
ON SECOND READING - PRIVATE BILLS**

MR. SPEAKER: We are in Private Members' Hour, and the first item on Private Members' Hour on Tuesday afternoon . . .

Order please. Adjourned Debate on Second Readings of Private Bills on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Bill No. 38 . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Do the members wish to continue?

The motion before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Bill No. 38, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I'd like the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

**BILL NO. 53 - STEINBACH CURLING CLUB
LTD.**

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Bill No. 53, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, we have considered this bill. We're prepared to let it go to committee where we'll ask some of the questions.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

**ADJOURNED DEBATE
ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS**

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate for Second Reading on Public Bills, Bill No. 41, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that discussions have been held between the Minister of Labour and the Member for St. Norbert. An agreement has been reached to have the content of this bill, referred to the Labour Law Review. So, I would like to keep it stand in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I am informed that technically the Honourable Member for Wolseley has spoken to the bill; therefore, it does not stand in her name. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield. (Stand)

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

**RES. NO. 12 - A PEACEMAKER ROLE FOR
CANADA**

MR. SPEAKER: On the matter of Private Members' resolutions, Resolution No. 12, the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to move, seconded by the Member for Thompson, that

WHEREAS Canada has historically played a lead role in peacekeeping; and

WHEREAS Canadians from coast to coast have clearly stated their desire to strengthen our role as a peacemaker and a peace builder; and

WHEREAS developing new weapon systems only serves to exacerbate the arms race when the world is already spending well in excess of one billion dollars per day on armaments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba urges the Government of Canada not to permit the testing or the development of the Cruise missile or any other military hardware intended to be used in the deployment of nuclear weapons; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we urge the Government of Canada to strenuously promote peace and dialogue between Nations and that the Clerk of this Assembly forward this resolution to the Government of Canada.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly did not expect this resolution to be handled by the members of the opposition with the catcalls that they have already started with in calling the resolution a joke.

Mr. Speaker, their absence this afternoon at the ceremony for the United Nations Association Canada at the Pool of the Black Star is perhaps indicative of their respect both for the United Nations or lack of respect for the United Nations.

I brought this resolution forward; I didn't really know it was going to come today, that we would be able to have the introduction of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, on the very day that the United Nations Association of Canada and, in particular, co-ordinated by the R.B. Russell students from the R.B. Russell School and also the Stonewall Collegiate School, that they would have a presentation with Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba in attendance and speaking on the role that Canada has to play in the world today; that also in attendance would be the

Mayor; the Premier; the Minister of Cultural Affairs; and Canada's Ambassador to Disarmament. All those people, Mr. Speaker, spoke of the role Canada has to play in the world, both on our own and in particular within the United Nations.

Canada's Ambassador to Disarmament spoke on the essential role that the United Nations plays. He spoke, Mr. Speaker, on the need for Canadians to stand up and speak out on the issue of disarmament for the role in the future of the world is very much at stake as we go on almost senselessly in this world in armaments buildups and, in particular, in nuclear armaments buildup.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, Canada developed a very strong role in the world, an incredibly strong role, a role that was respected, a role that we still carry over a good amount of respect for in Third World nations, in European nations and in nations, I might add, throughout the world both in east and west blocs.

We were heard, Mr. Speaker, during the years of the Suez crisis when our delegate to the United Nations, Lester Bowles Pearson, was a prime negotiator between France and Great Britain and, on the other side, Egypt. A bloody conflict, Mr. Speaker, I think was avoided in that, and that really became, more than any other single event, the start of an active foreign policy by Canada in peacekeeping.

We established first off a peacekeeping force in Egypt, followed in Cyprus, also participated in U.N. peacekeeping missions in the Congo and an observer force in Lebanon. We saw an era when Canadians were promoting dialogue between the east and the west; we saw it not only in the government efforts, but we saw efforts of individual Canadians and people tied to this country.

We had the start of the Pugwash Conferences in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, sponsored by Cyrus Eaton, the great industrialist. In his role of having confidence both and, in particular, in the United States and Canada, but also being able to go and talk to Soviet leaders, members of the Soviet Politburo, to academics and to scientists in the Soviet Union to try and bring together - and very successfully and the conferences are continuing to date, Mr. Speaker - people from the east and from the west. Instead of never having our twain shall meet, having them meet.

Beyond that, and still continuing with the United Nations Association of Canada, are the Couchiching Conferences, which once again are stressed towards recognizing Canada's role as a lead community in the world. We have a unique opportunity, Mr. Speaker, in that the role that we have to play is because our nation, as one of the more industrialized nations of the world, with one of the highest standards of living in the world, even though it's slipping, but probably more than any other nation except for some of the Scandinavian nations having respect and justifiable respect for other nations in the world. We have that position of honour and respect, and one cannot throw that position of honour and respect out the window.

We have acted in Vietnam with Chester Ronning as the Canadian representative to try and promote some dialogue between the Vietnamese, North Vietnamese in particular, and the United States. We opened the door for the United States in China; first off, with Mr. Stanfield going as a Canadian representative - the then

leader of the official opposition - to China to start opening some doors.

Prior to that date, Mr. Speaker, you may all well remember, and if you listen to world politics and to the world evolution of political thought and also of the arms race in different balances of powers, prior to that we had the building of the great "Yellow Threat," it was called. All of a sudden, in many people's eyes, the Soviet Union wasn't the main enemy. I don't know why we always have to have an enemy to be able to exist ourselves, but there seems to be that need always to create an enemy and build the enemy way beyond proportion, so that we had to have an excuse to build our own defences beyond proportion as well. But following the Korean War, the great so-called Yellow Threat, after the explosion of the first atomic bomb by China, it reached a crescendo and then, all of a sudden, with Mr. Stanfield's trip to China, Mr. Trudeau's trip to China, paving the way for Mr. Nixon, the then President of the United States of America, to go to China on what was probably the greatest media extravaganza on foreign affairs and foreign relations ever undertaken in the world. Instead of people, who just years ahead of time, even months ahead of time, were casting aspersions at one another, you had two great leaders of this world embracing one another.

That shows you, Mr. Speaker, the power of dialogue. At different times, we've taken positions, stood out and been counted in the world. Prime Minister Diefenbaker, when he was Prime Minister of this country, stood very firmly against the army of the Bomarc missiles with nuclear warheads. He withstood a tremendous amount of pressure from the U.S. at the time, from the Liberal Party at the time, which wanted to arm our warheads with nuclear weapons - a seemingly complete turn of face, but one can expect that and does expect that of the Liberal Party in changing their minds and opinions very quickly. But we had even the Minister of Defence, Doug Harkness, resigning in that period because he was in favour of arming the weapons with nuclear warheads. The Prime Minister of the Day, Mr. Diefenbaker, very nobly accepted his resignation and maintained a position that no nuclear warheads shall be on Canadian soil.

It is amazing to see how his party has altered so dramatically in its opinions, Mr. Speaker. We have a Prime Minister now who engages in a fair amount of what I can only call "schizophrenia." He says in one message in an open letter to the people of Canada that we are hypocrites who stand up for disarmament and promote disarmament on both sides. He says we are hypocrites, Mr. Speaker, and at the same time he says that, because other nations - or the Soviet Union is what he's referring to here - do not have the same freedom to speak, we should not be speaking as freely as we do because it supposedly weakens our position. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what he thinks of democracy, then I think it is high time that he stepped down if he is not free, if he is not happy and confident in living in the free world.

That was, I believe, on May 11th, when that letter was released to the public via the press instead of having to face the cameras or face the House of Commons. Less than a week later, he releases another statement, Mr. Speaker, which said that the attitudes and statements of President Reagan and his

administration are not conducive to constructive talks on a nuclear arms issue. He further goes on to say, as I said earlier, unfortunately President Reagan and some of the people around him have given some justification for those fears, for the fears that the American state has turned into a very warlike state. Not the people themselves, Mr. Speaker, very carefully, not the people themselves, but certain members of the administration - in the Pentagon, particularly.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that long ago, some 21, 22 years ago, when President Eisenhower was stepping down and retiring as the President of the United States of America, just a couple of days before he turned over office in his final statement to the nation, he gave a very incredible speech to the U.S. at the time. The New York Times reported it under the headline of "Eisenhower's Farewell sees Threat to Liberties and Vast Defence Machine." Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote in some length from Mr. Eisenhower's speech to show the kind of role that he was fearful of, of what was happening in the United States.

He said, "America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interest of world peace and human betterment.

"Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purpose has been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among peoples and among nations.

"Any failure traceable to arrogance or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt, both at home and abroad."

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, to speak of the hostile ideology as represented primarily in Soviet Union. He said, "To meet it successfully there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle - with liberty the stake."

President Eisenhower went on to reflect on the state of the military industrial complex in the U.S. and he said, "Prior to World War II, the U.S. had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well." And he recognized that those times had changed; times had changed dramatically. He recognizes they've been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.

"Added to this" - and this was back in 1961, it's many times this now, in 1983 - "three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in a defense establishment. We are annually spending on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations.

"Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment," he goes on to say, "and a large arms industry is new to the American experience. The total influence - economic, political, even spiritual - is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the structure of our very society.

"In the councils of Government," he added, "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex." These are President Eisenhower's words, Mr. Speaker. "The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted," he said. "Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of a huge industrial and military machine of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Mr. Speaker, this great man in his leaving office, leaving office of the most powerful nation of the world, and a nation that had built up by that time the most powerful military force in the world, recognized what can happen if a military becomes rampant, if a military becomes the primary influence on the government, and on the government's directions. If we become too paranoid over so-called defense, and end up reducing and lessening our defense. For in our democratic nation our defense will always be first guided and guaranteed by our free institutions and not by letting ourselves become subjected and influenced too unduly by the military machinery.

He noted a need for dialogue. Further in his speech he says - "During the long lane of history yet to be written America knows that in this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be instead a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect." Such a confederation," he added, "must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

"Disarmament," he went on, "with mutual honour and confidence is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences - not with arms but with intellect and decent purpose."

Mr. Speaker, yet today we have the Canadian Government taking a position, which is to say the least mealy-mouthed, talking out of one side of the mouth at one point in time of Canadian Federal Government, and a few days later repeating and going almost in an opposite direction. What we need is a consistency of direction, Mr. Speaker. We need for Canada not to be silent for in silence one has compliance and complicity in the developing arms race.

We have statements coming forward, not by people who can be considered as anti-American. I have little doubt, unfortunately, that some members opposite will try to nail myself and other members of our Caucus speaking in defense of this fine resolution of us being anti-American. But you cannot say that four former defense secretaries in the United States are anti-American when they claim that the United States is budgeting for more money than it can afford to spend over the next decade on armaments. When they say that they could cancel the B-1 Bomber, the MX missile, 3 aircraft carriers and slow down to modernization and stockpiling of arms. When they say that we do not need, as the 1983 Budget provides and forecasts for, 17,000 new nuclear weapons in the United States of America's arsenal by the end of a decade, by 1993.

Mr. Speaker, it is anything but anti-Americanism for us as free citizens, in a free and democratic country to stand on our feet and to stand on our position in a world as a respected nation, to stand clearly towards a position of nuclear disarmament, bilateral nuclear disarmament, verifiable nuclear disarmament as President Eisenhower called for. The only alternative, Mr. Speaker, is a holocaust beyond all of our comprehension.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I recommend this resolution and I hope dearly that this resolution will have the acceptance of not only members of my side of the House but also the side opposite.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this resolution out of a feeling of sincere concern for the future of my country, and the future of its allies, the future of the Western Alliance, the future of freedom and the proper realistic sensible education of our young people in Canada today, who having not suffered through one or another of the various world wars that have plagued mankind in this century, are not as knowledgeable of, and are not as attuned to the threat of aggression and the many guises in which aggression comes, as perhaps are some of us who have gone through that experience.

I would hope that those teachers, those legislators, those leaders in our country and throughout the west who experienced the kinds of insidious and not so insidious, the kinds of overt and subversive aggression that have been waged against freedom, and against freemen and women in this world, in this century, have the courage and have the sense of responsibility to stand up and tell our young people that aggression is abroad on this planet, that aggression comes in many forms and guises, and that it's very easy to be duped into believing that those who would conquer us and those who would deprive us of our freedom are in reality friends.

We have seen men and women, free men and women, overrun in their societies, imprisoned, enslaved, murdered, exterminated by aggressors in Eastern Europe and in Western Europe in various parts of the world in our time, Mr. Speaker. We have seen the guises and the forms in which that outrage against freedom and free men and women has taken form.

One of the compelling responsibilities of teachers, and of legislators, and of leaders in our society today is to tell our young people about that threat, to tell our young people about dishonesty, to tell our young people about aggressors hiding under the guise of friends and allies, and to warn them always to be on the lookout for that kind of threat that nearly ripped this planet asunder between 1914 and 1918, did it again between 1939 and 1945, and in the guise of Soviet Communism could do it again, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with very little in the resolution that's in front of us at the present time. I agree with little more than the opening phrase. The opening "Whereas", which cites the fact that Canada has historically played a lead role in peacekeeping.

It is true, Sir, that we have historically played a lead role in peacekeeping and I want to come back to that in one moment. But first I want to say that I believe in a peacemaker role for Canada. I would hope that nobody on the other side of this Chamber accuses me or any of my colleagues on this side of lacking in support for a peacemaker role for Canada simply because we oppose this resolution, and we do oppose this resolution. We believe in a peacemaker role for Canada, but we don't believe - certainly I don't believe - in a dupe's rule. I don't believe in a pawn's role. I don't believe in a submissive role. I don't believe in beating our swords into ploughshares unless our enemies are prepared to do the same thing.

We have responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, in this world. It would be lovely to think that all we had to do was say, hands across the border; hands across the ocean; hands across the polar icecap, and we'll be friends. The reality is that the people whom we confront in the struggle for men's and women's minds in this world today; the people whom we confront in the struggle for the preservation of freedom, namely, the power brokers in Soviet Russia do not understand the same kind of approach to friendship, the same kind of approach to peaceful gestures, the same kind of ideals and values with respect to individuals. They do not even play with the same deck of cards, Mr. Speaker, and there is no point in deluding ourselves on that point.

First of all, Sir, we have responsibilities to NORAD, to NATO, to our American neighbours, cousins and allies, to our international allies and to our own sense of honour. Over and above that, Sir, we have responsibilities to our generations yet unborn, to our children, our grandchildren and our future children and grandchildren. We cannot and dare not allow this precious institution of freedom that has been built, created, preserved and defended and has shone through all kinds of threat and danger from this area of the world, North America and the western world, to be doused, to be smothered through a naive, acquiescent, unknowing, unrealistic kind of foolish surrender.

Aggression, as I said, Sir, comes in many guises and in this country we've seen it both nakedly obvious and cunning in its disguise. Now let me say that with respect to the opening statement in the resolution that "Canada has historically played a lead role in peacekeeping", as I suggested a moment ago, Sir, I agree with that much of the resolution. That is true, but what is more true and what the resolution does not say is that Canada has historically played a lead role in defending freedom, in recognizing freedom and in moving out to resist aggression in all its guises and forms and to carry its fair share of the burden of keeping the world safe for democracy, to use a phrase that was famous and current in my teenage years and that was first, I think, employed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We have also, Sir, historically demonstrated our awareness of our responsibilities to our freedom-loving friends and to the Western Alliance in general. So it is not good enough to simply start on an apology and an argument for resisting testing procedures on the Cruise missile with the statement that "Canada has historically played a lead role in peacekeeping." Over and above that and much more than that, we've

historically played a key role in defending freedom and in fighting for freedom. We have stood firm to resist dictatorship, political authoritarianism and totalitarianism whenever called upon to do so, and whenever any of those three ugly spectres raised themselves upon the world's landscape - and let the Member for Inkster and his colleagues make no mistake about it - that spectre stands astride the world's landscape again today, and it does so in the form and posture of the leadership of the Soviet Union. Let there be no mistake about that, Mr. Speaker.

When a friend and ally, in the person of the United States or Great Britain or any other member of the Western Alliance, stands up to that spectre and that threat, let us not denigrate that kind of action and deride them and weaken that posture and weaken that resolve because, Sir, there have been too many incidents, too many occasions since World War II when Canadians, many of us in this country, have blushed over the fact that our country has not carried the burden of responsibility, has not borne its share of the load that it should bear in resisting aggression.

The poet, John McCrae, said, Sir, "If ye break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders Fields." I remind members of this House that more than 100,000 Canadian servicemen and women were killed in combat in two world wars and they are buried on slopes and in cemeteries from Hong Kong to Monte Casino to Flanders Fields, and they are heroic testimony to that proud record of Canada's in defending freedom. We must not break faith, either with them or, as I say, with future generations in this country.

Sir, we will be amending this resolution. I make my initial contribution to this debate today simply by registering my very strong opposition and what I believe is my party's very strong opposition to the sense of this resolution as it's currently worded, but we will be moving on to amend it and to offer our support for joint participation in maintenance of western defences and in maintenance of the western alliance and in protection of western freedoms against the threat of Communist aggression. If that means living up to our responsibilities as articulated by the Prime Minister of this country a few days ago and accepting our role in testing the guidance system of the Cruise missile, then so be it.

I say that I personally, the MLA for Fort Garry, am fully in favour, and I believe that I speak for the majority of my constituents and the majority of Canadians when I say so, that I am fully in favour of our living up to our responsibility as allies of the Americans, as members of the Western Alliance, as Canadians who have fought in the past for freedom, and accepting the Cruise missile guidance system for testing of that missile and its guidance system over our terrain so that the Western Alliance can remain strong in the face of the Russian medium-range nuclear threat in continental Europe.

Sir, you don't need to look very far for the strongest and most vivid and most compelling messages about the threat in the Soviet Union. You need look not very much further than former citizens of the Soviet Union who have left that country, have managed to emigrate and have moved to positions in the western world, whether it be the United States, Great Britain, Canada

or some other country in the Western Alliance to carry on their careers in those societies. Many of those people have spoken out.

One of the most recent to do so is none other than the distinguished Russian author, Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Solzhenitsyn has made some very strong and compelling points in recent interviews with the press and I think that they should be read to every school child in every classroom in Manitoba, if not in Canada. Solzhenitsyn says, and I quote from an Associated Press dispatch recently carried in the Winnipeg Free Press that, "... anti-nuclear protesters in the west are blind to a threat from the Soviet Union and do not know the difference between good and evil." He accuses "young disarmament campaigners of having their 'eyes bound' about the Soviet Government and of lacking any concept of absolute good and absolute evil," and here, Sir, comes the most important and, I think, the most disturbing aspect of Solzhenitsyn's comments. He says and I quote, of these young or not so young disarmament campaigners, "They are against any kind of struggle at all. They just want to give up altogether. They feel their carefree existence will go on forever."

Sir, that's the most damning and the most damaging of the comments offered recently by Alexander Solzhenitsyn and others - other commentators from the Russian milieu about the current confrontation that's taking place between misguided, well-meaning but misguided, demonstrators protesting the Cruise missile and protesting nuclear defences in the Western World and the Leaders of the Western Alliance; namely, those persons in Washington, in Ottawa, and in London, and in Bonn, and elsewhere in the Western Alliance, who recognize the need for building up and maintaining a counter threat to serve the west against the spectre of Soviet Russian aggression. That's the most damaging and damning comment of all, that these protesters, in Solzhenitsyn's view, are against any kind of struggle, just wanting to give up altogether and feeling that their carefree existence will go on forever.

Well, Sir, there are millions of Canadians who will testify that that's not the way life is and that isn't the way you build and preserve the important things in life and there are 100,000 others who can't testify to that, because they laid down their lives in defence of that, and it's up to us to speak for them. We cannot ignore the threat that is posed by Soviet Russia and all that it has stood for and all that its leaders and its architects have preached and have pledged and have promoted since World War II, Mr. Speaker. We dare not ignore that sort of threat.

Peace, of course, is everyone's desire, Mr. Speaker, but it must be honourable peace and as Solzhenitsyn himself said, that Bertrand Russell is dead wrong when Bertrand Russell said, "better Red than dead." Solzhenitsyn himself said there was in Bertrand Russell's view, "an alternative" and, in fact, in reality "there is none, because to be Red means to become dead gradually."

Mr. Speaker, there's no question about the desire for peace, but I repeat, it must be honourable peace. Everyone on this side of the House shares with all the vigour at our command, as much desire for peace as anyone in this country, or anyone in this world, and certainly, as much desire as anyone on the other side of the House. There is no argument about the desire

for peace. We do not believe that acquiescent peace, submissive peace, peace achieved through surrender, is worth anything at all, in the struggle for our country and the struggle for society, and in terms of the institutions, that organizations like this Legislature have historically defended and have been established to defend. We believe that the peace that we maintain and the peace that we secure must be backed up by and guaranteed by strength and we do not believe that a worthwhile peace can be secured or maintained through weakness.

If members opposite think so, if the Member for Inkster thinks so, let him talk to the people of Czechoslovakia; let him talk to the people of Hungary; let him talk to the people of the Ukraine; let him talk to the people of Poland; let him talk to the people of Afghanistan; let him talk to the people of a number of African countries, and other areas of the world, where they have seen what guise aggression moves in, when it comes in from the Soviet Union offering apparently and spuriously the hand of friendship, as a means of establishing a base and a beachhead with which to launch further assaults on the integrity of western freedoms.

So, Sir, we resist this resolution in its strongest terms and we'll be bringing an amendment to it and I conclude my remarks by saying that I believe, I can take pride as a Canadian, in assuring you, Sir, and members of this House, that I am pleased to support the recent statements of the Prime Minister of this country and statements by many other Canadians in the past, to the effect that we have a responsibility to do our bit, with respect to the testing of the Cruise missile and we are prepared to do it. And then, Sir, we can hold our heads up, as we always have been able to, as Canadians, and say that just as we did in 1914-18, and just as we did in 1939-45, and just as we did in Korea, we fought with our friends and our allies to defend freedom. We met our responsibilities. We played our role to the full. That is the kind of pride that most Canadians, young and old, want to take in their country. That's the kind of pride in our country that I grew up on and that many Canadians grew up on. It's been lost, to some extent, in recent years, Sir, by a kind of acquiescent drift that doesn't recognize reality, that tends to overlook the lessons of history.

Sir, the strongest argument that can be mounted, the best case that can be mounted for preserving our society and preserving our freedom is a strength that enables us to preserve it, is a deterrent. We are interested in disarmament, but only in bilateral, verifiable disarmament; not unilateral disarmament, such as implied in the resolution proposed by the Member for Inkster. This resolution from the Member for Inkster implies that Canada should lie down and undertake unilateral disarmament, Sir, and trust its foes. That is precisely what is implicit in this resolution.

Sir, we do not believe in that kind of disarmament . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We do not believe in unilateral disarmament.

MR. D. SCOTT: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We believe in the deterrent in order to maintain our strength and so we stand . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . for the testing of the Cruise.

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

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry just took my speech and my address totally out of context and tried to say that I am for unilateral disarmament, and I am not for that. I said very clearly in my statements, President Eisenhower stated in the quotes from his speech, as well, that it is bilateral, that it is multilateral disarmament that we're working towards. That is the role we're trying to get for Canada to play in this resolution, working towards multilateral disarmament - not the fallacious garbage that he's trying to insinuate towards me, or any of the members opposite on our side of the floor.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank the Honourable Member for Inkster for making that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has one minute remaining.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Inkster will check the record, he will see that I said that implicit in his resolution, is endorsement of the concept of unilateral disarmament.

We believe, Sir, that to defend the kinds of freedoms and institutions we enjoy in this country, and the Member for Inkster enjoys them too, we must maintain a deterrent. We do not believe that that freedom, that strength, that democracy, this society can be preserved, without a deterrent that will discourage the naked desire for greater world control and the naked tendency to aggression that exists in the hearts of the Soviet leaders. We do not believe that without that deterrent that we can maintain peace and security for our country. Therefore, we look for a staged process that would lead us into bilateral and verifiable disarmament, Sir, and until then, we must maintain our strength and be sure that we keep ourselves on our guard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, after that previous speech, I think there is no doubt that the Member for Fort Garry is running for Conservative leadership. If that wasn't a Sterling Lyon clone speech, I don't know what was. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the vast majority of Manitobans can see through that kind of right-wing rhetoric and can see the facts in this particular situation. They can see through the red herrings that were brought forward so eloquently by

the member opposite; the red herrings that suggest somehow by being against the Cruise missile, that we are against the Western Alliance, that we are against NATO or NORAD, that somehow we are dukes of the Russians, that somehow we are anti-American, Mr. Speaker. That is not the case; that is not the case at all.

In fact, I would like to respond to the member opposite and our Prime Minister by saying that I am not anti-American; I am pro-Canadian, and that statement, Mr. Speaker, it may sound familiar to members opposite. That was a statement that was made by the late great John Diefenbaker in a very similar situation in the 1960s. Then, the issue was the Bomarc missile; then, the issue was whether we were going to accept nuclear warheads on the Bomarc missile, and he stood and said, no. And what was the result of that, Mr. Speaker? He was labelled as an anti-American. The Liberal Party switched its policy. They said, you're anti-American for being against the Bomarc missile; you're not living up to our responsibilities with the Americans with NORAD. Very seldom has the United States attempted to nullify the Prime Minister at that time for those statements. They called him anti-American. I've seen many of the statements they made against him, and it is the same kind of statements that are being made now, Mr. Speaker, by members opposite.

But what has happened in the last 20 years? What has happened to the policies of John Diefenbaker and other Canadians such as him who stood for an independent Canadian foreign policy? What has happened to that, Mr. Speaker? Well, it is clear that for political reasons they are doing the same thing that the Liberals did in the 1960s; they are switching their stand. They are trying to satisfy, as did the member previously, those that would spell it right-wing slogans, particularly those that seem to be dominant in the Conservative Party now, Mr. Speaker.

The fact is, though, the vast majority of Canadians and Manitobans reject that, as indicated by the fact that the vast majority of Canadians are against Cruise missiles. I will, the next time we debate on this when I get to speak on the remaining portion of my time, demonstrate why the vast majority of Canadians are against the Cruise missile; not because they're anti-American, not because they're anti-NATO, but because they are concerned about Canada and the future of the world.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30, when this resolution next comes before the House, the honourable member will have 17 minutes remaining.

The time being 5:30, I'm leaving the Chair to return this evening at 8:00 p.m.