

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 8 May, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a statement; and I wish to table an Auditor's Report as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to advise the House on the status of an investigation into alleged fraudulent activities pertaining to equipment rentals at my department's Carman office. Members may recall that two Manitoba Department of Highways and Transportation employees were arrested by the RCMP in March of this year.

Both employees, a maintenance supervisor and a maintenance superintendent, have resigned effective April 22nd and March 29th respectively. They have recently been formally charged by the RCMP with seven counts of fraud under Section 110 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

When I announced their arrest by the RCMP in March, I also requested a joint investigation be undertaken by the Provincial Auditor's office and the department's Internal Auditor.

The review was to include an assessment of the internal controls in place, as well as those that were currently being developed by the department for equipment rentals, giving particular attention to the circumstances surrounding the alleged Carman incident. The review was also to include a review of equipment rental costs across the department in all districts.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the Auditor's investigation has been completed and it has found that the system being used - and which has been in place for several decades - for equipment rentals is basically sound.

However, their report identified a number of opportunities for strengthening the management information system and control over equipment rentals. I would like today to table a copy of the Auditor's Report and a paper outlining the action plan and the time frame we have established to address the recommendations in the Auditor's Report.

We are determined to take every measure, Mr. Speaker, to avoid similar situations to the Carman one from occurring again and to ensure the fair and equitable distribution of equipment rental work to

owners providing this service to the Manitoba Department of Highways and Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before calling on the honourable member to make his remarks, I would caution him not to make any remarks which might be prejudicial in a case which is before the courts.

The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I just want to thank the Minister for his statement in making a formal announcement of the situation to date in the House. We'll be interested in reading the other documents tabled on the policies that the department will be now following and I notice that they have taken steps to avoid any other occurrences of this nature, so we thank him for that statement, Mr. Speaker, and we'll be perusing the documents he's tabled in the House today with interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a statement.

Forty years ago this month, the most disastrous conflict in the history of the world ended.

I rise, Sir, on behalf of the Government of Manitoba to pay tribute to those who fought, those who died, those who gave so much so that we, today, could live in peace and freedom.

I rise also, Sir, to pay tribute to the millions of men and women who fell victim to the Nazi holocaust. Millions upon millions of men, women and children whose only crime was their religion, their race, political belief or their nationality.

To the veterans of World War II, Sir, a heartfelt thanks. They fought hard and sacrificed much. Many of them died to win the peace. They gave up their youth so that future generations would know the joy of youth - so that future generations might know what it is to be free.

Today is a day of mixed emotions. With liberation, came great joy, but that joy was tempered by sacrifice, liberation, by the revelation of a world of a world gone mad.

We will not forget, not should the world ever forget, the death, the destruction unleashed on this world throughout World War II.

In this, the International Year of Youth, I urge our young people to listen to those that survived when they speak of the horrors of that time.

Listen and learn - and realize that they keep the memory alive for you. They keep it alive so that your generation can be aware and ever vigilant - so that your generation will not allow such atrocities to ever occur again.

There is no greater respect or honour that can be paid to the victims of the Nazi holocaust or the veterans of World War II than to have their sacrifice serve as the beacon that protects the world from it ever happening again.

Their sacrifice will not be in vain if all of us fight as hard as they did to preserve freedom and peace. We must stand up and say no to war - no to intolerance, to human persecution everywhere in the world. We must stand up and say no to those who would deny that over six million Jews and millions and millions of other Europeans died at the hands of the Nazis. If we stand by today and we watch freedom denied, political murder go unchecked, intolerance tolerated, then we will have not learned from the past, Mr. Speaker.

It is because so many died fighting World War II that we must look to peaceful ways of settling our differences. It is because millions of Jews and political prisoners died that we must look to tolerance, to justice, to dignity, as a basis of all human relations.

Sir, at 5:30 this afternoon, the Government will be hosting a reception to commemorate the end of World War II and to honour those who served, those who sacrificed, those who survived the terrors of that time. The reception will be followed by a march to the Cenotaph where a commemorative wreaths will be laid. I invite all members of this House to join in the reception/ceremony beginning in the Manitoba Room.

In closing, Sir, I would like once more again, on behalf of the Government and the people of Manitoba, to say thank you to the men and to the women who fought so hard for freedom and for justice, to remind those touched by the death or a murder of family or friends that their loss will forever be remembered and will not be in vain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased, on behalf of the members of the opposition, to join with the Premier today in marking the 40th Anniversary of V-E Day, the day that is recognized and commemorated as marking the end of the Second World War in Europe, and it is fitting today that we pay tribute to the more than 40,000 Canadians who lost their lives in that great and horrible world conflict.

As well, to recognize that it wasn't just people who were themselves fighting in the war, but so many others. In fact, I think the number is close to 50 million who lost their lives in the Second World War, many of whom were referred to by the Premier in his statement.

Indeed, I think it's important that we remember at this time, Mr. Speaker, that at one time early on in the conflict, Britain and the Commonwealth countries stood alone against Hitler and the Nazi forces in their march across Europe.

It's important that we spend at least a few brief moments remembering and dwelling upon the sacrifices that were made by so many throughout our country, the commitment of hundreds of thousands of Canadians, men and women who joined the war effort and went into the conflict to fight for freedom, democracy and peace.

Indeed, the peace that we have enjoyed over these past 40 years is, in large measure, due to their sacrifice and their commitment; and I believe that it's fitting as well that in the United Nations International Year of the Youth that we remember that so many of those who went to war were indeed youth, and that in many cases,

we as a country, as the world did, lost our best and our brightest people, people who had so much to offer to our country, to its future development, to the achievement of our goals and aspirations were wiped out in this horrible conflict, and our world was denied the opportunity to have the benefit of their knowledge, their wisdom and their talents for all time.

Most of all, all of us in recognizing this day and the heroism of all of those - certainly the Canadians - who served, should, I believe, be called to remember that the ultimate tribute that we can pay to these commitments and sacrifices is to pledge ourselves, as they have I know, to strive for everlasting world peace.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery. We have 8 students of Grades 7, 8 and 9 from the Marymount School under the direction of Mr. Mattreck and Miss Schlmojl. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

There are 24 students of Grade 9 from the Acadia Junior High School under the direction of Miss Carman and Miss Nielsen, and 24 visitors from Quebec under the direction of Mr. Maltals and Mrs. Tremblay. Acadia School is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hudson Bay area - Manitoba jurisdiction

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, statements can be attributed to Federal Government officials; today would seem to clearly indicate that in the minds of the Federal Government there is no question of jurisdiction in the Hudson Bay area. I ask the First Minister, has this government been informed directly to butt out of any question of jurisdiction from the Federal Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Energy has information in regard to that. I think the statements that the honourable member is referring to are statements that were made which there could be such an implication drawn from, some two years ago by a federal official. It may be that the Acting Minister of Energy can provide further input.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

The Government of Manitoba at the present time or in the past has never questioned the jurisdiction of the

Government of Canada with respect to looking after and administering the activities in the Bay outside of the six-mile limit that was suggested some years ago.

The question that the government of Manitoba feels should be discussed and agreed on, as it has been in other jurisdictions, is the question of royalties, if any, that might result from that development. That is the issue that is still pending with the Federal Government and indeed other provinces, and one that we would hope the Government of Canada would conclude in a favourable and co-operative fashion with the Province of Manitoba like they have with other provinces in Eastern Canada.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it's not appropriate to keep repeating questions but, again, the Minister refers to some action taking place some two years ago. This is fairly imminent news; it's happening right now. I ask the Minister, can he give me a date and a time and the name of officials who have met with the appropriate federal department on this same question in the last little while?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I have indicated and I'll repeat the answer, there have been ongoing discussions going back many years with respect to any potential offshore developments in and off the shores of Manitoba. Those discussions have been continued for some time and will continue with the present government and are going on at the present time. We will continue that.

The development that is taking place in the Bay is some test drilling. Any actual development of the oil reserve there is still some time away, and we would hope that through discussions, through co-operation, that they will be resolved with the Federal Government and the other provinces and territories that might be impacted by that development.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the greater question of jurisdiction of the Bay itself is still not being satisfactorily answered by the Minister. I understand that particularly the Province of Quebec has set up a committee of several Ministers and some MNAs, as they call them there, and are currently lobbying in Ottawa to establish their jurisdictional share of the Hudson Bay area. Is this government contemplating any similar action?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: As I have indicated, the Province of Manitoba will continue discussions with the Federal Government with respect to any agreement on the sharing of royalties from developments in the Bay. Those discussions will continue and we will continue to press Manitoba's position in co-operation with the other provinces and the Federal Government.

Limestone Generating Stations - Agreement with workers

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a further question to the First Minister. On several occasions I have asked for a copy of the agreement that was signed with the

Allied Hydro Workers Council - I don't know what the proper term of that group is involving the workmen at the proposed Limestone construction site - that agreement that includes affirmative action clauses, etc., to be tabled in this House.

Both the Minister of Energy and, I believe, the Minister of Finance, at one point, indicated that that document would be tabled. Is there any reason why that isn't forthcoming? Is there something the government wants to hide, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any reason to hide it, but I will take it as notice and as soon as I have an answer, get back to the member some other time.

Manfor - Salary of CEO

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister responsible for Manfor. The Minister has taken several questions as notice, the present employment agreement and status of Mr. Bourgeois with Manfor; and secondly, the personal expense account of Mr. Sweeney, President and Chief Executive Officer of Manfor.

Can the Minister now provide details of Mr. Bourgeois' employment status; and also the details as to the specific personal items Mr. Sweeney is permitted to charge?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I did answer a number of the questions and perhaps the member was not here when I did so.

First of all, with respect to Mr. Sweeney's expense account, the \$6.73 that was charged for cigarettes, we have reviewed that incident with staff and I have discussed it with Mr. Sweeney. It was an oversight. An error was made and it has been acknowledged. I don't know what more can be said about it. It is certainly my view and I've said it on many occasions, that those kinds of expenses are certainly not deemed to be reasonable, nor are they deemed to be reasonable by the chief executive officer. It was an error.

With respect to Mr. Bourgeois, Mr. Speaker, his contract is going to be renewed, my understanding is, under the same terms and conditions as were originally established.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I therefore direct another question to the Minister and ask the Minister if he can explain why Mr. Sweeney is charging meals and bar expenses at the Laval Club, in Laval sur de Lac, or whatever it's called, near Montreal, on his personal expense account?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I believe this information has already been placed in the public domain. Mr.

Sweeney does in fact have a membership at a golf club in Montreal. That is in lieu of an option that was provided in his contract for membership in similar clubs in Manitoba.

The rationale for that is obvious. Mr. Sweeney has a long-standing relationship with a number of industry people from Eastern Canada. That is why, I suppose, in chief executive officers' contracts, those kinds of provisions are made.

The particular reference to an item which appeared in his expense account referred to a business meeting and the justification for that, I suppose, is the justification for any business executive entertaining, and that is that it's in the interests of pursuing the interests of the company that those kinds of meetings take place.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Just for clarification then, the Minister is saying that it's perfectly legitimate for Mr. Sweeney to charge meals and booze on his expense account in the club in Montreal to the taxpayers of Manitoba?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I said that it was all right to charge booze. If Mr. Sweeney has done that, I have no idea. I do know that he had an entertainment bill, I believe, from the club that the member is referring to. It has been explained to me that that particular expense was a business meeting; I have no knowledge of alcohol being included on that menu. Again, Mr. Speaker, whether that is a legitimate expense or not, I suppose, is open to question.

The honourable member may wish to acknowledge that those kinds of questions are raised by individuals who have access to expense accounts on a regular basis. My own sense is that I would not do that as a matter of course, and I would certainly hope that is not a matter of common practice with respect to Manfor or anyone else.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, a further question on the same topic. Did I hear the Minister correctly in saying that he does not plan on reviewing the personal expense account of Mr. Sweeney?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I have had staff review Mr. Sweeney's expense account with him, to itemize those items which may be raised, for whatever reasons, by the member opposite, and I am satisfied that with perhaps the minor exceptions that the member has raised to date, the expenses were in line with what one might expect a chief executive officer to consider reasonable expenses.

Mr. Speaker, for \$6.37 which I've already indicated was an error, I find it unfortunate that this individual who has a reputation which is unblemished in the industry, to tarnish it in that way is unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, the chief executive officer is a well-known individual in the forest industry. He took on a challenge that is an important one to Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Sweeney, to be an honourable man; I believe that he is conducting his affairs in an honourable way and it's unfortunate that these kinds of questions are raised on a regular basis by the Member for Swan River.

MR. D. GOURLAY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not questioning the integrity of Mr. Sweeney. He worked for a number of years with a private company. I am questioning the management of the affairs of Manfor by this Minister who is responsible.

Manfor - Tabling of Annual Report

MR. D. GOURLAY: A further question to the Minister. I wonder if he can now indicate to the House when he'll be tabling the Annual Report of Manitoba Forest Resources.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling the Annual Report shortly.

With respect to the member's further question about management. Mr. Speaker, I have accepted the responsibility and this government have accepted the responsibility for hiring Mr. Sweeney to do a very difficult job. Mr. Speaker, we have met the challenge. We recognized that there were problems in Manfor. We said that there was need for refinancing. We said there was need for retrofitting. We said there was need for reorganization. We have undertaken the challenge. I make no apology for attempting to deal with what is a difficult situation. The people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, expect us to behave in a way that will turn around that corporation. The people of Manfor want that to happen and so do we.

Mr. Speaker, the government opposite had their four years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . and they chose to do nothing . . .

Ontario Hydro strike

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

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister in relation to the sales by Manitoba Hydro to Ontario Hydro and the fact that there are now thousands of workers on strike in Ontario. Is this NDP Government prepared to act as strike breakers during the duration of this labour dispute?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, since they are acting as strike breakers, I'd like to know whether the government has abandoned its policies and principles in relation to the labour movement and, specifically, in regard to their stand on scab labour.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do regret that the honourable member would raise a question that really has absolutely no basis in fact, and would make

allegations of that nature. It saddens most to hear unfounded allegations of that nature in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, this is an agreement by which hydro is being provided to Ontario Hydro, part of a continuing commitment between Manitoba and the Province of Ontario and is certainly not a strike-breaking effort.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, is the First Minister saying that it's all right to cross a picket line as long as you do it by the back door, or as long as you have a contract with the company? Is the First Minister saying . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

The question is argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to ask a question to seek information and not to put an argument.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply say to the First Minister is he, in effect, saying that where there is a contract it implicitly contains a clause that if the government has a contract, it will honour that contract in spite of labour difficulties?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: The Honourable Member for Elmwood might like to have some information that the honourable member who's responsible for Energy in the absence of the Minister of Energy has which might throw some light on the honour member's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The situation is, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba Hydro does have an arrangement with Ontario Hydro where there is interruptible power provided on a reciprocal basis in event of need in either province. That same arrangement exists with the Province of Saskatchewan.

In fact, this same particular situation did take place in 1972, 1975 and 1976 when there was some difficulties both in the province of Ontario and in the Province of Saskatchewan - at the same time that that member was part of the Treasury Bench which is responsible for that situation.

PCBs - precautions in shipment of

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week I took as notice three questions from the Member for Niakwa, the first of which was in regard to the precautions which were being in Manitoba to avoid PCB spills.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that PCB equipment and the contaminated materials, fluids, etc. are taken out of service, packaged, handled and stored according to the federal guidelines outlined in the PCB handbook.

Also, the Environment Management Division staff, Mr. Speaker, inspects storage facilities at least annually to ensure that they comply with federal guidelines.

Manitoba Hydro is conducting a survey of PCB containing equipment in Manitoba and is examining sensitive areas.

Further, Manitoba Hydro has placed special absorbent pads under some of their PCB containing equipment to absorb PCBs should a spill occur. The Federal Environment Protection Service has conducted an inventory of PCB equipment in Manitoba and it has inspected and labelled this equipment.

Furthermore, under The Provincial Dangerous Goods Handling and Transportation Act, PCBs will be listed as licenceable hazardous waste and this will require a licence for all PCBs in Manitoba both in service and out of service to ensure that we have an up-to-date inventory.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, under The Provincial Act a manifest tracking system will be put in place to track the movements of PCBs from their source to their final disposable site.

Presently, I believe the two final questions that the member had asked on that had to do with whether we were notified of PCB shipments coming from outside the province. Presently, Mr. Speaker, there is a 24-hour emergency response staff that is notified of most PCB shipments travelling through Manitoba.

As far as those that are moved presently by Manitoba Hydro or Winnipeg Hydro, if and when they do, we are not generally informed of that, but as soon as the manifest system which will be part of The Transportation and Handling of Dangerous Goods Act comes into force, that will be accommodated as part of that manifest system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you.

To the Honourable Minister of the Environment, Workplace, Safety and Health, I thank him for his answers, but what I've been trying to get across or trying to find out from the Minister and from the government are what we are doing with the PCBs that we have stored here. Are there any plans for the future destroying of the PCBs, getting rid of them, what have you, or is the Honourable Minister just going to store them and present the problem to the new government that's going to take place?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I do believe the Member for Niakwa forgot that he already asked me that question and I did indeed indicate that in the past, some of the PCBs that are presently in use or were in storage in Manitoba, were indeed transported outside the province. Some of these went, in fact, to the United States, to Oregon.

Presently, for some time now, because they no longer accept PCB oils, none have gone that route and some are being stored in Manitoba. In fact, I gave the member and all of the members of this House a fairly accurate inventory of all of the PCB substances in Manitoba.

For the information of the Member for Niakwa and all other members, there is a meeting scheduled with the other Environment Ministers from the other provinces and the Federal Government, coming up later on this month where we'll be discussing the very question of how we address the problem of PCBs, in

terms of disposing of them, either centrally or regionally or provincially. There is no, of course, definite solution at this point. That is why we are meeting and will be discussing, in terms of seeing how best we can address this issue for the future protection of all Manitobans and the environment.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'll just make it as straight and as clear as I can. What are we doing with the PCB materials in Manitoba? Why do we have to go to the other provinces to find out what they're going to do? — (Interjection) — What are you going to do about it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of squawking going on there. I have a hard time providing any answers.

Mr. Speaker, one of the members across there is saying, just give me a short answer. What are you going to do with it? The answer is not as simple as that. I said that we are presently storing some of these substances in Manitoba and I suppose it doesn't take any great speech to explain that "storing" means we're doing just that - storing; and that, on the other hand, we are doing more than that.

At the insistence of the Federal Minister responsible for the Environment, we have agreed to meet with the Federal Minister. So have the other Environment Ministers, not because we are looking to see just how we are going to deal with our problem, but to see how we're going to deal with that problem as a nation. I would be the first to agree that it is nonsense to simply say, well, we'll keep on doing what we've been doing in the past and start transporting from Eastern Canada to Western Canada and vice versa; but that is exactly why we are going to meet, to determine what kind of policy we're going to put in place.

Mr. Speaker, it's not a simple solution that every province perhaps can afford to venture into. There are indeed very important costs attached to that and we have to look at it in terms of how best to address it. There are provinces that have a very small amount of it and we indeed are part of that and perhaps we have to deal with it regionally, but that's what we have to study.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the Honourable Minister, the same Minister. The cost factor is what he's saying he has to consider now. If we're talking about a cost factor, what about the people who are responsible? Has he considered charging back the cost to those people who are responsible for the PCB material in the first place?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't think that there is only one factor attached to this; I certainly don't think that there's only a cost factor. There are many factors, Mr. Speaker. I gave that as an example. Transportation is a factor, distances are factors. There are indeed many factors; that is why it further complicates arriving at a solution.

I want to tell the member that is why also we are very concerned about that problem and that is why we are anxious to hold this meeting to determine what responsibility and role we can play in solving it. Thank you.

Industrial Mill Installers - status of company

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Manfor operation.

The recent installation and alterations done to the mill was done by a company called Industrial Mill Installers. It has come to my attention that that company, together with others associated with it, are now in receivership. I wonder if the Minister might report to the House on the condition of that business establishment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I can report on the financial stability of IMI. I do know that the work conducted for Manfor has been completed. Whether there are any outstanding corrections, adjustments that need to be made by that company I will endeavour to find out; but the majority of the work obviously has been completed. It may simply be a matter of the holdback and the performance bond which obviously would be in place.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, for the Minister's information, that company, along with Mill Installers, Boundary Mechanical, Boundary Electric, KTS Construction, Interior Mill Contractors have all been placed in receivership, some of them were in Vernon, B.C.

It has also been brought to our attention that the work performed at the mill has been grossly unsatisfactory, causing delays and malfunctions. I wonder if the Minister could inform the House what holdback there was and what guarantee there was for the work performed by this company.

HON. J. STORIE: Although I will check formally, I believe that IMI was responsible not for any of the electronic equipment which has provided most of the difficulties, but was responsible for laying some of the decking and similar iron work, but I will report back to the member.

MR. D. BLAKE: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could report to us or, if not, he could take it as notice and report back when he brings the other answers, if the contract of the employment of IMI in this particular installation was handled by Mr. Sweeney, the Chief Executive Officer or was that handled by the corporation itself and the management of that firm.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, the contract to IMI was awarded by tender, as were other contracts at Manfor.

ManOil-Inter-City pipeline - date tenders called

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

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

A question was taken as notice by the Minister of Energy and Mines from the Member for Virden on May 2nd regarding the date tenders were called for with respect to the construction of the Waskada crude oil pipeline and I'm pleased to provide a response to that question.

On May 17th, 1983, the Minister of Energy and Mines released a notice calling for applications for the construction of the subject pipeline. In addition, the member also asked whether the tender system was a public tender or an invitational tender call. Mr. Speaker, the same notice indicated that application would be accepted from any interested parties.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Virden wished to know if these submissions were made to the Minister. I would confirm the Minister's previous response to this question that these were submissions received by the Oil and Natural Gas Conservation Board which was established in the legislation of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A further supplementary to the Minister. Can the Minister inform or give us the tender prices of the various bidding companies?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I'll take that question as notice to determine whether or not that information can be provided.

Farmlands Ownership Act - Lending institutions, exemption from

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether he intends to exempt lending institutions from the provisions of The Farmlands Ownership Act which make it illegal for non-family farm corporations to own more than 10 acres of land after, I believe, September of 1987.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I believe the act was, as the honourable member is aware, proclaimed last fall and there are three years time. We are having discussions with the financial institutions and when that decision is reached, it will be reached through negotiations in attempting to deal with a much broader issue than just the question of land.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether he is concerned that if no exemption is granted in these lending institutions which, according to the Minister, apparently own 100,000 acres

of land in Manitoba, that they will sell their land within a short period of time thereby lowering land values in Manitoba and making it much more difficult for existing farmers to borrow money.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the financial institutions and the managers are pretty good businessmen. They don't want to lose their assets and there is ample time in terms of the time frame that we're discussing. There are other issues involved in the whole financial plight of many farmers and the treatment of those farmers - that certainly those kinds of discussions are on their way and we will make those decisions down the road.

Certainly there is no need for any panic in terms of the time frame. The institutions are well aware of what the law is and are certainly doing what they have to in terms of the land they have in place. They've indicated to me as well, Sir, that they don't want to hang on to the land and they're making provisions on an ongoing basis to see that the land is farmed and any land that they do hold is for them, in the short run, a drain on their assets. That's a consideration that we will be making as time goes on.

MACC - five-year leases on farmland

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A question to the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has gone largely to five-year leases because they don't wish to dispose of land that they're holding at prices that are below what they would consider to be market, and therefore would result in a decrease in the general value of farm land?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we've had representations made from farmers who do not wish to purchase land that has been put on - would like longer-term leases in which to farm. That's certainly one of the considerations that MACC is undertaking. Those kinds of discussions we would have with the financial institutions as well.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell me whether or not there are parcels of land that MACC tendered for sale and did not get tenders that they considered to be high enough, and have subsequently gone to a system of five-year leases?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt that, in fact, there have been instances where the corporation has tendered and prices received did not meet the appraised value of the land as sales dictate in the area and the land has been leased.

PR 547 - construction on

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

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

I should maybe apologize to you for yesterday calling order. I, unfortunately, couldn't hear you in my seat here when you called order in the question period. I want to raise the same question again today, Mr. Speaker.

I wonder, could I ask the Minister of Highways - some two weeks ago, the Minister tabled his Highway and Public Roads Project Schedule for 1985-86 during the examination of his Estimates. I read from Page 14 of his project schedule for '85-86; it says, "PR 547 - Saskatchewan boundary, 2.1 miles grade and gravel."

Could I ask the Minister why he would write the Village of MacNutt, Saskatchewan, who is directly interested in the construction of this road and tell them, on the 18th of April - and I quote from the Minister's letter: "It will be my intention to consider" - only consider - "this project next year when developing the 1986 construction program"?

Which of these double-talk-type of standards will apply to MacNutt? Are you going to build it this year or are you just going to consider it next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously we are going to be doing more than I was saying in that letter to MacNutt, Saskatchewan. It seems that we are doing more for the member's constituency than I had indicated in that letter. Apparently the staffperson who drafted this letter looked through the Highways Program and missed out this particular project, did not realize that it was in the program and drafted the letter accordingly. It was a mistake and we apologize. As a matter of fact, I have a new letter that's going out today and the member will be copied on that, saying that that section of road will be graded this year and the contract will be let shortly.

PTH 83 - removal from maps

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I have another question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Tourism and Business Development. I don't know why this government continues playing games with the highways in Western Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism and Business Development recently removed Provincial Trunk Highway 83 from the road map showing Manitoba's possible tourism corridors. Can I ask the Minister of Tourism if he's prepared to recall those maps that he sent out, replace them with new maps which show that International Highway 83 starts at the Gulf of Mexico and goes all the way to Swan River and is an important tourist route in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I assume that question was directed at myself. The tourism corridors were not something designed by myself and certainly no fault of the Department of Highways. The tourism corridors, as identified in the map that the Member for Roblin-

Russell is referring to were identified as a result of tourism-oriented studies that were conducted under the auspices of Destination Manitoba, a tourism development program that was signed by the previous government. The purpose of designating those tourism corridors was for the purpose of further identifying what kinds of infrastructure and facilities would be required in the successor agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I think members opposite know that we will be signing a successor agreement this coming Monday. The Honourable Tom McMillan, the Minister responsible for Tourism federally, will be in Winnipeg to share the signing duties with myself and the fact that that particular section of Highway 83, I believe, that is not in there is reflective of the fact that those studies were conducted. They were conducted under Destination Manitoba, a joint federal-provincial program. They were not a departmental responsibility per se. If the Member for Roblin-Russell finds it unfortunate, we have to nevertheless concentrate the kinds of spending that flow through from these agreements in the areas where they are considered to be doing the most good.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have the map in front of me and in light of the fact that these tourism corridors are designated by the Department of Business Development and Tourism, can I ask the Minister how come No. 10 Highway has a priority and gets on the list and Highway 83 is left out?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I obviously have some bias toward Highway No. 10 myself. I can assure the member that I had no part in that designation. As I indicated, they came about as a result of studies undertaken under the auspices of Destination Manitoba. We can only say that the facts speak for themselves and I can assure the member that the temporary Tourism Information booth that was installed in Russell last year will be in place again. In fact, I met some of the people who will be working there this morning. We will be doing everything that we can as a department to ensure that tourism is promoted throughout the province if that's the member's fear.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious why they're not going to put the road in. Highway 83 is all in Tory constituency.

Manitoba Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Plan - reduction in broilers

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I had a question of the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. I raised a question the other day of the Honourable First Minister and asked him about the new Manitoba Broiler Hatching Egg Marketing Plan and see if he could tell me if the regulations indicate reductions in the number of birds that can be dressed at a killing plant will be reduced from 1,000 to 200? Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I asked the board for that information and as soon as I have it, I will provide it for the honourable member.

Canadian Wheat Board - opening of quotas

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the House will be aware that the wheat crop in Western Canada last year was drastically reduced from normal and some of the wheat farmers in Manitoba are having difficulty understanding why they have not been able to move more of their product. I don't believe there's been a quota since last December, and my question to the Minister of Agriculture is, has he been in touch with the Wheat Board to urge that quotas be opened as soon as possible?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, we raised a number of issues with the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board, especially at the time when they announced a reduction in initial prices to farmers which would reduce farmers' income in this province by somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$50 million offsetting very greatly the \$70 million payout from the Western Grain Stabilization Plan.

Sir, the question of opening up of quotas and permits for wheat in the Province of Manitoba, as the member well knows, we raised this question last fall because of the concern with the closure of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the lack of shipment through the Seaway, the Wheat Board did, at that time, indicate to us that there would be very little transportation to put grains at seaboard, not at the Lakehead, because of the lower prices and the cost of operation so that they would be doing through the winter months very little freighting.

If the honourable member has specific areas that have a lot of grain in storage, that has not been raised with me lately but, certainly, we'll want to look into that and see what areas they are and make sure that there is equity of treatment in terms of the quota system to producers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I have a correction for Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

On Page 1636 of Hansard for Monday, 6 May 1985, the evening session in the left-hand column at the top of the page, in the second paragraph: "HON. R. PENNER: The Crown cannot oppose bail conditions." The word should be "impose." The Crown cannot impose bail conditions.

MR. SPEAKER: Duty noted.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By leave of the House, I would like to make a non-political statement.

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

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

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

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, during the Manitoba Youth Week, I would like to inform our members in this Chamber and our people of the Province of Manitoba that for the first time in the Manitoba sport history an all-Native soccer team from Manitoba has been selected to participate in the world competition in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the All-Native Junior Boys' Soccer Team from The Pas will be participating in the Gothia Cup in Sweden and the Copenhagen and Dana Cups in Denmark in July, 1985.

Mr. Speaker, as chaplain for that team, I am particularly proud of this announcement and would ask all members to join with me in extending our best wishes to the team and the International Sports Exchange for providing this opportunity not only for the Native youth, but all amateur sport groups in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, people who make the International Sports Exchange Program possible are:

President, Ernie Nairn; Vice-President, Ben Kussy; Executive Director of Transportation, Jack Walker; Director of Promotions, Larry Grymek; Advisory Committee, Gordon Mackie, John Shanski, Jr. and myself.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a non-political announcement if I could today please.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure every member in this House and across this province would like to join me today in wishing the Royal Canadian Legion good health, every success for the future on the occasion of their 60th anniversary. The Legion was founded in this great province 60 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure every member would like to join me in wishing them well.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, before I ask you to call the business of the House, I would like to advise the House that it will be my intention to call for a condolence motion this Friday with respect to the late Donovan Swail, past member of the Assembly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, could you then please call the Government Resolution standing on Page 3.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of my Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In addressing this resolution put forth by the Premier, we must give serious consideration to the principles and the objectives with which we're dealing today.

I believe that it's very important that each one of us in this Chamber pledge our support to the goal of everlasting world peace. I think it's equally important, Mr. Speaker, that each of us declare strongly and forcefully our abhorrence for nuclear war and our opposition to the continuing nuclear arms build-up in the world.

Each of us knows that in the event of a nuclear war, there can be no winners. Everyone is a loser and the human race will not survive. The fact of the matter is that there must be a commitment that nuclear weaponry can never be used on earth and, further, to ensure that this weaponry can never be used either by accident or on purpose and, therefore, it must be removed in its entirety from the earth.

Unfortunately, this resolution does little to accomplish this goal or to give any assurance whatsoever that we will be any closer to the elimination of nuclear weaponry in our world today.

The Premier has put this resolution forth as a government resolution. Normally, that action should signal the significance and a commitment of great importance and meaning - one that involves action. Unfortunately, the stature and the thrust was almost immediately diminished by the comments which the Premier made both inside and outside the Chamber.

He's termed it a symbolic gesture. He conceded that by adopting this resolution, it would not make Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. I quote, "It's a small signal to remove the cloud of uncertainty," he is reported to have said.

Mr. Speaker, how is the cloud of uncertainty removed? What assurances are we giving our youth? Indeed, are we not instilling a false sense of security, a false sense of hope in our youth? Surely, our youth can face the truth and deal with reality.

Last week the Premier was quoted in the House as admitting that his government was being forced into the world of reality. By this resolution, I'm not sure that they are. I believe that the youth of our province, as the youth of our country, know and understand this issue very very well.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I look at some of the comments that were contained in an article that by coincidence was in one of the weekend newspapers - it's an article from the Winnipeg Sun, and it's entitled, "Life from a Grad's View." As part of it the author interviewed a

number of students and gave their reactions to a variety of different topics, one of which was nuclear war, and here are some of the quotations. I'll quote from it:

"These students born in the last '60s have never lived without the threat of the bomb, but despite that, there's a consensus among them that a nuclear attack is unlikely.

"I can't comprehend it, says Ryan. Ken ventures to say that somewhere in the recesses of his mind he might acknowledge the possibility. If it should happen, it will likely be an accidental flick of a switch. Dave says nuclear war makes no sense. The side that wins lives an extra two or three minutes. Both Dean and Ken agree that their generation knows more about the bomb and the hazards of nuclear fallout than their parents' generation. We are more pragmatic.

"The students' voices are united that should the bomb be detonated, they'd seek the heart of the radiation and walk towards it. You wouldn't want to escape, there'd be nothing to escape to, they said."

Mr. Speaker, our youth know, just as everyone in this Chamber knows, that we have more than enough nuclear weaponry in the world today to kill everyone many times over. They know, as I've said, that nobody can win in a nuclear conflict. They know that a nuclear conflict would be a horror, the like of which the world has never known and we never want to see, and that it must be avoided at all possible cost.

Unfortunately, this resolution does very little to help. I believe that the Premier is underestimating the intelligence of our youth today when he says that the passage of a motion that declares that we are a nuclear free zone, but lacks the power to ensure that we are a nuclear free zone will remove the cloud of uncertainty from their heads.

Surely, the passage of a symbolic gesture which carries no commitment will not remove the cloud of uncertainty. Indeed, it will not raise any impregnable barriers around Manitoba that will prevent us from nuclear attack. No one within the superpowers of the earth, certainly on the Soviet side, is going to outline on a map, Manitoba, and say, no nuclear warheads shall fall there.

Indeed, when we look at the Second World War, for instance, and we are remembering that today in the commemoration of V-E Day, we know that even a country such as Holland that declared itself neutral was trampled under by Hitler's army when they chose to invade that country and not even a declaration of neutrality on their part had anything to do with stopping a bellicose nation from invading them and attacking them.

Mr. Speaker, when we refer to commitment, I believe that the Premier's intention were further demeaned when he said immediately after proposing the resolution, that this resolution would have no effect, for instance, on Bristol Aerospace or Boeing of Canada or perhaps Sperry or CGE or others, who are producing or could produce components or parts to be used in nuclear weaponry right here in Manitoba. In fact, I'll quote from the comments made immediately after the introduction of a resolution by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It says in an article in Free Press of May 7th, "As well, Industry Minister Eugene Kostrya said, 'The government will not subsidize any Manitoba companies directly involved in the manufacture of

nuclear arms." So, they won't get a Jobs Fund grant to come here, Mr. Speaker.

Further, it says as well, "Kostyra said the government will not welcome any investment in a province that creates jobs directly related to the production of nuclear arms." So, we'll turn a blind eye as we are today and will continue to do on the part of this administration, turn a blind eye to those who might be involved. We won't welcome them; we won't say that they can't be here; we won't attempt to restrict them; we'll simply turn a blind eye.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't sound like the kind of commitment that might be expected from a resolution of this nature, put forth by the ruling administration of this province.

Mr. Speaker, as well, of course, we have a number of armed forces bases here in Manitoba, and some of them, such as Shilo, upon which weapons are being utilized, weapons that could conceivably, under other circumstances, carry nuclear warhead payloads. Not here, because our Canadian Parliament has already decided not to allow nuclear weapons in the country, and that is a matter that should be clearly understood. Canada has a long-standing non-nuclear policy. Other nations respect it and no one has tried to change it, Mr. Speaker.

Furthermore, NATO, of which Canada is a member, has repeatedly stated that it is committed to no first attack. I'll quote, Mr. Speaker, from as recently as May 31, 1984, the NATO Foreign Ministers announced again, and I quote, "The purpose of the alliance is exclusively defensive. None of its weapons will ever be used except in response to attack."

That, of course, doesn't go far enough, all of us agree. What has to happen is that everyone, NATO and the Soviet Communist Bloc, and every other world power that possesses or has the ability to develop nuclear weaponry, must be convinced to abandon and get rid of their nuclear arms. This resolution doesn't address that.

It doesn't work towards making that objective happen. Indeed, it's a symbolic gesture on behalf of one small entity lacking in jurisdiction and secure in the knowledge that we are protected by a superpower on our southern border, which deters anyone from attacking us.

Let us be honest with ourselves, as well as the people for whom we speak in this resolution. We must not only make symbolic gestures, we must work towards and commit ourselves towards the total abandonment of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, to abandon the possession . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please. There will be no expressions of opinion from the gallery.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, to abandon the possession of nuclear weapons would only contribute to world peace if both sides were to abandon them. This is the very thing that has not been achieved so far in international negotiations. The Americans, who had a monopoly on nuclear weapons in the mid-1940s, offered to abandon them if the Soviets would agree

not to develop such weapons. However, the Soviets did not agree and the rest is history.

In the early 1970s when the Americans made a net reduction of 1,000 warheads, the Soviets did not respond.

In October 1983, the NATO Defence Ministers agreed and publicly announced that they would further reduce another 1,400 warheads; and thus far the Soviets have not indicated that they are prepared to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that by adopting the concept of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, that we not lull our people, particularly our young people, into a false sense of security. We should not be so naive as to suggest that that is all that it takes when we know that it's not so.

Symbolism can never replace hard work and effort and commitment. The goal of world peace and nuclear disarmament will not be achieved by declaring ourselves and by deluding ourselves and our young people into a false sense of security.

We must recognize that this symbolic gesture does not even point us in the direction of our real goal - verifiable, bilateral, nuclear disarmament. In fact it almost skirts that entire issue, Mr. Speaker. Peace and security are worth working for. Many of those who we remember and honour today on V-E Day, proved it was worth dying for.

Mr. Speaker, we must work to convince equally the Soviet Communist Bloc, our NATO allies and every other nation in the world that has the prospect or the opportunity to arm itself with nuclear weaponry; we must work to ensure that every one of these people know that we are horrified at the threat of nuclear warfare and that we don't wish to tolerate its existence at any time, now and in future, and that we're committed - committed as we said earlier today - to everlasting world peace and that we believe that all of these things can only be achieved by mutual and verifiable nuclear arms reduction.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that the resolution be amended by striking out all of the words following "April 25, 1985, and" in the second paragraph of the preamble, and adding thereto the following:

WHEREAS the freedoms enjoyed by people of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were secured at immense cost in human suffering and property destruction during World War II; and

WHEREAS Canada has a continuing commitment to the defence of freedom through NATO; and

WHEREAS all Manitobans desire a lessening of world tension and a lifting of the threat of nuclear annihilation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, in the name of all humanity, to intensify their efforts to achieve mutual and verifiable nuclear arms reduction through the Geneva negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, the amendment as read. Do you require it read again?

Are you ready for the question?

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could have you read the motion as it would read in the amended form, in its entirety.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion then, in incorporating the proposed amendment would read:

WHEREAS Manitobans continue to state their desire to end the nuclear arms race; and

WHEREAS Peace is one of the principal themes of the International Year of Youth which the Manitoba Legislature unanimously accepted in a resolution on April 25, 1985; and

WHEREAS the freedoms enjoyed by people of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were secured at immense cost in human suffering and property destruction during the World War II; and

WHEREAS Canada has a continuing commitment to the defence of freedom through NATO; and

WHEREAS all Manitobans desire a lessening of world tension and a lifting of the threat of nuclear annihilation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba request the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, in the name of all humanity, to intensify their efforts to achieve mutual and verifiable nuclear arms reduction through the Geneva negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks on a personal note and I would like to end them on a personal note. I thought it important for me, personally, to speak on this resolution today, the 40th Anniversary of V-E Day, the day which, for me - as it does for hundreds of thousands of Canadians - has special significance.

Forty years ago today, as a member of the Canadian Army overseas, on what I best remember as a very sunny day, just outside of Wilhelmshaven in Northeast German, the war came to an end and our small troop breathed a collective sigh of relief. It was over and we had survived. Over one-third of our small troop had not and I remember them especially today.

We thought that that was it, never again. You see as the war moved to a close, there was, in a way, a growing sense of terror - not for our own lives particularly - one becomes, to a certain extent, used to the facts of war when you're there - but about new weapons of destruction.

We had known, as we were stationed in England about the V-1s, the so-called buzz bombs, and after while one got used to the buzz bombs, they seemed to be rather ineffective - people were killed by the buzz bombs so they were not totally ineffective.

But towards the end of the war we became aware of the V-2s and we knew that they were not ineffective, and towards the last days of the war there were rumours of something even more terrible than either the V-1 or

the V-2 rockets; and that, of course, were rumours of the ultimate weapons - nuclear weapons, atomic weapons, as they were subsequently to be called. They were only rumours; they are no longer rumours.

Nuclear weapons have tragically become an overwhelming reality of our times and something - no, Mr. Speaker, I should put it differently - everything has to be done to stop the nuclear madness which has gripped this planet and threatens this planet.

The movement to declare various parts of the world as Nuclear Weapons Free Zones must not be trivialized, as I feel with regret that the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Brandon West, has in fact trivialized it. I'm not wanting to take away at all from what I clearly feel is his dedication to the cause of world peace. Don't let me be misunderstood on that. I have no doubt that he feels passionately about world peace.

He says that the resolution does little. Let me just stop for a moment on that. Does he expect that any resolution of this House, the moment it's passed is going to, in itself, bring about nuclear disarmament? He knows better than that. He says it's, and he quotes the Premier, "a symbolic gesture." Well, of course, it is in one sense a symbol of the passionate feelings which countless millions on this planet have for world peace. It's more than a symbol. It was never suggested by the Premier that it was only a symbol.

The declaration of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone is, in fact, in my view and I know in the view of the Premier, a powerful and positive action towards world peace. Nuclear Weapons Free Zones, Mr. Speaker, help create, in my view, a climate of international trust. The purpose of creating such zones would obviously not be to ensure the safety of people living just in those areas in the event of nuclear war. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, should such a disaster take place, it is unlikely that many - if any - people would survive the resulting nuclear winter which would follow, no matter where they lived on the planet.

I want to quote very briefly from an article on Nuclear Weapons Free Zones which appeared not so long ago, about a year ago, to the day in a magazine called "The Facts" put out by the Canadian Union of Public Employees, CUPE. It says in part, and I adopt these words, "The growth of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones" - let me pause here again. We're talking about adding Manitoba's voice to a growing international movement. It is not a step in isolation. "The growth of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones and the example of countries like Canada," and we are part of the whole, Mr. Speaker, so the example of a province of Canada, "who are capable of developing nuclear weapons but have deliberately chosen not to do so would inject a moderating influence into a world madly pursuing military power at any cost."

This is particularly important now because, and it's partly in that context that this resolution is moved, the Non-Proliferation Treaty comes up for review in 1985, in this year.

The article goes on. "A Canadian initiative towards this end would thus be consistent with our best traditions, but would also go a considerable way towards freeing a significant portion of the globe's surface, the portion as it happens lying between the superpowers from nuclear domination, thus paving the way for similar developments in other regions. There

is increasing support in Canada for our country to declare itself a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. Leaders of Canada's major churches, in briefs submitted to the Prime Minister in 1983 and again in 1983, called for such an initiative to be taken. Similar calls have been made by a large number of groups and organizations across the country.

"In 1983 - and the number can be added to now - 51 municipalities in Canada voted to become Nuclear Weapons Free Zones: Toronto, Vancouver, Hamilton, Windsor, Regina, and smaller communities are mentioned."

What we're saying is that we here should join that movement, join the moral strength that the leaders of these municipalities could show, but somehow or other the opposition on this issue does not want to show and I regret that, and that the leaders of Canada's major churches have shown, the moral strength that they have shown and that this resolution shows, but I regret that the opposition is not willing to show, so that it becomes not a symbol in itself. It becomes part of a very significant movement towards world peace, towards nuclear disarmament.

"These initiatives," the article concludes, "augur well for the spread of regions in the world where nuclear weapons will no longer hold sway." It was partly in recognition of that that this resolution was moved, so that we could give some impetus to that movement. We are not an insignificant voice. We are sitting here, the elected representatives of the people of Manitoba, an important province in an important country. We have something to say and if we have something to say then it is our duty as the elected representatives of those people to say it.

The notion that such a declaration is a hollow gesture, a mere symbol and nothing more, or equally bizarre, that it's not the business of politicians, misses the point entirely.

Just pause for a moment. That notion that was expressed in this House that somehow or another politicians should have nothing to do with this evades the central question of our political responsibility as elected representatives to take the lead, to interact with that mass movement for peace which is so characteristic of the Canadian people, particularly young Canadians.

When I was thinking about the speech of the Member for Brandon West, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was reminded of a cartoon by the British cartoonist David Lowe. There are not many of us in this House old enough to remember his brilliant cartoons. He had one. We all remember the Geneva Disarmament meetings of the mid-1930s, and they failed. When the one in 1935 or 1936 failed, Lowe drew a cartoon for *The Express*, for which he was the cartoonist, and it showed the masses of people out in front of the steps of the Geneva Palace of Peace. They were drawn by him because essentially the people of the world are passive, they are not aggressive as some people would like to think. He had them represented as lambs. There, standing in the pillars outside the front gate of the halls of Geneva were the leaders of the world in the guise of crocodiles weeping crocodile tears, and saying, we're sorry, dear people, we could not curb your aggressive habits.

There, of course, was a complete abdication and a commentary on that abdication of the political

responsibility of the world leaders at a time in the history of the world and the history of Europe when disarmament might have meant that we would not have had to go through the horror of World War II.

A MEMBER: It wouldn't have stopped Franco in Spain.

HON. R. PENNER: Well, I'll tell you, if the member would like to engage me in a discussion some time of what would have stopped Franco in Spain, I'm willing to tell him a few things. — (Interjection) — That's right.

I would like not to get up a side path. I would like to speak, albeit briefly, about this resolution.

The Leader of the Opposition says that what we really ought to do is resolve for total abandonment. Well, fine, but there must be first steps towards that goal. There must be a series of first steps and more towards that goal. It's not enough to say, let's all resolve that we would like to have nuclear disarmament. There has to be something which goes further and contributes to the possibility of that being achieved. The declaration of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones is that kind of a step.

It's not the only step. I don't want to suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is something necessarily antithetical between the Premier's resolution and the amendment. I promise the Leader of the Opposition this, that we will very, very carefully consider that amendment, but it has been presented to this House as an alternative, as if the notion of the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone cannot be supported, but this particular step can. We must plead with the members of the opposition that rather than make this appear to be a debate between opposites, as something - you can do that but you can't do this - that we have to search, and we will search, I assure you we will search for a way of bringing those resolutions together.

We are not going to attempt to turn this into an adversarial kind of set-up - not at all. We take our commitment - as does the Leader of the Opposition, and I have no hesitation in saying it - to world peace very, very deeply. I know that he does and I hope he has the strength to bring his caucus along with him on that issue as we seek to find a common ground, but it should not be suggested that one is necessarily the opposite of the other.

In saying these few words about what I think is a tremendous opportunity for us, and with the Member for Brandon West here now in his seat, let me say again, something for which politicians pre-eminently have a moral responsibility that they must not abandon, they must not say, as if they are helpless neuters, that I can't do something, the people have to do something. Well, we are part of the people, and if we're not part of the people we ought not to be here in political office. We have, Mr. Speaker, as politicians, a trust.

But I want to end on a personal note as a parent and as a grandparent. I believe that I, at least, have to say to myself that I hold the future for them in trust, not only as a politician - God help me if I'm only that - but as a human being, as a parent and as a grandparent. We have, in that sense, a sacred duty and I, for one, intend to do everything in my power as I've sought in various ways - and not always rightly - to do for world peace.

I remember as a boy, when I might have spent more of my time playing with my friends on the prairies out

in the northern end of the city where I lived, going from door to door on Poison Avenue and Atlantic Avenue, selling a magazine called "Against War and Fascism." That's a long time ago, when I was eight and nine years of age. I have not lost and I will not lose that dedication, nor will I let it be trivialized, nor do I hope it becomes, in this context at this time, a matter of adversarial kinds of debates.

I recognize that there can be different approaches, but I hope that it is not suggested that the approach that is taken in this resolution is one that, because it doesn't have the immediate effect somehow of bringing about world peace, cannot be supported.

As I say, we have a sacred duty. I intend to do everything in my power in that respect and I say that, as elected representatives, we have a special role to play. It was 40 years ago that the war in Europe ended and, as I say, I remember that day well. I also remember what we all hoped - not just those of us who happened to be in that particular place at that particular time - for ourselves and for all of humankind. Let's not abandon that hope and certainly, let's not abandon it by looking for little political in-games to play on something as central to the future of mankind as this.

Let's support the resolution; let's find out if we can meld the two propositions that have been put forward in this House today by the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition. I think we can do that; I think we must do that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I rise with a certain element of disappointment to participate in this debate. When I was preparing my thoughts for the debate today, when I was preparing my speech, I thought at that time that we would be reaching some sort of general consensus between most members of this House - certainly between the two major parties in this House.

But as I read the amendment that has been proposed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I see that what the Leader of the Opposition is proposing to do is essentially delete any reference to a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in any resolution that this House would pass. I must say I found that profoundly disappointing, profoundly disappointing.

I find it particularly disappointing in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition, when we first tabled this resolution in the House, seemed to give some encouragement that he and his party would support it. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, he even, I think, went to the heart in some of his comments of what a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone has to be all about, when he indicated that the province has to be mindful, for example, of the job creation aspects of nuclear arms work and he said, and I quote, ". . . we may very well agree that it is worthwhile to forego job creation . . ." That's the end of the quote, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

You know, in those comments, I thought that the Leader of the Opposition had truly grasped what the resolution is all about. I was encouraged. I must say I was surprised, because I've seen comments from other members of his party, from the Prime Minister, for

example, trying to trade off concerns about nuclear arms against those jobs. We all remember the comments about 10,000 jobs in Winnipeg-Fort Garry, that somehow if we were to attain those jobs, it would not matter that we would be concerned about the effect of that development on the arms race, the effect on the peace of our world, that somehow it would be a worthwhile trade-off.

I hoped that the Leader of the Opposition would then take what was an initial understanding of the very root of this resolution and come in and support it wholeheartedly, but he has not, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the amendment to the resolution that he has introduced essentially deletes all reference to a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in Manitoba.

It's unfortunate, because if he had moved that amendment to follow the resolution as it was originally tabled in this House, I can say that I, personally, would have absolutely no problem with his expressed concern about the need for negotiations in regard to ending the nuclear weapons build-up that we're seeing develop in our world at the present time. He chose instead to delete the essential element of this resolution.

You know, in doing so, he and others have said that this resolution is somehow only symbolic. I wish they would read the resolution, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I wish they would read the comments of the Premier both in this House and outside of this House with regard to this resolution, because I think they would see exactly what this resolution is aimed at.

When the Premier said that this would not result in the elimination of work on nuclear weapons systems in Manitoba, he said that because that is clearly a decision that can only be made by the Federal Government in its role as the ones with jurisdiction over defence. He did not say that that work should continue; in fact, if you read any of his comments you would find that what he said was that we realize the limits to our jurisdiction, but we still think it's vitally important to speak up on this important matter.

What then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the purpose of this resolution? Some would suggest perhaps there is an element of idealism in it. I say, what's wrong with that? When we're talking about peace, surely that is the most idealistic concept that man has ever developed. When we're talking about difficulties in this world today, the build-up of nuclear arms, what can we as Canadians do, but express our deep concern and our hope that something will be done to end that arms race.

We're not a superpower; we never have been; but we have for many decades had a vital role to play in this world, a vital role as a peacekeeper, as a middle power if you like, and we are greatly respected for that role throughout the world.

I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never cease to be amazed when I go to Europe, when I travel around the world, the good sense people have about Canadians and the sense they have about our moderation and our true desire for international understanding and peace.

I think it's totally appropriate that we be debating this on the day that we are celebrating V-E Day some 40 years after it occurred, Mr. Speaker; because it was that action of Canada in that war which I think developed that reputation. We did not go into that war through

any other goal of trying to preserve peace in the world, and I think that international understanding of our role out of that led to several decades in which we were very influential in the U.N., where we were very influential as peacekeepers, where we were respected on the international stage for our concern about peace in this world.

I must say that I'm concerned that we're beginning to lose that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I'm very concerned. That is why I oppose our testing of the Cruise Missile, for example, and have opposed it since it was first raised in this country, because by testing the Cruise Missile, we're essentially abandoning our previous role, are becoming partners in the nuclear arms race. That is why I oppose the Star Wars initiative and I oppose Canadian involvement in the Star Wars Initiative, because by participating in that, we will be participating directly in one of the most destabilizing developments in the nuclear arms race in decades.

Sometimes I think we have to perhaps reverse the way we look at issues to really appreciate the consistent stand of Canada in regard to matters such as this. We're looking at it from the perspective of peace, but let's look at it from another perspective, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that of sovereignty. Let's recall in the 1960s when the Prime Minister of our country, John Diefenbaker, opposed the stationing of nuclear missiles on Canadian soil. That's correct, he opposed it; and you know, there was a great deal of pressure on his government and Canada to buckle under to the wishes of the Pentagon, which wanted our defence policy changed.

When I look at that, I'm reminded so much of what is happening today in New Zealand, because that's what they have done, Mr. Speaker. They have said that New Zealand is a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone; they have said that they still stand by their commitment to ANZUS' traditional defence alliance, but that they will not allow nuclear weapons on their soil. I look at the pressure that is being brought to New Zealand, to brave New Zealand, to buckle under once again.

I say that if we are to have any role in contributing to world peace, we must not buckle under, whether it be in regard to Cruise Missiles or Star Wars or any participation in the nuclear arms race, and that is why I as a legislator in the Province of Manitoba want to see us in this House stand up and say that we will be a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. It is our only hope of having any role to play in trying to bring some sanity to what is increasingly becoming an insane world, in terms of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the resolution says what we can say, as legislators in the Province of Manitoba. We cannot direct defence policy. We can only get up and say that we, as concerned elected representatives, speaking on behalf of what I feel is an overwhelming majority of our population, that we do not want our province and our country to be part of the nuclear arms race.

So no matter how you look at it, Mr. Speaker, whether you look at it in terms of the overall issue of peace or Canadian sovereignty, if you look at it in terms of our historical role as a peacekeeper, I think that one comes down to the realization that we have to take a stand.

In closing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to add my own personal note to this debate. For myself, I've

grown up under the threat of nuclear annihilation. I must say I've thought about it often myself and, on the one hand, I suppose I'm apprehensive when I look at some of the developments in the world, but I do see some hope. I see hope when I talk to young people, the generation past, my generation, in the sense that they see hope. They do not see the nuclear arms race as inevitable. They see it as being avoidable. I think that's important.

I see hope, Mr. Speaker, when in my own constituency an organization of churches has arranged an exchange program with Aldan in the Soviet Union and not at addressing the political issues that we face, but of trying to get greater international understanding between one mining community, in this case in Canada, and another mining community, in this case in the Soviet Union. I see hope when I hear the reaction to the original resolution that was tabled in this House, because I think it was overwhelmingly positive. In fact, the only member who spoke in opposition to it, prior to the Leader of the Opposition, opposed it not in substance, but because he felt that we shouldn't be debating it, that it should be a people issue. In a way, I actually agree with him; I think it should be a people issue, but we're people too. We speak for people day in and day out on many issues in this Legislature. I think it's totally appropriate for us to take a stand.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, as one who is deeply concerned about what is happening in our world today, I would hope that we would take, not merely a symbolic gesture in the form of passing the original resolution, but I think a substantive gesture too. I think we are signalling that we will not only not participate, in an abstract sense, but we will forego jobs or business opportunities in the nuclear arms field, because we feel it's important, as part of our contribution towards furthering world peace.

That was what I think the Leader of the Opposition was saying when he responded to the initial resolution. I'm disappointed that there is no indication of that in his amendment, but I think that's what we have to get back to. I don't consider that a symbolic gesture at all, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When I look at what has happened in New Zealand, it certainly wasn't symbolic. They took a stand and they're taking the pressure now and they're not buckling down. They are being put under incredible political and economic pressure and they have said, no, we are a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone and that is the way it's going to be.

In our own way, in Manitoba, that's what I'm hoping we will say, that we will say we do not want any part of the nuclear arms race. Perhaps that's idealistic; I don't know. I don't think it is. I think it's totally realistic. I think the only way we're ever going to achieve what we all seek as an overall goal is to combine that and to make the necessary sacrifices. That is why, when I look at the amendment as it is proposed, when I look at the fact that it deletes any reference to our being willing to take a sacrifice ourselves towards this goal, that I cannot support it in that form; and that is why I would urge the Leader of the Opposition and the members opposite to reconsider that amendment, to even bring it back in a very similar form, but bring it back in such a way that it will not delete the intent of the original resolution.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only way in which our debate here today, it's the only way in which our overall

discussion of this issue and this matter of extreme concern to Manitoba can have any realism. We can't simply say any more that we encourage the superpowers to negotiate. We have to do our part. We have to do our part, not only to encourage those negotiations in an abstract sense, but to do our part to say that we are no longer going to have any part of the nuclear arms race.

The way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to establish our province as a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. The only way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to establish our country as a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, members opposite obviously aren't aware of the degree of testing of nuclear weapons that is going on in our country at the present time. Mr. Speaker, we're testing the Cruise Missile in Alberta. What is the Cruise Missile, Mr. Speaker, but a weapons delivery system for nuclear weapons?

Mr. Speaker, what is happening across this country when the former Minister of Defence goes across this country and starts saying that we as a country should be pushing the economic benefits of nuclear weapons development; when that Defence Minister brings in the Pentagon from the United States to try and get more nuclear development in Canada; when we as a country make no clear statement on Star Wars; when even countries such as Britain and other European countries over whom there's no question of loyalty in terms of their alliance with the United States have also questioned that very initiative.

We're doing it today, Mr. Speaker. It's not an abstract question. If we say that we are not involved in the nuclear weapons race today, we're putting our heads in the sand. That is why it's so important to get back to that original resolution, pass it in its original form, given whatever amendments in addition to that that the members opposite want to place into it and also why it's so important for us to do it in a unified way.

I don't see any problems with the statements that the Leader of the Opposition has made on this issue. I can support him in any of those statements. I feel if he looks at it, he can support any of the statements made on this side of the House. The key thing, though, is to get that understanding. We cannot treat this as merely a symbolic matter. We have to support it totally, Mr. Speaker.

A Nuclear Weapons Free Zone is idealism, yes, Mr. Speaker, but in a way it's very realistic too because without that idealism, I don't see how we can get out of this vicious cycle of continuous arms development.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had not really intended to participate in this debate this afternoon, but since the Attorney-General and the Member for Thompson have participated in the debate, then I feel it would be appropriate to put some of my comments on the record at this time.

I'm pleased to see that we are able to have a debate of this nature. I would hope that members on both sides would realize that positions may be sincerely held with respect to this issue, that there is more than one

way to approach what we all regard as being something that is unthinkable.

I want to begin by saying to the members opposite that I was five years old, perhaps a couple of months past five years old when the bombs were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. As a five-year-old child, I recall that happening and I recall at the time that not only were there reports of the great destruction of those cities, but there was also talk that they could develop an even bigger bomb that would destroy the world, that was capable of destroying the world. I, as a five-year-old child, remember with, I can't really say with horror because a five-year-old is not capable of grasping that kind of concept in its entirety, but I do recall being afraid of that prospect and of receiving assurance from my parents that that was not going to be the case.

I lived with that as a teenager and up until the present just as many, many teenagers are living with it today. It's something that I thought about a great deal and when I had an opportunity to serve briefly in the militia in the early 1960s at a time when Civil Defence was a policy that was being pushed by the Diefenbaker Government at the time and, I, being a university graduate with some exposure to scientific knowledge, realized at that time the futility of that kind of program, of the Civil Defence program.

I think because of that experience, all those experiences, and the continuing exposure that we have to what the effects of a nuclear war would be, I'm certain that there are none of us who have come to any other conclusion but that a nuclear conflict would be unwinnable and would be a disaster of the utmost proportions for the world. We don't want to see it happen, but there are different ways to try and see that it doesn't happen.

I hope that the members opposite will treat the position that I have with respect just as I treat the position that they have as being a position that is sincerely held.

One approach, of course, to secure peace is by way of unilateral disarmament and pacifism. Of course, there are many people in the world who are pacifists. Some of my own colleagues of the Mennonite faith, their people were pacifists and are pacifists. In the Second War, most of them refrained from participating in that conflict in a violent way. Many of them served in other ways. That's an approach to securing peace.

I'm sure that when J.S. Woodsworth stood in the House of Commons and voted against Canada going to war against Nazi Germany, he was sincere in that view, but it would have been an absolute disaster for the world and for Canada if all the other Members of Parliament had followed J.S. Woodsworth's example and voted against going to war against the Nazis.

Another approach, of course, is to secure peace through strength. That's basically what has secured an uneasy peace for the last 40 years between NATO countries and countries of the Warsaw Pact. It has been secured because each side has feared the other. The world is full of examples of treachery about how one nation has turned on the other as a consequence of the weakness of the one, and the belief that the other could prevail.

We need look no further - and we should go back and remember today as we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany. We should

remember that in 1939 both Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union attacked Poland, because both of them thought that they were strong enough to attack that country and to divide it up and at the time, they had a Non-Aggression Pact. The Soviet Union signed a Non-Aggression Pact with Nazi Germany and when it came Hitler's turn and he thought that he could defeat the Soviet Union, then he turned against them.

So one doesn't need to look far for examples of treachery that can only be encouraged through weakness. So the position that Canada has taken has been to participate in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to maintain strong defences and Canada is part of that organization. We don't play the same role that some other countries do, but nevertheless we do play an important role and we have that commitment.

It's a concern to me to think that we might be expressing something here that is different from the position that our country takes and that we are going to express it because it happens to be convenient or opportune for us; convenient because of where we live in the shelter of our great neighbour to the south, and opportune because there is a very real and understandable desire amongst all people - not just young people - to be free of the threat of nuclear annihilation.

There are other members of our alliance that cannot adopt the type of resolution that the members opposite have proposed. Those countries of Western Europe that live with the threat of the Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc countries next door, are not able to take this kind of position. I'm sure that the people in Western Europe have no less desire for peace and no less of an abhorrence of the concept of nuclear war than we do here, yet they collectively, as countries, realize that they are best protected against that eventuality by continuing to have a strong defence.

New Zealand perhaps is an example of a country that also is somewhat removed, geographically, and perhaps they are able to take that kind of position of declaring themselves a Nuclear Free Weapons Area. At least they are a sovereign nation in making that declaration and not a province of a sovereign nation. I'm not going to comment any further on the advisability or the inadvisability of the action that they have taken, but to see Manitoba alone, a province of part of a sovereign nation protected by our NATO alliance, taking a position that our other allies in Western Europe could not afford to take, is something that causes me concern, Mr. Speaker.

I know that the members opposite like the concept of a Nuclear Free Zone. I like the concept of a Nuclear Free Zone as well. I would like the world to be a Nuclear Free Zone. Unfortunately it is not that simple, and when the members, in their resolution, make reference to treaties of Nuclear Free Zones in Antarctica and Outer Space and most of Latin America, the Sea-bed and the Ocean Floor, those aren't unilateral declarations. Those are agreements. Those are international agreements and just because the Government of Manitoba says that Manitoba is going to be a Nuclear Free Zone does not make it so, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that if the countries of the Western World, if it was possible for them to simply declare their nations

Nuclear Weapons Free Zones and be protected forever from the threat of nuclear attack, they would do it. But unfortunately it is not so, and the weakness of this resolution before us is that it holds out some false hope, especially to the young people of today; some false hope that this declaration will indeed somehow make them more safe. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it won't do that.

It may very well have the opposite effect by seeming to contribute to weakness on the part of Canada and our NATO allies, but nevertheless it's a position that the honourable members have put forward and I'm sure it's one in which they believe. I can't accept the reasoning that they use in putting that position forward.

Mr. Speaker, in the amendment that we have proposed, we make reference to the fact that the freedoms that we and the countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization enjoy were secure - not won on the battlefields of Europe - but secured once again on the battlefields of Europe when we fought, with our Soviet allies, against Nazi Germany after a period of time. But by way of passing, let's not forget either that for a period of time that Britain and the Commonwealth Countries and people such as the Polish Freedom Fighters and the Free French and others who fled from Nazi-dominated Europe stood alone against Nazi Germany, while they had a Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviet Union, and the United States was not yet into the conflict, because they had not been directly attacked.

When the members opposite speak of the position that Canada enjoys or did enjoy in the 1950s and the 1960s as the honest broker, they didn't get that reputation by simply being an honest broker. They won that reputation on the battlefield of Europe, in two wars. They won that reputation because they went to war against Nazi Germany, when many other countries were not prepared to. So it was a reputation that was well-deserved, but I believe that the members opposite should understand how the reputation was won.

The resolution and the amendment that we make, Mr. Speaker, makes reference to the fact that Canada has a continuing commitment to the defence of freedom through NATO. That is a policy of Canada. I'm not sure at the moment whether it is a policy of the New Democratic Party, nationally or not, but it is a policy of the Government of Canada and our resolution simply recognizes that.

We acknowledge, of course, that all Manitobans desire a lessening of world tension and a lifting of the threat of nuclear annihilation. All that we are proposing here is that we acknowledge that and that we do something that might have some impact, but will not mislead the people of the province - and again I say especially the young people - into thinking that somehow their declaration of Manitoba as a nuclear free zone is going to make them more secure. And so we are resolving that the Legislative Assembly communicate to both the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America the abhorrence that Manitobans have of the threat of nuclear war and that we tell them that we want them to redouble their efforts to bring about mutually verifiable reductions in nuclear arms.

Mr. Speaker, even if the Soviet Union and the United States both agreed tomorrow to eliminate all of their

nuclear weapons, that would make the world a less stable place than it is today, because what defence would you have against the Moammar Khadafys of the world who could get their hands on such a weapon. When we talk about and the members opposite talk about destabilizing effects, I think you have to look beyond the mirror of rhetoric and declaration and symbolism. What will really happen if we were able to achieve that tomorrow without involving the other nations of the world and without it being mutually verifiable?

I happen to believe that, abhorrent as the concept of nuclear war is, that the relative peace that we enjoy in the Western World, between the Western World and the Eastern Bloc countries is because of the force that both of them have. — (Interjection) — The Member for Inkster says, nonsense. One of my colleagues says that might be stupid. I don't say that necessarily. That's a position that he can hold. If he doesn't believe that, then that's his right not to believe it and he can have his own concept and his own theory about how the world works. I happen to believe it, because I have seen what happened in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, when those countries in the Eastern Bloc tried to move more towards freedom, I saw what happened.

I've seen what happened in the countries that were liberated by the United States, by Britain, Canada and members of the Commonwealth and how free those countries are today as opposed to the countries that were so-called liberated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and they didn't have the strength to defend themselves and they never have had since, so I happen to subscribe to that theory. The Member for Inkster doesn't. I respect his position because he has as much right to hold a differing position as I have.

I don't intend to go out on the hustings and attack his position and I hope that the Member for Inkster and the members opposite will not go out on the hustings and attack my position.

Maybe that's a signal, Mr. Speaker. I'm losing my voice here to be able to carry on. Let me just finish the comment that I was making because I don't think I'm going to get much farther. The Minister of Agriculture wants an explanation of the previous part of our amendment as to why certain parts of it were taken out. I'm not going to be able to cover that, Mr. Speaker, in the time that I have available and the voice that I have left. I'll leave that to someone else.

But I just wanted to say again that I think that this resolution that is before us is meaningful; it acknowledges the common position, the common abhorrence of the concept of nuclear war and it proposes something that can be done and that might have meaning and it doesn't trivialize the fear and the concern that people have; and it's put forward with the greatest of sincerity by the members on our side. I hope that the members opposite will give it serious consideration and that, as I say, they will respect the positions that individual members have on this side of the House just as I respect the positions that are sincerely held by the members on the opposite side.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is with a great deal of regret that I have watched the members of the opposition stand and speak against our resolution.

I had believed that this would attract the support of all people in this Legislature, but unfortunately that has not been the case. We have heard criticism such as how this is trivializing the peace movement. We've heard that it's a meaningless gesture for us to declare ourselves a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, and yet, Mr. Speaker, if you go around this city you will see houses everywhere with stickers on their windows that say, "This House is a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone." You'll see cars with stickers on them that say, "This is a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone." That's just as meaningless, but it's a statement by an individual. It's a statement which has been building and now it is repeated by municipalities all across Canada.

Sixty five - is it? - have now passed resolutions declaring their municipalities to be Nuclear Weapons Free Zones. This is a further step up the ladder; this is a province declaring itself a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. It may sound symbolic in the context of Canadian policy, but it is far from symbolic in the context of international policies.

We've heard about New Zealand having declared itself a nuclear weapons free nation and, yes it has. It attracted a great deal of attention for doing that, a lot of subdued rage in the United States over the effrontery of the New Zealanders to declare themselves a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, but they weren't the first nation to do that, Mr. Speaker. The first nation to declare itself a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone was the Republic of Palau - and I bet nobody here has ever heard of that country, because in essence it's not really independent. It's still pretty much under the thumbs of the United States.

The Republic of Palau, in its Constitution which it passed in 1979, entrenched by a 92 percent majority of its people, a clause which proclaims the island nation and its surrounding waters to be a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. This country, unfortunately, happens to be located about 500 miles east of the Philippines; the United States thinks that it has a strategic interest in this area. It wants to station nuclear submarines in Palau, and ever since that Constitution was passed in 1979, the United States has been worming its way in, subverting the Constitution from within.

In 1984, Congress appropriated \$439,000 for a voter education program. They wanted to have a referendum in Palau which would rescind the constitutional entrenchment of the Nuclear Weapons Free Zone - a \$439,000 education program in a country with a population of 15,000 - \$30 for every man, woman and child to educate them on the benefits of having U.S. nuclear weapons stationed on their soil.

If this is such a symbolic gesture, why is the United States so afraid of these things in the areas in which it has strategic interests? Why would the United States spend so much money to try and reverse a constitutional provision in an independent country, declaring that country to be a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone?

Mr. Speaker, this is hardly a symbolic resolution. It is showing leadership; it is taking us up in Canada through the rungs, up the ladder to the national level and, hopefully, the Federal Government will declare itself

officially to be a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, send the message to Washington so they can't have secret policies saying they're going to send nuclear weapons to Canada in the event of a war and just sort of neglect, overlook telling the Canadian Government that they're going to do that.

Let's make a positive statement here and now today to declare this province a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, to help to determine that Canada is a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, to show leadership through the world that we are against the nuclear build-up. Let's not try amending our resolutions, taking the initiative away from us when we make positive statements. Let's not try to amend the resolution to say you do something; you Ivan or Igor or whoever the Russian leader is next week, you do something to reduce your arms, or you Ronnie, you do something to reduce your arms. Let's make the statement, we don't want to participate in your mutual madness. That's what this resolution is.

The amendment changes the whole emphasis, the whole approach from a positive statement of what we want, what we think should happen in our area to what we think some nebulous power groups in other countries should be doing. That's not it at all. I would suggest it's not even an amendment which would be in order, because it speaks against the whole essence of our resolution, but it's there. It's been declared in order so we now debate the merits of it. The merits are obviously not the kind of position which we would want to support. I know the opposition would. The opposition has always taken the approach - I guess you would call it an individualist approach, as opposed to our collective approach. We see that the world is becoming increasingly complex and the world which we are creating, mankind is creating, is so complex that there's no longer room for an individualist approach in many areas. Nuclear warfare is certainly the most paramount example of the foolishness of even suggesting that there can be an individualist approach.

You know, we have survivalists running around digging bomb shelter, stocking up food and stockpiling guns and ammunition to fend off all the other people who might want to take advantage of their frugality, but it's foolish. They won't be there. When there's a nuclear war, there is no individualism, everybody's gone. It's either collective survival or collective death; that's the alternative.

We hear all about World War II and there was no possibility of total death in War World II. We weren't talking about the death of the race. The Member for Lakeside says collective survival on whose terms. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it matters. It does not really matter when you consider it's the survival of the race which is important.

We had the Middle Ages. There's been forward and backward progression in progress all through the ages. The barbarians overran Rome and we had a recession in civilization, but the race survived, and as long as the race survives there's the possibility of progress, there's the possibility and the promise of a better world to come, but if we're all dead, there's no promise, there's no possibility for any improvement.

Even if it means that Igor the great Russian can swoop around the world and conquer everybody and convert everybody to communism, it doesn't mean that two centuries, three centuries, 2,000, 3,000 years from

now we can't have the resurgence of human society on better terms than even today. If we all kill each other and say, well, that's it, I'm not going to be a Red, better dead than Red; if we kill everybody, there's never going to be a better world is there? You're not going to have any opportunities then, are you?

The individualist approach is dead. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is not only our declaration of independence, it's our declaration of interdependence. We must remain independent in our policies. We must remain independent of the United States, of Russia, of any other nuclear power. Yet, at the same time, we have to recognize that our interests are independent with the interests of everyone else on earth, whether they're Russians, Afghans, Nicaraguans, Cubans, Americans, it doesn't matter who. They still have a certain amount of common interest. That interest is survival and if we kill each other, it's all gone. There's no sense even talking about the issue if we're just going to go out tomorrow, push the button and eliminate earth. That's the issue.

That's why I support the resolution as it was originally introduced in this House. That's why I vote against the amendment which is proposed by the opposition. The opposition's amendment has nothing new to offer. I have no objection to them bringing that in as a separate resolution. I'll pass it. I mean there's nothing wrong with it as it stands, but I will not allow it to alter the intent of our resolution, which is a positive statement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I see time is running out. I don't want to discourage a vote on this before Private Members' Hour, but I would urge the opposition to come down from their partisan differences and support the future of humanity, rather than their own narrow interests in this issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, before you call the question, there may be a willingness to dispense with Private Members' Hour. I know there are other members certainly on this side who do wish to speak to the resolution. If we have leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour, Sir, I believe other members do wish to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to dispense with Private Members' Hour today? (Agreed).
Leave has been granted. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure for me to be able to add my few words to the debate on this particular topic.

Mr. Speaker, the comments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on this issue disturbed me somewhat. I think perhaps he misunderstands the motive and the motivation of members on this side of the House with respect to this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is a symbolism involved in any kind of human action, I suppose. It has a concreteness and it has its symbolism. This is a symbolic gesture.

It is a unique gesture across Canada by a Provincial Legislature. It's a symbolic gesture for other individual Manitobans, for individual Canadians, for our country and its current leadership. It has symbolic significance, I think, for other nations as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I find most regrettable is the fact that the opposition, for their own motives, and I don't suspect for a minute that they're pure motives, deemed it necessary to introduce an amendment. Mr. Speaker, I'm disquieted and I'm disturbed and I'm concerned, and I hope other Manitobans are concerned by the silence that's emanating from that side of the Chamber. It is an unhealthy silence, Mr. Speaker.

I know that the Member for Turtle Mountain spoke, Mr. Speaker, but despite his words, there was silence. There was no real sense of commitment either to the words of his Leader or to the meaning of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most disturbing part of the remarks from the Member for Turtle Mountain was the fact that much of his comment, and I don't doubt that it reflected accurately the history of some of the conflicts that have occurred over the last 100 years; his comments, particularly about the Second World War and how Canadians fought in that war.

Mr. Speaker, my father fought in that war. I respect his willingness to sacrifice as much as I respect anyone's willingness to sacrifice, to lay down their life if it is necessary, if it is a matter of fate, no one has denied that. No one has denied that's a tremendous sacrifice and no one has denied that it was necessary. On behalf of civilization, on behalf of democracy, it was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, what the member's comments lead me to conclude is that we still haven't come to grips with the real problem. A former general or lieutenant-general, lieutenant-colonel, who was the Commandant of the National Defence College of Kingston, talked about a path to peace. The Member for Inkster referred to some of these comments in his speech yesterday.

It was almost 30 years ago, Mr. Speaker, when Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell issued their famous manifesto, in which they implored us to remember our humanity and forget the rest; to recognize that nuclear weapons change everything but the way we think.

Mr. Speaker, the comments that I have heard from time to time from members opposite lead me to conclude that many people - and I don't say this is only indicative of the thinking of members opposite - but many individuals around the world have not yet changed the way they view the weaponry that exists and our attitude towards international conflict.

Mr. Speaker, if I could continue to read from this particular article:

"This was a call for cultural transformation for examination of the values and attitudes of the past and for rejection of those which now endanger the well-being of humankind or biological species.

"At the top of this list of this maladaptive values is the ancient Roman creed, 'Let him who desires peace prepare for war.'

"Despite millennia of evidence that preparation for war leads to the kind of war prepared for, this false creed now called 'Peace through Strength,' motivates those who determine our national security policies. Aggressive preparedness for war is the dictionary definition of militarism, and militarism is what we suffer from; militarism that calls itself deterrence and sacrifices every social value to military preparedness."

Mr. Speaker, the original resolution that was introduced talked about the cost. I don't think that the issue, the monetary issue of the cost of preparing for war, whether it be the cost to the United States or the cost to the Soviet Union, the cost is not the main issue.

Certainly there can be good arguments made for the fact that this money, the money that's going for preparedness for war could be put to better use. No one can deny that.

But the real issue is the survival of the species, and despite the fact that our forefathers and my father and some members in this Chamber fought for democracy and fought for peace, we're no longer talking about that kind of war.

So I don't think that we can use the same kind of sensibilities to interpret the modern defence policies that exist between our superpowers. We have to distance ourselves for the kinds of schemes, the kinds of rationale that world leaders - and those who advise them particularly - use to determine how our money is going to be spent for preparedness for war.

Mr. Speaker, this is a supremely important issue and I don't think that anyone in this Chamber wants to trivialize the issue. As the Member for River East suggested, I believe that I, personally, could support the motion or the amendment introduced by the Leader of the Opposition, if it was an independent motion. I don't think there is anything inherently wrong with that motion that we request that somebody else do something for ourselves, rather than we, as individuals, make a symbolic step, make a determination for ourselves that this is something worthwhile to do.

What the initial resolution was intended to do was to give individuals in this Chamber an opportunity to make that public declaration. Because, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for River East said and other members may have said, it is easy to ask someone else to do something for you. It's easy to ask when you know that your voice won't be heard by those other individuals or there is very little opportunity of that voice being heard. It's a lot more difficult to take a public stance, in a public way, and commit yourself to that particular action, and that's what the resolution called for.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can or we should renege on our responsibilities as political leaders to make that kind of commitment. Almost two years ago I took part in a peace march in Flin Flon, the first of its kind. I have also participated in peace marches in Winnipeg, and I believe that that kind of symbolism - and I don't know what else we can call it - also means that I am committed to something. And I would like to see members in this Chamber commit themselves to the idea that the symbolic gesture in proclaiming this a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, is worth the effort.

Not that it isn't worth the effort to do some of the things that the amendment suggested we do, but that that, in itself, that symbolism, is a significant enough gesture to create questions in the minds of other Canadian citizens, other Manitobans, and perhaps other nations.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the resolution or the amendment that was introduced asks anybody to do anything. I think it says to young people, we can't do anything, let's leave it to our friends. Let George do it. I don't think that that's good enough.

Mr. Speaker, while the Member for Turtle Mountain was upset at my impugning motives - and I did not

intentionally impugn his motives - but I still have some serious doubts about the motivation behind introducing a resolution which we agree is acceptable on its own independent terms, but which does not allow this Chamber to deal with the real issue on whether we're prepared to take a personal stand.

Mr. Speaker, I could speculate on why members opposite are reluctant to take that particular stand, and perhaps I'm going to be in error and perhaps individual members will stand up and say, yes, we could support declaring Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. Perhaps they will and I would certainly applaud that action.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is clearly a conflict; a conflict with what has been said and certainly by Canadian leaders on this issue; what has been said on this issue by previous leaders certainly of the members opposite, and that is that they view peace marches, they believe that these kinds of symbolic gestures are undertaken only by kooks.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the current Minister of Defence, or perhaps it was the previous Minister of Defence, was involved in seminars supporting the development, supporting the research and development of weaponry which has nuclear capability. As the Member for Thompson indicated, there were business seminars across the country touting the advantages of becoming involved in that kind of technology and that kind of research. I believe the previous Minister of Defence was quoted as saying that the peace movement was dead and, in effect, I suppose, encouraging its demise.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution that we have before us is very straightforward. No question that it is symbolic, but I think it's very straightforward. And I don't believe for a minute, as the Member for Turtle Mountain and perhaps others have suggested, that this is going to give young people of Manitoba a false sense of security.

Mr. Speaker, the young people of Manitoba are not that stupid. The young people of Manitoba know that nuclear weapons, if they are ever implemented, can mean the end of mankind, the end of the earth. They're aware of the eventuality. But what they want someone to do is take a stand. And, Mr. Speaker, no one in Manitoba before has taken a stand. The Government of Manitoba has not taken a stand. Mr. Speaker, we are taking a stand. We recognize that it is a symbolic gesture, but we think it's an important one to take. It's important to take it because no other province has taken it.

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't doubt that this action is going to lead to some other province bringing up the possibility of declaring themselves a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. I believe that you will see, once this resolution is passed and, certainly, if this resolution is passed in a unanimous way, other jurisdictions will be looking and saying, my God maybe we'll take a stand too.

Mr. Speaker, someone has to start it. Someone has to take a stand. To my knowledge, we are the first province in Canada who has decided that it's time to take a stand. The Member for Inkster and the Member for River East have indicated that other jurisdictions have taken a stand. I applaud them. I applaud their courage.

Mr. Speaker, there are always reasons, there are always ways to rationalize not taking a stand. There

are always excuses for those who are gutless, Mr. Speaker. I think that on the whole the young people of Manitoba, those who are interested in this matter, who are between the ages of 1 and 99 will applaud the gesture and who will feel better because the gesture has been made by their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Turtle Mountain talked about his own past and how he was five years old when the first nuclear weapons were exploded in the atmosphere. Mr. Speaker, I was approximately 11 or 12 years old when the Cuban missile crisis created fear and anxiety throughout the world. It's something that I recall and I was a little older at that time than the Member for Turtle Mountain. I did understand the implications and I did have nightmares and it did traumatize me. Mr. Speaker, the youth of today are traumatized. Mr. Speaker, they have - I forget what the exact psychological term is but it's something like free-floating anxiety - about the issue of nuclear war. They don't know how to pin it down. There's nothing that they can say yes, do this and that will make the difference. It isn't that simple of an issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the young people of Manitoba who see and hear what is going on in this Chamber will applaud it because they'll say well at least someone's trying to take a stand. They're not kidding themselves and I don't think that we're kidding ourselves that this will have a cataclysmic effect on the attitude of other nations, on the attitudes of the superpowers who are the main principals in this horrendous game. I believe that it will signal other leaders who will signal perhaps other nations that it's time we took a stand.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, a unanimous approval of this resolution will signal to Manitobans, to other Canadians a disapproval of our participation in Star Wars; certainly it will signal our disapproval of the arms race in general; certainly it will signal our disapproval of the half-hearted efforts of the superpowers, and I include them all, in arms limitations and arms reduction talks.

Mr. Speaker, this small step that we as a Legislature have the opportunity to take can have real significance. Whether the members opposite like to acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker, I think that the small step that has been taken by countries such as New Zealand has had an impact. They have gained a world-wide recognition for their stance. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this kind of symbolism that is inherent in a gesture of this kind has to be begun and if it can be done with sincerity, if it can be done with unanimity, I think its impact will be felt for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should be supporting the resolution as it was originally introduced. I believe that we should be declaring Manitoba a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. I believe that we should be doing that in the interests of our responsibility as leaders, in our capacity as parents, as citizens of Manitoba and as citizens of the world.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm prompted to make some comments on the amended resolution before us, largely because

of the comments put on the record by my colleague, the Member for River East.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, from his words, the significance of today, V-E Day, has totally passed my friend from River East by in the sense that what we were doing then, what our fathers and what the free nations of the world then were doing was making a conscious decision not to subject themselves to a totalitarian regime of particular evil character.

My friend and colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain put on the record the very difficult personal position that people of pacifist convictions have when faced with very serious moral questions like that.

More interestingly, the Member for River East indicated that today he is totally pessimistic about being able to have our relatively, certainly not problem-free, but open and free society sustain itself and to accept what often happens and what's been demonstrated over so many years of our history - the situation as described by the Member for Turtle Mountain - when weakness encourages treachery.

Now, that's a point of view, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for River East expressed. I happen to believe that's a point of view that's held by many . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, lest the Member for Lakeside misrepresent my position, Mr. Speaker, I'm not pessimistic at all. That's why I am here.

MR. SPEAKER: That was a clarification, not a point of order.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member put forward his view as best I understood, that unilateral setting aside of arms is one of the few ways - perhaps the only way - of assuring us from the destruction of our species. I thought I understood him to make that plea, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the nature of the weapons we are now in possession of that we no longer have the choice of even fighting wars as horrible as they were in the World War II situation. That's what he was saying, so that we should be pessimistic from that point of view of acknowledging that we cannot stop an aggressor nation - and I'll leave members opposite to describe it; I describe it as totalitarian and I describe it as evil. But acknowledging that, we should set aside our defences and expose ourselves to what history has demonstrated time and time again the consequences of doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I am an optimist. I happen to feel that, given time, our group of open, relatively free societies can prevail and that perhaps one of our greatest strengths is - that's really what we should be addressing ourselves to in this Chamber, in this land, all our western nations, in demonstrating that in our kind of society that, economically, we can do so much more for our people, for all mankind. Mr. Speaker, surprisingly, we're gaining in that sense.

As the economic conditions of the East Bloc nations continues to stand still, stagnate virtually, despite the difficulties that we've come through, the truth of the

matter is that more and more people, including people in the East Bloc are recognizing that they have to bring about major changes of attitude, introduce economic freedoms into their systems, to begin to provide their citizens with the services, goods and material wealth that we so often take for granted in the West.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps nothing more dramatic is happening today than what is happening in China; and I can recall being extremely frightened, concerned, when at the height of U.S. and Sino hostilities, shortly after and during the Korean War, I can remember watching documentaries where Chinese children in kindergarten classes were taught with dummy guns, with wooden toy guns to kill the imperialist Yankee and I saw thousands of them being trained that way and I had great difficulty in expressing optimism at that time.

Mr. Speaker, what has happened - and that to me is very encouraging. What has happened was enlightened leadership, communist be it, enlightened leadership, the recognition that the massive problems of feeding the world's most populated nation of 800 million or close to a billion people, could not be resolved on the ideological path that they are on. Today I'm told there are thousands of new businesses being formed a month in China.

To the detriment of our Western grain farmer, we now all of a sudden have the situation where, in China this year, the Chinese farmer is planting six million acres less wheat because they are approaching - in fact, on a net situation, they are food exporters. So, Mr. Speaker, to me those are signs of hope.

Mr. Speaker, I read into the tense situations in Poland, signs of hope. What little organized labour they can have there recognizes that there need to be fundamental shakeups, economically speaking. Those few countries that have a little bit of elbow room, Hungary being one of them, in the Eastern Bloc nations, that provides for some of that economic freedom, and Rumania, enjoy a considerably higher standard of living than the USSR, for instance, where such freedom is still tightly controlled.

Mr. Speaker, I have hopes; I have considerable hopes that under the new leadership of Mr. Gorbachev who represents for the first time at least another generation rather than the old guard, that he will come to his senses and realize and respond to the pressures of that great nation, that more and more into arms production, more and more into maintaining a bloated military, that some of those resources will have to be directed to consumer goods to begin to create the kind of society that they want.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will come to that in a minute, to do that. On the other hand, I've never heard an American President say or covet other people's, other nations property and land. . . .

A MEMBER: What?

MR. H. ENNS: I've never heard that. American troops that liberated all of North Africa, Algeria, Sudan, Morocco, they have all gone home. Mr. Speaker, American troops that liberated France are home and

when the French Government, de Gaulle, asked them, because they didn't even want their involvement in NATO, they went home; and if the European countries want the last American soldier to go home, they'll go home, Mr. Speaker, unlike what my friends opposite want to do.

Mr. Speaker, I'm being diverted. The issue is, surely what is needed is to carry on without giving up the hope of maintaining our free and open society, with allowing our system, economically speaking, to prevail and allowing its adoption by more countries that currently have not had the opportunity to practise it. Forty years of peace, as nervous as it is, has prevailed by the status quo.

My friend from River East asks, what is Korea? Korea was exactly a demonstration of what the then Premier Krushchev demonstrated in front of all the nations of the world at the United Nations, when, to demonstrate his case, took his shoe off and said, we will bury you. We will defeat capitalism and we will conquer capitalism and North Korea was a prime example of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recall, the Member for River East said, and he said so, he is prepared - and I must give him credit. He says he's not saying that the communist system would prevail forever. He said maybe only two or three centuries, but far better red than dead is what he is saying. That is what he is saying and that's what — (Interjection) — Well he said it. He put it on the record, Mr. Speaker. He said, "Far better red than dead."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . that is a choice that we don't have to make, Mr. Speaker. It's just that simple.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Yes, the Member for Lakeside is, once again, misrepresenting what I said. I specifically said that there are many people who think better dead than red. I did not say better red than dead. Perhaps you can get those words in order. What many people think is better dead than red. I did not say better red than dead.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I did not predict that communism would last two or three centuries. I said perhaps, maybe. But let's get the record straight.

Perhaps the member would like to adjourn the House and he could continue tomorrow when he's had a chance to read Hansard.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, okay, I accept that. He said perhaps communism will rule for two or three centuries. I accept that. He didn't say he predicted; he said perhaps. But, Mr. Speaker, it certainly indicates to me and to all reasonable people that in his mind, faced with the awesomeness of nuclear destruction,

that that is acceptable. I don't think I'm being unfair to my friend. That is acceptable to him; it's certainly acceptable to the Member for Inkster.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I am simply saying is that it's understood that nobody wants a nuclear war. Mr. Speaker, it should also be understood, except by those who wish to show fear and hate, that the west will never strike first. It is a cardinal part of the terms and conditions of the NATO Alliance, and, Mr. Speaker, if on occasion general muses or mutters about whether or not if we could strike first with these weapons or what effect this kind of weaponry would have in a first-strike situation, that should never be confused with government policy.

The truth of the matter is, there is no possible way that the democracies would strike first. Again let's look at history and let's look at particular American history, Mr. Speaker. As Britain was standing alone and in need, the Americans were not prepared to enter into a war on foreign soil. It was only when they were attacked that they came into the war. The same thing in the First World War, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that cannot be said about our adversary, the USSR. They have, through their surrogates, demonstrated all too often their willingness to strike first. Mr. Speaker, what their resolution could encourage - whether it does it or not - but it certainly could encourage to invite what weakness has always invited, a certain amount of domination. To what extent, I would not care to speculate.

What our amendment encourages, Mr. Speaker, is to acknowledge the utter horror of nuclear war and then specifically directs it to the particular spot, the focus of where the adversaries - if you want to call them that - where the two superpower nations are talking together to begin the gradual count-down where we reduce our dependency on that kind of defence weaponry.

Mr. Speaker, surely our lifestyles, surely our free and open societies are worthwhile safeguarding. Mr. Speaker, if it takes 20 years, 30 years, 40 years, we can buy another 40 years under the current arrangement. I believe the world will be far better served in the sense that technology, hopefully ideology, as expressed by free men and women of this world will also prevail.

I, for one, am not prepared, not for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to take the chance of setting aside unilaterally our defences, of walking away from the obligations that we, as a country, along with all other free nations of the world - or a goodly number of them - have accepted in the defence of our system.

I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that technology could well render nuclear weaponry in the future obsolete, or at least their deployment. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, there we hear the voice of the pessimists again. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is every reason to be encouraged in the strategic defence initiative that the Americans are currently considering.

The idea that missiles could be rendered impotent before they even leave their silos, the concept of not putting more weapons into space, but clearing the space of any weaponry. The concept that would clearly make it totally suicidal to press any button, anywhere, if a laser beam zapped that weapon in your own silo, in your own backyard, it would certainly make nuclear

arms, as we now know them, obsolete, a distinct possibility.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is that the free world be given an opportunity to have more countries currently in the Eastern Bloc and outside of it, such as China, begin to learn and appreciate the economic value of a free or open system. My concern is for the millions of men and women, people that the Member from Point Douglas, Father Malinowski, not so long ago spoke about. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I should not be naming him by name. I don't recall whether it was in the Throne Speech or in the Budget Speech when he listed off the 50 or 60 or 80 or 100 millions of people that are currently in bondage of some kind as a result of the suppression that they are living under as exercised by the USSR.

Mr. Speaker, I believe with optimism that if we hold to our points of view that our way will prevail. I certainly accept the responsibility that we have an obligation to the rest of mankind to allow our way to prevail with all its imperfections and with all its difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I view the resolution, currently amended, before us as the one that is a legitimate expression coming from a Chamber such as this. It's not hollow; it is in concert with what our Federal Government policy position is; it's in concert with what our allies position is. Mr. Speaker, if allowed to be explained properly, I'm totally convinced it is in concert with the vast majority of Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the amendment and the original resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the chance to address an issue of deep concern to both sides of the House. I've been sitting here touched and disturbed, because I guess it's an issue that I've wrestled with for longer years than most here - not quite as many as a few - and it's an issue where I guess an older person bridges more of the opinion eras, if you like, and can well remember. I can well remember thinking very much as I hear some of the members on the other side thinking. I can also recall - sometimes with pleasure and sometimes with pain - the arguments, the information, the debates that made me shift my position to a new position.

I agree with members opposite that a debate of this sort should be conducted with great mutual respect. I personally do believe that what we do have consensus on, on both sides of the House, indeed in almost 100 percent of society today, is an absolute abhorrence of nuclear war and its possibility or probability.

I do think what we must discuss and we must discuss in some kind of environment where we hear one another and don't too easily yield to the quick quip or insult or putdown. We need to hear why another thinks the way they do and why they approach the question of peace the way they do, because if we aren't able to do it here in this House with no immediate threat to our well being and without any particular immediate action hanging on our decisions, how on earth do we expect people that we send to negotiate and to make the decisions about military policy and about diplomatic policy and about international economic policy to hear one another and work out peaceful solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it's a matter of guts. I guess I differ a little from some of my own colleagues on that. I don't think it's a question of that at all. I think it's a question of perception, of how one thinks the international system works, of what the logic of militarism and military conflict is in today's society, of what the real choices are that are available to us. I support both resolutions, Mr. Speaker. I don't think they are contradictory. I don't think they work in contradiction to one another. I will vote against the amendment if it displaces the government resolution, because I think the government resolution is an important resolution to be passed, but I would welcome the amended form to be presented as a separate resolution initiated by the opposition and I can tell them now that I would vote for that.

I think both represent a legitimate approach to the problem. It is true that we have to carry on negotiations on disarmament. It is also true that the key powers that must carry on those negotiations are the U.S. and the USSR because they have the biggest arsenals and they have the greatest decision-making power relating to the maintenance of those arsenals and in the development of yet new more horrible ones.

It's also true that negotiation is going to be protracted. It's almost so difficult and complex as anyone who watched the CBC series that was on just before the last Geneva talks opened up, demonstrated it's almost impossibly complicated because it's not simply a matter of numbers, it's also a matter of which weapons are more modern, although they look as though they're a single weapon. In fact, they're made up of multiple warheads. It's a question of how on earth you can ever get to the degree of madness that we've currently arrived at in our buildup of weapons, because it is a state of madness. It's a state of preparedness for overkill that goes so beyond our normal way of thinking and imagining that it cries out for a new type of logic.

I was older than some, younger than others, when the atom bombs were dropped. I can remember the unreality I felt when I heard that news. I was actually reading a Big Little Book that was talking about U-2 35 and espionage in the low countries and how the Germans were developing this and were we going to get the secret in time or who was going to win, and I saw the world then as evil on the other side and good on our side and that the only way to survive was to have a bigger, better weapon that you launched faster and looked after our guys and controlled and put down the other guys and somehow won the battle and settled down to peace; and it was the way we all thought then.

We all thought the atom bomb was a bigger, better bomb that was going to bring peace more quickly and keep us from losing, not only more of our people, but many civilians in Japan, Germany and Britain as well.

But I was of an age, I was very interested in physics, in nuclear physics and of course it was a fairly young science then, but a very exciting one, and over the years I spent a lot of time reading and trying to understand just what had been unleashed and learnt about the tremendous power that we were learning to unlock, and that was in the infancy of the new weaponry. That was when we were just dealing with little atom bombs, before we had hydrogen bombs, before we had intercontinental ballistic missiles, before we had all these multiple warheads and now this new Star Wars family and multiple subdivisions of all of those weapons.

I think the thing that touched me the most and made me keep hunting for some answers was the genetic issue, that all of a sudden we weren't only dealing with more dynamite, more explosive power. I grew up in a mining town; I learned to live with explosions, TNT. It was always around and we just got used to thinking of explosions as rather useful; but when I heard of the scope, of just the straight power of these new weapons, that was one thing, but when I heard about the genetic aftermath, that was another, and that was in the very early days. Since then, the aftermath of any kind of military conflict is so devastating to the total environment very few would even have a chance to discover genetic damage. We're into destruction of the very ecology of the world we live in.

We're really into an era when there needs to be some fresh logic. What is that fresh logic? I think it is recognizing that you reach a certain stage in buildup, in balance, and I think we all learned about collective security and that you couldn't sit back and do nothing. You had to arm to a certain extent so the other side wouldn't miscalculate, think you were weak and invade; and I think we all bought that it was a reasonable approach to military buildup.

But as we developed that principle and we got into this buildup of enormously powerful and destructive weaponry, those concepts ceased to make any sense decades ago. They ceased to make any sense because there was to be no winner in any war. The questions of deterrence and balance, of being a little superior so the guy would be afraid of you and not come after you, forgetting of course that he was sitting on the other side of the table afraid of you and trying to get to a superior position and you had the escalation.

Gradually, over time, people did arrive at the notion of balance rather than superiority, but then the question of how much risk you dare take in the balance started to come in and no one wanted to take the risk first because somehow that was seen as having no guts or exposing yourself to weakness or letting totalitarianism take over, all the fears which are real fears; and I respect the fact that people honestly present them, but I just lost any faith in those arguments because it seemed to me what we were dealing with was, once you got to a certain point, it didn't matter whether you had more or less. You had so much power to destroy yourselves and the others, even if some of it could be destroyed before you had a chance to get your button pressed and get your weapons launched. There was so much room for error and the weapons were so spread around that really there was no deterrent, there was no pre-emptive strike possible, there was no prevention.

So the question of risk taking in unilateral positions, I think, changed. Now that's about what's going on up there at the negotiation table and I'm all for a lot of support for that and unending patience. It's better to be talking even if we're arguing and going in circles and not appearing to get anywhere. But it seems to me there's two other levels we have to address. One is that governments, in time, don't just tell people what to think or lead them. Governments are also persuaded by what people think and by what people want governments to do and that's the importance of the bottom up thrust, the education of people in some of the basic approaches to peace.

The Member for Flin Flon presented the issue very well. We have some obligation to our children to say

there is some hope and that no one of us alone can do a lot, but if we band together, we may be able to do something. Stating our position on a nuclear free zone is one small statement. I think it's one we should all be prepared to make and then to look at the consequences and start planning what we can do there.

The other level where I think we have to keep taking action is one that the logic of whether you look from the bottom up and small action first, or whether you look from the top down in international politics and diplomacy. It seems to me whichever way you come at it, you come to the economic problems that people face.

When you go into the history of wars, there are always the political ideas and there are the variations from time to time, the particular leaders, but common threads running through nearly every war and the causes leading up to wars and the failure or success in winning the peace, has to do with the economic relationships, and whether the various nations or parties are so indifferent to the basic needs of the people they've defeated that they become punitive and cut them off from a legitimate opportunity to build their own security, and feed themselves and house themselves, and do all those things which we so often take for granted, or whether you try to be punitive and cut them off from markets, cut them off from natural role in the international world of trade and economy.

It seems to me that what we're being faced with, if we could, I suppose, afford to do expensive deterrent systems which we feel we're never going to use and they're just going to sort of add to the deterrence and the balance; if we could afford to do that and all the economic development that the world cries out for as well, maybe it wouldn't be which choice we made.

I think what we've been seeing in the last decades throughout the world, but particularly in North America and Europe and probably in the USSR as well, is such a tremendous diversion of our human resources, of our money, of our skills, of our technology to building up the armaments that we have neglected the very path that may in the long run create the lasting peace and that is building on the very often insignificant homely little projects and economic development issues that are available for us no matter where we live in this world.

In Manitoba we cannot, of course, influence the entire world. That doesn't mean that we can't state and act on what we think are sane principles for how the world can develop, and consciously choose in developing our economy to keep away from contributing - although I know we're all part of an interdependent world and there's no purity in this world - but wherever we have choice to keep away from contributing to the build-up of weaponry and to promote, in people's thinking and their understanding, new alternatives for how we learn to live together.

The old day of "might is right" is no longer effective; the old day that might can somehow deter the inappropriate use of force, I think has to be questioned again and again. While we're working through at the diplomatic level some kind of better confidence so that we can achieve disarmament - real disarmament as the opposition's amendment suggests, and which I fully support - until we do that we have to not stop building sound economies, fair societies, people who think in

different modes, so that we have the basis for lasting peace coming from the bottom up, through the people, and throughout our society.

I think, therefore, that the resolution and the amendment are worth supporting, but because of the mechanics of voting here, I will vote against the amendment and for the government resolution when the vote comes up, but I urge the opposition to table their amendment as an independent resolution after we have completed the initial voting.

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

MR. B. CORRIN: Yes, I would ask . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The debate will stand in the honourable member's name.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: Mr. Speaker, I have some committee changes . . . (inaudible) . . . Committee of Economic Development, the Member for Ste. Rose substituting for the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. SPEAKER: The time of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Thursday).