



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 83A - 2:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 7 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 7 June, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

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

I move, seconded by the Member for St. Johns, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Manitoba Municipal Employees Benefit Fund Sixth Annual Report for the year ended December 31, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce today that the Advisory Committee of the Maternal and Child Health Directorate of my department has been directed to prepare specific recommendations for the introduction of a comprehensive counselling and information program on family planning. This program is to be available to all Manitobans and will focus on the provision of: Education, Information, Counselling, and Medical Services.

The Advisory Committee of the Maternal and Child Health Directorate will be reviewing a family planning report shortly and will prepare recommendations for proposed action. The primary aim of the family planning program will be to promote individual responsibility regarding conception, contraception, as well as child care and development.

The issue of abortion is one that will be addressed in this program. Under the Criminal Code of Canada, physicians on hospital therapeutic abortion committees make the decision to provide abortion services based on the perceived risk to the health of the mother. The government has the responsibility to ensure that safe therapeutic abortion services are in place for women who are deemed eligible for this service.

I must acknowledge the need to provide for therapeutic abortions as defined by the Criminal Code

of Canada. Without expanded facilities, some women will continue to seek therapeutic abortions outside the province. I have instructed the Manitoba Health Services Commission to provide the capacity of Manitoba facilities to perform safe, therapeutic, legal abortions as required by federal law.

I am convinced that the family planning program which is being developed will meet many maternal and child health needs, including the reduction in the number of women who are seeking therapeutic abortions outside the province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for his statement and assure him that it will be studied very carefully by my colleagues, and me, on this side of the House. I would assume that reference, in large part, to child and maternal health initiatives and family planning initiatives emanate from announcements made earlier by the Minister in that respect. He indicated at the time that he was looking at the consolidation of obstetrical units; that one of the primary objectives was to free up money to finance greater initiatives in the area of child and maternal health.

The question on the rationalization of obstetrical units still remains unresolved, of course. One follows developments in that area very keenly, in view of the anxieties that have been expressed by individual citizens and by medical staff in two of the areas of this city that would be most directly affected. Insofar as the references to expanded therapeutic abortion facilities are concerned, I would only raise the point, at this juncture, Mr. Speaker, that it must be acknowledged that whatever we do here, the law of the land must not be held up to disrepute. The law of the land must be held high for the respect of the people of Manitoba, and the people of Canada generally, and whatever decisions are taken by the Minister and the government in the next few weeks with respect to therapeutic abortions and the availability of them in Manitoba must be made in that context.

We welcome any initiatives to expand family planning educational capability in the province, and public health in the maternal and child health and family planning fields generally, but there is an issue at hand that has to be resolved now with respect to the Criminal Code of Canada and the respect that people have for the law of the land. I don't think this initiative should be allowed in any way to detract from the government's responsibilities in that area.

While welcoming this statement, we still await some resolution by the Minister and by the government in the immediate future of a situation that is causing the law of the land at the present time to be held up to disrespect.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Press release - election financing

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. Yesterday he distributed a press release to members of the House with respect to the new Election Finances Act which he has introduced into this House, which will provide for public support from the taxpayers of Manitoba for candidates and registered political parties involving some 50 percent of the expenditures that the candidates and parties respectively incur.

My question to the Attorney-General is this, Mr. Speaker: Based on the records of the 1981 election, which are readily available to the Attorney-General, what is his estimate, based on those records, of the cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba if this bill were in effect for the 1981 election campaign?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I will be introducing the bill for second reading. I think it appears on the Order Paper tomorrow, in which case I'll be introducing it tomorrow, and at that time in my introductory notes I'll deal with that question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has, despite the traditions of this House, distributed a press release to members of this House in the news media yesterday before having introduced the bill for second reading. I'm asking a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: The point being made by the Honourable Member for St. Norbert was discussed as a point of order and ruled on by yourself. I don't know why it's being raised again.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has distributed a press release yesterday. On the basis of that press release, we have some questions for him. He has chosen to make this information available to everyone and we would like to ask a question on the basis of the press release that he has issued, and we shouldn't have to wait until he introduces the bill on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member for St. Norbert restrict his remarks to a question without making too long a statement in advance.

MR. G. MERCIER: Would the Attorney-General advise this House of the estimated costs of The Elections

Financing Act, if it were in effect for the 1981 election campaign, on the basis of the records which he has readily available to him and no doubt which they, I would hope, would have looked at and would have used as a basis for the introduction of this bill?

HON. R. PENNER: As I have indicated, and I will put it more explicitly, because apparently it has to be put more explicitly, I am taking that question as notice and, in my introduction of the bill on second reading, I will deal with those kinds of questions and many others.

MR. G. MERCIER: I have a supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. My question to him, Mr. Speaker, is: Why is it considered right for the government, and the Minister of Agriculture, to do away with the compulsory checkoff for beef producers, even though they have the right to apply for a refund of their contributions and, at the same time, to impose upon the taxpayers of Manitoba a compulsory checkoff to support the New Democratic Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that question deserves a reply. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know, since he was in government and it was his administration that did not accept the will of the producers which was made in the mid-'70s about the compulsory funding of an organization, which was subsequently brought in by his administration. We have had representations made to us and, as well, we oppose those provisions when the bill came into place.

Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture, as well. Could the Minister confirm that the Manitoba Hog Commission has rejected and turned down many Manitoba hog producers that have applied under the Manitoba Hog Income Stabilization Plan?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that. In fact, anyone wishing to join the plan may do so, but certainly there was a deadline, in terms of the initial application, where there would be full coverage from Day One. There were producers who did not join the plan before the deadline that was put into place on the advice of the Hog Committee and the Producers Board, had a period of phase-in in them, and they would have to follow those rules that were established by that board. Certainly, no one is prevented from joining the plan at any point in time but, as I've indicated earlier, there are different rules for those who applied at a later date because there is a phase-in period.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the same Minister then, I'd like to maybe put a correction in there for him. Many small hog producers that are on a contract basis have been refused - and I'll table a letter if the Minister wants,

to indicate exactly what has happened. Can the Minister confirm that many of these small farmers who have been rejected under the plan are people who do not have the financial resources to establish their own operations and, as a result, will have to possibly go out of business?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that approximately 75 percent of the hog production in Manitoba, or approximately 1,000 producers, raising approximately 850,000 hogs in the province, are presently enrolled in the program. I will take the specifics of the question as notice, but I do believe that one of the requirements that the committee in its recommendations made, which is similar to that which was in place prior - but I will check it - was that the hog production must be owned by the producer raising those hogs; that, in fact, if hogs are owned by other than the producer, they would not be eligible for insurance under the program.

Press release - election financing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can he advise the House whether or not the press release dated June 6th and distributed in the House yesterday entitled, "Election Finances Bill Before the House" - can he advise whether or not that was distributed publicly?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that . . . The Attorney-General indicates, no.

Natural Resources deficit - 1982-83

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Natural Resources who was there a minute ago, I thought.

A MEMBER: Here today, gone tomorrow.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'll direct the question to the Minister of Finance, in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister of Finance advise what he now expects the approximate deficit to be for fiscal 1982-83?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: No, Mr. Speaker.

Winterkill - alfalfa

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I quote directly from his latest information bulletin released by the Department of Agriculture which indicates that many

Manitoba livestock producers may be searching for emergency hay and pasture supplies this summer following reports of extensive winterkill to alfalfa in many areas of the province. My question to the Minister is, what is he doing about it; are he and his department considering any emergency program to put into place to offset the loss of supplies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know that that question was posed by the Honourable Member for Emerson, and the Honourable Member for Arthur raised similar questions earlier, where we have indicated, initially, to producers while, at this point in time, we have not finalized our total assessment of the province, in terms of the losses . . . Mr. Speaker, while there have been areas in the province where there has been severe damage, we have advised farmers that there is an opportunity to put in greenfeed, in terms of allowing for greenfeed availability for producers; as well, the opportunity to seed grass with the greenfeed; as well, crop insurance has insured between 400 and 500 farmers and crop insurance is in the process of adjusting.

Once we have the full report on this whole situation, we will be determining the full extent and the nature as to what kind of additional programming might be necessary; but certainly one of the encouragements and advice that we are providing producers is to, at this point in time, early enough in the spring, to make sure that greenfeed programs and additional crops are put in to supplement any shortages of feed that they may not have for their livestock.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I just indicate to the Honourable Minister, the last time the livestock producers faced a similar situation, in 1980, the then government and the then Minister acted in time to put a very successful Greenfeed Program in place. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is, his own department says that it is extremely important, the first thing to do is to get an annual forage crop into the ground to replace the feed lost. His department is aware of what is going on, and the time is short, the time has to be now when seed can still be put in the ground in time for an effective program. Is the Minister considering the program? A simple answer, Mr. Speaker.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that at the time they were moved into assistance for the livestock industry, there was no support program as far as income for livestock producers. We certainly have not ruled out that there should be a program for greenfeed at this time for feed, but certainly there's ample time now during the seeding time for farmers to make some individual decisions to supplement their feeding requirements at this point in time.

We have not, as I've indicated before, had all the final assessments made. Because of the late spring, there are many many crops which were deemed, at least indicated at first instance would not be coming up, are now coming up in terms of the tame forage,

and assessments are being made by individual ag reps. We expect, within the next week, that assessment will be completed and we'll be in a better position to decide whether or not an emergency program would be required.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I regret to hear that there will be likely no program in place.

Fee increases in Agriculture

Some time ago, a long time ago as a matter of fact, I asked this Minister a question about inordinate increases in charges and fees that the department was levying for various services to fowl producers, turkey and breeding stock on chickens, egg testing, etc. He undertook at that time to look into the matter. These were extremely high increases for one year. I forget the amount; 50-60 percent increases for certain fees. I know the Honourable Minister was aware of it; he indicated that he was checking it at that time. Has the Minister looked into those fees as to whether or not they are, in fact, justified?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, that question is a fairly detailed question because what it reflects was the additional charges made by the Vet Services Lab dealing with ascensions on poultry versus livestock, and what was not reflected in the charge, or to the individuals, was the further consultation and an assessment made by the veterinarians.

I want to say to the honourable member that in terms of the costs of that program, we have reviewed the changes that were made by the Vet Services Lab and we have determined that those fees, in fact, because of the way that they were brought forward in dollar terms, they amounted to, I believe, \$10 per test increase, which was approximately a 75 percent or greater increase.

We have reviewed that situation and have indicated that there will be an increase as a result of changes, but not the magnitude that was originally put into place by the Vet Services Lab.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, really, this Minister who is perpetuating a 25 to 58 percent increase on Crown leases to the cattlemen, not providing any program, subjecting the poultry and turkey producers to a 75 percent increase, is the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.
The Honourable Attorney-General on a point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: The Member for Lakeside has launched, with wings outspread, into a flight of rhetoric and oratory that has nothing to do with question period. It doesn't purport to be and, indeed, it clearly is not a preamble to a question, and I would ask that you rule with respect to the nature of a preamble to a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member has a question, would he please place it?

MR. H. ENNS: I'll ask a question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Agriculture answer whether or not he

is satisfied with commodity prices staying where they are in beef, in poultry, in eggs; that his imposition of charges of upwards to 50 percent to 75 percent increases are in fact justifiable as Minister of Agriculture for the Province of Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member gives those kinds of percentages, what he doesn't say, that the follow-up and the hours of time spent in the work and the charges that are made are but a small portion of the costs incurred.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should understand that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member has a further question, he can rise in his place and I will attempt to answer it. The honourable member well knows that in terms of the beef industry, there is a price support program which covers far beyond the costs of land in the support program, and producers certainly are open, it's open to them to join the support program. Insofar as the other commodities, they are in a nationally regulated price situation and there's no doubt that the returns of producers reflect the prices of their costs.

With respect to the services provided in the Department of Agriculture, there's no doubt that the dollar amounts charged are but a small portion of the costs incurred and we will continue to keep that relationship, but surely, in terms of the work provided and the follow-up of veterinarians and the diagnostic work provided by the lab, the costs certainly are not out of line in dollar terms, which amount to \$15 per work on half a dozen birds. As in the case of the poultry industry, the new charge is \$15 for the ascensions and the like, which is certainly not out of line of any of the charges that would be paid anywhere in this country or in this province and far less than they would be, taken to any private lab.

Campgrounds - Northwestern Ontario

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Has the Minister of Natural Resources made any representation to his colleague and his counterpart in Ontario concerning the restrictions that are allegedly going to be placed upon Manitobans in their use of campgrounds in Northwestern Ontario?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: No, Mr. Speaker.

Staff cutback in campground facilities

While I have an opportunity, I would also like to take that to answer a question that was put by the Member for Swan River on May 27th in respect to concerns

about a cutback in staffing for campground facilities. I indicated that I would take the question as notice. I didn't believe that there had been any cutback per se. I thought we had been required to trim our budget very effectively, but I must admit that I am advised that there was, in fact, a cutback in services at Overflowing River Provincial Recreation Park, and I confirm that the honourable member was right in respect to that.

However, the facts are that the camping facility in the park cost \$11,898 to operate in 1982, while the revenue was only \$3,640.00. While the 24 camping sites are closed, the day-use area continues to be operated at a reduced service, recognizing that only 10 percent of the users in 1982 were campers. There were 8,000 vehicle entries with only 734 permits sold.

There are alternative camping facilities along Highway No. 10 that are available; 90 kilometres south, there's the Birch River campground where there are 20 sites, self-registration camping. There are alternative facilities in the Porcupine Forest of interest to local residents; including Steep Rock Lake, which is 37 kilometres northwest of Birch River, where there are eight seasonal and 18 transient campsites. At Whitefish Lake, 27 kilometres west of Bowsman, there are 25 transient campsites.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are waysides at Mafeking, that is 50 kilometres south, and Red Deer River, 35 kilometres south, where overnight camping capability for travellers is available. The reduction in service was the only other solution, as the option of uncontrolled camping was not proceeded with due to rowdiness and vandalism.

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

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise two points on a point of order. One is that the Minister was asked a question and gained the floor by way of responding to that question, and then proceeded to use that opportunity to launch off into a lengthy answer which had nothing to do with the question which I placed to him. In addition to that, Sir, which I would not normally object to if he was giving a brief response, his response has clearly been of a detailed nature, and it's been the practice of this House that detailed answers to questions asked previously should be given in writing and distributed to the House.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd almost completed my answer despite the noise I was hearing from opposite. It was an answer to a question that was properly made by one of the colleagues of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. It deserved an answer and I thought I would give it a full answer. He objects apparently, Mr. Speaker, to my giving an answer to one of his colleague's questions. I had the floor and I wanted to make sure that I gave that information as quickly as I could to the House. I cannot see on what the point of order is based. It has no basis in logic or in past precedence in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank both members. It has been the practice in the House if an answer to a question is to be unduly long or

contain a list of statistics or figures, that it be given in writing so as not to take up too much time of the question period. Perhaps the Minister would like to complete his answer.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I was about to conclude with the observation that the reduction in service at that campground appeared to be the only solution as the option of uncontrolled camping was not proceeded with due to the expectation and the problems that we have experienced in respect to rowdiness and vandalism.

Staff have been directed to investigate the leasing and operation of that facility in a subsequent year by a private operator.

Manitoba Tourism Industry

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. In view of the fact that the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism in Manitoba has been working with the Minister of Tourism in Ontario to help develop tourism on the western side of Ontario and the eastern side of Manitoba, has the Minister made any representation to the Ontario Minister re the fact that Manitobans will not be able to utilize the western side of Ontario according to the articles that we have read in the papers and that have been announced by the Ontario Tourism Department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly take it as notice and acquire more information, but I think it's been a practice in both provinces to set some priorities for use of parks. There's some prioritization goes on in our allocation of places too, but I will undertake to get a fuller report for the member and report back to the House.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister in her answer mentions priorities of parks. In view of the fact that the Provincial Government through Destination Manitoba has given a grant to a tour company to organize, I believe, naturalist-type of tours so that people could use the facilities of the eastern side of Manitoba and the western part of Ontario; in view of the fact that we have spent money supporting a tour operator to arrange tours for this area, is the Minister going to make a very strong protest because we have spent money to have tourists to go into this area?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, our first effort will be to clarify what the situation is and if we then feel a protest is the appropriate response, that will be made.

Pelly Trail School Division

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Education. Out of which of her special sources of grant money did the Minister take the recently announced special grant of \$100,000 for the Pelly Trail School Division?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, that money did not come out of a special grant allocation. That money came out of the Educational Support Program that was designed by the members opposite that had a number of elements and factors in it, one of which dealt with the ability to offset the declining enrolment factor which in some cases was lost to some school divisions as of January, 1983. What you have is a recognition by us that there were deficiencies in the Educational Support Program related to declining enrolment that were compounded as the three-year program was under way, and Pelly Trail was an excellent example, Mr. Speaker.

They lost, I think it was about 222 students in a year, 79 regular students, but over 120 Native students, Mr. Speaker, and that loss was unpredicted by either the former government or this government, because the master tuition agreement was cancelled. Because it was cancelled, they lost their protection in the Educational Support Program for the Native students. It was recognizing that there were three or four school divisions in the province that suffered declining enrolment factors ranging from 5 percent to 11 percent which was extraordinary since my recollection is the provincial declining enrolment factor is about .8, that we made a grant that was to offset the grant that did not continue in existence in 1983.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has me confused. How could it come out of the Education Support Program if the Minister has just said that the Education Support Program was deficient in being able to deal with a situation such as this of a major decline in enrolment. Did it come out of the Education Support Program, in which case the program was sufficient to deal with it, or did it not?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, yes, the money that goes to school divisions that is granted to school divisions comes out of the Education Support Program. As the member opposite knows, there is money in each year that is additional unallocated money and a yearly decision is made on which grants, where the increases will come. In this case this year, we gave additional money to transportation. We gave additional money to school divisions to increase their basic operating unit.

I think the largest grant went to the basic operating unit which allows school divisions to decide where to spend the money. It went up from I think it was \$92,000 for a basic operating unit to \$109,000, so there were a number of increases in grants that are brought in every year, that were brought in in each year of the life of the program, and this is one of them where we brought in a grant to cover increasing deficiencies that were causing three or four school divisions in the province serious difficulty this year.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, then the Education Support Program was sufficiently flexible to deal with this matter because it had unallocated funds available to take care of special situations. So my second question to the Minister then is, in view of the fact that this division has a surplus of \$800,000, and did not choose this expenditure as a priority in setting its own budget, why has the Minister given the extra grant here when there are many other instances in which there are not surpluses to deal with, and the divisions are facing similar problems?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Mr. Speaker, the reason is that the grant was brought in based on a criteria and a formula that was based on need, and that was not based on whether or not school divisions have, or have not, surpluses. That has never been a question, to my knowledge, that has been asked school divisions when the government is bringing in its program and deciding what its responsibility is to provide funds to school divisions, that if they are in the numbers where the declining enrolment is the greatest then that, and that alone, was the criteria for making the decision about the funding. To the point that the member suggested that, because there was unallocated money in there, one of the reasons that the amount of money was there is because of this government's decision to put a large amount of direct provincial support toward the cost of education that would allow us to maintain programs and services to school divisions.

I did say that neither the previous government, nor this government, could have predicted the taking away or the cancelling of the master tuition agreement. You did not predict it, nor did we predict it; but it is a factor that happened last year that is causing a serious problem to school divisions where they have a big loss of Native students like Pelly Trail losing 122 students - finished.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this Minister and this government agreed to the cancellation of that agreement, they ought to have thought about that. But my final question, Mr. Speaker, is in view of the fact that the Minister says that having a surplus of \$800,000 is not a criteria with respect to financial need, is she then going to offer extra special grants from whatever sources, whatever allocations, to other divisions, such as, the Rolling River School Division which is facing the loss of some 20 teaching positions and programs; can they expect to get similar treatment out of whatever extra special funds that she can make available?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Well I think that the member that covers the School Division of Pelly Trail would be interested in hearing that point, Mr. Speaker. Rolling River School Division did have a declining enrolment of about 5.4 percent, but those were not Native students and they were still covered in the basic operating unit. In other words, the loss of students that Rolling River faced, they are still protected because they still get the basic operating unit. It's others, where the enrolment declined into the 10 or 11 percent increase, or where there were large numbers of Native students involved, that are the ones that are the most seriously hit.

I would also like to say that I think Pelly Trail's increase in provincial money, money they got from their province,

because of their loss, was only about 7 percent, and Rolling River - I am trying to remember and I'm going from memory, but was much closer to the provincial average which was about 11 percent. Rolling River got quite a bit more money from the Provincial Government to cover their programs than did Pelly Trail because of their serious decline in students.

MR. G. FILMON: In view of the fact that we're getting into some very complex matters with these extra special grants that the Minister is shifting back and forth; and in view of the fact that she said that Dr. Nicholl's Committee Report would be available in June, has she now received it and will we be able to get a copy of its recommendations shortly?

HON. M. HEMPHILL: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't received it, as of this day, but I did indicate that I was expecting to receive the report from Dr. Nicholls in June, and I still am expecting to receive the report in June. As soon as we have received it and have had a chance to give it full consideration, I hope to be beginning public discussions about the content. There is going to be some very serious issues addressed in that report; they are going to take a lot of thought and a lot of discussion.

I would like to just say one other thing related to the points he made about the special grant. I think when we bring a program in, and the member opposite recognized this during the Estimates, it's hard to bring in a perfect program. We learn from experience; we learn what the deficiencies are. The worst thing you could do is not recognize them and not admit them and not make the changes that need to be made when you recognize serious deficiencies. It's because of that that we were willing to make the changes this year to meet the serious deficiencies of the program.

Irrigation systems - upgrading

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, regarding the recovery program that was announced by the Federal Government April 19th, I think, some \$2.4 billion. Can the Minister advise the House, or the people of this province, if he's had any meetings with the Honourable Eugene Whelan, or any Ministers of the Federal Government, re federal participation and the upgrading of the irrigation systems in our province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Natural Resources has been involved with PFRA dealing with water management projects and the like. In terms of specific projects we certainly are, in our discussions with the federal people on future agreements, putting that as a high priority for the province in terms of future agreements. As the

member well knows, at the present time there are not very many specific projects dealing with irrigation, but the question of irrigation, the honourable member should be aware, is one that during these periods, the difficult times, the economics of which are, at this point in time, questionable.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder can the Minister advise the House, or the people that are irrigating this province, why the Province of Saskatchewan qualified for \$4 million and Manitoba has qualified for nil?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice, but the honourable member should be aware that there are no new agreements at the present time that are on stream and that the agreements that were on stream certainly did not call for any major expansion of irrigation, but as I indicate, the question of irrigation in many areas of the province during these difficult times is questionable in terms of the economics, of the feasibility.

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

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're talking about \$2.4 billion federal dollars that's on the table. Can I ask now a question of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, if he or any of his staff or the government have had any meetings with Whelan before they brought in Bill No. 12?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I can say that I have not; I would have to take as notice any question about staff having discussions. In respect to the negotiations under that Act, it is I think traditional and customary that the Minister of Agriculture has the direct negotiations in respect to agricultural development and the necessary irrigation or drainage works ancillary thereto.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to bring a point of clarification to the House and the Minister of Agriculture.

The Minister of Agriculture indicated to the House that under the current agriculture agreement with the Federal Government, that there weren't funds made available for irrigation projects. That is not the truth, Mr. Speaker. There is funding provided through the Agro-Man Agreement, which is a Federal-Provincial agreement, and it is in place in Roblin and . . . it was expenditure by Federal-Provincial funds under a program, Mr. Speaker.

Manitoba Beef Commission

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture dealing with the \$400,000 that some time ago a member of the Beef Commission had indicated

had been written off by the Province of Manitoba, substantiated in a press announcement by the Minister of Agriculture, that that in fact had happened. Questioned again in the House, Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that had not happened, but when it did happen, the Minister of Finance would table a document. During the Public Accounts, I asked the Auditor if he would provide for us the documentation

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I'm not sure whether the honourable member has reached his point of order yet or whether he has a question. I would remind him that we are in question period and if he has a question it would be appreciated, I am sure, if it were short, concise and to the point.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the Minister of Agriculture, where is the \$400,000 that's owed to the province by those beef producers who were initially in the New Democratic beef program started in 1975-76?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, it appears that a point of order is no longer a point of order and never was and never will be from that member. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member spoke about irrigation and if he calls the project, which is an innovative project in the Roblin-Russell area, would be very small in terms of what might be expected in terms of irrigation and could not be considered as a massive development that I spoke about in irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, the question dealing with the dollar amounts, we have referred this matter to independent legal advice. When that advice is in, a final decision will be made.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, who was the independent legal advice that they referred it to, and why did he not refer it to the Attorney-General?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should know, when he was Minister, that there were so many legal opinions and conflicting legal opinions on this whole matter that it became almost an impossibility to discern what one should do after the mishmash that they created in this program.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated some time ago that the direction the government would be taking on this particular issue would be tabled by the Minister of Finance. The Provincial Auditor indicated that he would be making a report to the people of Manitoba and to the Legislature. Has he been in touch with the Provincial Auditor on this particular \$400,000 repayment to Manitoba?

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Auditor wishes to raise any questions and advice from my department, he will know where to find me, Sir.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery.

We have 21 students of Grade 7, 8 and 9 standing from the Hugh John MacDonald School. They are under the direction of Miss Hummelshoj. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

There are 42 students of Grade 5 standing from the Lavallée School under the direction of Miss Dion. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Riel.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have a change on the Agricultural Committee: Downey for Orchard.

HANSARD CORRECTION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a correction to make with respect to Hansard, Thursday, June 2, Page 3391. Near the bottom of the page, it indicates that I said that we will consider funding up to a maximum of \$15,000.00. That should read, and what I stated at that time, was \$50,000.00.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, two announcements. Law Amendments, in addition to the meeting of Law Amendments for this week, will convene again on June 16th; secondly, by agreement, a meeting of the Standing Committee of Agriculture, immediately following a motion of Supply, to be convened in Room 255.

Again, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Supply - I'll make the motion in a moment - by leave, because of the Rule 65(7), therefore by leave, the continuation of Estimates which began in Committee, Executive Council Estimates will be in the House, upon the motion being made.

Accordingly, with those announcements, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Executive Council.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY
SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Executive Council, Item 1.(a) the Premier's Salary.

The Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, last evening dealing with Information Services, the First Minister said he was unable to give a ballpark figure at that time on the additional cost that Information Services would be costing the government. He said on Page 3491, "We could attempt to obtain a ballpark figure but I wouldn't want to offer one this evening." I wonder if the First Minister could give us that figure now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suspect staff is in the committee room. They likely went there anticipating that the Estimates would proceed in the committee room. They'll be back here shortly. I trust — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We're on the Salary, Item 1.(a). No staff are allowed.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'll take that as notice. I'll have to check to see if we can obtain that information yet. If you recall, neither the Finance Minister nor the Finance Department or the Auditor's Department were able to give a precise figure, but we thought we could get a ballpark figure. Leave it with me as notice still to obtain.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, when we're dealing with the Information Services, I noticed one of the factors that the First Minister overlooked completely. He talked about the transfer of people out of the Information Services, and the Photo Section I believe went to Government Services. Could the First Minister give us any information as to where the personnel that had operated the very effective Information Services in the Department of Agriculture and the Information Services there has now been decimated. Can the First Minister indicate where that staff has disappeared?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, those members of the staff will be working from the Queen's Printer, from the central communications group serving the various needs of various departments. One of the problems that existed previously is that some departments had communications staff, had effective means of communicating with the public. In other areas of government there was a complete and total vacuum. We are attempting to ensure that the service is maintained not only in those departments that have enjoyed considerable staff, but in those areas of government such as Consumer and Corporate Affairs and other various departments that had no staff previously, that all departments of government have access to the skills and talents that are available within government.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, what the First Minister is telling me is something that is somewhat rather scary,

because I know as a rural member that probably the most effective Information Service that was available was done by the Department of Agriculture. It now appears that because it was so successful and so beneficial, the government has decided it should now be decimated and spread out through other sections. I would wonder why the First Minister would want to do that rather than when there is a good, effective operating unit, why he would not have other work sent to that unit rather than destroying the unit and spreading it around throughout government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I must simply comment that I'm a little surprised that the member did not pursue these questions during the line-by-line discussion under Information Services Branch when we were dealing with that area of consideration last evening. It's my understanding that we're dealing with the general subject of Salary, but I will try to deal with the honourable member's specific questions in any event.

Mr. Chairman, we are not decimating the services to the Department of Agriculture. We are not decimating the information function that exists. What we are doing, Mr. Chairman, rather than adding additional staff, rather than loading the existing staff with additional people in order to handle the various departments of government that have no information availability, the skills and talents are being made available to the entire government. So the beneficial programs, those programs that are beneficial to Agriculture will be continued.

As well, Mr. Chairman, the staff will be made available in order to provide needed services to other departments of government. This would appear to me to be a better method than continuing to permit the various departments of government where there are no communication services to continue without Information Services of any basic kind while other departments enjoy maximum benefit from staff, a fair distribution of the skills and talents that exist within a few departments so that those skills and talents are made available to the totality of government and all the departments of government.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister may think that probably that is what is happening, but the reality is that right today, when agriculture is facing a major crisis; when the forage industry has been largely destroyed by winterkill; when much of the early seeded crop has been destroyed by frosts in the last few days, the Agriculture Department doesn't have the information staff left anymore to be telling farmers what to do in the problems that are very crucial to their very existence, and it could cost the agriculture industry of Manitoba millions of dollars this year.

This government has destroyed that Information Service that was available to farmers and has been available to farmers for many years under many administrations. We now find a member of this Assembly just a couple of hours ago found out how crucial the situation is in his own area, because farmers there cannot get the information from the Department of Agriculture because of rapeseed crops being frozen in the last two or three days. You've heard the Member for Lakeside asking questions about the forage

program, a greenfeed program, you've heard the Member for Emerson asking for information, and that Information Service that was there in Agriculture has now been destroyed and farmers are not getting the information that is very vital to their very existence.

So I would ask the First Minister to consider that, and if he deems it advisable to reunite that Information Service that was in the Department of Agriculture to assist farmers in the very trying times that they're facing today.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the member is wrong when he suggests the service has been destroyed or curtailed. If the member had been listening last evening, he would have noted that there has been a redistribution insofar as the functions of Information Services, to the extent that there will now be communicators communicating on behalf of departments of government. Those communicators on behalf of departments, unlike communicators on behalf of Ministers, unlike the political staff that were working on behalf of Ministers previously, these are communicators working for departments hired through the Civil Service Commission. They'll be responsible for the initiation of news releases and then those news releases will be forwarded to the Information Services Branch that would do the editing of those news releases and then will arrange for the distribution of the news releases in the same manner, in the same style, as has been the case traditionally. The news release will be prepared, in this case in the Department of Agriculture, and then forwarded to Information Services for final editing, and then for distribution.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Well, I may be wrong, but I would ask the First Minister if he would call the Information Services in Agriculture, as I have, and talk to the head man there. He says, my hands are tied; I have no staff; the staff has been stripped from me; I cannot put a program together that you could put on TV, or on the media, because his staff has been stripped and it takes time because they have to check everything and doublecheck everything. If you're providing professional advice to farmers it has to be factual and correct. To find out that he hasn't got the staff to do it, Mr. Premier, that bothers me. As a farmer, it bothers me, as a member of this Legislative Assembly, and it bothers me as a Manitoban, to see that this government is destroying a service that farmers in Manitoba have had for years.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would doubt very much that the staff member that the member has referred to has indicated that his ability to provide programs in respect to the Department of Agriculture have been destroyed. I would doubt very much that the member is correctly quoting the responsible member in that branch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to the First Minister. In view of the letter which Mr. Martin of the Manitoba Federation wrote to the Minister of Finance and to the Minister of Economic Development

on February 23rd, 1983, in which he indicated that he wished to bring to their attention his concern that very little short, medium or long-term economic planning is being done by the government; he hasn't seen any evidence. There appears to be many more closures or layoffs about to happen. In view of the fact that the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce said that the government is anti-business, the government is out of step, and they offered him their regular publications, some comments from members, does the First Minister plan on having another Economic Summit?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do want to spend a few moments, in fact, discussing the success of the Economic Summit Conference, and I believe I can say, without hesitation, that this New Democratic Party Government is probably the only Provincial Government in the country that could successfully bring together labour and business and government to an Economic Summit Conference. Mr. Chairman, though honourable members may be sensitive to this point that has, in fact, been spoken well of by the Chamber of Commerce, by the Manufacturers Association, by the Manitoba Federation of Labour, and other participants.

Mr. Chairman, there has been, as I would encourage under all circumstances, a healthy discussion insofar as the policies and objectives of government, of labour, and of business. I know that honourable members across the way would be very very sensitive and very very defensive, as they are inclined to be, insofar as criticism that may be directed of a constructive way toward them and, indeed, that were very very defensive toward the Manitoba Federation of Labour during their term in government, to the extent that, if I recall, the situation reached such a bad level that the Manitoba Federation of Labour said there wasn't even any point in meeting with honourable members because of the reception that they received from honourable members across the way.

So unlike honourable members across the way, we encouraged the Summit Conference, we encourage . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. Mr. Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, we indeed encourage constructive criticism and I am not at all sensitive to concerns as to whether or not this government, or any other particular government, has yet adequately outlined medium and long-term objectives, insofar as the economy is concerned. We are working in connection with that.

Mr. Chairman, I had a letter from the business side not so long ago which encouraged the continuation of this process and the effectiveness of the Steering Committee process, recognizing at the same time that there are problems that must be ironed out in order to improve and to better communications, government, labour and business. But, Mr. Chairman, unlike honourable members across the way that are sensitive, I am not sensitive to good constructive criticism, whether that be from the business community or from the labour community.

No being sensitive, of course, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't mean that I agree with the particular lines of criticism, but it is legitimate constructive criticism that the government must be prepared to look at and examine, and to develop alternative policies from time to time arising from those lines of criticism.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister terms a success, terms the Economic Summit a success, when within a matter of a few months, after that meeting, the President of the Federation of Labour condemns the government for not having any short term, medium term or long-range planning, and the Chamber of Commerce refers to the government as being anti-business and out of touch with the times, Mr. Chairman. If he terms that a success then I want to see what the failures of this government are going to be. That's incredible that the First Minister would make that kind of a response.

I have a question to him, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the brief presented to the First Minister, and his Cabinet, by the Manitoba Federation of Labour, a copy of which I do not have. Could the First Minister advise what comments the Federation of Labour made with respect to unemployment in this province?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first, I would like the honourable member, for his benefit, to have the full context of the discussion that he makes reference to by the President of the Chamber of Commerce, because we're kind of inclined to - I suppose we all are guilty of this as politicians and I am no exception to the rule - take only that which we want to take from a particular individual's comments and to ignore the other aspects of an individual's comments. I'd like the honourable member to know that I was present and participated in that very panel. We had a very good exchange, and Mr. McGuinness' comments were related to certain taxation policies he disagreed with. But I want the honourable member across the way to know that Mr. McGuinness, the President of the Chamber of Commerce in Winnipeg, also said that he was impressed and pleased and related to the fact that this was the government that is the most accessible government, this is the government with the most open-door policy of any government he had dealings with in the Province of Manitoba.

Some honourable members were present, Mr. Chairman, after last summer when the president or one of the officials of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce also pointed out in public meeting, in front of some of the honourable members across the way, that this indeed was the most accessible, open government. Not that we agree with each other on every given point, that is not expected. There is no family in which members of the family do not have disagreements from time to time, but there is mutual respect. There's an openness.

I made reference to the Federation of Labour being unable even to present their brief to honourable members across the way because of their defensiveness. In 1980 and 1981, there were also comments from officials of the Manitoba Chamber of Commerce that reflect very dimly on the inaccessibility that developed during a very short period of time during the previous administration in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, this government may have what they call an open-door policy, but they've got a back-door policy too, because you come in the front door and you're just whisked out the back door, and then the government goes ahead and does what it wanted to do ideologically in the first place. That's the only explanation, Mr. Chairman, for the kind of comments that have been made within two or three months after the Economic Summit, judging the government on the basis of their budget and on the basis of their action, Mr. Chairman. So the First Minister can gloat all he wants about this accessibility and discussion and consultation, but when it comes down to action, we've seen the action of this government and their Budget and their policies and they're rejected not only by business, by the Chamber of Commerce, but in a private letter supposedly by the Federation of Labour and by Mr. Martin.

My question to the First Minister though, Mr. Chairman, was - and he hasn't answered it - with respect to unemployment in this province. Mr. Chairman, there are some 52,000 unemployed people in this province. That number has grown by almost 30,000 since this government took office. I can say to the First Minister, if we were in government and this had happened, the Federation of Labour would be picketing this building every day of the week, Mr. Chairman. They'd be picketing every day of this week. It happens, Mr. Chairman, that the Federation of Labour is tied politically to the NDP. At least the leadership of the union is, Mr. Chairman. I don't think the workers of Manitoba are - if they ever were - now tied to the NDP, Mr. Chairman, because they've seen the results of the policies of this government, the 52,000 unemployed people in the Province of Manitoba, and the bankruptcies and all of the other tragic economic statistics that one can cite at this particular time, Mr. Chairman.

I want to know from him, Mr. Chairman, what did the Federation of Labour say to the First Minister and their Cabinet about the unemployment situation in this province which has grown so dramatically since they have been in office? Did they speak out strongly on that particular subject, Mr. Chairman, and the actions of this government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to have a further opportunity, in case there remains any doubt in the mind of The Honourable Member for St. Norbert, as to the accepted success of the Economic Summit Conference. I'd like to read and place again on the record the comments from the President of Inco on Page 2405, May 4, 1983 of Hansard, to Mr. Cowan: "The Manitoba Economic Summit Conference was useful. I hope it will prove to be a productive experience. Our general economic problems and open dialogue at the conference again made it clear that the various groups represented have very much in common."

I'd like to underline those words, "very much in common," because honourable members across the way believe in a form of class conflict; that there is no commonality between the interests of working people and the interests of a business community and the interests of government. Continued dialogue and co-operation will provide the quickest path to economic recovery.

So, Mr. Chairman, there are many many testimonies, in case the honourable member is doubtful as to the success of the Economic Summit Conference and what is incumbent upon us. It will not be easy. There will be many trials and tribulations in the process for government and for labour and business to ensure that the continuing process of consultation will continue and there'll be concrete benefits. I'm sure that honourable members across the way will hope that there'll be success from this kind of dialogue. Just one reminder though, Mr. Chairman, dialogue does not mean that in every given case there will not be disagreement from time to time with labour or with business on any given subject. Mr. Chairman, we have had our share of disagreement with business and with labour on various items from time to time, because we are responsible for representing the public interest as a whole and not sectional interest, not regional interest but the public interest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to be given the opportunity to deal with the brief that was submitted by Mr. Martin of the MFL, because he did deal quite extensively with the question of joblessness. He did not deal with the issue of joblessness in any narrow sense as the Honourable Member for St. Norbert is inclined to do. He did not deal with the jobless situation as though it was only a Manitoba phenomenon. He dealt with the jobless situation with the general state of the economy. I would read — (Interjection) — to the honourable member words from Mr. Martin on Page 6 of his brief to the Cabinet. "In a national context the economy of Manitoba is in a relatively favourable, though precarious position. Economic indicators such as employment growth, unemployment, price inflation suggest that Manitoba is performing well relative to the national average. However there are signs of weakness which indicate a potential for mounting economic problems in the future."

Mr. Chairman, I share those concerns, though I have mentioned on different occasions the fact that, first, we have been able to reduce the level of unemployment in Manitoba from a traditional third spot to a second-lowest spot. Mr. Chairman, it is cold consolation.

Mr. Chairman, the cause of unemployment is one that we ought to be prepared to address. We ought not to address the problem of unemployment in any parochial or insular manner, but we ought to examine the problem unemployment as to the root causes of unemployment that exist. Tight money, high interest rate policies have caused unemployment, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, during the present period, there are too many governments in the world that would prepare themselves to turn the clock back to the 1930s to the policies that were pursued by R.B. Bennett. I know honourable members don't like to hear this because they are the true followers of R.B. Bennett. They are the true followers of Hoover in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, what is regrettable is rather than leadership being demonstrated in the Western World context, there is too much of a reverting back in too many countries in the world to the kinds of restrictive conservative forms of policies that have emphasized tight money, high interest rates, and the result of that has been severe damage to western economies; to Third World countries with all the human cost and economic costs that exist.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has touched on the most serious problem that confronts us in this day and age. We must address those problems; we are prepared to address them. Mr. Chairman, that is why we proposed at the Provincial Conference of Finance Ministers in which my colleague, the Minister of Finance, presented Manitoba's position in a very articulate fashion, that what is required is a federal-provincial initiative in which the Provincial and Federal Governments of this country co-ordinate their efforts; that they match funds; that they move ahead basic, public works projects, so that we can stimulate the economy; so that we can create jobs; so that we can restore consumer confidence in Canada again, and in restoring consumer confidence, then people will again be prepared to purchase homes, to buy appliances, to purchase cars, and then again we can increase the amount of employment, the amount of business investment.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that short of that, we may very well be left with continued high unemployment levels until the end of this decade. I would appreciate any comments from honourable members across the way that deal in a general way pertaining to approaches and methods, but if they simply are talking in terms of reverting back to the 1930s and the approaches of the 1930s that were so disastrous, created such chaos, created so much human destructiveness, then I can tell honourable members that we do not share those views. We do not share the views of the Peter Pocklington, the Peter Gambles and some of the other leading spokesmen of the Conservative Party.

I know that honourable members are preparing for an important convention, but if honourable members are looking to this side for any support for any of their chosen friends seeking leadership at the forthcoming convention, I would warn honourable members to look in another direction than to members on this side of the Chamber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, as some of my colleagues have noted while the First Minister was speaking, the First Minister had promised to turn the economy around in the election campaign of 1981.

I have a question though for the First Minister, Mr. Chairman. The First Minister has acknowledged the proposals of the Finance Minister as being the strategy of their government. I think in every document in every submission in every representation in every speech of the First Minister and members of this government and of the NDP, they have talked in terms of improving the economy by greater public expenditures, Capital expenditures and new programs, as being necessary to improve the economy.

I may have missed something, but I don't think I've once heard the First Minister talk about the private sector when almost every leader nowadays, even the Prime Minister of this country in past months has acknowledged that the economy and long-term employment have to be generated through the private sector.

My question to the First Minister — (Interjection) — The Finance Minister has said what the Prime Minister

is saying is probably wrong, that it's not the private sector who will generate long-term employment. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the First Minister then would offer his . . . of how does he see the importance of the private sector in Manitoba and what is he doing to encourage it.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the honourable member was not listening too closely a few moments ago when I did indeed make reference to the need to restore consumer confidence, so that again we could ensure an expansion by way of investment by the private sector. Mr. Chairman, rather than the private sector and the public sector being two opposing poles as honourable members across the way would have this appear in their picture of some class enemy-like situation, we see the private sector and the public sector joining together and working together.

Mr. Chairman, for what other reason did we implement an Interest Rate Relief Program, the Minister of Economic Development, that resulted in the saving of some 800 small businesses in the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, for what other reason did the Minister of Economic Development proceed with a joint venture capital program that is geared toward assisting the private sector? For what other reason, Mr. Chairman, did we initiate a Homes in Manitoba Program that has meant that builders, the house-building industry in the Province of Manitoba were able to resume house construction and with the very excellent federal program, were able to result in significant increase insofar as housing construction in the Province of Manitoba? For what other reason, Mr. Chairman, did the Minister of Finance reduce the corporate tax rate insofar as small business enterprise in the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Chairman, the Minister responsible for Tourism, the Destination Manitoba Program. So, Mr. Chairman, rather than us dealing with two opposing forces, there is a role for the public, a role for the private, and during times that are difficult, there is need, Mr. Chairman, for increased activity insofar as encouraging economic activity pertaining to the private sector through increased public sector activity.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Virden asked some questions re Communications expenditures and these are the major areas of expenditures; the Department of Finance and the Provincial Auditor's Office have commented that in many departments it is impossible to segregate such expenditures. There are fewer Communications staff than there were one year ago. Information Services, \$553,000; Agriculture, \$807,000; Education, \$315,000; Natural Resources, \$502,000.00.

I would like to also, just before we lose track of another comment that — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, just on that point, not to interrupt the First Minister's line of thought, I wonder if he'd mind tabling those figures for us.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Yes. As I mentioned, these may not be precise figures because Finance and Auditors can't . . . The Honourable Member for St. Norbert might

be interested, in view of his earlier remarks, re the Martin letter, in a comment on Page 2 of the Annual Legislative Presentation to the Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba, in which the Manitoba Federation of Labour state, and I quote, "This government is to be congratulated for its ongoing commitment to open dialogue with all groups in our society. It is to be congratulated for its initiatives that have to date been undertaken. We urge you to neither slow down nor stop, but instead show even more leadership and to demonstrate to the rest of the country that boldness and initiative can go a long way toward curing many of our urgent problems."

MR. G. MERCIER: That boldness and initiative over the past few months has led the credit people to, first of all, impose a credit watch on the province, and then to reduce the credit rating of the province with the suggestion that it may be lowered even more in the future. It is also that boldness and initiative, Mr. Chairman, that has caused the City of Winnipeg over the past two or three months, to have the highest consumer price index of all major cities in Canada, Mr. Chairman, all as a result of government-caused tax increases in the area of sales tax, gasoline tax, payroll tax, corporate tax, etc. In addition, this past month, the hydro consumers will have had imposed upon them a 9.5 percent increase in their hydro rates, an essential service. Mr. Chairman, my question to the First Minister is what leadership is he giving to his Cabinet, in terms of the credit rating of the province and in terms of government actions that have led to the consumer price index increase in Winnipeg being the highest in Canada for the past two or three months?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to deal briefly with the matter of the credit rating. The more detailed write-up on Manitoba which had been released by Standard and Poor's as a background to its decision to assign the province a AA-minus credit rating does present some extremely interesting reading and I'm sure that members opposite have read it, although I'm sort of curious to know why, in a number of weeks, they haven't raised it. It's probably because of some very salient points raised in that report. It states, quote, "The recession caused much of last year's deficit," and it also stated, quote, "The deficit was 45 percent greater than budgeted, largely because of a \$120 million revenue shortfall, caused by the recession."

That is something which members of the opposition have refused to acknowledge, but they may do so now that Standard and Poor's have reached the same conclusion, and of course there will be other numbers coming within the next few weeks. We will have the official numbers and we can discuss it again then, but there is no question that they are right on that issue.

That report notes as well, quote, "The province's budgeted deficit for fiscal '83 amounts to \$579 million, again equivalent to 20 percent of revenues." This, of course, suggests that the province has succeeded in containing the deficit, in relative terms, for '83-84,

contrary to the impression one may have from listening to the opposition. The report notes — (Interjection) —

MR. B. RANSOM: The report contains \$579 million?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'll read it again. The Member for Turtle Mountain doesn't seem to understand, quote, "The province's budgeted deficit for fiscal 1983 amounts to \$579 million, again equivalent to 20 percent of revenues." That is, the year before that it was at about 20 percent and it remained at 20 percent. It remained at 20 percent and they recognized that. Again, that suggests that the province has succeeded in containing the deficit, in relative terms, contrary to the impression that people on the other side are attempting to leave.

The report also states, quote, "Provincial purpose debt remains moderate because until recently, the province borrowed primarily for Manitoba Hydro, not to finance its own budgetary deficits." The report notes, quote, "The province's revenues are becoming increasingly volatile as the federal share of total revenues decreases." That's an issue that we've been talking about since December of 1981, the fact of our volatile revenues because of problems with respect to transfers from the Federal Government. The Member for Turtle Mountain, if he's suggesting for one second that revenues weren't improving during his term, is totally erroneous again, because what was happening was that federal revenues were increasing significantly under the Tories.

They also, Mr. Chairman, commented on the province's economic performance. We've heard the Member for St. Norbert suggesting that somehow our economic performance during the NDP years wasn't so good, during the last year and a half. They say, Standard and Poor's, quote, "Manitoba's recent economic performance has been above the Canadian average. Manitoba's inflation adjusted economic output fell by 3.3 percent last year, well below the average Canadian decline of 4.8 percent. Similarly, the province's 8.5 percent unemployment rate was the third lowest in Canada, following Saskatchewan and Alberta."

Since then, of course, we've improved, with respect to Alberta. We haven't really improved; they've gone worse than we are, but we are now second-lowest. Very interesting; here we get to some interesting information. The report talks about Manitoba's longer term going backward, longer term economic performance, rather than the short term. Now again, in the short term they indicated we'd done better than the national average, but then they deal specifically with the 1976 to 1981 period. That's a period for which some of the members opposite occasionally take some pride. They suggest that somehow things were well here in Manitoba between '76 and '81. What does Standard and Poor's say about it? What does Standard and Poor's say in terms of their relative position nationally? During the NDP years we were doing better than the national average. What do they say about 1976 to 1981? This is what they say in '76 to '81. "The province's long-term economic performance however has not been above the Canadian average. The table below shows that real GPP employment investments have grown less

quickly in Manitoba than in other provinces with rated debt."

Of course that's what we were saying to the people of Manitoba in 1981. They knew that. They were comparing what was happening here to other parts of the country. They could see we were falling behind under the Tories. Under the NDP we've come back in a position where we are above the national average and Standard and Poor's says so in their report.

HON. S. LYON: You sent them the figures, why shouldn't they?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: It may be useful to remind critics that Standard and Poor's background analysis referred specifically to the relatively favourable economic performance again last year as compared to what had been happening during the Tory years. I think that's interesting information and for them to be suggesting somehow that things are worse under us, is simply totally inaccurate. The report also refers to Manitoba Hydro and says, "last year a rate freeze and low water flow conditions caused a \$24.2 million operating loss." A rate freeze and low water flow caused \$24.2 million operating loss. "This year the province has approved a 9.5 percent rate increase for Manitoba Hydro which will reduce the forecast deficit. Water flow conditions have also improved so higher export sales will be possible once extra provincial demand for power recovers."

So in summary then, the factors cited by Standard and Poor's in assigning a AA minus included in an '82-'83 deficit largely caused by the recession; a similar deficit in relation to revenues for '83-'84, the decline in federal transfers in relation to total revenues; the poor economic performance over the 1976-81 period relative to other provinces, notwithstanding the relatively favourable performance in 1982; and the Hydro deficit caused by the rate freeze and low water conditions.

I think even having said all of that, it is important to note that Manitoba's revised credit rating is still favourable. In fact, in terms of provincial ratings, Manitoba ranking is exceeded by only four provinces in this country. The same is true under the Moody's current credit rating with Manitoba's AA rating obtained in 1975 under the Schreyer administration being exceeded by only four provinces. I think that is something that members should keep in mind.

There are a few other comments I'd like to make though, as one of the Ministers who is on the Steering Committee of the Summit Group. There was some allegation that somehow we had had a one-shot conference and nothing was happening since. Nothing indeed could be further from the truth. We had a further meeting of a number of people involved in that organization in February and we've had several other meetings at which we are proceeding to work out development strategy. When Dick Martin says that we don't have sufficient short-term or long-term economic planning in place in this province, I couldn't agree with him more. We were left with a pretty rotten rickety planning machine by the Tories when we came into office. They don't believe in economic planning. We are moving ahead. We will be developing an economic strategy that will work for Manitoba. We're developing it in co-operation with other groups.

Now the Member for Lakeside was saying, no, we didn't meet with the MFL, they're NDP. We didn't meet

with the National Farmers Union because they're NDP. — (Interjection) — That's not what the Member for Lakeside said. He just finished saying, the National Farmers Union are NDP so we didn't meet with them. Mr. Chairman, we have no doubt that the CMA's general persuasion is P.C. The Premier just read off a statement from the President of Inco. Inco sent you people a cheque for \$30,000 during the election campaign. That didn't mean that we wouldn't talk to Inco. We're prepared to talk to Inco. We're prepared to talk to the business community that supports the Progressive Conservative Party. We expect criticism from our friends. We expect criticism from people who criticize us at other times but we expect that all of us will work together for a stronger Manitoba. Not like the Tories do, just working with their friends and ignoring those who tend to vote against them.

I think that that's not a way to run a government and I think that's one of the reasons they're on that side after just one term.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I am ashamed to have this member be Minister of Finance in the province. To hear that kind of drivel, of bombast from the Minister of Finance which is totally incorrect. What happened was that the Federation of Labour refused to meet with the government because of two things: (1) Dick Martin had publicly stated that his primary objective was to defeat the government; (2) They couldn't stand the light of day on their brief because their brief was so shot full of irrationalities and errors that it couldn't stand to be examined carefully and so they then refused to meet with the government.

For this Minister of Finance to stand up and say that we refused to meet with the Manitoba Federation of Labour is absolutely incorrect. Go back and review the record, you'll find out. The Minister of Finance is trying to tell us that his government is in some kind of difficulty today because of federal cutbacks that weren't in place before. Isn't the Minister of Finance aware that the total federal transfers only increased by less than \$5 million between fiscal '80-81 and fiscal '81-82; \$5 million. The Minister of Finance since that time has had increases that have been running over \$50 million for the fiscal year ending 1983 and they're now estimated to be up close to \$100 million in fiscal '84 over fiscal '83.

The Minister of Finance tells us that we didn't have problems with federal transfers when we were in government? That's nonsense. Why doesn't this Minister of Finance find out what's going on. I can't believe some of the things that I hear from this Minister. I just can't believe it, Mr. Chairman, and we keep on hearing it.

We find a government here that's got their spending completely out of control compared to every other Provincial Government in Canada. The First Minister stands up and makes statements about they can't afford to put the Budgets together, in splendid isolation. What we have here is with their own figures which the Globe and Mail reports and the figures provided by the Minister of Finance understate the spending increase, they show 15.8 percent and the average of the eight other governments - eight other governments - that

are presented in the same article by the Globe and Mail, the average is 7.2 percent.

Here, we have a government that has a rate of spending that is over twice as high as the average of those eight other governments, and that figure of 15.8 is low. The real spending increase is up in the range of over 19 percent, and the Minister of Finance is going to stand up and make announcements about containing the deficit and containing the expenditures. Do you know why the deficit is contained, Mr. Chairman, so-called, relative to the amount of revenue? The reason is because the Minister of Finance has been slapping on taxes every year. He's raising the revenues and as the deficit continues to go up, perhaps he is able to maintain some kind of position relative to revenues.

But what he did last year was put \$110 million tax on labour. He put a sales tax on labour, that's what he did, if you can imagine, when the economy is facing the problems it is and you've got the unemployment problem you have, that you put a sales tax on labour, and that's what the Minister of Finance did last year. This year he comes along and puts up the sale tax on the other items to which it applies and then proudly proclaims that he has contained the deficit when his spending rate is running double, more than double what the average of the other provinces is. Things are out of control with this government.

Mr. Chairman, they don't want to acknowledge it and it's becoming frightening that the Minister of Finance doesn't seem to even understand the seriousness of the figures that he faces. He might be well advised, having passed through his own Estimates, to sit down and keep quiet and let the First Minister try and answer the questions that are being put to him.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There we have the Member for Turtle Mountain, again, just completely distorting the numbers for Manitoba. In quoting the increases in government spending, what he doesn't talk about is, for instance, the bottom line, which would be spending per capita. And I would challenge him, in all fairness, to tell the people of Manitoba. The member knows very well that he cannot tell the people of Manitoba that we're No. 1 in spending; that we're No. 2 in spending; that we're No. 3 in spending; that we're No. 4 in spending; that we're No. 5 in spending. Indeed, per capita surely is the sensible way of talking about Provincial Government spending.

We were saying for four years that one of the reasons we were falling behind economically in this province was the acute protracted restraint of the Sterling Lyon Tory Government. That was why we were falling behind, and we were. Nobody on this side would argue that you people weren't cutting back on spending when you were in power. Every poor person in this province knew that, and a lot of people who had to leave this province knew all about that. They had to leave because of the terrible conditions that they were setting up in this province, and it is true that percentage-wise we have increased spending over the last two years. For that we don't apologize; we had to do that; we had to do that. But to suggest that we are the biggest spending government in Canada is an absolute out-and-out lie; it is a pure lie; it is the big lie that the Tories are attempting to lay on us in this province. People know

full well that we spend less money per capita than the average government in this country.

Now, surely that is something that people should be taking into account when they are talking about the spending of the Government of Manitoba. They can say, as they have, that our spending rate is up, yes; but compared to what? The year before last the Alberta Government spending rate went up by something like 25 to 27 percent.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, people on the opposite side have talked, the Member for St. Norbert has talked about the fact that we were saying we wanted to turn the economy around, and certainly we wanted to. We said we would, yes, and we have indicated to you that it has comparatively improved from the Tory days — (Interjection) — The Leader of the Opposition keeps yapping away. I would remind him of some of the statements that he made back in 1977. Now we have two and a half, three years to go in our term in office and we will do what we can for the people of Manitoba. When we made our election promises, we believed that we would be able to carry them out, we still hope we can carry them out, and we do have time to do precisely that.

The Leader of the Opposition was saying, in a speech in Rossmere in 1977, when he was asking the people of Manitoba for the right to become Premier. He said, "More and more of our young people will have to leave Manitoba if they are to find the opportunities they will need to build their own prosperous and independent lives." That's what he was saying, that's why we were talking about population when we were on that side; and what happened? He was right. When the Tories came into office more and more young people did have to leave the province; that was the kind of thing he was saying. And then he said, "Today in Winnipeg alone there are more than 1,300 senior citizens on the waiting lists for nursing homes, 1,300 people who cannot get the care they need because we have not built enough nursing homes." You know, Mr. Chairman, what's the first thing they did? They froze construction on nursing homes; they froze construction. So they didn't have a line-up because there was no point in being in a line-up when there are no new homes coming up.

And then he said, "We are saying that we must keep the good health care programs, Pharmacare." Pharmacare he referred to — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: And what did he do? He changed the rule so people wouldn't collect enough Pharmacare. Well, the Leader of the Opposition talks about the deficit. I would remind him that we were caught with a pretty big surprise when we took office.

Then he goes on and he says, "There is today in Manitoba a need for clear and helpful government action to permit people to own their own homes." What did they do? They did nothing, absolutely nothing. And then he talked about preserving the older neighbourhoods . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: I appreciate that's his attitude in dealing with the Salary item of the person involved, but I do remind you, Mr. Chairman, we are on the Premier's Salary. Regrettably, the Minister of Finance has his salary; I am sure with the benefit of hindsight, and his present performance, we would want to withdraw that and retroactively reduce his salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance to the same point.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chairman, I believe that as a member of this Chamber I have the right to speak like any other member does.

The Leader of the Opposition was referring to repairing, digging up older neighbourhoods in this city. He talked about filling in the gaps that existed in the health care system; he talked about including such services as ambulances in Medicare. You know, Mr. Chairman, for that group to be suggesting that because we haven't fulfilled all of our election platform in a year and a half, that somehow we are doing something wrong, when in that year and a half we've been hit with the worst recession since the '30s, I think that's just astounding.

Just one last comment. The Member for Lakeside did indeed say that they did not meet with the National Farmers Union because the National Farmers Union said they were members or they were supporters of the New Democratic Party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I do want to get back, for a few minutes, to the issue at hand, that is the First Minister's Salary. What I was referring to with respect to the NFU or indeed the MFL was the dangerous course that are there for any organization that ties itself so exclusively to a political organization and that surely is the case that the New Democratic Party itself must be asking itself in reverse, as to what their future lies in that close marriage that is publicly being proclaimed, whether nationally, by one Dennis McDermott, or provincially, by Mr. Dick Martin. I would suspect that we will have further proof of that on Thursday, within two days, when Margaret Thatcher wins a resounding victory in Britain and that once powerful Labour Party will be reduced to a shambles of its past influence and power, Mr. Chairman.

Thinking journalists are advising the honourable members of that; thinking New Democrats are concerned about what is the problem of the New Democratic Party in Canada. It's because of this total commitment to each other that has made them virtually a single interest group, in that respect, and therefore, when we have people like Dick Martin, the President of the Manitoba Federation of Labour proclaiming publicly and in print, not once, but on several occasions, and acknowledged by your own material after the election, about the powerful help and support of the Manitoba Federation of Labour, how sweet it was, then, Mr. Chairman, that same group then cannot walk into a Conservative or different political party's conference table and expect to be listened to, expect to be treated in a manner that one should be able to treat with a

responsible organization representing the true interests of whatever group that organization is supposed to represent; in this case, the organized working people of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to specifically come back to the Premier's Salary and ask the Premier about his future plans. Mr. Chairman, it's been my privilege, my experience to have worked with several, three Premiers, to be exact. So, Mr. Chairman, I have some first-hand knowledge about how important the First Minister's office can be in initiating, in bringing about the kind of major thrusts, particularly in any area, but we are talking specifically, and it's a major concern, not just in Manitoba but in Canada, about bringing along some long-term economic development to the province that can provide some hope, some relief for the current 55,000 that are unemployed.

Just in passing, any disillusioning that the Honourable Minister of Finance wants to take place, wants to partake in as to what that does in terms of our standing with other provinces, the fact of the matter is that there are 55,000-56,000 Manitobans unemployed and the fine argument as to whether that puts us second or third or fourth or fifth isn't going to wash because when we left office there were some 22,000 or 23,000 unemployed, which was bad enough, or 18,000 or 19,000.

Mr. Chairman, my specific question to the First Minister is, I recall very clearly, because of very direct and personal interest, that within months, the first Session, coming into office, I remind honourable members that's now some 14-15 months ago, and just laterally again, in this Chamber, his Minister, the Minister of Energy and Mines, about three or four weeks ago, again responded in a particular way on the questions that I want to raise, what specifically is the First Minister's plans to bring about some specific economic development in this province. Mr. Chairman, it's nice to talk about opposing forces of the private sector and the public sector, class problems that he perceives and what have you, and that's their terminology; that's not our terminology, but I want to know what specific trips has he got in mind; what specific Executive Officer of a major company or what fellow Premier is he planning to meet in the next week, weeks or the next month? He's had 16-17 months to do it, but to specifically generate the kind of things that Manitobans hope for and indeed were so close to accomplishing back in 1981, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, his words are on record. He said, "Well, of course, Alcan isn't the only aluminum company, for instance. We are talking with other aluminum companies; we're talking with Kaiser; we're talking with Reynolds and we're talking with all other kinds of opportunities in that particular field."

The same statements were put on Hansard, on the public record, if not by the First Minister, then by his colleague, the Minister of Energy and Mines, that IMC is not the only potash company to deal with and we can strike up a better deal with Sask. Potash or somebody else. Well, Mr. Chairman, that's fine; they're government, and let me be very clear, this First Minister is worth every cent of his salary and more if he can use the weight of his office and if he can use the influence of the Premier of Manitoba to bring about at least some signs of something happening, Mr. Chairman.

In the three areas that I've mentioned, he had very specific things to say about the immediate start-up of Hydro, of Limestone, during the election promise. He didn't just say it to us; he said it to those people that are waiting for it in the North and he spoke to them at Gillam, and he put that in his literature; he promised. He put his signature to it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to know what kind of meetings. So his Minister of Energy and Mines flubbed the ball, but what is the First Minister doing now about it, because I want to tell you I was privileged to serve under a First Minister that made it his business to pick up and go out and seek and initiate these kind of negotiations, and then to see that his Ministers carried out those negotiations, so I want to know who is he going to be meeting in the next little while, if I want to be charitable. What trips has he planned to regenerate, to revitalize the hope for an aluminum industry in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman?

My constituents want to know about that. Now if he doesn't want to deal with IMC, that's fine. Has he been talking to Saskatchewan? Has he been talking to Premier Grant Devine about seeing what can be done, whether in co-operation with their provincial Sask. Potash Corporation or with some other private corporation? They didn't like our deal, fine, or are you talking about building your own potash mine?

Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to say is that the First Minister is wringing his hands and making these kind of global nonsense statements, but we're talking about his salary at this moment, and I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that First Ministers, one of the fundamental responsibilities of his is - and it's equally as important as just keeping the ship going around the Cabinet table or keeping his government running, although I know that with that group that's probably more than a full-time job - but it is the First Minister and the weight of the First Minister's Office that can often create that climate and create that contact to initiate these kinds of important discussions.

I would like to hear from the First Minister - we're going to be gone for a few days, tending to other affairs - can the First Minister tell me that upon our return that he has contacted these and these corporation heads, that he has reopened the channels of communications with our Prairie Provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan and said, okay, somewhere along the line we flubbed the deal; we flubbed the deal on the Western Power Grid. He might have to make his own apologies for saying, look, I'm not here now to campaign against you, Mr. Lougheed, I'm here to see whether or not anything can be salvaged from the Western Power Grid. His counterpart, Mr. Notley in Alberta, thinks there ought to be and thinks there should be and is asking some very interesting questions in the Alberta Legislature right now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister if he can do us that courtesy to answer specifically to these questions? Is he and his office, or is he planning to with the Salary that we're now going to vote him, prepared to give us an undertaking? Can he tell us that the office has arranged for the kind of contacts, the kind of reopening of negotiations with Premier Lougheed, with Premier Devine having to do with Western Power Grid, or having to do with a future potential potash developer that could help, in conjunction with us? As I remind the Honourable

First Minister, that was also a program that we had entertained where some equity might well be maintained in that particular venture. Has he talked, has his secretary planned him a trip to visit the President of Reynolds or of Kaiser or has he got it on the top of his calendar to go back to Alcan and talk about what can be salvaged out of that agreement that was so close to fruition?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have some answers to that. If the First Minister is not looking after those affairs then I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, he's failing in one of the major responsibilities as Premier of this Province and not fulfilling and not earning the Salary that we're about to vote him. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, any First Minister is worth far more than the Salary that's indicated here that we pay our First Ministers, if he is prepared to put that kind of a dedication and have that priority in his own mind-set, to understand what could set this province towards a long-term future and towards a long-term plans and provide some relief for the 50,000 to 55,000 unemployed and, more important, for those youngsters that are coming out of our schools, out of our training schools and out of our universities.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask the First Minister to use his office for those purposes. I would like to hear from him, Mr. Chairman, whether or not he has instructed his staff, instructed his Ministers, arranged for me the kind of meetings that I am now speaking about. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, it was only through that kind of effort on the part of my First Minister when I was privileged to serve in government during the years of '77-81, that we came so close to the fruition of some of these major projects, any one of which you would be very happy to have right now, despite the disclaimer of Limestone only creating 40 jobs. That has to be really the height of gobbledegook talk.

When you listen to your own speeches that you made in the North, you know how important a 5 to 6 year construction, \$2 billion construction job is to Manitoba. You know what that did because you were Minister during the Schreyer years when the economy was fed upwards at the rate of \$150 million to \$200 million a year on construction, some of the construction not necessary but nonetheless that went an awful long way in providing the stats that you now like to quote when you refer to those times.

So, Mr. Chairman, surely the First Minister is not going to parrot that kind of nonsense that his Minister's felt obligated to come up with, that Limestone, the development of the Western Power Grid was never really a worthwhile project. I think the First Minister will again chastise those Ministers as he did on one other occasion, and say that that is expressing, showing naivety and poor judgment, because the people of Manitoba know what cranking up the development wheels on the Nelson River is all about. I know the First Minister knows that too. But I want to know, can he set aside whatever bruised feelings he had because he was not successful in defeating Peter Lougheed the last time he went out there campaigning against the Premier? One wonders about the judgment, the naivety being shown under those kind of circumstances.

But more important to the people of Manitoba . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Premier on a point of order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, just on a matter of privilege, I would not want to leave an incorrect statement by the honourable member on the record. I was not out during the Alberta election campaign, campaigning in the Province of Alberta.

MR. H. ENNS: I have no difficulty in accepting that correction from the First Minister. My understanding then - I'll revise it - is that he accepted as a guest speaker, the invitation of the New Democratic Party in Alberta for which there is nothing wrong, but took that occasion to leave on the public record some remarks that were hardly conducive to putting together the kind of co-operation that was so close to being there, that could have created thousands of jobs in this province; could have brought about a \$2 billion development program on the Nelson River that could have trickled right through our economy.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to be diverted from my initial question to the First Minister. Has the First Minister on his calendar, specific trips? Has he allocated time to visit with different influential people, Premiers and the public sector, executive officers in the private sector, to bring about some economic development in this province?

You name it; it's yours; anything. I am not suggesting that they have to pick up what we had just about accomplished. But, Mr. Chairman, the people of Manitoba are going to be looking for some accomplishment to at least come close to this promises that honourable members opposite gave to the people of Manitoba in November of 1981.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted that the honourable member has given me an opportunity to deal in detail with the economic thrust and direction of the present government. I want to certainly compliment the honourable member for giving me this opportunity to deal in some detail pertaining to the present policies and directions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside on a point of order.

MR. H. ENNS: It's only because of my generosity and good nature, not wanting to see the First Minister in any way be in error. I wasn't asking for his general policy thrust. I was asking specific questions like, are you going to see the President of Alcan next Thursday? Are you going to see Premier Lougheed next Friday? I was asking for specific dates on the Premier's calendar as to what he was going to be occupying his time with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Premier.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, what the Member for Lakeside is indeed doing is demonstrating a different approach between the approach of the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party. The Conservative Party, Mr. Chairman, went for the big bang, the two or three large projects which did not come to fruition during our term and would not have come to fruition if indeed the honourable members for some unfortunate reason had been re-elected on November 17th, did

not come to fruition because of the recession. Mr. Chairman, I can recall vividly in 1981 clearly warning honourable members that all one's eggs ought not to be placed in one basket; that there are many components to the economy, and certainly insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned, ours is a diversified economy.

What indeed was wrong with the approach that honourable members across the way - and I want to deal with the positive in the main - I don't want the honourable member to think I'm only going to relate back to the '77-81 period. I must indeed demonstrate to the honourable member that when you do put all your bets on the big trip; on the big junket; on the trip to Taiwan, or the trip to Hong Kong, or the trip to Pittsburgh, or to some other capital, or Switzerland, that, Mr. Chairman, is the big bang approach that failed insofar as Manitoba is concerned, and even more drastically failed when that was a policy adopted by the cousins of the Conservative Party in Canada, the Liberal Party of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, shortly after our election in April 1982, we attended an economic summit conference which the Prime Minister had called, at which all Provincial Governments were present. What did we hear, Mr. Chairman, from the Prime Minister of this country? The Minister of Finance was there, he can verify. If honourable members want to ensure there's verification from other Premiers, I welcome them to check with other Premiers. What was the Prime Minister's recipe; big mega projects; \$50 billion. We're going to generate the economy of Canada. I turned to the Minister of Finance and I turned to my Minister of Energy and Resources that were also present, and I said the Prime Minister is talking about \$50 billion of mega projects. Where have we heard about mega projects before? We heard about mega projects from honourable members across the way. We heard about mega projects from the Prime Minister of this country, and because of the international recession, Mr. Chairman, those mega projects that the Prime Minister of this country had planned upon went down the drain. The Prime Minister went for the big bang; the Conservative Party in the Province of Manitoba went for the big bang rather than dealing with the fundamentals. — (Interjection)—

I want to now deal with some of the fundamentals. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost what is essential in the Manitoba community is the strengthening and the improvement of the small business community. The small business community is the largest single employer of Manitobans. Mr. Chairman, there is a comment from the Member for Sturgeon Creek why don't you do it? I have a report which I would like to acquaint members with from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business People dealing with registrations. This report was recently issued by the Federation and they're certainly not socialists in case honourable members think. Maybe in the eyes of the Leader of the Opposition this is a socialist, Marxist group, I don't know. But I think on the part of most observers, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business People would not be recognized as socialists.

Their report demonstrates that in respect to incorporations - I'm talking here about small and medium sized business basic and essential to the

economy, and the importance of developing policies and programs to assist the small and medium-sized businesses, Manitoba's the leading province — (Interjection) — by way of — (Interjection) — if the honourable member would just listen for a moment, he might digest some of these words that might do his mind some good. Manitoba's the leading province increasing from 2,921 to 3,037 incorporations representing an increase of 4 percent compared to a national decrease of 17.6. With respect to registrations of proprietorships and partnerships, Manitoba's increase was from 3,292 to 3,557, representing an increase of 8 percent compared to a national decrease of .01 percent.

I would point out to the honourable members that might be interested that insofar as some of those Conservative Governments that honourable members love to embrace to the west of us, the Province of British Columbia new incorporations forecast a decline 34 percent; the Albert dropped 47 percent from the 1981 level; and other jurisdictions showing smaller decreases.

Mr. Chairman, the reason that small business and middle business incorporations increased in Manitoba was not an accident. I don't claim, Mr. Chairman, unlike members across the way, that it's all because of New Democratic Party Government. It's due to the diversification of our economy and secondly progressive acute restraint-minded policies of the Provincial Government of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, is the Member for Sturgeon Creek, is the Leader of the Opposition, is the Member for Lakeside prepared to swear an oath that if acute protracted restraint policies had been pursued in the Province of Manitoba in 1982 — (Interjection) — that the number of incorporations and the registration of proprietorships in the Province of Manitoba would increase as they indeed did under New Democratic Party Government? Is there one member that would be so foolhardy as to declare and to affirm or to swear that would have been the case.

So No. 1, Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, in shouting from his seat, has said that the same happened while they were there. Mr. Chairman, what we do know while they were there, the economy of Canada, the economy of the Western world was in a period of growth; was in a period of increase by way of business activity, and that Manitoba despite that was going downhill, not to the same extent as — (Interjection) — pardon? — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is shouting about manufacturing shipments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Not the same place you're going fortunately. I would not want to go to the — (Interjection) — though I might enjoy it, Mr. Chairman. It might be a very enjoyable and interesting experience to follow the Honourable Member for Lakeside in listening to some of the chat from the Peters and the — (Interjection)—

So, No. 1, Mr. Chairman, what we have is a need for the strengthening and I would be delighted to proceed into more detail, if the honourable member would like, re the small and medium-sized business community.

No. 2, Mr. Speaker, this government has ensured by its policies and its programs, and I believe, considerable credit must be paid to the Minister of Energy and Mines here for an increase by way of oil activity in the Province of Manitoba, by the increase by way of exploration, by the increase — (Interjection) — honourable members don't appear to enjoy hearing that there has been — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: What are you smoking, Harry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm a little disappointed. I made sure that I listened closely to the comments by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, comments by honourable members across the way and I guess I'm not surprised; I'm a little disappointed that honourable members would not have granted me the same courtesies I attempted to grant them.

HON. S. LYON: Oh, stop whining and bellyaching. What are you bellyaching about? Act like a leader, for God's sake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. Committee will reconvene at 8.00 p.m.

IN SESSION PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. The time being 4:30, Private Members' Hour. The first item on the agenda for Tuesday afternoon is the adjourned debates on second readings of Public Bills.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert, Bill 41, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia.

MR. P. Fox: Stand.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Stand.

RES. NO. 10 - RECOGNITION OF MACKENZIE-PAPINEAU BATTALION VETERANS

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Resolution No. 10, the

Honourable Minister of Natural Resources has five minutes remaining.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, when I was last speaking on this resolution, I had indicated that the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion members were subjected to the imposition of an amendment to The Imperial Foreign Enlistment Act which made it unlawful for people concerned about the development of Nazi and Fascist movements and their participation in Spain. It made it unlawful for Canadians to go and resist that movement.

Mr. Speaker, laterally, the Federal Government finally rectified part of that mistake; they took away the penalty that would otherwise have been available by rescinding the effect of that law against the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, so that they were not considered to be criminals for having broken that law - great effort on the part of the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government, then in Ottawa, governments everywhere turned their back on what was happening in the Old Country. That same Federal Government denied refuge to Jewish people who were fleeing the holocaust in Germany.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution now calls upon a Federal Government to finally rectify the mistake that was made many years ago and to give recognition to this valiant group who were prepared, and many of them gave of their lives, to resist the development of Nazism and Fascism in the world.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says, "Oh come on." These are facts of history. The Leader of the Opposition wants to turn his back on history. We know, Mr. Speaker, that Governments of the Day, in the '30s knew about the development of the Nazi war machine; they chose to turn their backs on it. Charles Lindbergh, the great American hero was shown, by Hitler, the development of his great Luftwaffe. He went back to the United States and he said, "There's a great war machine being developed there. We should be alarmed, we should be concerned." Forget about it; just forget about it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, people knew, people in the left knew, throughout the world, that there was a design on the part of the war machine that was being built in Germany. That design was to march east into the Soviet Union to destroy Bolshevism; that was the answer of the capitalist world. Destroy Bolshevism with a military machine. That was the purpose of that army. We know, and it's a fact of history that Maksim Litvinov, the Foreign Minister for the Soviet Union, pleaded with France, pleaded with England to sign an agreement, a non-aggression agreement, an agreement that if they were attacked by Germany, they would together resist that. They wouldn't sign; they wouldn't agree. — (Interjection) —

We're hearing this nonsense from across the Chamber which I choose to ignore, Mr. Speaker. We know that today we must be vigilant against Nazis and Fascists that exist, that survive, that were welcomed to this continent, welcomed to this continent by people in Canada and the United States. Nazism is not dead, Mr. Speaker. We still have people who call themselves Progressive Conservatives that talk about holocaust as being a mistake, holocaust not having occurred.

Mr. Speaker, we know what happened in Germany; we know that millions of people died because conservative people were afraid to stand up and speak for truth and to defend democracy. It was democracy that was being defended in Spain by the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion and nay-sayers, like we have in this Chamber today, Mr. Speaker, were saying, "It's none of our business. It really doesn't matter what happens there." That's what they said about the Japanese rape in China. That's what they said about Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia; it really didn't matter, it's not close to home. That's the same kind of attitude that persists in the Conservative Party today, Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many.

Mr. Speaker, when I last spoke, I said there was depression everywhere in the world in the '30s. I was mistaken, Mr. Speaker, and I admit that today, I had the privilege of re-reading an article in the Manitoba Commonwealth, a paper of the CCF, was published in Winnipeg on Friday, August 12th. I would like to read just a few sentences from that article, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, do I have leave? Well, Mr. Speaker, if I do not have leave let me end with Hemingway's words. The bell tolls, Mr. Speaker, the bell tolls for us all. I hope that some people in this world will open their ears and listen. We still have the same poverty; we have the same misery; we have the same problems throughout the world that breed Communism, Fascism, Nazism. Mr. Speaker, Democratic Socialists are alert to the danger. We ask that other people join us in being concerned about the danger of these forces in society. We ask, Mr. Speaker, that people recognize the valiant efforts of people of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion in resisting aggression in 1936.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I consider it a privilege to follow the remarks of the Minister of Natural Resources. I've always found him to be most eloquent on all issues and I would say that his remarks today and his remarks when he spoke previously were certainly in keeping with that great tradition of eloquence from him.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives us the opportunity to reflect on a number of issues. It gives us the opportunity to reflect on the specific question of the recognition of the members of the Mac-Paps, the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, that fought in the Spanish Civil War. It gives us the opportunity to reflect on the terrible history of the 1930s, of the rise of Fascism in Spain and elsewhere in Europe. It gives us a chance to reflect on the personal courage of the millions of people who fought against this terrible rise of Fascism, Mr. Speaker. It gives us the opportunity to reflect on the historical experience in Europe and the way in which many democratic governments chose to ignore the rise of Fascism, chose to take the course of appeasement and the vain attempt to sell the souls of many people, many countries, in the attempt to appease the Fascists. Most particularly, Mr. Speaker, I think it gives us a chance to reflect on the personal courage of the members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion, the "Mac-Paps" as we affectionately call them, who made

the commitment to fight Fascism well before the governments of the west made that commitment in 1939, who made that first valiant attempt to stop the Fascists in their tracks in Spain.

The sad fact, Mr. Speaker, is that some who have spoken on this resolution thus far have chosen to ignore these opportunities. Instead, Mr. Speaker, they have chosen to distort history, to distort the attempt to rectify some of the mistakes of the past that are outlined in this resolution. They've chosen to do that, Mr. Speaker, because of their own ideological blindness to exactly what those issues are. I am referring of course, Mr. Speaker, in particular, to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, the remarks he made in this House on Monday the 16th of May, 1983. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I have heard him speak on a number of occasions in this House before. I've been disturbed at times by the bombast, the pompousness of that member, Mr. Speaker, but I must say the most disturbing speech I've seen him give was on this very same issue on the 16th of May, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to refer in particular to a couple of gross historical distortions contained in his speech. I use those words, Mr. Speaker, with care. I've chosen those words with care, because I can think of nothing else to describe the statements he made because they were, in fact, gross historical distortions. I refer, first of all, Mr. Speaker, to his comments in Hansard, Page 2786, in which he said that the Spanish Civil War was not much more than the ideological fights between the Communists and the Fascists in Spain. He continued, Mr. Speaker, to say this matter was one in which the Canadian Government should not have been involved at that time. Also, Mr. Speaker, in Hansard, Page 2787, he stated, "Well, they happen to be on the USSR Communist side," in referring to the Mac-Paps, "and that's what motivated many of them to be there in the first place."

Well, it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see the mind of the Leader of the Opposition in action. We've seen it many a time in this House. We've seen how he manages to bring things down to some rather ridiculous conclusions, Mr. Speaker, of left and right, of polarization, even here at the provincial level. But here I think we see it in a historical case, Mr. Speaker, gross historical distortion. He's saying, basically, that the Spanish Civil War was a fight between Communism and Fascism. How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous. That couldn't be further from the truth. What happened in Spain, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite, those who will stay here for the rest of this speech - unlike the Leader of the Opposition who chooses to hit and run - if they will look at the history of what happened in Spain, they will see that the fight was between democracy and Fascism.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is not proper in this House to comment on the presence or the absence of other members.

The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, shall I put it this way? I must say the atmosphere in this House has improved recently in the last few minutes due to the absence of somebody who I will not refer to specifically.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris talks about cheap shots. I can't think of anything which was more of a cheap shot than the speech that the Leader of the Opposition made on this resolution when he spoke only one month ago. As I said, Mr. Speaker, if one looks at the history of the Spanish Civil War and what happened before it, Mr. Speaker, one will find that the fight was not between Fascism or Communism, it was a fight between Fascism and democracy.

If one goes back, Mr. Speaker, to the 1920s in Spain, one will see that there was a continuing problem in that country with military dictatorship between 1923 and 1929. One General Primo de Rivera was the military dictator of Spain. That changed, Mr. Speaker, in 1931 when the results of elections lead to the overthrow of that dictatorship and the monarchy in Spain at that time. Mr. Speaker, what government came in at that time in Spain? Was it a Communist Government? No, Mr. Speaker. It was a government consisting of Socialists and members of the various Republican parties. That changed in 1934, Mr. Speaker, when a right-wing government was elected under the CEDA Party. That changed again in 1936 when there was a new set of elections and the Popular Front, the Peoples Front, was elected to government.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was prior to the Civil War in Spain a number of elections. There was democracy in action and there were no Communist governments in Spain, Mr. Speaker. But I am sure that if the Leader of the Opposition were to rise on this particular point if he had that opportunity, which he can't for some reason which I can't mention, but if he were he would say, oh yes, but in 1936, the Peoples Front, well, that was Communist. Well, was it, Mr. Speaker? Let's look at the election results in 1936 in Spain. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, a left-wing government was elected and it consisted of 99 Socialist deputies; from the Republican Left Party, 87 deputies; from the Republican Union Party, 39 deputies; from the Cathaline Esquara, 36 deputies. How many communist deputies were there, Mr. Speaker? There were 17 out of a total of 278 from the Popular Front candidates; 17 out of 278.

Mr. Speaker, there were other parties represented as well. There was CEDA on the right with 88; various other parties with 11, 13, 10, 9, a total of 134. There were also a number of centre representatives, as well, Mr. Speaker. So for the Leader of the Opposition to reduce this as being a communist government is absolutely absurd, Mr. Speaker. It was a government of the left, certainly. It was a government of socialists, of republicans and communists, Mr. Speaker, in the general support in the Legislature. But if one looks further one will find that the Cabinet of that particular government contained no communists, so where does he come up with this reference to communism?

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's continue with the history of what happened in 1936, on July 17th. There was a military uprising which began in Morocco under General Franco. It soon spread through a number of other locations and after about eight days, the Fascists in Spain controlled approximately one-quarter of the population of Spain. This situation had stabilized after awhile, Mr. Speaker, because there were many elements of the military for example which were loyal to the Republican Government. What changed that, Mr. Speaker? What changed it fundamentally was the

involvement of the Italian Fascists and the German Nazis. They began to pour millions and millions of dollars worth of equipment into that country. They began to send in troops, Mr. Speaker, in continuing numbers. If members opposite dealt with the impact that had on that war, I would note, Mr. Speaker, that by 1937 Italy alone had provided 50,000 soldiers to Spain; 763 airplanes; 1,900 canons; 10,000 machine guns; 240,000 small arms and 7,600 vehicles.

What does the Leader of the Opposition say? Well the Republicans, they were fighting on the communist side. Why does he say that, Mr. Speaker? Well because the Soviet Union, many months later provided the Republican side with arms, mostly small arms, Mr. Speaker. He will, I'm sure reduce that to being an indication that the Republicans were, Mr. Speaker, a communist movement. Well, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous can one get? The reason that the Republic Government went to the Russians, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. They weren't getting any help from the British. They weren't getting help from the French, the democratic governments, their kin, Mr. Speaker, in the democratic governments because by that time France had a Popular Front Government very similar to the one in Spain at the present time, so that's why they went to the Russians.

So, Mr. Speaker, one can see in looking at history that the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition are completely and absolutely false. What happened in the Spanish Civil War was a fight between democracy and fascism, it was not as the Leader of the Opposition suggested, a straight case of the communists against the fascists.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I must say that I am not as concerned about the statements made from the Leader of the Opposition as some might expect in the sense of historical accuracy because I know that he cares very little for history. If one looks at his remarks on other matters of current interest; his remarks in regard to Chile or Central America, it's obvious that he continually ignores the lessons of history, and that is, Mr. Speaker, if we in the West either stand by and do nothing or actually support right-wing fascist governments wherever they occur in the world, we will not be fighting communism, we will be promoting it. Because that is what is happening in areas of the world where the West through the United States or whatever form of government, Mr. Speaker, is supporting pro-fascist governments.

These governments in Central America, these governments in South America, Mr. Speaker, what are they doing to fight communism? Well nothing, Mr. Speaker, they're promoting it because people, the peasants in those countries are turning to the communists in greater and greater numbers. If the Leader of the Opposition is really concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, he should look at history because that is what has happened in the past.

What does concern me I think beyond that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the mentality we're seeing from the Leader of the Opposition is not just simply a reflection of history, a matter of historical curiosity, it's something that he applies day in and day out in this Legislature. He applies it on all sorts of issues, Mr. Speaker. Oh, it's the NDP, they're all communists. We know his mentality. We saw it yesterday on the Election

Finances Bill, Mr. Speaker. Oh, Mr. Speaker, he talks about the NDP being communists. We all know that he likes to throw the Liberals in with the NDP. We can see after awhile that pretty well anybody who doesn't agree with Sterling Lyon has got to be a communist or something of a similar nature, Mr. Speaker. That is his mentality. What scares me about that, Mr. Speaker, is that it shows a fundamental lack of concern for what I would consider one of the basic principles in any democracy, and that is tolerance of the ideas of others. I know how difficult it can be. I have a great deal of difficulty tolerating the views of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, but I do. I do not get up in this House and call him a fascist even though I find his political views distasteful. I say to myself consciously that I should try and tolerate his views, but that's a tolerance that he does not show, Mr. Speaker, for anything connected to what he describes as the left, and that scares me, because it was that kind of mentality which led in the 1930s to the rise of fascism.

The fascists, they were against the communists. That's what they said time and time again, Mr. Speaker, were anti-communist. It was something, Mr. Speaker, that they used with people who would not normally have subscribed to their views; people who said well at least they're anti-communist. Mr. Speaker, what was the result? The result of this negative push, was that the tolerance which I referred to disappeared totally and with it went the democracy; with it went democracy in Italy; with it went democracy in Germany in the 1930s. It's the same kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that can eat away at our democratic system here in Canada; here in Manitoba at the present time.

I'd really take this opportunity when an issue of this, to urge members of this House to look at history and look what happens when that tolerance disappears, Mr. Speaker; look what happens when one gets the inane kind of anti-communist rhetoric that Reds under the bed, Red scare sort of rhetoric that one gets time in and time out from the Leader of the Opposition on this and other issues. When one looks at it, Mr. Speaker, one can see that is a danger to democracy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think if one pieces together the various aspects of the debate on this issue thus far, one can see that it is very relevant, not just in a historical sense, but in a present sense. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, in this world, there are people who don't wear swastikas perhaps, but who practice the very same ideology, the very same brutal totalitarianism as the Nazis and Fascists of the 1930s and 1940s, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, the Member for Morris says like who; like the Government of Argentina which killed 30,000 people through military terror; like the Government of Chile which is a fascist government.

Mr. Speaker, I know that members opposite perhaps aren't that concerned about it. I know the Leader of the Opposition in this House has said, well at least these governments don't threaten Canada. Well let's look at the kind of result in a country that can result from this kind of government. Let's look at what happened in Spain because of the Spanish Civil War, Mr. Speaker. More than 1 million people died as a result of that conflict, Mr. Speaker, more than 1 million. They did not all die in the battlefield, Mr. Speaker. Estimates are shown that as many as 400,000 people died at the

hands of the fascists either as a result of the terror that was conducted during that time, Mr. Speaker, or as a result of death in concentration camps, not only during the period of the war, but up until the 1940s, there were documented reports from American Consular officials. I have them available for members of the opposition which will show that as late as 1944 there were as many as two and three hundred executions a day in some areas of Spain, Mr. Speaker. This is the impact that fascism can have on a country. What about, Mr. Speaker, what about its impact on other countries? Mr. Speaker, is a brutal totalitarian regime only a threat to its own people and we should just dismiss it as being that?

Well, let's look at the experience of Fascism and Nazism in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker. There were those who said the same things; they said, in those years, that if we leave them alone, Mr. Speaker, if we contain them, if we appease them, then there will be no problem for us. I can think of dozens of leaders of the western democracies who tried that, Mr. Speaker, the most infamous example being Neville Chamberlain; the most infamous example of that being the Munich Pact. And I can look at that, Mr. Speaker, and I can look, not just at leaders of democratic countries who attempted to appease the Fascists and Nazis; I can look at an even more direct example, of Stalin who signed a pact with Hitler in 1939, who then proceeded to carve up Poland, Mr. Speaker, attempted not to just restrain the Nazis, but to attempt to attain some benefit from that pact themselves.

And what was the result of that, Mr. Speaker? Less than two years later, the Russians found out how much that piece of paper meant when they were invaded, and when more than 20 million of their population died in the Second World War.

So that, Mr. Speaker, is the essence of the whole problem. If we, as citizens in any part of this world, turn a blind eye to Fascism or Nazism, or any kind of totalitarianism, the Stalinism of the 1930s when millions of kulaks in the Ukraine were eliminated, liquidated by that regime; if we turn our backs on any of those kinds of situations anywhere, Mr. Speaker, the result will be that we may get a few years of peace and quiet, we may be able to put our heads in the sand for some short period of time, but we eventually will pay for it, we eventually will pay for it. The 1930s show that if we turn a blind eye to these problems, eventually we will have that problem at our front doorsteps, Mr. Speaker.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this particular issue I will say that I think that we have to look at history. We have to see here in this particular situation what members of the Mac-Paps did, Mr. Speaker, and that was basically, as far as I am concerned, to help stop Fascism. They tried, Mr. Speaker, to stop it in its tracks in Spain, but they did at least delay it for three years and perhaps gave the world some time, gave the rest of the west some time to get ready for that conflict. So we must credit them for that.

We can't change history in regard to the treatment of the Mac-Paps, Mr. Speaker, they have been neglected for years, but I think we can correct it somewhat by recognizing their efforts now, and that is basically what the resolution states. But in doing that, I hope that we will do one further thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is to

look at history in the sense of that phrase that we've all heard that says, "Those that choose to ignore history are those who are condemned to repeat it." Because, if we ignore the efforts of those gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, if we ignore the efforts of the Mac-Paps, of those who did fight against Fascism and Nazism; if we try and even ignore the horror of Fascism and Nazism in the 1930s and 1940s, if we try and ignore the horror of the totalitarian regimes that are oppressing millions of people throughout the world at the present time, Mr. Speaker, then we are condemned to repeat the same thing. We are condemned, Mr. Speaker, to suffer that fate ourselves, because suffer Canadians did in the Second World War in trying to correct the abuses of Fascism and Nazism. Many died, Mr. Speaker, many families today remember loved ones who died in that war.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition said, well, talk to the Legions. If you talk to members of the Legions, as I do with my members of the Legions, they are painfully aware of history, Mr. Speaker, they do not want us to forget history. I hope, by supporting this resolution, that we will all remember history on this particular question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the member used up all of his allotted time or not but, with leave, I would like to ask him a question if he would be receptive to that.

MR. S. ASHTON: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. If there is leave the honourable member can ask his question. (Leave)

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member indicated that we should not turn our back on some of the "isms" like Nazism and Fascism and totalitarianism. I am wondering if he, by design, left communism off that list or, indeed, can we turn our back on communism.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite obviously was not listening to the entirety of my remarks. I stated a number of times that we should also be concerned about the abuses of any totalitarian government; I referred specifically to the abuses of the Stalin Government when they murdered 9 million Ukrainians in the 1930s, Mr. Speaker. If he will look at the resolution he will note that it refers to the Mac-Paps and that it refers to the Spanish Civil War, and that I referred, specifically, to the fact that that was a fight between democracy and Fascism, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, history is a wonderful thing, you know, and those that try to preach history quite often, by their sins of omission, create greater faults than they do in the story they tell. I would suggest that the honourable member, by the very fact that he refused

to answer the question that was asked of him by the Member for Morris, has created a greater sin than that of having told the truth . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: I don't know where the member was about two minutes ago, but I did answer the question from the Member for Morris. If he is not happy with that, that's his problem.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I thank the honourable member for that clarification.

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I listened very carefully to the supposed answer given by the Member for Thompson and that is why I made the very statement; that by refusing to answer the question he has committed a greater sin and probably, in trying to tell a story in history, by refusing to answer the question has, in fact, given very little credibility to the story that he has put forward.

Mr. Speaker, I had a great deal of difficulty this week in deciding whether I should be here or in Brandon. I chose to be here because this is the responsibility the people of the area conferred on me, and I decided I would not be a delegate to the Royal Canadian Legion meeting. I am a member of the Royal Canadian Legion and I am very proud of that membership. It's a group of people who have served their country at the call their country, and have served in various capacities and, having served, are recognized for that service.

I have asked the Royal Canadian Legion, and received an answer, as to whether or not they were willing to recognize the Mac-Pap Battalion, and the Royal Canadian Legion has had great difficulty in giving that recognition. In fact, the Royal Canadian Legion has said that to recognize them officially would seem to establish an impossible precedent whereby any Canadian, who might involve themselves unilaterally in all sorts of conflict in foreign lands, perhaps to the embarrassment of government, could claim veteran status. — (Interjection) — Well, the Honourable Member for Inkster may think that's garbage; I would want him to tell that to the Royal Canadian Legion, and I would hope that he took the opportunity, the closest opportunity, to go to a Royal Canadian Legion Branch and tell them that very same thing; that everything they do is garbage, because the Honourable Member for Inkster has got a lot to learn in this world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about history, because history will tell you a story, and history tells you a story dependent on those that write the story; and for every story you'll get, you'll find another author who will give you a different version of it. I like to refer to something that involves me and the area that I used to represent, when I represented the Constituency of Birtle-Russell.

Mr. Speaker, many years ago when I was a school child attending school in the Foxwarren area, there was an area in the Russell community that was given a special name and it was the Rural Municipality of Bolton. That municipality was named after Major Bolton who

was the local hero. Major Bolton was given special consideration by the Government of the Day and special land considerations in return for his valiant service and dedication of service to this country, because Major Bolton organized a battalion - actually it wasn't a battalion; there was a very small number in reality. I think there was some 24 or 27 members of the Bolton Scouts who fought for this country and joined the Northwest Mounted Police in the fight against a person who at that time was branded a traitor to our country, was captured and consequently tried and hanged in this country as a traitor; a fellow by the name of Louis Riel, and history that I learned some 50 years ago in school, in Manitoba, indicated that Major Bolton was a hero and Louis Riel was a traitor to our country.

Many years later, Mr. Speaker, I came to this Legislature to find a statue being raised on these very grounds, and today Louis Riel is considered to be a hero. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the facts have changed at all, but time has changed, and the telling of the story over a period of time has changed to the point where, what I was taught at school, that Riel was a traitor, is now, in the eyes of most people in the Province of Manitoba, not true at all. To most people in Manitoba today, Louis Riel is a hero and I accept that because that is history and history has numerous ways of telling stories; stories that all stem from the same facts, but depending on who tells the story, arrives at a different answer.

So, Mr. Speaker, I tell you that story because it's one that I was personally involved in. I didn't know Major Bolton, but I was raised in the area that he came from and in which he was considered to be a local hero.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that much of the same has occurred with the telling of the stories of the Mac-Pap Battalion in the Spanish Civil War. When this resolution first came up, I became interested in it because I could not remember in my own mind, although I was in high school at the time, I couldn't recall too much in my own memory of what happened, so I wrote a letter to a well-renowned historian here in the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Eric Wells, to see if he could provide me with any information on it because I was interested. There was a resolution coming forward, and the information I received from Mr. Wells and many other sources has led me to meet some very interesting people. Some of them are members of the Mac-Pap organization.

I certainly have a degree of empathy for the case that they put forward, but I am caught between that concern for their case and the greater concern I have for the organization to which I belong, and that's the Royal Canadian Legion. I would say to those members that are left of the Mac-Pap Battalion, that if they can get the support of the Royal Canadian Legion, they will have my support as well. — (Interjection) —

I thank the Honourable Member for St. James for those comments. It's very interesting that he would make those types of comments in this House and I appreciate his respect for individual members in this House and for this House in general.

The Honourable Member for St. James is a man who is well-known for his rising rhetoric. Whether or not it is germane to the fact or whether it's a flight of fancy doesn't seem to be that important to him. As long as he makes wind and rabbit tracks, that seems to be his major concern.

MR. C. MANNES: He demonstrates at the U.S. Consulate.

MR. H. GRAHAM: So, Mr. Speaker, I've given you the reason why I am not going to support this resolution at this time. As a veteran; because I am a veteran; that is why I am not supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to rise and speak in favour of the resolution, and in doing so, also to respond to the arguments of the Member for Virden.

The Member for Virden stated that to grant recognition to the surviving members of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion of the 15th International Brigade is to set a very dangerous precedent in the sense that any future group of individuals, who on their own would enlist in the service of a foreign nation or foreign state, may also claim the same benefits or recognition. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not a very good argument because the very Government of Canada itself, through the Minister of Justice when this member of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion returned, made a solemn promise and he did live up to that promise that he will never prosecute them for acting in violation of The Foreign Enlistment Act of 1937.

So that is already an exception, a recognition of what they had done. Moreover, there would be no other group of persons, I would say, that could match the courage of the members of the Mac-Pap Battalion. They are a very unique group of individuals. They are unique because they not only speak in accordance with their conscience, but they also acted on the basis of their conscience. We are often judged by what we say. I say that we must be better judged by what we do. Actions speak louder than words, and the fact that they are willing to lay down their lives in defence of freedom of choice and against the forces of totalitarianism, which was engulfing Spain, is a tribute to their courage. Courage can only emerge and arise from clear conscience. Courage is not pugnacity. It is not the ability of a person to make a fight when there is no cause for a fight. That is foolhardiness. Only when you are acting on the basis of clear conscience can you find true courage to stand up and say what you want to say and do what you want to do.

These members who are surviving, mostly now over 65 years old, they acted on the basis of their conscience that they're going to defend the Republican duly instituted government against the onslaught of the totalitarian faction of the followers of General Francisco Franco.

The truth must always be said and no one can suppress the truth of the courage that they have shown in fighting and defending the side of Republican democracy. True, there might be some committed Communists who joined the same international brigade. There are a variety of motivations of people who join in that brigade. There are some people who joined the brigade because they are fed up with the Depression, poverty that had engulfed our North American continent in that era. They had no jobs. They are frustrated. They

are unemployed. So it is room to condemn everyone who joined because they joined on the basis of ideology. Some of them are idealists; some of them are humanitarians; some of them are intellectuals. Therefore, let us always bear in mind that they are always fighting for a cause which their conscience dictate and for that alone I give them recognition and I salute them for their action, an act of courage.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to end by saying that we may lose our wealth; if we do, we lose much. We may lose our friends, if we do, we lose more. If we lose our courage, then we lose everything and all.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a Legion man I certainly will not support this resolution that's been brought before the House during this Session.

I have, Mr. Speaker, as a member of my own Legion of Portage la Prairie, the old Major Fawcett Legion, No. 65, spoke to several of the members of my own Legion. They say to me as a man who is representing them in the Manitoba Legislature of Manitoba, they do not want me, Sir, to in any way support this resolution. To go further on that, Mr. Speaker, when the President of the Supreme Command of the Legion of Canada suggests that we not support it, that in my opinion is a strong reason for me to certainly not support it.

Going a little further, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with the president and some of the members of our local Army and Navy Association in Portage la Prairie. The president of our local club today can remember, Sir, going with his father to the old Elite Theatre back in the '30s. He used to attend or did attend meetings with his father and at that time they were pleading, Mr. Speaker, for support from the residents of the area of Portage la Prairie, both in support for manpower and for the monetary support that they apparently needed at that time.

Mr. Speaker, when I'm in the position that I am as a veteran today and have spoke with these men and they have related the early history of this particular group of men, once again no way could I as a veteran, as a man representing a fine constituency as Portage la Prairie where many, many men served in their services both in the Airforce and the Army and in the Navy. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, Sir, to listen to them, to listen to what they have to say and relate to this House their feelings on this very important issue.

A MEMBER: Think about your words, because we're representing our constituents.

MR. C. MANNES: Educate them, that's the socialist plan. Educate the masses.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to many of the members in the Opposition speak in favour of this resolution and it's very disturbing to me today to listen to the Member for Thompson get up and relate to this House . . .

A MEMBER: A true representative.

MR. L. HYDE: . . . a young representative, I'll say, from Thompson who spoke about the early history of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion. He spoke of them as if he was a man of knowledge of the early history of that era, Sir, and he was asked a question point blank by the Member for Morris, asking him if he believed and would include the word "Communism" in the reference. He would not, Mr. Speaker, stand up in this House and mention the word "Communism."

Mr. Speaker, it is men like that - and he's not alone, there are several men on that side of the House, Sir, who have referred . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Does the Honourable Member for Thompson have a point of order?

MR. S. ASHTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said and I will repeat it, that I was particularly concerned in context of the 1930s about the Communist brutality in the Soviet Union. The question I thought was not in regard to words but against brutality. I said then and I will say it again that I am against all forms of oppression and murder, no matter which government commits them and no matter where they're committed.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, once again, he has not got up in this House and mentioned the word "Communism." Does he believe in it? I say he does.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I will say the word "Communist," I have said it many times before. I would also say that I am totally against the barbaric abuses of the Communist regimes in many areas of this world. I have said that before and I'll say it again. For the member to now try and twist my words, Mr. Speaker, and suggest the kind of ridiculous insinuations that he is putting forward in this House is absolutely and 100 percent disgraceful.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I thank the Honourable Member for Thompson for that clarification, which I hope was heard clearly by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. He may continue.

MR. L. HYDE: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I guess I will have to listen and accept what he has said, but we certainly do have it on record - his full meaning. Mr. Speaker, yes, we may have our doubts about that individual and he's not alone. There are other people who have spoken on that side of the House who are very much in favour of this particular resolution. We know, Sir, their true feelings on this issue. They may not have come out and all spoke in strong terms in support of the resolution, but deep down they do believe and will be supporting this resolution, Sir.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, we've heard this afternoon from the member representing the constituency of

Virден. He spoke well on this issue. He's a returned individual, a returned man, who believes in the reason he served for a number of years. Mr. Speaker, when individuals like the Member for Virден gets up and expresses in the words that he did, the way he did, Sir, indicates the true feelings of the members on this side of the House. — (Interjection)—

A MEMBER: What have you been into, Russ?

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I was not prepared nor to speak at this particular time, however, I want to and will take and — (Interjection) — the name of the Member for Inkster was brought to my attention. Well, I have my own opinions of that individual as well. There are other ones there, but there are some there that I know deep down would not wish to support this if they had their own wishes, but I am certain that they have been told in their caucus which way to vote when this does comes to a vote. I am sure.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. HYDE: Yes, this is sure, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure that the members of the caucus and of the government certainly do not have their freedom of speech, the opportunity to say exactly what they wish to say in this House. They're being told, Mr. Speaker, they've been told. It's many many cases of just what will happen if they say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. It is one of the principles of our democratic system that there is freedom of speech and members are entitled to give their own opinions. It is improper, I believe, for the honorable member to insist that is not shared by other members.

The time being 5:30, when we next reach this resolution - by the way, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie will have 10 minutes remaining.

COMMITTEE CHANGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: A committee change on Agriculture: The Member for Thompson will be substituting for the Member for The Pas; and the Member for Ste. Rose is substituting for the Member for Dauphin.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will accept a motion to adjourn. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: I move, seconded by the Member for Turtle Mountain, that subject to the two committees meeting this evening, this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).