

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 30 May, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report on the Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Your committee met on Thursday, May 30, 1985 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 255 of the Legislative Building to consider the Annual Reports of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. and Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation.

Messrs. David Gardave, Chairman of the Board and Malcolm Wright, President, provided such information as was required by members of the committee with respect to the operation of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd.

Information with respect to the operation of Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation was provided to members of the committee by Messrs. Robert M. Silver, Chairman of the Board and John R. Sadler, President.

Your committee examined the Annual Report of Manitoba Mineral Resources Ltd. for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1984 and the Annual Report of Manitoba Oil and Gas Corporation for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1984, and adopted the same as presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for River East, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a few words on what is a very special day for all Canadians, including Manitobans. I want to join all members in this House and all Manitobans today in congratulating Steve Fonyo on the completion of his run.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is not an exaggeration to say that while Steve Fonyo was in the Province of Manitoba he touched each and every one of us. We

are proud of the support that he received in Manitoba, and also Steve Fonyo himself indicated that upon crossing the border into the Province of Manitoba he felt that's when his campaign really commenced to take off. There was that spirit of desire to contribute to a community cause.

One of the highlights of the run, Mr. Speaker, from the Manitoba perspective was reflected in the spirit of his endeavour, indeed, was the greeting that he received at the Manitoba-Ontario boundary from a late colleague of ours, Mary Beth Dolin, representing the constituency of Kildonan. I know that she would be delighted today in the success of his run. If she were here, she would be very proud of the success of Steve's run across Canada.

Steve Fonyo has brought hope to cancer victims throughout all of Canada, to disabled people everywhere. For this, and for the example that he set for each and every one of us, we indeed from Manitoba - I think all Manitobans - say, thank you, Steve Fonyo, for a job well done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my leader and our group, we're certainly pleased to associate ourselves with the comments just made by the First Minister, the kind of courage and respect that this young Canadian displayed for all Manitobans to see is something we can all be proud of. I, like the Premier, take special pride in the fact that it was, indeed, in Manitoba and West where this young Canadian found such a large measure of generosity and hospitality along this long walk across this country.

May the funds that he has helped raise and may the spirit of giving that he has called upon the part of so many Canadians to help in the ongoing fight of the dreaded disease that has struck this young man in a particularly cruel way, and may it help in assisting that other youngsters, other people, will be spared from the ravages of that disease.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. R. PENNER introduced, by leave, Bill No. 47, The Infants' Estates Act; Loi sur les biens des mineurs. (Recommended by Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have the Italian Consul General, His Excellency Dr. Massimo Macchia, and Mr. Proveledo, the Consul of Italy in Manitoba.

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

Also in the gallery, there are 64 students of Grade 9 standing from the Mennonite Brethren Collegiate under the direction of Mr. B. Enns and Mr. H. Wall. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

There are 50 students of Grade 9 standing from the Andrew Mynarski under the direction of Mr. V. Bonin. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Manitoba Energy Heritage Fund - revenues from NSP

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has been making numerous statements outside of this Chamber with respect to revenues and where they will be flowing from the Northern States Power sale.

I wonder if the Minister would use the courtesy and confirm in this Chamber that he intends to divert revenues from the Northern States Power Sale into a "heritage fund" in the year 1993.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: . . . to deal with the matter, we will be taking the profits from that sale and we will be allocating profits. These are profits that are arrived when one takes the revenues, subtracts the costs in terms of the financial aspects of a business, and allocates 50 percent of the profits to Hydro for utilization and keeping rates below that which they would be without the NSP sale, and the remaining 50 percent of the profits will be put into a Manitoba Energy Heritage Trust Fund for economic development in this province which are long-term jobs in this province, Mr. Speaker.

Legislation re diverting of funds

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, some time ago - I will refer the question to the same Minister - at the time of the National Energy Board hearings that were held here in the city, either the Minister or members of his staff indicated that may well require legislation to divert Hydro funds to any other source.

Is it the Minister's intention to introduce legislation during the course of this Session to do that?

HON. W. PARASIUK: We certainly - to put the question straight - aren't diverting Hydro funds; in fact, we are taking revenues, Mr. Speaker, taking profits and allocating them. These are derived from sales outside of the province to people outside.

We intend to bring in legislation and it could be at this Session. We are making sure that the legislation is well-drafted, and we are taking a look at the Heritage Funds that exist in other provinces. Alberta has a

Heritage Fund; Saskatchewan has a Heritage Fund; it would appear that the Conservative Party of Manitoba does not want Manitoba to have a Heritage Fund, Mr. Speaker. We are doing that; we will be bringing in the legislation. It may be in this Session; but it will certainly be in the next Session at the latest.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the same Minister. Mr. Speaker, quoting from a document that is often used by members opposite, the report of the National Energy Board with respect to the sale of energy and power to the Northern States Power group, that report indicates that by the year 2000 Manitoba Hydro still will be losing \$131 million on that sale.

My question to the Honourable Minister: well, how are we going to divert profits in 1993 if in the year 2000 we are still losing \$131 million without asking the ratepayers of Manitoba, the users of Manitoba Hydro, to provide those funds?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question is argumentative. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, I will rephrase the question. I will ask the First Minister: would the First Minister consider freezing hydro rates for the next few years and put off putting so-called profits into a heritage fund?

How about just giving Manitobans a break, no hydro rate increases for the next few years? Would that not make a lot more common sense, Mr. Speaker?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, just so that the member recognizes and sees a clear picture which removes the somewhat muddy picture that he has of the Energy Heritage Fund, I would ask the Minister of Energy to respond fully to that question.

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to deal with this question because frankly what it does is show the complete lack of business sense and knowledge on the part of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Premier, you will recall that last night we met with the business group and I asked them if they, in fact, had earned a profit last year and they said, yes. I asked them if they had paid off that entire debt relating to the cost of making the revenue that led to that profit being created and they said, no, they hadn't.

I then said that they could not declare a profit. They looked at me as if I was crazy. I then told them that it was not my thinking, it was the thinking of the Conservative Party in their logic, which says that you cannot declare, you cannot have profits, unless all of the costs are entirely paid off, Mr. Speaker. When they looked at the situation the fellow was dumbfounded and said they are grasping at straws.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. An answer to a question should not be a speech.

**Job creation record -
reason for decline**

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister arising out of the release of the Manitoba Labour Market Information Bulletin for April, 1985.

On Page 2, Mr. Speaker, the report indicates that Manitoba had the ninth fastest rate of employment growth between April, 1984 and April, 1985 and along with Newfoundland was one of only two provinces with employment declines over the year.

I would ask the First Minister if he could explain to this House and to Manitobans the reason why Manitoba had the second worst job creation record over the last year?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time the honourable member received a lecture from the Minister who is responsible for the Statistics Bureau; it might be very informative for the honourable member.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.
The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member sounds as though he's asking the questions that he normally asks about once a month when the labour force statistics come out.

But I think that when you take the performance of the Province of Manitoba into perspective - I don't have the figures with me - but when you look at Manitoba in perspective, and I'm satisfied in the past few years our performance has far outweighed and outstripped the performance that Manitoba achieved when the honourable members opposite were in government. Because when you take the four years when the Conservative Party of Manitoba was in government between the years October '77 and November '81, regrettably, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba's performance was No. 10 out of 10 provinces. We were at the bottom of the totem pole. Mr. Speaker, that is regrettable, but that is what happened when the Conservatives were in office.

We have been struggling and working in Manitoba through the Manitoba Jobs Fund and other programs to stimulate the economy. We'll do our very best. As I've said before, we would like a little bit of help from Ottawa once in a while. We would like to see a lot more coming into Manitoba than has in the past. But I'm satisfied that, generally speaking, our years in government have shown employment performance far in excess of the performance that occurred under the Conservatives of Manitoba.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I thought the Premier would have taken the opportunity to answer the question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. MERCIER: . . . in view of the amount of advertising this government does with respect to its so-called Jobs Fund.

MR. SPEAKER: Question.

MR. G. MERCIER: I would ask specifically of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, these statistics indicate Manitoba was second-worst in the country in job creation over the last year. Why is Manitoba second-worst in the country in job creation over the last year? Can he give us the reasons?

HON. L. EVANS: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the statistics with me, and the honourable member obviously has some numbers and some tables in front of him. Therefore, I would like the opportunity to take another look.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, you can pick out any particular month or you might choose three or four or five months - we've got five months of this year - and conveniently find some unfavourable performance, some unfavourable comparison that suits the honourable member's purposes. But I'm saying that if you look at the long run and look generally where we fit into the Canadian economy we've had a difficult time for many years.

I'm just saying that the record is quite clear. We do have the statistics for a complete four-year period which gives you a far better picture than three or four months of any one year. He's taking three or four months of this year and comparing it with last year and saying, well, it's terrible.

I'm saying, if you take four years of the Conservative administration, we were at the bottom of the totem pole, No. 10 out of 10. The first three years of our administration, we were far better than that; we were somewhere in the middle. I don't have the numbers, but the first three years of our administration compared indeed very very favourably. The comparison was much more favourable in the first three years of our administration.

Mr. Speaker, we can stand here and sit here for hours debating these particular numbers. I suggest that you can take any specific number and play around with it as you will. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, you have to look at the long run, and you also have to realize we're not an economic island unto ourselves. What happens in Manitoba is also affected by policies that are pursued by the Federal Government. It's affected by trade policies of the United States Government and other major economic factors.

The main thing, Mr. Speaker, is that you have a government that's committed and dedicated to creating jobs for the people of this province. We have that particular dedication.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier, because obviously the Minister of Employment Services and Economic Security, who published these statistics, has no understanding of what is going on

with these statistics. I asked the First Minister: why, during the past year, does Manitoba have the second-worst record for job creation in Canada? Why is Manitoba's unemployment rate over the last year gone up, while the national rate has gone down? Why is Manitoba ranked eighth best of all provinces in terms of percentage point changes over the year? What are the reasons for this?

I have my own ideas, but I would like to know what the Premier and this government think are the reasons.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is a certain repetitiveness in the question. Does the honourable member have a new question to seek information, if so, he may pose it?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could, with leave, I would like to answer the question even though it's been repetitive.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the honourable member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, what is very important to keep into proper context is that there are 12,000 more Manitobans working now than there were prior to the recession. In five provinces in Canada we have yet not returned to the prerecession employment levels.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we have been able to increase our employment by some 12,000 in the Province of Manitoba at the same time that in British Columbia, in Alberta and in Saskatchewan there are 100,000 less working than there were prior to the recession.

So, Mr. Speaker, let the honourable members not nitpick because we are prepared to compare our record during the last three-and-a-half years with other provincial jurisdictions across the country, with the previous Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba. We are prepared to compare our investment record, by way of rate of growth, the best in the country last year, with the projected best rate of growth for investment across the country this year of any province in the country. We are prepared to compare our retail sales records for this year, the best in Western Canada. We are prepared to compare housing starts, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the Province of Manitoba is concerned. We are prepared to compare all the indices.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised and startled that the honourable member who sat on the Treasury Benches during the previous Conservative administration, that year after year and month after month, and witnessed economic indices that were eighth, ninth and tenth, had the gall to ask questions about what has happened in the last few months, particularly in view of what happened on November 4th in this province as a result of the Minister of Finance's statement, the impact that had on this province, the impact that we pointed out at the time, that his financial strategy would have on the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a squeak from the Leader of the Opposition or the Member for St. Norbert in respect to standing up firmly in support of Manitoba's interests. Instead, they were cloaked in by their ideological blinkers.

Chloramphenicol - legislation re banning use of

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the First Minister. Mr. Speaker, the opposition today are prepared to give leave to the First Minister if he is prepared to introduce legislation banning chloramphenicol in the Province of Manitoba; will he be introducing that legislation today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me inform the honourable member that I think I am just an hour-and-three-quarters ahead of the honourable member. I have instructed an Order-in-Council to be prepared in order to ban the use of the antibiotic in the Province of Manitoba. Our hog farmers in the Province of Manitoba have been damaged too severely. Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to wait on the inaction on the part of the Federal Government until they make up their minds; it is our responsibility, Mr. Speaker.

I trust the O/C will be adequate, Mr. Speaker. If legal opinion is received that we need legislation, then I would look forward to unanimously immediate approval from honourable members across the way, but it's my legal opinion at this point that the Order-in-Council will be sufficient.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, if it is not sufficient, will we see legislation in this Assembly today so that the opposition can, as well, deal with it, Mr. Speaker, and support it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is hypothetical. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question to seek information?

HON. H. PAWLEY: We have an O/C which is being . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The question is hypothetical.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister has indicated he is preparing an O/C that may not in fact do what he is expecting it to do.

I ask him if he is going to be bringing in legislation today, as well, and will that legislation be banning all antibiotics, or just the one in which the Americans are opposed to, chloramphenicol?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the honourable member that legal opinion has been obtained; that the Province of Manitoba has the legal authority in which to impose the ban.

We do so because we have waited on the Federal Government to settle the trade issue with the United

States. We asked them to ban the drug and do their tests and, unfortunately, it doesn't appear that that action will be undertaken.

We hope that, in fact, it will be done nationally but, in order to take away the argument of the governors of the United States who have imposed the ban, we in fact are moving with the ban. There has been no difficulty as reported to us from the producer groups with the banning of the drug; they certainly concur with us and we are moving with this immediately, Sir.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister or the Minister of Agriculture.

Does that mean immediately today or tomorrow that the hog producers of Manitoba and the beef shippers of this province will be able to ship to those states that have banned the antibiotic chloramphenicol?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to also announce to the Honourable Member for Arthur that I have arranged a meeting to take place with the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

I am going to inform the Governor of the State of South Dakota as to the action that we have undertaken, Mr. Speaker. I would trust, as a result of the information that I'll be relating to him, that there will be further desisting from any restrictions on the importation of Canadian pork into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't work let me assure you and let me assure honourable members across the way that I will be in Ottawa, I'll be raising hell with the Honourable Joe Clark, in order to ensure that the Federal Government move away from their indecisiveness and inaction on this matter and take firm action in order to ensure that this matter is resolved.

Private Members' Hour - intention to abolish

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader and ask him whether it is the intention of the government to abolish Private Members' Hour?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe all members who have read the Rules Committee Report, which is currently on the Order Paper for concurrence by the Assembly, are aware that members of the Rules Committee unanimously approved certain modifications, as a proposal for a trial basis for this Session, to Private Members' Hour which were designed to enhance the role of Private Members' Hour and the role of private members within that hour.

If the Honourable Member for Elmwood is proposing that the role of private members not be enhanced, I welcome him to enter into the debate when we get past the obstacle he has placed in the way of getting to the balance of the report.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, my remarks are not specifically directed at the report, although the report is consistent with my question.

My question is: why is the House Leader continually downgrading the right of individual members to participate in Private Members' Hour by daily asking this House to waive it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is argumentative.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, can the House Leader indicate the purpose of his daily questions to the opposition asking them whether they would be agreeable to waiving Private Members' Hour? What is the purpose of that daily request?

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition House Leader and I attempt to manage the Business of this House in a co-operative fashion. I, therefore, look to the Opposition House Leader for his concurrence on most of the business that takes place in this Chamber. And, Sir, on those items that require the unanimous consent of all members, members of the Treasury Bench, the opposition leadership, as well as all private members in the House, I ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised that anyone in this Chamber, let alone a member of close to 20 years experience, would suggest that there's some sinister plot, or something wrong, or some ulterior motive, when every time Private Members' Hour is waived he is party and agreeable to the waiver. It is only done, Sir, with his consent. If there's a sinister plot, he's part of the conspiracy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Heritage Fund - revenues to offset borrowing

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. It is reported that a spokesman for Merrill Lynch Capital Markets estimates that Manitoba might require \$22 billion of money to be borrowed over the next 10 years.

Can the First Minister advise the House whether or not it would be his intention to use revenue from the Heritage Fund to offset the province's borrowing requirement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the question dealing with that economic conference which was a tremendous success for the Province of Manitoba because we had people in from across Canada, and from many countries around the world, business people, economists, bankers, etc. who were, after that conference, unanimous in their praise of the economy of this province, and confident that we would be able to carry on with our development over the next 10 years, which is what that particular speech was about. See, I was getting to it.

The particular speech which I was not present for but happen to have a copy of the printed version, referred to that money . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Answer.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: I'm trying to, Harry, just take it easy, I'm getting to it. . . . referred to that kind of borrowing on the basis, Mr. Speaker, that there would be other projects coming along, including a \$5 billion, for example, hydro-electric plant in addition to the particular one we're building right now and so on. There were some references made that certainly it wasn't a firm figure, it wasn't a figure that he suggested would happen. It's a figure he suggested could happen. As people were projecting in the late '70s, there would be \$80 billion in borrowings, I believe, in the Province of Alberta during the 1980s because of megaprojects that did, in fact, not happen.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you detected an answer in there or not; I didn't. I asked the Minister a question. I asked the First Minister the question, as a matter of fact. Was it his expectation to use revenue from the Heritage Fund to offset the estimated \$22 billion borrowing requirement?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: The borrowing requirements, I just want to emphasize, are not borrowing requirements that we would say are numbers that we would agree with at this stage.

What we do, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the investing of the Heritage Fund is something that we will have to decide at that time. That, as the member knows, is some time down the line. There won't be any sales for some time. The first dam will be completed in the early 1990s, so of course it's only after that, that we will be looking at that particular issue. At that time, we'll be putting half of the profits from that sale into the Heritage Fund.

MR. B. RANSOM: We're making some progress, Mr. Speaker. We've got him talking about the Heritage Fund and funds that are going into it. Now I am interested in the funds that are intended to come out of it. Would it be the government's intention to use revenues from the Heritage Fund to offset the borrowing requirement that the province will have by 1994 or 1995, at the end of that 10-year period, when Merrill Lynch estimates they could have as much as \$22 billion in cumulative borrowing requirements?

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

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, isn't that a delightful situation. Now we're having the Conservatives admitting that we will have profits; we will have money in the Heritage Fund to be used.

Mr. Speaker, we will deal with that happy prospect. We, the New Democratic Party Government, in 1993, 1994, 1995 will deal with the happy prospect of seeing how we will use those funds. We will do so, Mr. Speaker, in the context of looking at projects that are economically viable, which are financable, which the speaker indicated were very excellent projects. He said, Mr. Speaker, in that speech that these are projects that could be project financed off the books of the Manitoba Government, many of them. That shows how sound those projects are.

We, on this side of the House, are pleased to have those types of projects in the works in this province that are far better than any other province, Mr. Speaker. That was the consensus of all the international people, the national people, who were at that conference over the last two days.

Pension Management Fund

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance is quoted today as saying that the government is considering getting into the pension management field. My question to the Minister would be: would it be the intention, the primary objective of any pension management fund established by the province to maximize the return to the pension fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for that question. The first aim of that fund would be no different from the current funds which we now administer, and that is security of investment. The second aim would be yield, and the third would be provincial economic development.

MR. B. RANSOM: Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance that the fund would have the authority to invest wherever they wished, according to what they saw as minimizing risk and maximizing return?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, we would not see the government intervening. There would be a board. Obviously, the government would have some input into membership. I'm thinking in terms of the model set up by Premier Lesage in 1965, an independent board that would have those objectives in mind in making those decisions.

But obviously, in their particular case, it appears to have assisted somewhat in the economic development of their province. That doesn't mean that they have always invested all their money in their province. Indeed, some has been invested in other provinces and in other countries, and we would certainly not suggest that this be only a Manitoba fund.

Vicon - location of assembly plant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Industry. My question is: in signing the agreement with Vicon and providing that firm with \$1 million to locate in Manitoba, can the Minister inform the House whether the government has placed any precondition on where Vicon can locate their assembly plant, or whether the province has a veto as to the choice of location by Vicon for the location of that plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, there are no specific conditions with respect to where Vicon locates in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry could provide members of the opposition and the House with copies of the agreement with Vicon by which the Province of Manitoba and the taxpayers are providing that \$1 million of assistance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: That question was taken as notice some time ago, and I still have it under consideration. It would certainly be my intention to provide that information, if at all, where possible.

We are reviewing at the present time what legal impediments there may be to that, also looking at the practice that has been in place with successive governments not to provide that kind of confidential, commercial information. But I am in the midst of that review; once I complete it I'll provide an answer to the member.

Federal Budget - impact on Native communities

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. E. HARPER: My question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister advise this House and all the aboriginal people of Manitoba whether he has had an opportunity to assess the impact on Native communities of the federal Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, we have had opportunity to evaluate the Budget, and to find in fact there has been a cut that will impact directly upon Native Canadians in Canada. Mr. Speaker, there is a cut of some \$100 million in the Department of Small Business. We have discovered that \$60 million of that \$100-million cut will be from the Native Economic Development Program.

As honourable members know, that Native Economic Development Program is headquartered in the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that economic development activity by our Native communities ought to be cut back, given the obvious difficult challenges that are confronting our Native people. I would hope that honourable members across the way again would demonstrate some commitment to the Province of Manitoba and to express their displeasure at this severe cut involving our Native people.

MR. E. HARPER: I would like to ask the First Minister: was there any consultation to the Budget with the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister on their acts in respect to the Native Economic Development Fund?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, regrettably there has been no consultation. I am not clear, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this is an outgrowth of the Nielsen Task Force involving Native peoples in Canada and intended cuts insofar as Indian people are concerned in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, let me advise you and the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, there was no consultation with the Government of the Province of Manitoba in

respect to this very major specific cut involving Native peoples.

MR. E. HARPER: Mr. Speaker, my final question to the First Minister, will the First Minister undertake to find out and advise this House what further impacts on Native communities are planned for the Native communities by the Federal Government?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me assure the Honourable Member for Rupertsland through you, Mr. Speaker, that this government will be doing all that it can to ascertain what cuts — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I don't think this is a laughing matter. Honourable members across the way may think it is. It's not a laughing matter to the Indian people of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, this government will do all that is possible to identify all those cuts that are affecting Native peoples. Mr. Speaker, we will expose those cuts. We will not rest content in only exposing those cuts. We will do all that we can as a Provincial Government to ensure federal restoration of any cuts affecting our Native peoples.

Vicon - type of assembly plant

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Technology. Will the Vicon plant that is receiving a million dollars from the people of Manitoba be an assembly plant assembling parts that are made in other areas of the country, or by other plants of Vicon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Culture.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The method of producing farm implements that Vicon will be engaging in, is the process of assembling parts that will be manufactured by other manufacturers. As part of their agreement with the Province of Manitoba on the development agreement for the location of their industry in the Province of Manitoba, there is a requirement that they do a major sourcing of the manufactured products that will go into the assembly of their tractors from Manitoba suppliers. So we would expect that the majority of their parts will be manufactured by Manitoba suppliers.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then will Vicon be supplying all their dies and brakes and all of the things that they have at other factories elsewhere in Canada and around the world to the manufacturers in the Province of Manitoba?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: I can't answer that specific question. I will take that question as notice and ask the company if they are prepared to provide that information.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: A follow-up question, Mr. Speaker. Of the \$1 million, there's a large portion of it for research and development. Will the money paid for research and development just be paid to Vicon Corporation for

research and development? Is it done anywhere else in their corporation, or must all the research and development be done in Manitoba?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: The research and development will be done in the Province of Manitoba for products that will be produced in Manitoba, providing jobs for Manitobans.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to Orders of the Day, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the loge on my right. We have a former member of this Assembly, Mr. Bill Jenkins.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

RESOLUTION RE MANITOBA - A NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, could you please call the resolution moved by the Honourable Premier on the nuclear weapons free zone?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable First Minister, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition, and the subamendment thereto proposed by the Honourable First Minister.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: Mr. Speaker, I would beg that this matter stand, but I have no objection if any other member in the Chamber wishes to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Leave has not been granted by the House for the matter to stand.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am momentarily lulled by kind words that the Government House Leader just mentioned a little while ago about how co-

operatively we are managing this House. I find this outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

We have, Sir, by your own description a very complex amendment. You, Sir, took several days to consider its admissibility. We only received it a few days ago, Sir. It took the First Minister and the government eight days to draft it, Mr. Speaker, and this government and this House Leader is going to force closure on us?

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Honourable Government House Leader to reconsider. In case he didn't hear, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry indicated very clearly that he begged the matter to stand, but would have no objection if anybody chooses to speak on it.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. A. ANSTETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't a point of order, perhaps I can raise a point of order as to the propriety of denying, by members on this side, leave to have a matter stand. I believe, Sir, that is perfectly in order at any time, that leave for a matter to stand is exactly that - leave, Sir.

I remind honourable members that contrary to the information supplied to the House by the Honourable Member for Lakeside a moment ago, I provided the Member for Lakeside a copy of what the final resolution would look like based on the proposed subamendment last Friday, a week ago tomorrow. That's not two days, Mr. Speaker. That's six days.

Mr. Speaker, more importantly, the subamendment is purely a technical amendment. It was very clear on the day the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment in remarks made by the Minister of Community Services and by the Attorney-General that it would be our intention to seek a way of providing for the Leader of the Opposition the sentiments he expressed in his amendment with which we concurred, and the sentiments expressed by the Premier in his main resolution.

Our proposed subamendment purports to combine those two sentiments, Sir. Today, the Premier signed the proclamation declaring next week National Peace Week in this province. Mr. Speaker, next week is National Peace Week in this province. If members on the other side don't want to speak, they should vote. This is not a question, Sir, of us denying anyone the right to speak — (Interjection) — the Member for Sturgeon Creek yells closure from his seat, Sir. That it is not.

But, Sir, denying members in this House the opportunity to decide the issues, that's what's happening. We expect members to either speak or vote, that's why we deny leave - either speak or vote.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The question is before the House and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has asked for leave to have the matter stand. Leave has not been granted. The honourable member may exercise his right to speak on the matter, otherwise it moves on.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. C. BIRT: I choose to speak on the matter.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I had asked that this matter stand was the way to resolve a dilemma

in my mind, and the dilemma touched basically on the removal of a specific clause which dealt with the clause that says: WHEREAS the freedoms enjoyed by the people of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were secured at immense cost in human suffering and property destruction during the World War II.

This matter was introduced on the anniversary date of victory in Europe and it had some very significant, I felt, message for those who had contributed so mightily in guaranteeing this period of peace that we've had since 1945.

I felt that in listening to the words of the First Minister in dealing with what the children of this province want today and in dealing with this desire for peace and the horror of the nuclear world that we live in could be done away with, or somehow controlled, or this madness could be put to rest, that we were giving specific recognition to those who had allowed our children today to argue and worry about this concern that they have. In other words, they paid a very large price so that we could live in freedom today.

I believed this whole purpose, the whole idea, to bring an unanimous consent to a peace motion to this House to give the hope and the leadership not only to the people of Manitoba, to the young people of Manitoba, but to those who deal in the International Arms business, the superpowers, those who wish to play in the Third World countries. It was that clause, the removal of that clause, that dealt with their sacrifice that caused me a great concern, because I am trapped by the rules, there are two amendments and we can't add another amendment. That's the trouble I had and I wanted to find a way around this particular problem. But honourable members have refused to grant me leave to try and find a solution to that problem, that's the will of the House. I will then deal with this matter.

I think the underlying theme to the motion as initially proposed, then amended by my leader and then subsequently amended again by the First Minister, is to deal with the issue of peace. I guess everyone has their own understanding of what peace is and everyone has their own ideas on how peace can be achieved.

The concern that Manitobans have is that we don't want to live under this fear of the nuclear threat that seems to be in this province and in this world today. We will be involved because the neighbours to the south of us have these weapons based right along our borders and, in any war that should develop, we will bear the brunt of it. We will not be the survivors; we will bear the brunt of it. That is not a very encouraging or a very easy thing to live with.

But you know, I'm a child of the war, and speaking to parents who gave birth to children during the war and long before the tide had turned in favour of the democratic countries, they did not know if they would have a world in which to raise the children. In fact, they thought the war would go on forever, that the children who were being born at the time might end up having to go to war because there seemed to be no end to it. The horror that they experienced can be no different than the fear and the concerns that people today have. It isn't just young people; it's adults; it's everyone in our community.

The intriguing thing about the first motion is that it wants to achieve a certain goal, and as I understand

it there is sort of four basic reasons for adopting a nuclear weapons free zone for the province. The first being that the country, or the particular geographic area, must be free and remain free of nuclear weapons. That is a very laudable and in fact a very supportable position. It's also a very important position when you consider that in fact is what Canada, I believe, has taken throughout its history.

The second ingredient of this, as I understand it, deals with verification; that the country is free of these weapons and must remain free of them; there must be some system or method put in place to determine the detection of any possible violation or to prevent this from occurring. Again, a very laudable and, in fact, the only way to proceed to ensure that these weapons are not present.

I gather probably the most key element to this request or this desire is that the nuclear powers not use their weapons in the free zone and therein lies, I think, the rub or perhaps the shortcoming of this particular resolution - and I don't mean that in any negative sense - only that it relies on someone else to guarantee this very fact. They must say that they shall not attack, nor shall any attack flow from the area which has been designated a free zone. But we need all of the countries, not just Manitoba, not just the municipalities, but we need all of the countries to agree to that.

And Canada shall not support - I believe this is the fourth ingredient of this motion - or participate in the operation of any weapon system or the delivery of such weapon system. That is where I think we as Canadians and Manitobans fail, because we are participating in this process. We are doing it here in Manitoba; we are doing it in Canada; and we're doing it in other parts of the world.

But I find support in trying to establish this particular removal of nuclear weapons, not only from our soil, but from the entire world. Those basic ingredients are found in the substantive amendments to the first motion, and the reason for the substantive amendment, as I see the logic in this particular resolution, is that if you get a municipality or a city or a province you start building the numbers and you start squeezing out the area where nuclear weapons may be stored and/or used, and in fact is pushing them over onto other people's shoulders and hopeful, in time, almost like a domino effect, that the whole world, through its various Legislatures, elected representatives, Chambers, whatever, Parliaments, would say that we do not want weapons of this nature on our soil. Therefore, that would disband the whole need and it would eliminate the nuclear weapons.

Unfortunately, that would take too long in my opinion, and that necessitated the amendment because I believe the thrust of the first motion did not go far enough. Laudable as it is, it had to be something more substantive and meaningful, and therefore that is why the amendment tried to attack the very basis of the weapons, the creation of weapons, the holding of them, and the manufacturing of them, to move into a more realistic request of those who have the weapons or have the potential of developing those weapons on how to have them removed.

We want them totally removed. We just don't want them eliminated from the soil of Manitoba. We want them removed from the entire earth and we don't want them in the skies above us either.

One of the things that troubled me just a little when the First Minister introduced it was the basis for introduction of this motion. The motion itself, I accept, but in the Year of the Youth, the First Minister indicated that he wanted to give some meaning to the themes, to the request, to the purpose being expressed by young people throughout Manitoba that they wanted this resolution.

Now, I find it rather difficult, being a parent and spending considerable time, energy and money in trying to make my children well-educated, independent, thoughtful, the ability to make decisions for themselves, that we should deem it that we have the total knowledge and we know what is best for them. I find it unusual or strange that in the Year of the Youth and in the attempt to get as many young people involved in various community activities throughout the Province of Manitoba and, indeed, throughout Canada that we would not ask them to participate in this process.

If, in fact, this is a legitimate desire of the children and the young people of this province, why didn't the province encourage - in fact, the committee operating the International Year of the Youth Program in this province - a debate on peace in each school in this province? And why did they not then elect a representative or representatives to come to a model United Nations Assembly or, in fact, in this House, and allow them to debate and draft the resolutions that they would like to see this Chamber adopt? They may very well have recommended the type of motion we have here today.

But if, in fact, we are to give the young people their due credit today, why did we impose what we thought they wanted? After all, this whole program is to recognize them, to encourage them and to make sure that they participate in our society. This is an important issue not only for them but for the rest of the community as well. I would like that. I would have thought that would have been a far more effective way of sending a message to those people in Ottawa, to those people in Washington, and those people in the U.S.S. of R.

The people here, the children of this province, wanted a specific program of peace and here is the method by which they would like to have it achieved - because remember that young girl in the United States, two or three years ago, who wrote a message to the Premier of Russia? She went on basically as a peace emissary mission to Russia and it got great play. I think, as symbolic as it was, it made people think that here a little child could really do something in attempting to achieve perhaps the impossible.

Well, maybe we should be a little different here; we pride ourselves of being different. I would have liked to have seen our young people do the thing they know best, which is gather, discuss, debate and present their ideas.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I have no trouble in supporting any resolution that would guarantee our peace. I have no trouble in supporting the removal and the continuance of the absence of nuclear weapons from our soil in this province of ours or in our country.

I am troubled that we couldn't work towards an unanimous agreement on the final wording of this particular matter in this House because that's what the First Minister wanted. At times we may have argued as to the best route to achieve a peace resolution from

this Chamber and just, with respect, the lack of courtesy of today in not granting me a leave to adjourn this matter on a matter that I felt was rather important - everyone else has indicated this is rather important - to allow this matter to have its full, proper debate and the merits of it dealt with and everyone put their thoughts on the public record, it disturbs me, and I don't believe that there is political maneuvering here. I believe that there is a concern, there is a desire to truly represent a feeling in this province, a feeling that is I believe shared by the world.

In closing, I don't know what the final exact wording of the resolution is going to be because I believe it can be improved; in fact, I think it should be. But should it not be, I will be supporting the resolution in its final form, whatever form it takes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like preceding members who have participated in this particular debate, I think that this is a very important occasion in the Manitoba Legislative Assembly. I am aware that it is the opinion of some members that this particular matter is not, as it were, within our sole jurisdiction, not within our area of stewardship governmentally, that it's not an area that falls within our bailiwick or control.

I am cognizant of those concerns as they have been raised by members on the other side, but I am also aware of the great potential and the rather unique opportunity which is presented by this particular resolution. It is not often that one gets to participate in what I would regard as the building of a new order.

Essentially what the Premier has presented to this House by way of resolution is an opportunity to engage not the superpowers, not the governments of the United States or the Soviet Union in debate on the subject of defence strategy or policy, but rather an opportunity to engage the people who are in charge of this planet and the people who live on this planet, regardless of where they reside in the general peace movement, it is a chance for the little people of the world to usefully and meaningfully engage in what might be a strategy and mechanism which will enhance the prospects for, at some point in the future, a nuclear free world.

I think there seems to be general consensus that the world has reached a state of alarming peril. I haven't heard anybody stand up and make light of that. There seems to be concurrence among all members in this Chamber that the nuclear arms race is life-threatening; that it has become an extreme problem; that it's a question which, hopefully, has to be addressed and resolved. The question seems to be before the House as to how that will occur.

Some members have proposed that it should occur solely through the course of discussions between the superpowers. They seem to view that as a matter which is essentially one to be dealt with between the superpowers themselves. We on this side disagree with that. We don't think that can be the case.

Members on the other side in some cases have suggested that our disagreement is perhaps rooted in some sort of special relationship, either with the Soviet Union or some sort of special enmity that draws us

against the interests of the United States. I'm not suggesting that many members on the other side when the debate was engaged said that, but certainly I heard two or three weave that into the fabric of their remarks, that we tend to be partisan towards the Soviet Union or that we tended to exercise an impartiality or bias against the American Government.

I don't believe that is true, and I can indicate it for the record, that in the course of our discussions in caucus, I have not heard any of those sorts of sentiments expressed. Certainly I haven't heard any of those sentiments expressed in this Chamber or on this floor. But I would like to assure members that I know of no member on this side who carries that sort of prejudice or bias.

I wish to tell you that speaking from a very subjective and personal point of view, that I will never act as an apologist for the USSR. I think I have been vocal on this subject over at least the past six to eight years. I have taken defined positions in public situations, including letters to the editor of the Winnipeg Free Press and, when it existed the Winnipeg Tribune, criticizing the government of the USSR.

I have frankly a firm allegiance and from my own point of view speaking very subjectively, my allegiances run with the American Government. I don't care who knows it. They may do things that, from time to time, upset us all, but my personal feelings run very strongly with that government. I might indicate that the basis for my feelings are rooted in the treatment of citizens of minority descent in the Soviet Union.

I was reading a book the other day which I guess for me put the issue before the House in some sort of dramatic perspective. I guess from time to time we all get wrapped up on the significance of our own worldly affairs and our own feelings about how the world should develop. While I was reading a book that dealt with astronomy, not a subject which I read about very often but nevertheless I was reading, and learned that there are galaxies, including our own, that move at the astonishing rate of 3 million miles per hour in perfect synchronization - hard to believe.

I sort of sat back and thought about it, that there are literally clusters of millions of stars, because the book also indicated that the galaxies were made up of clusters sometimes of many millions of stars, all like our own sun and many much larger, moving in a universe in perfect synchronization at some 3 million miles per hour.

MR. B. RANSOM: Where are they going?

MR. B. CORRIN: That was the question that was dealt with in the book. The Member for Turtle Mountain asked, where were they going? I guess the astronomer was trying to deal with that, because he couldn't fathom himself how a universe could be built in such perfect symmetry and synchronization. I guess I was thinking that here I am on a very small planet circling a very small sun in a galaxy which contains several million stars and which is apparently only one of a million known galaxies - radio telescopes and other research has now proven that there are probably over a million galaxies out there - and I began to think of how insignificant not only I was but really the whole planet and our whole solar system really is.

I know it sounds rather dramatic and perhaps a touch too romantic I guess I began to think that, given the fact that we have access to the secrets of the universe and given the fact that we're only now beginning to unravel some of the very minor problems which undoubtedly have been resolved by other civilizations far far away, and perhaps some of those problems resolved many millions of years ago, and since we're only just now touching the tip of that iceberg and emerging, as it were, into that broader universe, that it's such a shame that we stand an enthreatened species literally as a result of our own ignorance of ways to communicate and control our own propensity towards violent action.

The same astronomer indicated that when he was looking in his telescope he was observing a great galaxy, and he noted that the galaxy he was looking at in his telescope - which was one of the most powerful on the planet - was at such a distance that he really wasn't seeing it as it was today at all. He was seeing it as it existed thousands of years ago.

He said that sometimes it made him think - and that's because apparently light takes a very long time to travel over the vast distances - he said that he sometimes was moved to think how ironic it was that the entire galaxy and the stars he was looking at and the planets that were circling it and the beings that perhaps were living there had long ago ceased to exist entirely, some of them possibly because they had devastated themselves; that all their knowledge and all the things that made up their civilization, and they might be civilizations that were very grand and that had attained a special sort of pre-eminence in the state of creation, but they might be gone. As he was looking at them, all that was there might be completely devastated and gone and never to be unfolded or known again.

It made me think that it was worth doing this little thing on this planet now and I think it is. If members will think about it, no great idea necessarily has ever come from the top down. I think when you observe and if members would, think more parochially, think about the philosophy upon which their own party is founded, if they'll think closely and carefully about it, I think most of them will appreciate that most of that philosophy came from a lot of different people taking concerted and co-ordinated action, participating in a communicative exercise; some sort of public discourse was engaged and then that philosophy was legitimized through the action of political people; but first came the philosophy and then came the action.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I'm saying applies and is pertinent to the resolution before us, because members too, today, are being asked to take a small step to assure the destiny of mankind. We can chuckle and we can make light of it and we can suggest that people are partisan in their feelings about who should win the great war if it should come, or who should have a military advantage in the event that war is mooted. But the issue really is: what will we do as legislators, responsible for the sovereign areas we are legitimately entrusted with, to take action to protect that particular land, and the people who live on it and will come to live on it?

This is a significant resolution. The conciliatory resolution as subamended proposes that Manitoba be made a nuclear weapons free zone. It also proposes, in order to satisfy those who feel that not enough

perhaps is being done with respect to world disarmament, that the Government of Canada request the two superpowers to do their utmost in the name of humanity to intensify their efforts to seek nuclear arms reduction and disarmament through the negotiated processes which have been formally instituted.

So, Mr. Speaker, members on this side have, in our own minds, come forward and we've met members opposite halfway. When the Member for Fort Garry suggests that there hasn't been an effort to do that, we feel that we have done that because we've provided middle ground. We feel that we've come halfway. We've embodied the resolve of the our resolution with the amendment made by the opposition.

Why, you ask, is it important that Manitoba become a nuclear free zone? What is the significance of it? People are saying, well it's not even relevant that one little piece of the planet become a nuclear free zone and it may, in fact, act ultimately as some sort of a disadvantage to the western powers in terms of the defence of the country and the interests of the western world.

Well I suggest that it is of value because we're simply saying, not here, do it somewhere else. Do it somewhere else, not here. We don't want the weapons of war, these very devastating and destructive weapons of war, stored here. We don't agree with war. It's not so much perhaps that we're completely pacifistic because I think there are issues which members on this side would willingly agree with members of the other side must be resolved through arms.

The problem, of course, is that when one resorts to arms of the type that are now available to the superpowers, we are talking about a completely insoluble war situation. There are no winners, everyone is a loser. Recognizing that, we simply come to the logical conclusion that what is in the best interests of the planet and the people we represent, and the future of the western and, for that matter, the eastern bloc countries is to banish these weapons from our particular jurisdiction and soil. This has been done I'm advised by New Zealand, Australia, and both of those countries had many many thousands of soldiers serve in the last war, and I'm sure many thousands of soldiers, for that matter, were probably injured and lost in the course of that conflict.

Iceland, little Iceland, has apparently recently moved to accept the same policy position. We can make light of it, we can suggest that it's insignificant, that it's only little Iceland, but I have to assume that little Iceland is populated with humans of some intelligence and some sensitivity to the lot of humankind, some compassion for their fellow creatures, and that the legislators of Iceland must have had to wrestle with the same problem and they must have, upon their deliberations, decided that it was worthwhile to consider this sort of action. It's a step in the right direction.

The Member for Inkster mentioned in the course of his remarks that there were institutes of peace that were coming about in the world. He mentioned that there were several places where peace was now receiving serious study. That is, I think, the by-product of the type of action that we are proposing here. I think that obviously making Manitoba or any jurisdiction a nuclear free zone is not the final solution to the problem.

Goodness knows that better minds probably than most of those who are assembled here today have been working on the question of disarmament in Geneva for the better part of the last 35 years. There have been serious discussions going on every day and every week and every month almost of the year on this planet on this issue and some people have become extremely expert in the subject matter.

But I think the question is that if people engage in creative exercises of this sort something is just liable to come out of it. Relating it to business, I mean that's how innovation occurs in business, to use an example that's I think probably familiar to most members on the other side. When you have a problem in business people start to think about it and sometimes, if it's a big enough problem, people start to think about that problem, not only on a local basis, but they think about it across the span of an entire nation or sometimes across an entire continent, and sometimes, as the European common market bears testimony to, across the face of an entire subcontinent. That's how solutions are arrived at in a civilized sentient world.

So I'm suggesting that the member for Inkster - who has right now been kind enough to pass me back my notes, thank you - has brought forward a very useful proposition, the proposition that the study of peace has become an activity which is gaining prominence in the world, and that we can act in conjunction with others to assist those people in seeking the solution.

Now apparently in Europe very recently, Mr. Olaf Palme who I believe is the . . .

A MEMBER: Secretary-General of the United Nations.

MR. B. CORRIN: . . . Well, I think he may have been the Secretary-General, but he is no longer that, I don't think. Mr. Palme, in any event, has organized a group of people in the European subcontinent to discuss the question of peace and the threat of nuclear war. He has brought together in Brussels, apparently through conventions which have been negotiated between approximately half a dozen European countries, including Belgium, France, the Scandinavian nations and the West German nation. He has brought together a consortium of people appointed by those governments to discuss the risk to their territory which is created by the arsenals which have been stockpiled in Europe and in the eastern bloc countries by the superpowers.

The premise of Palme and this group is that a nuclear war in Europe is unconscionable, unthinkable, unwinnable and, from their point of view, a completely hopeless situation from the point of view of civilization there as they understand and want it to continue.

They are talking about an alliance of non-nuclear nations to be organized effectively for non-nuclear defence. They have given consideration to that and they have decided that it is impossible, that the situation is untenable. They are now moving to endorse resolutions to be sent to Geneva to encourage the superpowers to get out of Europe - very simple, just leave, leave us alone, we don't want your defence here any more. The risk imposed by the defence is now far greater than the defence and they become aware of that. Because everywhere there is situated a Pershing Missile silo, or whatever other type of special

instrumentation and structure is necessary to launch a missile, either offensively or defensively, is the inherent risk of an attack.

You know, that's how it works. Strategic arms limitations is predicated on that theory, but you have to get theirs before they get you. So if they have a string of them as we do very close to the Manitoba border - we used to have Bomarc's; I don't know what's there now around the Minot, North Dakota area - if you have a string of silos, the other side has to get the silos. They either get them first or they lose the war; that's the rationale.

So this group is simply going and saying we'll do it ourselves, thank you. Don't fight any wars here, don't defend us anymore. We'll worry about it ourselves; the other worry is too much of a bother.

I saw a show, and I am sure many people in the Chamber must have seen the show. It was on CBC last June and July; it aired six times. It was an instalment series done by a freelance reporter whose name again I forget. I am terrible with names. This fellow had a series of shows on. I think it was called "War" - that was the name of the series. The final series was on nuclear war.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I remind the honourable member he has been speaking for 20 minutes and the question before the House is the proposed subamendment which is of a technical nature.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try and deal more specifically with the technical end of it.

Just dealing with this because I will draw it into context, Mr. Speaker, I assure you. The premise of the narrator-journalist was - and this was based on interviews with pre-eminent military people in the Canadian military establishment in Europe - that nuclear war from the point of view of Canadian forces in Europe was hopeless.

But it was interesting, because what they did was, in the show, rather than dealing with full-scale holocaust in this particular segment, they dealt with small-scale holocaust. They dealt with the nuclear warheads which were stockpiled for artillery equipment. They apparently had stockpiled on both sides. Nuclear armament is capable of knocking supersonic aircraft and short-range missiles out of the air. They were talking to pilots. I remember it quite clearly the discussion the interviewer had with several pilots from the Canadian Air Force.

He was asking them how they feel about this. Some of the pilots were indicating, yes, that they flew aircraft that were equipped with nuclear tipped missiles and that their job in the case of a land war, initiated by the eastern bloc nations in Europe, was to get in the air as fast as they possibly could, and they reckoned they only had a few minutes to scramble on notice. Their job as a fleet was to get in the air as fast as they could and make some dramatic pre-emptive strikes.

I remember it well because the fellow said, and then what do you do? And the pilot said, then you hope you don't get shot down and you just keep flying. The guy said, what are you talking about? He said, well, there is not going to be any base to go back to; we

know that. This is the pilot of the Canadian crew. He said you don't go back to base because your base is gone. We are in the air within a few minutes because there is no base in this type of war and you lose your base almost immediately. He says if we are not in the air in two minutes, that's the end. These planes don't fly anyway and none of us do. Once we are up there, we are on our lonesome. This was confirmed. The interviewer went to the top brass of the military and that was confirmed that there would be no base.

So what are we talking about? What are we really talking about here? You know, if military personnel who are trained to fight the war see no hope and they see no possibility of victory even in a conventional land war, they were talking about that, and the fellow said, well, all the cities in this part, presuming that it was restricted to the European continent, they noted that all the cities around the base would be wiped out, that the weapons they were throwing around were going to just pollute the entire neighbourhood. It didn't matter how big they were, that once they fired their weapons, that would be it for everybody within a few days, that the fallout would start to descend on the populations, the forces and everyone else. There is nothing that could be done about it. So what we are talking about is taking a step to prevent that, and I think it's a reasonable approach.

One of the things, and I don't say this facetiously, nor do I say it as a result of a spirit of ill-will, but there has been a lot of concern on both sides of the House over the past few years about environmental pollutants. People can wax eloquent and become quite indignant, and I presume legitimately, consciously and in good faith, on the subject of things like PCBs, chemical spills, all sorts of man-made environmental pollutants. We are now talking about potentially the largest - it seems ridiculous to talk about it - which is pollution, but I suppose ultimately that's what radioactivity in any form is when it's unharnessed and released in an uncontrolled manner. It's the ultimate pollution; it's a pollution which sometimes won't break down for a thousand years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has been speaking for 25 minutes and has not yet addressed the motion before the House.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. B. CORRIN: Well, I am dealing specifically now, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for addressing that because I did say that I would return to the subamendment. Dealing specifically, I think, with the recitals with respect to the subamendment which notes that the new weapons systems is serving only to escalate tension between the superpowers, I want to deal specifically with that. So I will address my remarks to that portion of the subamendment because I think it's true.

There has been a lot of discussion with respect to the Star Wars weapon system. Members on both sides have talked about the viability and validity theoretically, conceptionally and otherwise of the Star Wars approach. Well, ultimately, this is the way it has gone. This is historically the progression which has caused the dilemma which now has put the Geneva negotiators in such a quandary and a bind.

How can we hope to wrestle with the problem when technology simply is so potentially destructive? How

can we? I suppose it's a bit of a domino thing in the sense that this continual escalation, which is predicated on the horror of nuclear holocaust, is leading us and leading the entire world to more and more alarming types of methodology with respect to mass destruction.

It doesn't matter whether one side says that they only want to use their weapons for defence or that this type of weapon is going to be capable of thoroughly defending. This is now against the most specious and the most astonishing type of argument that somebody will be able to invent a weapon system that when in balance, in synchronization with the other guy's weapon system, will eventually lead to greater arms control and the laying down of weapons because it will be so totally comprehensive and protective that they will create this fantastic technological umbrella around the planet that will somehow assure us all that nobody would dare start a war because you are wasting your money producing a missile.

But there is no way anybody can win. We have laser technology which can get every missile in the air before it re-enters the atmosphere and the technology that knocks out every low-flying aircraft and so on and so forth. I don't think that's true. I think the reality is over the past 30 years that every time one side has brought in an innovation, the other side brings in a complementary one which escalates the matter further.

In this regard, I was recently reading a work of fiction by James Michener entitled "Space." This book depicts the race for space supremacy between the two superpowers and obviously plots, or rather counterplots, with graphic depiction the American efforts in this regard. One of the things which astonishes you when you read the book is the rather harsh discord between the navy, the army and the air force as to who will have supremacy with respect to space flight and space uses with respect to military purposes. So who will get to build the rockets that go to the moon? Who will get to be in control of the orbiting military equipment and so on and so forth?

The thing that amazes me most is I suppose not the fact that the large bureaucracies will compete for priority and supremacy, the thing that amazes me most was that the conclusion of those who seem to be in the know at the time was that had cost them their first man in space; that the reason the Russians and Yuri Gagarin were the first ones to go into space in 1956 - whenever it was - '58 or '59, the reason why the first man in space was a Russian and not an American was because the Americans couldn't get their act together and were infighting. When you think about that and you think about the potential on the same subject matter for conflict on the subject of nuclear weaponry and you think about all the byzantine complications attendant upon bureaucracies with enormous resources doing political infights over who should be the first one to develop a certain type of Star Wars technology, when you think that's also probably going on not naively in the Soviet Union and probably elsewhere but at a more limited scale with people plotting to destroy their smaller neighbours - I'm sure that there are all sorts of people who spend long hours thinking about how they can get rid of the competition 20 miles away. I think particularly of the South American continent and the Middle East. When you think about it, the possibility is there.

As long as there are nuclear weapons, no one's safe because you never know what the bureaucrats are doing

and you never know who's going to win the next election. That was the other thing that came out of this novel very clearly was that you had one President who was nixing it, and President Eisenhower didn't believe in the space race. Even though he was from the military, he didn't believe in it, just wasn't part of it, didn't want to get involved. Lyndon Johnson, apparently largely because he had great dreams for an aerospace industry in Texas, did. I guess it made all the difference when Democrats started to take control of the program as they did in the Senate and the Congress in the late '50s and early '60s.

The issue for us, I think, is whether we want to take some deliberate action, and I'd like to see us do it by consensus and, frankly, I would like to see us come out of this by way of some sort of common resolve, because I don't think we should play politics with peace, or whether we're going to sort of be factional and follow the vast legacy that is the heritage of the people on this planet, the factional legacy which always leads to more conflict and less communication.

The potential in this resolution is enormous because if Manitoba can do it I suppose so can a province in France and so can a place in some other part of the world and maybe another province in Canada. Maybe then the impetus is there. Maybe it has momentum and maybe the message is becoming clearer and clearer.

One thing I know is that nobody likes to have these weapons in their backyard. I have some sympathy when Prime Minister Mulroney recently said that he felt some sympathy for the Americans in this regard; that struck a sympathetic chord. I agree with some members on the other side. If you're going to exploit the defence that's provided by your larger neighbours, it is a bit hypocritical to say, well, put it on your own property as well. I can sort of buy that; there is a reasonable note to that.

But what I can't buy is that we can't all start to come together and say, well, we all agree on that subject. Since we all agree that nobody can win this war and we all agree that it's a no-win situation right down the line and we all have something in common there, that we can't all start building on a common basis.

We can still believe that the time has not come for unilateral disarmament. I think only a fool would believe in unilateral disarmament. I don't think anybody in this Chamber would advocate unilateral disarmament tomorrow. Anybody who did would have very different views than my own and I think the vast majority of thinking people.

On the other side, that's not what is being advocated. That's not what's being mooted. We are simply saying and we're sending a message to our government that we don't want the nuclear weapons here, and they should think about that. Frankly, I think they could still impose it on us if they want to. I think jurisdictionally, if the Prime Minister when he expands the defence network, as he says he will, and spends those many tens of millions of dollars on that purpose, if he says, Manitoba, you're going to get an allocation of military defence equipment, I don't think we have the constitutional authority to resist that. I think we probably ultimately would have to accept the fact that they have paramouncy, and we must accept the initiative taken by our Federal Government. But we can still argue

knowledgeably and cogently in resistance to that and be able to say that the members of this Legislature felt strongly about the issue.

I guess the idea of learning to live together is the important thing that comes out of this resolution, and I guess it's an exercise for all of us right here in the Chamber. We don't often do that. We are adversaries and we're adversaries because we respect the democratic process and the need for good ideas to be soundly debated. I think again that most members in this House would agree with that principle. So we respect the right to be different, because we know that we protect the vast majority of our people by doing so, and our way of life. So we come at this conclusion from a point of great principle and I think a point of great ethical principle.

But sometimes I think that people of all political stripes and philosophies and ways of thinking can come together on great issues. Members of governments have done that during wartime. They have come together and they've stood together, toe to toe, in order to assure that the interests of the countries they governed are assured and promoted during time of great national crisis.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would bring to the honourable member's attention our Rule 39, which says: "The Speaker or the Chairman of any Committee, after having called the attention of the House, or of the Committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or repetition, may direct him to discontinue his speech; and if the member still continues to speak, if in the House, the Speaker shall name him, and, if in the Committee, the Chairman shall report the matter to the House."

I remind the honourable member again of the matter before the House. It is a subamendment which is of a technical nature. If the honourable member wishes to discuss the resolution, he should wait until the debate gets back to that.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on an unusual point of order.

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

MR. H. ENNS: I choose to rise on behalf of the Member for Ellice. Mr. Speaker, what you're asking the member to debate is the following: THAT the proposed amendment be amended by striking out all the words after the word "words" in the THAT clause and before the third WHEREAS clause, and substituting therefor the words "after the words 'third world; and' in the fourth WHEREAS clause and before the sixth WHEREAS clause and adding thereto the following: "and so and so and so.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you. I think the honourable member has to be able to debate and address himself to the subject matter of the resolution, indeed of the main motion, and he certainly has leave from the opposition to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order. I thank the honourable member for reminding us of the

complexity of the subamendment. That should not be beyond the will of all members.

The Honourable Member for Ellice.

HON. A. ANSTETT: That's why we should vote on it and get onto something we can debate.

MR. B. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry if I departed, in your opinion, from the text of the subamendment. I want to assure you that I didn't do that willfully or in any manner that was intended to bring your House into disrepute. But as the Member for Lakeside has indicated, it's extremely difficult when dealing with a subamendment, not just an amendment but a subamendment, to restrict one's remarks completely and entirely simply to the sub-text.

But I will attempt to do so, Mr. Speaker, and I take your admonition to heart and will give consideration not only now but after my remarks have concluded to the admonition you have brought to my attention. I'll give consideration to even talking to you personally about it in the future so that we can perhaps better understand what provokes your concern about my remarks, and perhaps I can improve my performance in the future with respect to cogent presentations that meet your very high expectations, Mr. Speaker.

I trust you won't be naming me, Mr. Speaker. If you will, I'll leave the Chamber. I trust the silence means that I won't be named, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has one minute remaining.

MR. B. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the subamendment in its final resolve deals with the request of those members opposite that the government of our country be requested to consult with the two superpowers in this important question.

I can indicate, as a member speaking personally on the government side, that if this particular subamendment is accepted by members opposite that I will encourage and I will personally work to assure, in whatever way I can, that that portion of the resolve is fully implemented. I think that's important because, I think, if we're going to reach a conciliated position, it's important to all members that both aspects be put in place and that no priority be given to one position or the other position.

So I would personally indicate that I would devote my personal time to assuring that the government act consciously and deliberately in order to fulfill the mandate which would have been given to it by virtue of these two resolve paragraphs to bring about that request. And, frankly, with the assistance of members opposite, I don't think there would be any problem because, after all, that government is of the same political stripe as the opposition, so I don't think that should present any problem.

I encourage the members opposite to give consideration to voting for the subamendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and defeated.

MR. ENNS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The bells having rung for 15 minutes, close the doors and switch off the bells.

The question before the House is moved by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that the debate be adjourned.

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

YEAS

Birt, Blake, Brown, Carroll, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Filmon, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Johnston, Kovnats, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Ransom, Steen.

NAYS

Adam, Anstett, Ashton, Bucklaschuk, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Evans, Eyer, Fox, Harapiak, Harper, Kostyra, Lecuyer, Mackling, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly lost.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you, Sir, that I intend to speak to the subamendment, to the amended resolution before us, as put before this Chamber by the First Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I can't help but note with some regret that the Government House Leader has chosen to, on this peace resolution, demonstrate his might and power and his majority in forcing members to speak. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, when the actual time allotted and taken by the government on their own resolution, and our amendment thereto, was some 18-19 days - I don't have the exact days - that the members opposite, the Government, took time to consider the amendment that was placed before this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of business, particularly in this Session, is not of that nature that calls for the kind of tactic that was displayed this afternoon. We received a further subamendment to what you would describe as a rather complex, by now, resolution some three days ago.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite true that up until now I was of the opinion that it is of some purpose to work co-operatively with the Government House Leader and he did, indeed, show me the purport of that subamendment a few days earlier on Friday as he indicated to this House.

But, Mr. Speaker, he knows very well, Sir, that showing it to me is a maybe a courtesy. I have to, of course, take it to my caucus at the earliest opportunity. It, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, isn't the first priority in our caucus. We meet on Wednesdays, Mr. Speaker, as is our format, of which he is also very familiar with, but then to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a three-day delay justifies the heavy hand that he imposed on us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave that rest with him, Sir. He who attempts to make so much . . .

A MEMBER: Get up on your feet if you want to yap, Scott.

MR. H. ENNS: . . . about the matter of co-operation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The arrogance is coming out again.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He's the type of guy when he tells you the time, look at your watch.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the issue that is contained in the resolution and in the subamendment, and more importantly in the amendment that was put to that resolution by my leader, I think really said it all. I mean, surely, Mr. Speaker, there is no real requirement or need to demonstrate the universal appeal, the universal longing for some form of nuclear disarmament. There is no question about the appealing feature of a resolution that calls out for international peace, world peace. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever a case of debating the obvious, that's what this government and this First Minister has hoisted on this Chamber. There is no debate about this question. There never has been, Mr. Speaker.

What is being attempted, of course, is to milk out of an issue of such importance small mean-spirited politics, and that's all. That's all that is being done, Mr. Speaker. To suggest particularly, for instance, Mr. Speaker, that the freedoms that we enjoy, privileges that we enjoy in a free and open society were not fought for, were not hard-earned is to belie history.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest and to insist by subamendment to remove any reference to what for the past 40 years has preserved, protected and shielded that history, that freedom in this country, and indeed in freedom-loving countries throughout the alliance that I now specifically refer to, NATO Alliance, suggests a degree of hypocrisy that has been seldom matched by any political group, leave alone by a Premier of this province.

Mr. Speaker, it's all the more regrettable that this should occur at a time when so many around the free world, at least, commemorate what took place 40 years ago, and at what price freedom was preserved for this country and for other countries so fortunate that still have it, because it should be pointed out - that is the concern that members in the opposition have. It's not the concern, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out and underline; it's not a question of not hoping for and praying for nuclear disarmament; it's not a question of not desiring a scaling down, a final abolition of nuclear weapons in this world. That is not in question at all.

But what is in question is this government's insistence that they would not even allow a reference to that

alliance that has preserved our freedom today; namely, NATO in this resolution that is before us; that government and that party's insistence to delete that WHEREAS, which acknowledged the role that we have, the role that we continue to play in the grand alliance known as the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I am not wishing to divulge private conversations with the Government House Leader, but I want to assure you and members of my caucus that I entreated with him to take consideration of that strong feeling that members on this side have and that perhaps unanimity on this question would be easier to arrive at. We find it extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker.

In the year 1985, 40 years after the conclusion of the Second World War in Europe, with the evidence that in those 40 years we have witnessed, whether it was in Korea, whether it is in Afghanistan today, whether it is the pressures exerted on countries like Hungary and Czechoslovakia in the intervening years, we at least have always been extremely sensitive to the role that we collectively, as Canadians, have agreed to play in partnership with our then-wartime allies, the United States of America, France, Great Britain, and our allies after the war, our former enemies, West Germany, Italy and the other member states of that alliance.

But, however, our government in Manitoba wishes, under the guise of appealing to us on an issue where no appeal is necessary - we agree with honourable members opposite that the nuclear weaponry ought to and should be scaled down and eventually abolished; we agree that there is danger inherent in the constant buildup of additional nuclear weaponry, but unlike the First Minister who introduced this resolution, who, on another matter, was forced to acknowledge that there is a real world out there - he had to face reality when it came to the marketplace for skilled managerial help - there is also the real world of real politics and real power that we have to acknowledge as being there, and we simply can't turn our backs upon it.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake; the Progressive Conservative Party of this province, indeed, of any other province, indeed of this country, is as concerned and supportive of an abolition or of a scaling down of the nuclear arms race. We object that on an issue so important, a little game of politics is played in this Chamber. But having raised the matter, we will not be silent about the fact that we have a responsibility in preserving peace and freedom in this world and have managed to do that reasonably well for forty years. Mr. Speaker, we have had very little evidence that they do otherwise. They do something unilaterally. They do something that cannot be verified; on which no agreement has been arrived at. In my judgment, it simply undermines the urgent necessity of the talks at Geneva from succeeding. If there is no will in the Western World to preserve our way of life, Mr. Speaker, what's the point of negotiations taking place in Geneva?

So, I rise to speak to this resolution. In the first place, object to the emasculation of the resolution; the amendment that we have put forward. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that it's an insult to the many thousands that have served to preserve that freedom in this country. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that ought to be acknowledged when dealing with a resolution of this kind and we are deeply disturbed.

We are deeply disturbed that a simple whereas, and I'll read it, Mr. Speaker:

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

"WHEREAS Canada has a continuing commitment to the defense of freedom throughout NATO . . . " - that, Mr. Speaker, is offensive to members opposite. That, Mr. Speaker, has been deleted from the question before us, Mr. Speaker, because they do not want to acknowledge that sacrifice. They do not want to acknowledge the debt owed; they do not want to continue the commitment to ensure that that freedom and those liberties will be forever ours, Mr. Speaker. And I say shame on you, Mr. Speaker. I say shame on the entire government members.

Mr. Speaker, it's my belief that the question of desiring a world free of nuclear weaponry is truly universal. Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe not. It's timely that I have this week's Time magazine on my desk and it talks about the bomb. And, of course, the great concern that there is, is that there are people like Colonel Ghadafy or something like that, that may well get hold of the bomb. Unless, Mr. Speaker, we strengthen the negotiations, the resolve of the two nations who can best control nuclear proliferation, the USSR and the United States, unless we can strengthen their hands with will and resolve by those who have some influence, by those who have some leverage, the world may well be in trouble, Mr. Speaker. Notwithstanding any kind of resolutions symbolic as this one is that we pass in Chambers like this.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

When this matter is next before the House, the honourable member will have 22 minutes remaining.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS - PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: On the adjourned debates on second readings of public bills, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for River East, the Honourable Member for Virden, Bill No. 29.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Can I have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS - PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debates on second readings of private bills, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, Bill No. 44, the Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Niakwa, Bill No. 46, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. ADAM: Can I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Stand.

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 2 - ABOLITION OF THE SENATE

MR. SPEAKER: On proposed resolutions, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Riel, Resolution No. 2, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland has 13 minutes remaining.

MR. E. HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I spoke of the Senate as being a non-democratic institution in Canada. As a treaty Indian and also representing the largest riding in the province, I am appalled at the continuing existence of this non-democratic institution, because it does not represent the interests of the Native people. As a matter of fact, today, the Premier indicated when asked a question of the House what are the proposed cutbacks and what the effects of the federal Budget will be, I think he mentioned in the neighbourhood of \$100 million to be cut back. And the Senate, which is supposedly to protect provincial interests of the minorities, hasn't really provided that purpose.

In the beginning, I think it was when Canada was being developed, it was there to protect the interests of the rich people and also we had to have \$4,000 of property, I believe, in order to become a senator, over and above your debts. You should have a lot of money. At that time, I might say that the Indian people didn't own a piece of property, because it was treaty land and collectively they had land, and no Indian could own a piece of property. So, even then when we talk about the electoral process and also the democratic process that takes place in Canada, Indian people weren't allowed to vote until 1960. So in that case, Indian people couldn't have been senators, and they didn't have the money to be senators.

Mr. Speaker, the senators receive an annual salary of \$63,400 a year, plus they get 52 round trips per year; unlimited long distance phone calls; a free railway pass; subsidized lunches and dinners; a secretary; an office; stationery and other perks; until they retire at 75 years of age. You know, with those kinds of benefits that go to these senators who are appointed by the Conservative Governments and also by the Liberal Governments, is just purely a case of patronage and a haven for these supporters of the political parties.

You know, when we talk about the situations on reserves, if we had the salary of at least about eight of these senators, that would look after the whole welfare program for the residents of Red Sucker Lake, because when I was chief there, our annual budget at least for welfare, was about \$360,000 to about \$400,000.00. So it took care of the Red Sucker Lake Band. There was about 400 people.

A MEMBER: You could have made them all senators with a lot less money.

MR. E. HARPER: And eight senators, the salaries alone is just a waste of taxpayers' money and this country endorses under the highest principle which is a democracy, free society, and yet the Indian people were denied that right some time ago until just recently.

I talk about these luxuries that these senators receive, Mr. Speaker, the contrast with the income and the lifestyles of the residents of my riding, the employment rate is over 80 percent for most of the reserves in Rupertsland. Few of my residents, Native people, can afford to have phones in their residences; they don't have toll-free privileges, courtesy of taxpayers maybe to phone their stockbrokers in Calgary, Dallas or Toronto.

A MEMBER: It's the remoteness of the area.

MR. E. HARPER: Food prices are not subsidized for which most of them have to pay high prices because of the high transportation costs. You have to fly it in by plane, which I think you'd be paying for let's say a pound of butter or a pound of anything, would cost you maybe 62 cents a pound, or 60 cents a pound, to ship into Red Sucker Lake, even much higher and much more remote communities. When they fly these things in most of my residents have never seen a paved road, aside from winter roads, but it goes away when the spring comes along.

We don't see a DC-3 load of vacationing senators in our community to take their vacation. Mr. Speaker, I've never been in a Senate cafeteria, but I'm told the prices and selection of food is among the lowest and the cheapest in the country.

Pollution and development and overpopulation have reduced our traditional food resources on our reserves and fresh food and vegetables are extremely costly and rare. Our reserve people pay some of the highest food prices in the country. I have listened all my life to snickering comments about Indians on welfare. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that when lobbyists, political hacks and directors of banks and other institutions are appointed to the Senate that it is a form of corporate welfare.

I have humbly said this, Mr. Speaker, that the welfare payments to senators is not only too high but unnecessary; and that the advantages that the senators have, they should pay taxpayers maybe \$63,000 a year. There could be little doubt that they have money. None of them are encouraged or compelled or even considered quitting their board of directorship to sit in the Senate. That is the reason that they are mostly there. The Senate at its best is a meeting of board of directors, at worst it is something else than a patriot haven. Personally, I it is a mixture of both; the Canadian reserves are poverty-stricken while senators are rich is not purely a coincidence. The purpose of the Senate has always been to preserve power and wealth and this Senate has been remarkably successful.

I have said that when the Senate was formed, Indians and even the women, were not allowed to vote. A lot has changed in the last 100 years. Transportation and communication technologies, for example, **have** developed dramatically and at the same time, **women** and natives have finally been given the vote. However, native people have not got their fair share of wealth

and potential of this country. It is time we had the opportunity to do so. In my opinion, one positive side and the will of this country towards courage and to allow natives to prosper, would be to abolish the Canadian Senate, a legacy of time, when society much less open and democratic at a time when Native people are trying to get fair treatment within Canada and also some of our treaty, for instance treaty obligations like treaty land entitlements, we don't need such anachronistic body to thwart our plans.

We recently discovered, much to our disgust, about the secret Conservative government to cut over \$300 million from Indian Affairs programs; an example which I asked the First Minister in the House today about what effect the federal Budget will have on the Indian people. Here we find that they're going to cut back a lot of money from the Native Economic Development Program which is housed here in Winnipeg, and also other programs. We don't know how far it'll go to cutting back later on and also in other areas aside from Indian Affairs, from other departments that do benefit from these programs.

In that secret document we also found that 11 departments of the Federal Government approved this plan, including the Department of Indian Affairs, which will have cutbacks on schools and also closing of some Indian hospitals and they're going to cut back on all kinds of services and start using some deterrent fees.

Also, the plans were to hide this report until the Budget and also the Aboriginal Rights Conference which were at the end of this month, or I believe the Conference will be held next week. I might add of course, that no senators stood up and said this is terrible. I am shocked and I will speak and act against this, I can no longer accept attempts to squeeze the Native people who are at the lowest scale of the ladder. We don't have any wealth or any resources that are available to other Canadians.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the senators represent the rich and the powerful and certainly not the Natives. The reforms that the Conservatives suggest for the senate are only gestures. These will in no way help the Native people. If he's talking about reforming the senate, maybe they should start talking about helping the Native people, because they should maybe start totally abolishing the senate and giving the money, in the neighbourhood of \$36 million, to the Indian people and start supporting maybe something democratic which will be Indian self-government and at least that gives a chance for Indian people to start planning and having a say as to their future.

I can't guarantee that the spot for Conservatives and Liberals to place their brag men, a Senate maybe even composed of let's say, Native elders maybe will go a long way rather than these people that are appointed by the Conservative and Liberal governments which come from a background of rich and the board of directors, and the banks, then the house of the Senate which exists inequities of power and also influence, I might say, that Native people don't have that because their interests have not been protected by the Senate at all.

Unless we are serious about Senate reform along the lines maybe to have Native people fully supported, I mean, and full of Native senators, maybe we should abolish it immediately and use these \$35 or 36 million

a year, wasted on programs, to get Native people trained on jobs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to agree with my colleagues that Senator Storie has a nice ring to it, but I'm afraid to disappoint them that it's simply not in the cards and that's because I believe that when a federal New Democratic Party Government becomes a reality that one of our priorities - certainly not one of our first but one of our priorities - would be to abolish the Senate.

I know that the Premier and the federal Leader have said unequivocally that abolition of the Senate is one of the reforms that are necessary to our parliamentary system. Mr. Speaker, I'm asked by the Member for Arthur whether I agree with that and I can say unequivocally as well, that yes, I do agree with it.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Chamber, I think, are well aware of our responsibilities and our relationship to people who elected us. I think it's rather anachronistic; it's rather ironic I suppose, that members from this Chamber and members in the Federal House on the Conservative side and even the Liberal side, do not sense the discrepancy between what we believe as elected officials and how we represent people of our constituency and the very existence of the Upper Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that if one were going to set up a list of criteria for judging the effectiveness or the utility of the Senate, one would have to start by assessing its function. I think most Canadians would be hard pressed to establish in their own mind what specific functions the Senate carries out in the interests of the average Canadian.

I think we all know that the Senate is a body that is considered to be a pert, high paying fiscal draw on the Treasury of the country, but I don't think the average Canadian - and I don't know whether members opposite could stand up and defend the Senate from a point of view of its utility, of what it provides to people of this country either in a concrete way, or perhaps more importantly given their reason for being, in a symbolic or in a leadership role.

Mr. Speaker, over the last two decades, I cannot think offhand of very many examples of significant contribution by the Senate or its senators. Individually, I have no doubt - and I don't think anybody here would quarrel with their individual abilities - I think there are in the Senate some some remarkable examples, of Canadian individuals dedicated to public service, people who have served as elected officials, I think were also equally aware of those officials who are in the Senate, not by virtue of their dedicated public service, but by virtue of their allegiance to a political party. There is nothing wrong with a strong and healthy allegiance to a political party. I would be the first to applaud someone for their continuing allegiance for their firm commitment to a set of principles and a set of beliefs. I don't think, however, that in itself is justification for an appointment

to a body such as the Senate. I believe that allegiances, as we all know, are in part justification for appointment to bodies that serve a useful function.

Mr. Speaker, I have said on a number of occasions that appointments to the board of Air Canada or to the Board of C.N. or to the board of other found agencies which serve a useful and continuing function in Canadian society, is not altogether unpalatable. Mr. Speaker, I said that it's not unpalatable and I believe there are other criteria that one should use.

I believe the current Prime Minister gave us reason to believe during the election that he was going to use other criteria. Certainly it's not as obvious that his actions follow in commitment with his word. However, I believe that he and other governments, federally and provincially, use reasonable criteria when making those appointments. I don't think the same can be said to the Senate because I don't believe that they have a useful function.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, in my view, the Senate has served more as an obstruction to the work of Parliament. It has served in a number of capacities to at least purportedly get a sense of what Canadians feel on different issues. The Senate does involve itself from time to time in questions of reform and review; but again, I don't think it's very clear that all of that activity, which some might liken to spinning ones wheels, has led to much fruitful change either in direct relationship to the activities of Parliament or in direct relationship to the activities of individuals.

So if one was going to apply some utilitarian principles to this, you would have to say, why have a Senate? I don't think there are very many good reasons, I'm also a pragmatist - for the Member for Turtle Mountain - I don't think one could come up with very many reasons for supporting the continued existence of the Senate.

I believe most members on this side don't believe that the continuing role for the Senate is in the cards. Then you have to say, well, what do we do with the Senate? I think we have three basic options. We have abolition; we have those reform-minded Conservatives who want to reform the Senate within its current constitution and within its current mandate; and we have those who said that we have to provide some impetus for serious reform.

The serious reformers I think probably have sparked the imagination of many Canadians as they ask themselves, "Is there a role for the Senate? If there is to be a role, how is that to be structured?" So that at least there can be the appearance of some accountability that they actually represent a constituent group, whether that be by region or some other form.

I think that over the years - and I know, again, there was a special joint committee on Senate reform published in 1984 which looked at some of the reform options. Mr. Speaker, I think the choice that was taken by the Prime Minister with respect to reform is probably the least palatable, the least palatable to most Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, what has been suggested and what has been rejected by Manitoba is the suggestion that what needs to be done is to leave the Senate in essentially its current form, but take away what review powers it had. Now some would say, "Well, it's not so much a question of review from a political point of view, it's more obstructionist." However, it did, for whatever

reason, create an awareness in the public of certain activities of the government and those were, I suppose, the actions of the Senate were viewed differently by different groups of people. But I think that we all recognized - at least I hope we all recognized - that it interfered, some would say needlessly, with the duties and responsibilities of those duly elected to carry out those duties and responsibilities. I think that creates, in the public mind at least, some question about the necessity of the Senate, or creates in the public mind, the belief that Senate reform is not only a good idea, but it's something that is a necessity.

I can't say that I have given long and hard thought to alternative approaches to Senatereform, but it seems to me that the proposal that has come forward from the Federal Government is acceptable to deal with only their particular political concerns. I don't think it deals with the real questions that are being asked by other Canadians, non-partisan Canadians, about the role of the Senate.

So I believe we have to look beyond the option of reform of the Senate within its current functions if we're going to deal seriously with those problems. Some alternatives have been supported by senators, such as, an elected Senate which represents different regions. I think that has some attractiveness as a proposal. But, again, the kinds of options that have been put forward, such as, the election of Senates to promote the interest of regions, I believe the original recommendation was for a 7- or 9-year term, something like that. It still begs the question of, how can one be accountable if one is elected for one term? To whom would one owe one's allegiance?

The other question is I think related to an elected Senate: what does that then do to what we believe to be the fundamental principle? I suppose it stems partly from historical development of the parliamentary system. It stems from, I suppose, a more modern perspective of how the parliamentary system functions is how would that work in relationship to, and what specific authority would that body have if it was going to have some power to modify, to change, to - perhaps the correct word is not - regulate the activities of parliament, then we are fundamentally changing the system as we know it?

If it isn't given those powers, but is provided with only advisory capacity roles, if it's provided with only review and not given substantive powers, then it's no different, in essence, from the kind of body that we have that is a creation - some would say certainly - of political opportunism or pork barrelling or other equally perverse epitaphs.

So I think that **leads** one to the conclusion, and I think a conclusion that is supported by a large majority of Canadians, that abolition of the Senate makes sense; that, in terms of its costs, in terms of what it contributes, there has to be a better way for those individuals of tremendous experience, some would say, and I believe that to be the case, to contribute in a more meaningful way.

So I'm not suggesting for a minute that there isn't a useful purpose in putting those people who have served in public life to work for the good of the public. I'm simply saying that this is not a vehicle; the Senate should not be seen as a vehicle for using the skills and talents of people who have contributed. I think **there**

are many other ways of providing them with vehicles and I have mentioned their appointment to boards of directors, to chairmanship of commissions, and other functions that can then directly link with Parliament, directly link with the Government of the Day, can feed into the parliamentary system as we know it, rather than being separate and distinct and, in the minds of many Canadians, an anachronism and a system of patronage that has grown to be despised by many Canadians.

So I think that the other two options that have been presented, either the serious reformers, or to reform the existing system, should be dismissed and, if we are going to act in good conscience with what most Canadians believe to be an unworkable appendage to the parliamentary system, that we should go ahead and abolish the Senate. I don't see much merit in supporting the current set of proposals, and I don't believe that it will receive the support of the majority of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting the contention that the Senate should be abolished and I believe that - no, I shouldn't say that, that would be imputing motives, I would be imputing motives if I suggested that. I think members opposite should seriously review their position on the Senate, although I must say that I know that privately some of the members opposite view the Senate as anachronistic body, a body that is out of touch with reality, if it ever was in touch with reality, and I know that they despise, as much as members on this side, the appointment of political cronies to a body that has no visible or known function in our current system.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say I support the abolition of Senate, not from any malicious motive. I recognize that there are many people in the Senate who could be serving a useful function. I don't believe the Senate is the appropriate vehicle for that contribution.

For that reason I think it is important that we seriously look at abolishing the Senate, removing the impression that the only legitimate vehicle for a retiring, defeated politician to contribute is by an appointment to the Senate. I think there are many other vehicles and we can all dream in our own little ways substantive ways for them to contribute. That's a preferable option to continuing - I was going to say a sham - but I don't think that's appropriate either.

I know historically, there are people who would use historical reasons for justifying the existence of the Senate, but I don't think those are any longer valid. Just as the parliamentary system and our procedures and our traditions have changed through the years, it's time to take that serious look, do the right thing and abolish the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset that I am not well-informed at all about the Senate and the proposals for reform. I don't intend to attempt to speak as an expert in any way on this subject, but I think that my views are probably representative of the views of quite a broad range of my constituents with respect to this matter.

It's interesting to listen to members of the New Democratic Party at the provincial level, perhaps the

federal level too, saying that they want to abolish a body such as the Senate because of the political patronage that is attached to that body from time to time. It reminds me of some of the ways, prior to 1969, that the New Democrats in this Legislature used to speak so sanctimoniously about the practice of patronage in the Provincial Government. But yet when the New Democrats formed government, of course, they practised it on a scale that hadn't been seen before.

So one has to bear in mind that we're talking about something here that the New Democrats really aren't going to have a chance to implement. The real test of these things is, what position does a political party take on an issue when it really has the chance to act on it?

Mr. Speaker, I would be amongst the first to admit, not to admit, but to state that the Senate has been used as a repository in many cases for people who could not be described in terms other than being simply political hacks, and that it has been opportune for the Prime Minister of the day to appoint them to that body. There have been other individuals who have been appointed to that body who certainly would fall into the category of being statesmen, people who have served the country well and continue to serve the country well in the Senate, despite the manner in which the Senate is structured.

I have had occasion from time to time to read some of the debates of the Senate, not extensively, but I know that on some issues, issues of the Constitution for instance, that some of the most informative debate on the matter of amending the Constitution took place in the Senate where the senators seemed to approach the issue on a more nonpartisan basis than members of Parliament or perhaps even members of the Legislature did, and I think that they contributed significantly to that debate.

Because of the nature of some of the people who are there, and because I believe that there is a need in a country like Canada to provide some balance to the parliamentary representation because of the situation that we found ourselves in from time to time where certain regions of the country were not represented in the government up until the election of a Conservative Government last September, which is the first truly national government that this country has had for decades, I believe that there is something to be gained by having a Senate structured in a way that can provide that balance. I don't know exactly how that would be brought about, but I have had occasion to talk to Senator Roblin about this from time to time and I certainly find his arguments to be very persuasive.

I think that is what the government should be doing is looking at ways of reforming the Senate, making it representative, making it elected, and giving it an opportunity to provide some balance to the government of this country; so that rather than simply moving that it be abolished, I would want to see it improved.

I guess there we come back to the difference of opinion that quite frequently crops up between members of the New Democratic Party and Conservatives is that we tend to recognize the world as being an imperfect place and we want to try and improve it and make it better. They perhaps want to look at things from a more activist or revolutionary point of view where you throw out institutions and start again. So perhaps it's not unreasonable for the New

Democratic Party to say, throw it out and we'll either do without, I guess the proposal is simply to do without it.

I tend to say that one doesn't want to destroy institutions until they really understand what role and function they play and how they might be improved. I certainly haven't had the case made to me that the Senate should be abolished, but I have had the case made to me that it could be vastly improved over the way that it operates now. I say again that I am not in a position to make the detailed sort of personal judgment even as to how it should be reformed, but I do think that reform is the way to go and a few principles such as an elected Senate certainly appeal to me.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would not support the resolution which simply calls for the abolition of the Senate, but I would like to see changes in the Senate and I would like to see reform. I will certainly take every opportunity to urge my colleagues at the national level to give consideration to reform of the Senate. I don't regard it as one of the great priorities facing the country today, but it's something that should be addressed, and reform is the way to go and not abolition.

I won't be supporting this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution. I have been listening with interest to the arguments made about the Senate, and I am struck by the caution, a note of - I don't know whether it's fear of change or undue caution - certainly reluctance to look at what the role of the Senate is; whether that role is an anachronism, what role it could have if it were reformed, and whether we want to take that route; or whether we want to face up to the fact that the Senate is a carry-over from a long period of historical evolution that has been interesting.

It's played a role, I guess, in helping people let go of ideas and values that are no longer functional. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that as I review the role of the Senate and its current function, and as I listen to some of the proposals for a change and a renewed type of function, I haven't yet been convinced that there is a genuine and helpful role, given the nature of today's problems, or that reform is being proposed in anything other than a spirit of, well, we are afraid to really face the issue. Of course, being afraid to face the issue is an attitude of mind that tends to preserve the status quo whether it's costly, whether it's effective, whether it's really carrying out any real function or not.

I guess I can't help but look at the institutions of democratic government somewhat from the perspective of a person member of a group of persons; namely, women, who have had a long struggle in the political arena even to be recognized as having a legitimate role. As I look at the evolution of democratic government in the western tradition, I can't say that I am very reassured by the people who have held back and not wanted to change, because as I see the pattern of change, it seemed to be initially that the people who wanted no change were protecting the power of hereditary wealth and ownership of property with no

consideration for the rights of the people who, for whatever reason, did not have an equal amount of wealth or property and that gradually, over time, I don't think power was ever yielded by the few who had hereditary power or property power. It was rested in some cases peacefully and in some cases with a degree of force by a broader group, who were saying that they, as persons, had some right to a share of the decision-making power in society, and by extension of the wealth that that society made decisions about, and just by action or inaction distributed among the citizens.

I must say, looking backward as a woman on the democratic process, I have seen the moves to broaden the basic power to recognize the political right of the individual in the society and of trying to clarify the political philosophies, trying to develop accountability, trying to improve the speed and efficiency with which elected people could deal with the problems of the day as positive moves. I have seen the desire to entrench what exists, to look backwards, to be terribly frightened of any broader sharing of power as basically rear-guard actions, fearful actions, lack of courage, lack of vision, and basically showing a lack of any will to share power.

I believe that the more egalitarian philosophy that democracy has brought with it, the gradual inclusion not only of men who have inherited wealth or property, but extended to those who had no inherited wealth or property - it took a long time beyond that to gradually include women. In our own country, we have seen a fair delay before oriental people were included, and latterly, Native people as fitting citizens to have a voice in elections and, by extension, in the decision-making bodies in the country. It has taken a very long time for those groups, once they received the vote, to gradually get themselves elected and have an effective voice in the decision-making bodies of the day.

I - I suppose I speak for many women in this - feel more a sense of impatience of how slow that process is and of how undemocratic it still is, rather than fear that any change would be for the worse. I tend to feel we've hung on to some of the old, rigid, dead, aimless types of structures too long. We have lacked the courage to examine what their real role is and how the resources, people power, financial power could be better used.

I gather when they put in a two-House structure, it was very much to allay the fear of too rapid a change by the wealthy classes. This super body was supposed to provide for delay as a counterbalance to the supposedly uneducated, impetuous, irresponsible - you can go on and on with all the adjectives that have been used - but of the opinions and decision-making of the mass. This superior body was thought to have a right to a veto, so that although you could let ordinary people have a say, you wouldn't want them really to have control over financial decisions when it came down to it.

So I see the protection of the Senate, the desire to enshrine it, to talk about reform without ever really talking about why it's there in the first place and whether it still has any function, I see this as a fearful, suspicious and anti-democratic philosophy. Therefore, I really cannot support it.

The only good arguments I've heard for keeping the Senate were if, in fact, it could somehow represent the provinces, the regions of the country in a more effective way. I don't think in Canada we have as yet figured out how to get more balanced and equal regional

economic development throughout this country. If I saw the Senate as playing an effective role in achieving that economic goal, I could be persuaded that it should stay.

I have heard proposals of converting it into a permanent secretariat where provincial-federal civil servants and politicians would address those national issues and relationship issues in an ongoing way, but I have never really seen a plan that I thought would work.

For one thing, I think it would confuse the electorate. By selecting year by year, or even having appointed a superior body that they thought was going to deal with these issues, they would take the pressure off the House of Commons and the elected people there to deal with those very issues. It would be very unclear who had the power and where the power rests, where the accountability.

I think, with rapid change and the challenges that are mounting year by year, that we need a sharpening of accountability, a much clearer focus on the political philosophies of the people we elect, of what they stand for, and of how the programs that they put in are designed to accomplish that. I can't help but feel that the continued existence of the Senate or of any of the reform proposals I've heard to date would only dilute that movement towards greater accountability, greater simplicity, greater clarity.

We have, of course, inherited a system from the United Kingdom. We have shown considerable ability over the years. I can't say we have shown great speed, but we have gradually evolved a system that is a made-in-Canada system. Goodness only knows, it took us long enough to wrestle with issues like the Constitution, but we have moved along in that direction. I don't think there is anytime to stop now. I think we should sit down and identify what we think the Senate has been doing and how well it's been accomplishing it. We should then look at options for the future, and stand up and be accountable for what its future should be.

Again as I see a lot of the current problems in Canada are not that we need greater slowness or less decisiveness or less accountability, which I think the existence of the Senate contributes to, we need the reverse. I think if we removed the Senate from the picture and had our focus very clearly on the House of Commons, we might then address some of the issues like how to get better representation by region, by province, by political party even in a constructive way, looking at the numbers we're voting into the House of Commons and the representation by region. Something could be done to get a more regionally representative group there by reforming the numbers and the relative weightings that come from the different regions of the country.

But then, once you have your group in the reformed House of Commons, they would be all addressing the same problems of the day, and they would stand or fall on the success with the people, with the electorate, of what they did. They would be visible. They would be called upon to be very clear about what they were doing and why, and they would be accountable to the electorate.

I must say that one of the most amusing and disappointing experiences that I've had in the last year or two was when we sat down with the McDonald

Commission, this great commission appointed by the Canadian Government to review the economy, and we had advanced material that asked all the great questions of the day about the international economy, trade, the financial system, the changing power relationships, changing technology, changing investment patterns, and on, and on, all the really very important economic issues that confront us as Canadians and with which we must wrestle.

We were sitting down, after having a very pleasant lunch with Mr. McDonald and the commissioners, and he led off the discussion after lunch. The question that was top on his list - the top priority concern - was how to reform the Senate.

Quite frankly, I couldn't see any connection between the proposal to reform the Senate and the agenda item that his commission had on their plate. It seemed to me a travesty, or a preoccupation, with appointments to a Senate, a kind of honorary place. I admit it's often a convenient place to send people who perhaps have outlived their usefulness in another area or that people just, rather than challenge at the polls, want to get rid of some other way.

But I maintain, if there are people who still have a great deal of value to contribute to society, why don't we put them into a situation where they can be effective. There may be fine debate go on in the Senate, but what power does it have? So far all we've seen it able to do is to delay or hold things up. There doesn't seem to be any obligation to deal with the problems of the day, to meet deadlines, to be accountable to the people.

I, for one, feel that we owe a great deal to the elders in our society and we still have a great deal to learn from them. I'd rather be more inventive in social institutions and put them into areas where their experience and their skill can be well used.

We know of senators, Senator Croll, for one, and I am sure there are others who have conducted valuable studies. Maybe we need some kind of body where we can fund that type of study across the country, but you don't need a Senate seat in order to do that.

Useful reform? If there were real reform of the Commons, if there were a real commitment to bringing about a more representative and accountable Commons, I think we could all applaud it; but I can't see where the Senate, retained it is or moderately reformed, would do anything to deal with the big economic issues that are in front of us, the big social issues . . .

A MEMBER: Jobs.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: . . . the need to relate jobs, yes. But how cynical, jobs for the people who probably, of all the members of society, are best able to care for themselves and find some alternative occupation.

So, for all of these reasons, I'd rather see government at provincial and federal levels demystified, more clearly accountable to the public. Also, I might suggest that one improvement in the Senate might be parody between men and women, but that might be the only basis on which I'd accept a temporary test to see whether a reformed Senate was an improvement.

In short, I fully support the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

Thursday, 30 May, 1985

Has the honourable member completed her remarks?
When this resolution is next before the House the
honourable member will have four minutes remaining.

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