



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 25A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 14 MARCH, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 14 March, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. J. DOWNEY introduced Bill No. 39, An Act to validate By-law Number 1311 of The Town of Melita; Loi validant le règlement numéro 1311 de la ville de Melita.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I didn't know anybody could beat Diefenbaker, but I saw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Before Oral Questions, I have received a letter from the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, noting that today being Commonwealth Day, it is requested that this be read to all of the members.

"Commonwealth Day is an appropriate occasion to focus our attention on the values which characterize this unique family. Built on the foundations of friendship and equality, one thousand million people representative of the world's races, cultures and religions, are members of a unique and voluntary community. This community of 47 nations, large and small, developed and developing, is served by a vital network of concern and co-operation. These are expressed in many areas: education, health, development, law and parliamentary institutions.

"It is in the pursuit of the positive ideals of parliamentary democracy that our association will continue to make its particular contribution to the Commonwealth itself, the parliaments and legislators which are its constituent members and the citizens we represent and serve. During the past few years the CPA Working Capital Fund has allowed the association to expand and diversify its activities, but always in furtherance of the association's aims and objectives to foster understanding and co-operation between members of the Commonwealth Parliaments, to support the rule of law and individual rights and freedoms, and to promote the study of and respect for parliamentary institutions.

"As we examine the future growth of our association to see how it may best achieve its objectives in a changing world, let us reaffirm those values intrinsic to our association, friendship, equality, parliamentary democracy. These values have characterized our association in the past and are the best guarantee of its future growth and strength."

It is signed by Gerald Ottenheimer.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre - fees

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections. You will recall that prior to the new year I had asked, in December, a question of the Minister with respect to a new fee schedule for children in day care at the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre and I thank the Minister for sending me confirmation of that information which I had inquired about.

However, my question, Mr. Speaker, arising from the information is, in view of the fact that some employees of the Health Sciences Centre, under a fee schedule approved by the Minister, are forced to pay \$25.50 a day for day care for their children when the cost is only \$18 a day, why should it be the responsibility of only some Manitoba residents, that is, those who happen to be employed at the work site of the Health Sciences Centre, to subsidize the day-care costs of their fellow workers out of their own income?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I can advise the honourable member that the fee schedule he refers to at the Health Sciences Centre and the flexibility that the Health Sciences Centre and the flexibility that the Health Sciences Centre has in regard to levying such fees was in response to requests made by that organization. Our staff discussed the matters many, many months ago with the staff of the Health Sciences Centre. We were trying to accommodate a problem that they have, but having said that, Mr. Speaker, if the member wishes to get into this in more detail, I would suggest that we could discuss this at some length during the Estimates process.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, having regard to the fact that the Minister had to approve that by Order-in-Council, that fee schedule, how can he justify using a day care centre as a means of redistributing income in Manitoba among only a certain group of people; that is, those people who happen to have to be employed at the Health Sciences Centre in order to have their preschool children in day care?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to discuss these matters at any time with those operators of work site day care operations, but my understanding was that this was a satisfactory approach. As I said earlier, it was in response to requests made of us.

MR. G. FILMON: May I ask then, is this the NDP Government's idea of improving day care in the province? Is this the manner in which we can expect to have quality day care delivered at reasonable cost under an NDP Government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if you will refer the honourable member to Beauséne, the citation will clearly indicate that that question is out of order.

Marxist Study Conference - funding

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have perused the Annual Reports of the Department of Economic Development and the Estimates of the Department of Economic Development for the last several years, and I wonder if the Minister of Economic Development could give us any justification or show us where, in the Estimates, money is available to support the Marxist Study Conference that was held at the University of Manitoba this past weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, our government and our department have a practice of giving hospitality grants to groups that come, national groups and international groups are generally handled from a central pool of money and departments will often chip in on a hospitality portion. In the case of the Conference on Marxist scholars, Mr. Speaker, there were to be around 700 people coming to the province for this event, which was of international scope and significance.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, there was money contributed from the Economic Development Department to the amount of \$3,125, matched by Education, and up to \$1,000 by the Department of Cultural Affairs for a cultural event to be held.

Mr. Speaker, other associations which are supported under the same policy are as follows: Canadian Association of Gerontology, a national conference supported up to \$10,000 by three departments; the Canadian Physiotherapy Association, a U.S. and Canadian conference, given \$4,800.00.

Mr. Speaker, I have the list of other groups which — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. SMITH: . . . have received grants under the same policy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did you give a grant to the Salvation Army?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for advising us that it was \$3,100-and-some-odd, matched by the Department of Education and Cultural Affairs. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister if she can outline to the House what benefit, economic development, creation of jobs, this donation has done for the Province of Manitoba? How many young people are going to receive jobs because of this donation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, economic development, as the member opposite knows, is a complex issue. It's also an issue about which people have many — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. M. SMITH: . . . I don't know if the members opposite wish to hear my answer, Mr. Speaker. I'll wait till they're quiet before I proceed.

There are many different points of view and theories about how economic development comes about. Regardless of one's personal view, Mr. Speaker, I believe, and I think my colleagues support me in this, that it's important to know and understand the major currents of thought and practice in the economic and political field. To do otherwise is to close one's eyes and ears to how people are thinking. We happen to believe it's important to listen to all currents of thought and listen to all perspectives and it is only out of consideration of that broader set of ideas that we're going to come up with the most effective Economic Development Program here in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question this time is to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Economic Development has named an amount of \$3,100-and-some-odd from her department, matched by the Department of Education, and then we have the insinuation that there is another department involved. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could inform this House the total amount of money that was donated to this Marxist Conference held at the University of Manitoba by the Province of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba.

HON. M. SMITH: A quick adding, two times \$3,125 plus a grant of up to \$1,000, to a total of up to \$7,250.00.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I wonder if the Minister could inform us if that \$10,000 - it seems to me it is 10 percent of the cost of the conference - was that about the amount?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a question not only of adding, but of listening. I think I clearly said a total of up to \$7,250.00. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, what the total cost of the conference was. I know we were initially asked for double that amount and that, in effect, was the total that we did see clear to grant.

Early Retirement Pension Benefits

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In the Budget there was an indication that for a three-month period starting March 1st, eligible civil servants will be able to take advantage of a special set of early retirement pension benefits. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Labour could advise the House of what these special pension benefits are, and if there is a great deal of detail, I'd be satisfied if she would undertake to send it to me after outlining the general program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Why? Are you thinking of retiring?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member is asking for a personal retirement program; I'd be happy to outline that for him. However, I will be introducing legislation in this regard very shortly.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I think it's members on the opposite side who had better enquire into early retirement and pensions.

Just to clarify the answer, Mr. Speaker, the Budget Address indicated these pension benefits would be offered starting March 1st. Is there to be no indication to civil servants until the legislation is introduced into the House as to what will be made available to them? I indicate that because a number have spoken to me, and I don't believe they're aware of what is going to be offered. The indication was that it's only going to be for a three-month period that this offer will be made.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, we are working very closely with the Civil Service Commission, obviously, in this and seminars have been set up. Information is already being disseminated about this, but until all the details are final and the legislation is properly prepared, it would be inappropriate, I think, to discuss the details.

Adoption Moratorium

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, the Member for Fort Garry and I asked questions of the First Minister with respect to comments on the Indian adoption moratorium. The First Minister indicated, I believe, that the Minister of Community Services would provide the House with an answer today. I wonder if he has that answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the honourable members that they're suggesting some sort of a crisis. I would suggest to him that there is no such crisis as they allege. It's in their own mind, I'd suggest.

Mr. Speaker, we've had no documentation of any kind outlining any specific problems forwarded to our department. I met in my office with the President of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg and the executive committee of the board on Monday, February 28. The issue was not raised. I spoke to Miss Schwartz on Wednesday, March 10, after a meeting held with various social service agencies and the matter was not brought up. Indeed, I've met with and talked to Judge Kimelman a number of times over the last few months and was surprised at the fact that there is not a problem.

As a matter of fact, I spoke with Judge Kimelman just this morning and he says that there have been no requests for any emergency meeting of his committee and indeed Miss Schwartz is a member of that very same committee or commission.

No one has come forward, no child-caring agency has come forward to ask for the lifting of the

moratorium. In fact, on the contrary, Native groups say it is working very well. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are in a transition period and there indeed is a response now evolving and developing throughout the child-caring system, including the various Native organizations that are becoming active to cope with the problem of cultural relevancy.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, why it is that Manitoba is the only province that was shipping children out of the province for adoption. Certainly, the Province of Saskatchewan, which has as large, if not larger, Native population as Manitoba, indeed does not do that and has not done that for many years. I would just in conclusion state, Mr. Speaker, that it's the considered opinion of Judge Kimelman that the moratorium has indeed helped the situation. It has helped. It has not hurt. It has made all of us in Manitoba aware of the fact that there's a need to cope with a particular problem that we have.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I would read two or three sentences, if I might, of the letter from Judge Kimelman of February 4th, in which he says, "Your Chairman would like to comment with some degree of concern about recent media reports which suggest that if the moratorium were lifted, the problems of the Child Welfare System would be solved. This is simply not the case. Placement outside of Manitoba may be the solution to the placement of a few children in very special situations, but Manitoba children belong here and that basic fact must be recognized by those in the Child Welfare System."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Honourable Minister of Community Services. Since the charges were made publicly and responsively by Betty Schwartz, the Executive Director of the CAS of Winnipeg, has the Minister consulted Miss Schwartz on the subject and explored the accusations and the claims that were made?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. L. EVANS: As I indicated to the honourable members of the House, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to be speaking with Miss Schwartz only a few days ago, albeit on a different subject, but nevertheless there was an opportunity to speak about other things.

Regardless, Mr. Speaker, I have requested my department to contact Miss Schwartz to get at any specific problems that she might be able to identify. They have been in touch with her earlier today and I believe a meeting will be held very shortly to see just exactly what specific allegations, what specific problems that she might be able to identify for us.

Lifting Freezes on Services

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Last year the government claimed

that such actions as the freezing of bus fares, tuition fees and the maintenance of the hydro rate freeze was going to lift some \$50 million of cost from Manitobans and that it was cited as a major economic thrust and would, indeed, contribute to employment creation.

Now that bus fares have been unfrozen, the tuition fees have been unfrozen and the hydro rate freeze is being lifted, can the Minister of Labour tell us to what extent that will contribute to greater inflation and how many jobs will be lost as a result?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, there obviously are not figures to answer that question and I don't believe that kind of an impact will in fact, take place. The freezes, on transit fares and so on, created a bit of a hiatus that allowed people to get back on their feet in many cases. There is no information that I have indicating that jobs are going to be lost because transit fees have been increased, or hydro rates.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary to the Minister of Labour. If the Minister of Labour says that the lifting of the freezes is not going to contribute to inflation or unemployment, does that also mean then that the \$50-million program, much touted last year, did not contribute to keeping inflation down or to create employment?

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably well-known, certainly by us and probably by members opposite, that the inflation rate is in fact going down. In fact, Winnipeg itself had the lowest CPI of any of the major cities in Canada, so I do not believe there will be a detrimental effect on the citizens due to the lifting of these freezes.

Grants re Arts Councils

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he can inform the House what consultation he has had with municipal officials throughout the province in connection with the new matching grant funding that was announced for the Arts Councils as announced over the weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. P. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that comes under my colleague, the Minister of Cultural Affairs. There are no cultural grants in the Department of Municipal Affairs, to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the question with regard to consultation of the new grant for community Arts Councils, myself

and my staff held a series of regional meetings throughout rural and Northern Manitoba - eight meetings during the months of November and December - wherein we had consultation and discussion with individuals, groups and organizations in the broad culture and heritage community and included a number of officials from the various municipalities in those regions. All municipalities were encouraged and invited to attend those meetings.

As a result of those meetings we revised a number of grant programs that come through the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources, grant programs that are for communities outside of the City of Winnipeg in rural and Northern Manitoba, and by way of revision have made those grant programs for a greater accessibility for those communities.

One of the grant programs is the Community Cultural Councils Programs, which is an expansion of an existing program, to allow for joint sponsorship of community cultural centres with municipalities and the Provincial Government in the same way as there is joint sponsorship and involvement in libraries and museums between the province and local municipalities. So the simple answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes, there was consultation as part of the regional meetings that were held throughout rural and Northern Manitoba.

MR. D. BLAKE: A supplementary to the Minister of Cultural Affairs. I wonder if he could give us some idea of how many municipal officials attended and was the particular program that was announced on the agenda and explained to them the way it has been announced.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe the honourable member heard my complete comments. As I indicated, the series of meetings in November and December were consultation with various groups, individuals and municipal councils out in rural and Northern Manitoba, to talk about the existing programs of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources. The issue of community cultural councils was on the agenda at the meetings and was discussed. The specifics of this new announcement were not discussed, Mr. Speaker, because we were consulting with groups and had not made any decisions with respect to revision of the programs. Those were made most recently and were announced.

As far as the number of officials, I can't give a definitive answer. I could take that as notice and check the records of attendance at those meetings, but I know that there was municipal officials in attendance at the meetings in Thompson, The Pas, Gimli, Ste. Anne and I'd have to check the attendance sheets from the other meetings, to give a complete answer.

MR. D. BLAKE: A final supplementary to the that Minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he could give us some copies or provide some more information to the House on the briefs that were presented by the municipal officials, and did he consult with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities in connection with these grants?

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there was any formal presentations made to me - I will check - and if there are some, I will ask those who made

those presentations if they would be agreeable for copies to be made available to the member and members of this House.

With regard to the other question, there was no specific discussion with the Union of Manitoba Municipalities.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I now direct my question to the Minister responsible for Municipal Affairs. Could the Minister indicate to this House whether he and his department is supportive of this program?

HON. P. ADAM: Yes.

Snow and Ice Storm - Manitoba

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

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, last week I took as notice a question from the Honourable Member for Minnedosa regarding the possible installation of underground wiring, in repairing the damage caused by the ice storm and I have been informed by Hydro that there had been some trial installations made near Niverville in 1973 and another one near Beausejour in 1974. The reasons for those trial installations were primarily the shortage of Hydro poles and the significant rapid escalation of the cost of the poles.

It was determined at that time that the costs were significantly higher for installing it underground than doing it with overhead wiring. At the same time, Hydro was moving from having a 12,000-volt distribution system to a 25,000-volt distribution system and they thought that the cost would increase even more so the disproportion.

So they aren't proceeding with underground installations because of the past analyses showing that the costs were prohibitive. However, they are undertaking a fresh look at this, but they won't be able to have it done in time to have it applied to the repairs that might be undertaken in and around the Minnedosa area right now. But the matter is certainly being reviewed in the light of the storm that we've had and in the light of some activity in this respect that's being undertaken in the United States. The Canadian utilities haven't been installing underground in rural areas, but it is being looked at and I would hope that in the course of the next two or three months we'd have something more to report on this.

Emergency Measures Organization Guidelines

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. H. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister in charge of the EMO. Last Wednesday evening in Brandon during a weekend hockey game there was a bomb threat phoned in. The local officials, in their wisdom, decided not to notify the audience or to clear the hall.

My question to the Minister is, does his department have any guidelines and are local officials set up and

advised of what these guidelines are and how to act and how to behave in emergencies such as that one?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. EMO is working with municipalities and the municipal officials with training seminars for emergency training and there are a number of those being set up for this coming week.

The emergency plans that are being set up in various municipalities cover all kinds of emergencies that are conceivable and they would encourage municipalities to make themselves aware of the kinds of resources within a community, therefore, they will cover those kinds of emergencies and all kinds of emergencies. Whether specific procedures are followed for evacuation when bomb threats are phoned in, I would have to take that particular one as notice and see whether they have procedures for that. But they are conducting training with all municipal officials as they show interest in these kinds of procedures, Mr. Speaker.

Snow and Ice Storm - Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. In the aftermath of last week's ice storm, many of the towns and unorganized villages in rural Manitoba are faced with a massive clean-up job of broken trees and my question would be to the Minister of Natural Resources; if he might entertain requests to make available the Dutch Elm Disease control equipment and personnel so that the safe limbing of those damaged trees might be undertaken by the towns and villages.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, that sounds like a proposal that I would ask my department to have a look at.

Homes in Manitoba Program and Jobs Fund - Capital

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Turtle Mountain had asked some questions over the last several weeks about carry-over capital. He asked with respect to a \$34.8 million fund and I can tell him that it represents the portion of the \$50 million included in Loan Act (1980) No. 2, for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, that is the Homes in Manitoba Program which will be unexpended at March 31st, 1983.

The \$83 million of capital authority requested for the Jobs Fund is comprised of \$20 million for the Home Insulation Loan Program; \$23 million for the Homes in Manitoba Program; \$40 million for as yet, unspecified employment creation purposes.

Dumping of Onions and Potatoes

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

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, on February 28th, Sir, I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the dumping of massive poundages of onions and potatoes in the Portage area due to the lack of markets. Sir, my question to the Minister today is, has the Minister requested his federal counterpart to assure that the present surtax on the U.S. imports will not be removed on March 15th as this will create an even bigger surplus and a drop in the prices to the producers?

My question is to the Minister, can he assure me and to the producers of the vegetables in the Province of Manitoba that he has dealt with that question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the honourable member that in dealing with the Federal Minister and Federal Department these issues are raised on a continuous basis with respect to the issues of marketing of products; the issues dealing with dumping; the issues with national marketing schemes as it relates to potatoes and ongoing issues.

To be specific in terms of whether or not we made a specific plea in the last while since this matter hit the press, Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. But there are ongoing discussions at all times dealing with specific issues, whether it be with the use of herbicides on vegetables, those kinds of things, because they have to be licensed federally, those are ongoing discussions.

MR. L. HYDE: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. The question was, has he dealt with this issue, this urgent issue? Apparently he is dodging that issue. I would like to know and I would like to be able to tell my vegetable growers at home that he is looking after their needs.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would urge and we have urged in terms of trying to deal with the international problem of over-supply of products whether it be in grain or in vegetables or in onions. The fact of the matter is our department is involved and has been involved in the promotion of Manitoba products so that all citizens of this province are aware that there is an abundant supply of fresh vegetables available for their use.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister is aware of the fact that tomorrow is March the 15th. We expected a reply to the question that was given to him and so far we have not got it.

Manitoba Archives - theft

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On March 4, I took as notice five questions from the Honourable

Member for Kirkfield Park and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I'd like to respond at this time to those questions.

It's in regards to the unfortunate theft at the Provincial Archives, Manitoba. The coins found missing from the Hudson's Bay Company Archives, which were in the custody of the Provincial Archives, were 628 U.S. minted, 1925 year, silver 50-cent pieces and a 1967 Canadian Centennial \$20 gold coin. The 50-cent pieces were coins struck to commemorate the founding of Fort Vancouver.

This matter is being investigated by the Police Department and I believe that charges have been laid. I'm advised by the Attorney-General's Department that because this matter is before the courts, 46 of the coins are in police custody while the investigation proceeds. We are still hoping that the whereabouts of the remaining coins can be determined through the investigation now underway.

The Attorney-General's Department further recommended to me that because of the current court action and possible insurance claims, that no comment be made with respect to the value of the coins lost. All the remaining missing items have been recovered by the police and are back in archival custody. These include an irreplaceable silver tray presented to Sir George Simpson in the 19th Century and some five other medallions.

I must say, however, as members opposite know, that the Provincial Archives have for some time required certain new resources and facilities, including upgraded and more modern security system and procedures. Indeed, the previous administration recognized this fact and had initiated various plans and renovation to help remedy problems at the Archives. These are being continued by this administration.

During the past eight years since the Provincial Archives of Manitoba occupied its new quarters in response to the question from the Leader of the Opposition, there have been a few minor thefts, some of which material has been recovered. No government employee has been implicated in the previous thefts.

With respect to security measures taken immediately, I've been in close contact with the Minister of Government Services and am satisfied that appropriate action is underway to increase protection of the Archives.

There was a further question with regard to the staffing level of the Hudson's Bay Archives and I can confirm that that has not changed, not decreased since November 30, 1981. The total Archives staff has increased since that time by a total of six staff persons.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister of Economic Development has her staff out in Melita today meeting with the local business people, could she tell me, as the member for that area and this Assembly, how many new jobs the oil industry has created in that area, and as well, how much economic activity, or in dollar value, how many dollars have been spent in the last year and how much do they believe will be spent in the coming year; information which I would assume would be provided to that meeting today?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have those kind of figures off the top of my head. I could undertake to get what is available and give it to the member opposite.

I think it's important to recognize the purpose of the meetings in Melita today - I think it's Brandon tomorrow - where local suppliers are being put in touch with all the oil-company people and a comparison of what the purchasing requirements the companies have is being matched up against the capacity of local suppliers potentially to supply in the future, and thereby increase the number of jobs and benefits to the area.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that that lead has already been taken by the Industrial Commission of Brandon, I want to compliment the Minister for following the lead of other rural communities. I did think that the Minister, and again, would request that she provide for this Assembly, just how much money has been provided by the oil industry in the last year; the economic activity; the new businesses that she or her department believe will be starting in those communities in the southwest. It is important, in light of the fact that it is the only economic activity of any meaningful support to this provincial economy at this particular time. I think that's information that this House would appreciate.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I will obtain what information is available.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as well, I would hope that she would take the information into consideration and would ask that she present it to her Cabinet when they are proposing their ManOil proposal to introduce a government program. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister after that if she will still support the ManOil concept.

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I can't see the connection between the final question and the earlier questions. In fact, whether there's investment and jobs created and spinoff for the local people is not directly tied to whether or not there is a public company present. I still think it's important for us to have a window on the industry and a share of that activity.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Final question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Minister believe that when the private sector is doing such a good job there's as well need for government to spend taxpayers' money on the same kind of industry that is now being proven to be done by the private sector?

HON. M. SMITH: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's my belief that you get the best result from investment from both sectors.

Gasoline Consumption - Province of Manitoba

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, last week the Member for La Verendrye asked me questions regarding gasoline consumption and declines in gasoline consumption. I undertook to get the information for him.

The information that's been provided indicates that sales figures for non-purple and purple gasoline showed that there was a 4.8 percent decrease in 1982 consumption as compared to 1981 consumption.

The second question referred to a projection of consumption changes for this year. A preliminary forecast shows a 4 percent decline in 1983 consumption over 1982 consumption.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Natural Resources, either in that capacity or as Acting Government House Leader.

I'd like to ask the Minister when the five-year report which was for Wildlife Resources, which was to have been prepared before the 1st October 1982, will be tabled in the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will refer to The Wildlife Act, Section 83(2), provides that that report, which is a five-year report, will be presented. The first one is within six months of the close of fiscal year 1982. Presumably, that six months is up, as the honourable member refers to, in October, 1982.

Then the section goes on and says, ". . . prepare and lay before the next Session of the Legislature following the close of the fiscal year, a report containing . . ." and so on. It clearly indicates that it is my obligation as Minister of Natural Resources to table that report this Session. That undertaking certainly will be satisfied. The report has been prepared in draft form; it is being further reviewed and hopefully it will be before this House in a relatively short time, but it certainly will be tabled before the end of this Session.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the section says, ". . . prepare within six months and lay before the Legislature." Why has the Minister not had the report prepared?

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this five-year report is the first five-year report that has been commissioned. The honourable member who asked the question was, I believe, perhaps the Minister of Natural Resources when this change was effected. This is an absolutely new report. It requires considerable work on the part of the department. We have not engaged additional staff to do this sort of thing. It has been fitted in, in respect to the work of the department; it is a very significant report; it has taken time, but it will be presented before the end of this Session.

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

the House today that there is approximately \$40 million of unallocated funds going to be included within the \$83 million of Capital authority in the Jobs Fund. Since his Budget says that that is part of a planned \$520 million spending program of the Crown corporations, from which Crown corporations has this \$40 million been gathered?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, the funds have not been gathered from any Crown corporations and they are indeed unallocated funds which were placed into Schedule A after all of the funds required on an ongoing basis for the Crowns had been allocated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questions has expired.

The Acting Government House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would you call the motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, found on Page 5 of the Order Paper. It stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

ADJOURNED DEBATE - CROW RATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Honourable Member for Virden has 26 minutes remaining.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I trust the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources will remember that there were boundary changes after the last election.

HON. A. MACKLING: My apologies, Mr. Speaker, I meant the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It is always nice, Mr. Speaker, to see that he is willing to keep up with the times and see that there are changes going on in the world.

I listened to him during debate on this resolution and quite frankly, Sir, I began to wonder whether or not he understood anything about what the debate was all about. The interest that he had in the debate didn't seem to be of any concern to the western agricultural industry at all. He seemed more concerned about engaging in a rather animated debate with members on this side of the House on matters which strayed rather distant from the subject matter at hand.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution that was brought in by the Minister of Transportation is one that is not of his own drafting. I'm sure he would like to have drafted one that probably was more in tune with the needs and concerns of farmers of Manitoba. It's certainly vastly different than what he proposed last year and when he took his road show out last year, the results he got from those meetings, I would say even the Minister would have to say left much to be desired. The interest that he thought was there in his position at that time

certainly wasn't too evident at those meetings. So I don't blame him for trying to change it, take a different attack this time, and we will see what the results are when he takes his road show out this year.

There are some things about the proposal, Mr. Speaker, that I find could have been worded a little better and it is my hope, Sir, at the completion of my remarks, to put forward some proposals that would make this a better resolution, more in tune with the realities of today's world and something that would be much more acceptable to talk to the farmers about.

I would suggest, Sir, that in drafting amendments, you do find you have some difficulty because this whole resolution is one that proposes you take a concept that has been passed by another Assembly in total, and either adopt it or reject it. But I suggest to you, Sir, that in adopting it, there may be some points in it that have been missed and there are maybe some wordings in it that would be better if they were changed. I give you an example in that resolution in the first operative clause and it says, "And because these are fundamental concerns and must be dealt with in any plan for the western rail transportation system, this Assembly therefore rejects the Pepin plan." And that was passed by the Saskatchewan Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find out that the present Pepin plan is one that has very little acceptance anywhere and I can tell honourable members that I would have a lot of difficulty accepting the present Pepin plan. But we do know that they are presently drafting amendments to that, so I would suggest that perhaps we should make reference to the present Pepin plan rather than just say the Pepin plan.

The new one that's coming out we don't know about yet so we can't unanimously reject something that we don't know anything about yet. And that's just a little matter of cleaning up some of the things but it makes it a better resolution.

One of the other points that has been of great concern to farmers as long as I've been in this Legislature and before that, were the problems that indirectly affect farmers in which they have no direct input. I refer, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the occasions when the movement of grain is halted for sometimes lengthy times and the farmer's product cannot get to its market when you have a costly longshoremen's strike at the coast, or protracted labour disputes at the Lakehead, or indeed, even rail transportation disputes that tie up all of the rail system and those things are of real concern to farmers. They are costly to our Canadian economy, they are costly to the workers who have lost income while that dispute is going on and it is costly to the rail company.

Now the rail company and the union are the ones that are doing the bargaining, but the farmer whose income suffers because he can't sell his grain is the innocent third party and he would like to have some assurance that these disputes, which do not concern him directly but he is the innocent third party that suffers, they want some assurance that any changes to the grain transportation system must have some insurance in there to the farmer before he is willing to look at change.

So I think you have to tie some of those guarantees into proposed changes to the Crow rate if you're going to have any meaningful discussion at all with the farmers

when you go to talk to them when you're holding your public meetings. So I would like to see some amendments in that field.

The area — (Interjection) — if the honourable member is patient he will find out in due course where we stand on this issue. The honourable member is one who needn't criticize members on this side because the contribution that he made in 30 minutes in this House didn't leave very much for members to discuss at all. Somebody used the term "wind and rabbit tracks", I believe, sometime or another in this House and I thought it fit very well to the contribution for the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one thing that this Assembly does do, it provides an opportunity for people to have a difference of opinion and that is part and parcel of the debating process. It's part and parcel of the legislative process which, when everybody has had their say and differences of opinion have been voted on, you usually end up coming to the right conclusion for all the wrong reasons. I think maybe in this resolution it's possible that when we get to the end of it we might come to the right conclusion but the reasons that are given from this side of the House don't necessarily concur with the ones on the other side of the House. Everybody has their own particular reason for supporting an issue or not supporting it. We will find out when we get to the vote on this resolution, and the amendments that I hope to propose, whether or not members in this Assembly will support it.

Then after we have reached that stage, we will go out to the people and see whether or not the farmers will support the stand taken by the various members in this Assembly, and that is equally important. I think that is probably the most important part of this whole debate. We will find out when we talk to the farmers directly, whether or not the members . . .

HON. H. HARAPIAK: When are you going to start?

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . reflect in their various opinions the true feelings of the farm community.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that members want to get into this debate eagerly and I await their contributions. So without any further ado, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose some amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris that the first operative clause of the resolution be amended by adding after the words "Saskatchewan Legislature and", the following:

(a) "add to the said resolution after clause 9 the following:

(10) Does not express comprehensibly the principle that grain freight rates shall continue to be distance-related; and

(11) Have not been accompanied by concurrent undertakings by the Government of Canada to deal with labour management disputes which have caused economic losses to Manitoba grain producers;" and by

(b) inserting in the final line of the Saskatchewan Resolution the word "present" between the words "the" and "Pepin".

That paragraph (a) of the second operative clause of the resolution be amended by adding after the word

"Canada" the following words, "and interlabour management disputes in the grain handling system."

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move this, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris. I have copies for other members of the House.

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER:

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

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some difficulty with the language of the resolution, the amendment, the Speaker always has the power to change the wording as long as the intent of the amendment is not destroyed.

MR. SPEAKER: There seems to be some problems as whether the 9 and the 10 as proposed in the resolution, in fact are to be inserted into the Saskatchewan resolution. — (Inaudible)—

The Honourable Member for Springfield to the same point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to modifications being made to clear up any spelling or grammatical problems with the resolution, but for me it's quite clear that 10 and 11, which are proposed to be added, would add the whole phrase that follows the letter (a) in brackets; in other words, that our resolution would be amended to provide in it the phrase, "add to the said resolution after Clause 9" but that that would come after the words, "Saskatchewan Legislature, and," so that in effect our resolution would read, after its been amended, if the amendment is successful, that we are actually adding to the Saskatchewan resolution, without changing the body of the Saskatchewan resolution as it's printed here. I believe that's the intent.

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

MR. C. MANNES: We were under the impression that because the Saskatchewan resolution was passed in another House, it is not within our power to any way amend it or change it, so consequently we've added to the Saskatchewan resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I do have a problem with (b), because what we're dealing with in this House is a Manitoba resolution, and (b) says in here, "inserting in the final lines of the Saskatchewan resolution." Once you have a resolution on the Order Paper in this House, it is not a Saskatchewan resolution, it's a Manitoba resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Virden like to withdraw his amendment and perhaps reword it to clear up these points?

The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, if that is an order of the Chair, we would be glad to do that, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa to the same point of order.

MR. D. BLAKE: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the Minister of Transportation, reading in Hansard of March 11th, the Honourable First Minister has said, "We are dealing with it. That's what we're trying to do; this is a Saskatchewan resolution."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources to the same point.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the proposed amendment is clear. There are grammatical errors and there are errors in inserting the word, "Saskatchewan," in (b). However, with those changes, "principal" is spelled wrong in 10 - it should be "le"; inserting in the final lines of the proposed resolution, instead of "Saskatchewan," and then, Mr. Speaker, I think we clearly understand what the amendment proposes, we don't object to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Since there seems to be an agreement on both sides of the House as to what the amendment means, it is moved by the Honourable Member for Virden, and seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, the resolution as read

MR. D. SCOTT: And spelled.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you need it read? Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was deep in conversation with a colleague of mine. I assume that the amendment has been ruled in order? Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment and, hopefully, over the next 30 or 40 minutes, I'll make my case.

First of all, I'd like to review from the beginning where we on this side stand regarding the Crow rate. I think we can state rather emphatically that we support the Gilson process at attempting to reach a compromise. We said that a year ago and I know as a fact our view has not changed.

Secondly, I can say that after reviewing Pepin's proposals, we have a number of concerns which the Minister of Transportation and indeed the Saskatchewan Legislature shares with us.

Our third point, basically although we want to see improvement in Pepin's proposals, we believe that the Crow is dying fast and I wonder again whether we will see it. In the minds of some, the Crow rate is something that they remember that existed 10 years ago. In the view of members on this side however, it's a bird that is fast dying.

My fourth point is that regardless of what we attempt to reach as far as a final conclusion here, let's try to work together. So I agree with the comment made by the Minister of Transportation. The Minister, when he

introduced the resolution, sounded again very sincere in wanting a non-partisan debate and I think his words in effect were, let's knock the Pepin proposal on the head and then argue philosophy afterwards. I suppose I could accept that except for three facts.

First of all, with the development of the resolution - and I think the Member for Virden spoke to that on Friday when he said usually I would assume when you want orderly and quick passage of a resolution through an Assembly such as this that you sit down with the other side, outside of this particular Chamber, and you work towards something that is more or less acceptable by both sides. That was not done. I came to the conclusion right then that maybe this wasn't a non-partisan resolution.

We were aware that, of course, Saskatchewan had proposed this. I am sure that we had a copy of that resolution long before the NDP Party here. We also knew of the unanimous support it had in that House. Indeed, we may have given some consideration to presenting it ourselves except, as the Member for Pembina addressed the other day, our situation is not the same as it is in Saskatchewan. He enumerated five principles as to why the situation here in Manitoba is different. Three of those which I happen to remember are the fact that our productivity per acre is higher; secondly, we are closer to the market and thirdly, our mix of crops is ever so much different.

So, it begs the question, why wouldn't the resolution that is concerned about the proposals that Pepin has put forward, that is being developed in this House, take its lead from a Manitoba perspective? I say that it should have. Another point that made me a little concerned about the sincerity of the Minister when he brought forward the resolution were the speeches by some members of the party opposite, particularly the Minister for Natural Resources and specifically the Premier last Friday, when for one of the few times in this House I have seen him without prepared notes, just speaking with emotion and rhetoric, but absolutely no substance - just chastising us, challenging us to debate this particular topic.

Then, I open my mail, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in two weeks at home, and wouldn't you know? I received a letter from the House of Commons, from an M.P. House of Commons urging me as a farmer to (1) keep the statutory Crowsnest Pass freight rate for grain farmers; (2) create 485,000 jobs, and that paragraph is expanded, and (3) ensure railway upgrading. It was signed by somebody called Terry Sargeant; an individual letter coming from some NDP member in the House of Commons asking for support in this whole issue in the whole southern section of Manitoba - pardon me, I don't have time to do that, sorry - the point being, why would this individual member see fit at somebody's expense to write me as a farmer in Southern Manitoba?

A MEMBER: Public expense.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I suppose it's because it is a political issue.

Then, I read something called "Transport Talk." It has three signatures at the bottom, one Vic Althouse, M.P.; Les Benjamin, M.P.; Stan Hovdebo, M.P., and I

read through this article and the last paragraph is and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "It is obvious that a new deal must be struck by the Federal Government with the railways," and particularly underline this, "Only the NDP Caucus alternative will act to ensure all public investment results in increased railway capacity." That's when I realized this indeed is a political issue in spite of the pleadings from the Minister of Transport that it not be.

Well, the third point that made me suspicious was the operative clause in the resolution before the House regarding the public hearings. Mr. Speaker, I remember last year's hearings on the Crow issue. I was in attendance at Portage when there were some 12 to 15 farmers present; I was also in attendance at Dauphin when there were some 25 to 30 producers - and I underline the word "producers" - present. I realized that - why would the government want to take this issue out to the rural areas again, if not again to attempt to make it a political issue. So for those three reasons, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I came to the conclusion again that it's a political issue.

Let's review what has happened over the past number of years that has brought us to this point, as I see it - of course, this is as I see it. If we remember the comment of the Minister of Agriculture the other day when he said words to the effect that this whole issue on Crow started during Mr. Lang's time, I think were his words. He's correct. But I think he tried to leave the impression that it started because of Mr. Lang. If I put words in his mouth, I am sure that he will stand to correct me. But he's correct; it did start during Mr. Lang's time because something else was happening during that time. That was that grain prices were very high in the mid '70s, and yet because of strikes and railway problems the grain was not moving. It happened over two or three years when we carried considerable amounts of grain on our farm and yet the world value of grain was particularly high, double the net value of what it is worth today. Of course the crop year 1978-79 was particularly noteworthy because that year farmers lost sales of \$1 billion because of a system that was not prepared or able to handle the grain. It was during that time that our government in Manitoba leased hopper cars and other governments purchased cars, indeed, the farmers of the nation purchased their own cars through the Canadian Wheat Board.

It was also during this time that we were told that coal, sulphur and sulphate were all moving, but grain was not. If you want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the Manitoba Pool article or letter that came out to me as a producer, the second paragraph probably states it the best, it says, "In the last few years it became evident that the volume of railway bulk traffic, including grain, was reaching a point where the current rail system was inadequate to meet all shippers' needs. In the light of the situation and with the prospect of grain becoming a low priority under current rates," Mr. Deputy Speaker, "Manitoba Pool Elevators and several other farm organizations indicated they would be prepared to consider changes to the freight rates charged for grain." And that's the setting and let not one of us lose sight of that particular period in time.

So, the tension then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came to be focused on the Crow and no doubt the railways did their job. Those of us that might not have been looking

at it, they turned our heads to look specifically at the issue, and I'm sure we don't disagree on that one. During that time the Hall Commission had made passing reference to the Crow rate throughout its whole text, supporting the Crow rate - I wouldn't want to mislead anybody in saying that Judge Hall indicated the Crow should be changed, because indeed he did not. Shortly after that you have Snavely who did cost accounting and began to determine the actual railway losses. The great loss of farm revenue in 1978-79, Mr. Deputy Speaker, came on the scene and then shortly after that you had a new PC Federal Government, which was prepared to address the entire grain handling system problem.

In conjunction with them, you had the Neil Report whereby branchlines were added to the basic network, you also had our Minister Mazankowski who began further discussion at attempting to try to determine the Crown benefit in real terms. So let not members opposite, or indeed anybody say that the PC Party federally did not realize that the very life and wealth of its constituents were at stake and that this whole problem had to be addressed.

Farmers know, and they knew then, of the tremendous benefit that we receive under the Crow rate, but how much was that benefit, how much was that so-called Crown benefit that we said we had.

Of course, you had another question and it was arising from Alberta. Was the Crow benefit as large as everybody expected or believed, and if it were as large were there other agriculture sectors within Western Canada that were suffering because of it? I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the question was very legitimate, it was very legitimate. Why had our beef and our hog industries not grown more quickly, in spite of the fact that we have a comparative advantage in the production of those items. Why had secondary manufacturing or processing of grains, why had not that particular industry grown more quickly, why had it not? Probably just as important could we expect to maintain the secondary processing that we indeed have now and that existed back those few years ago. These are the questions, Mr. Speaker, and I say to you they were very legitimate.

Shortly after that time the Crow began to be defined in terms of dollars, but an interesting event occurred. Western farmers who grew grain other than for export, in other words, livestock concerns, began to realize that vis-a-vis export grain farmers that they had not received any benefit and to their way of thinking they had, in fact, received a negative benefit in the sense that they were less competitive. They had lost markets to Eastern Canada, who could buy feed grain almost as cheaply as indeed the producers of livestock products here could, even though eastern producers were some 1,500 miles distance. By this time there was an unexpected change in the Federal Government; thanks to the NDP.

You must remember also, Mr. Deputy Speaker, through the last years of the '70s and the first years of the '80s we had rampant inflation in this country. The railways were able to document, in spite of some of the outcries by the members opposite, they were actually able to document substantial significant losses, and the Crow discussion had heated to such a point that, I don't care what government was in place at that time, there was no turning back, it had to be faced.

It had to be dealt with because of these five points that existed some two years ago.

First of all, the railways had large documented losses; secondly, you had a tremendous strain on the mainline traffic. Bottlenecks were appearing; thirdly, the Crow benefits were more or less defined; fourthly, large numbers of farm groups, not including the NFU, but including the Manitoba Pool Elevators, including them, large numbers of farm groups who did not want to see the negative impact of 1978-79 ever repeated again. High prices in the world, but 12 to 15 bushel per acre quotas with the grain left on the farm; also, the fifth point, there were provincial governments who were attempting through ad hoc systems and policies, trying to do their best to alleviate a bad situation; buying cars, renting cars, moving into a whole area they were never meant to be in. That was the time and that was the scene.

Along came Mr. Pepin and for whatever reason, Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Pepin for some reason decided to pick up the challenge and jump into this whole boiling pot. Whatever his motives behind the scene were I can't make comment to, but for whatever reason Pepin came. He named Professor Gilson and he asked him to do one thing, I think, to look for a consensus, and Dr. Gilson reported last June, as we're all aware. Some of Gilson's proposals were well-received, although you had on one side the coalition who wanted more, they felt that in fact that a greater benefit should accrue to all on an acreage basis. The Pool said we had gone too far.

However, what was the original issue? To me the main points through this whole exercise, and I feel it will always be the main point, was the fact that grain producers who produced grain for export and grain producers who produced grain for livestock consumption could not agree as to who would share the Crow benefit.

The form of payment became the final hurdle, became the final battleground, between those two thought processes. The Manitoba Pool Elevators, they define that term as slippage. The Minister of Natural Resources said I wouldn't have the courage to quote other aspects or other parts of this Manitoba Pool Elevator's letter. Well, I'll quote from Page 2, or I'll make reference to Page 2 when I talk about slippage. To me what slippage is, is nothing more than the grain grower not receiving the full benefit as he felt he should and the last hurdle became the form of payment. The whole battlefront for the whole entire Crow debate centered around the form of payment. That's why we are here today because some now have seen this final challenge; this form of payment as the battleground for bringing together again all the combatants; bringing together all the armaments to fight the whole Crow issue over again.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where do we go from here? I think to shut down the process of Crow renegotiation is uncertain. To do so is to leave us, as grain growers, completely vulnerable to the next year of bad movement, and again that's '78-79. — (Interjection) — To say, let's stay back there like we always have and maintain the system like we have over the last 60 years, and hope that we don't have a problem arise again, to me is totally unrealistic.

The ad hoc, let politics solve the problems approach, to me personally that type of approach is not

acceptable. I think we have to attempt to plan some type of forward-looking system that hopefully can take care of all the problems as we see them coming forward so let's work for a better federal proposal. I'm wondering if the members opposite will see fit to join us in attempting to do that; by disagreeing with those points that we find unacceptable and to some degree offensive, but by not throwing out the whole process of Gilson.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think there are some positive points that maybe we should consider. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs says, tell us what they are.

I think one of the first ones surely has to be, that the railways must be adequately compensated for hauling grain. That's a fair rate because in fact if they're not, we as farmers will be the end losers and I don't want to move into the detailed question of costing. I accept that the Manitoba Pool Elevators have done a good job in showing where, in fact, railways were asking for too high a return on equity. They've done a good job for all of us as farmers, in effect, attempting to hold down what the railways would be asking for under a compensatory rate.

HON. A. MACKLING: Do you agree with it?

MR. C. MANNES: Another issue that I think we should accept is the reduction of the transportation rates as between raw and processed. Even the members opposite give lip service to that principle, Mr. Speaker, but in fact, I don't see where a solution other than let Ottawa subsidize processed products to the same amount. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Deputy House Leader.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, for the edification of the Member for Lakeside, I am standing.

Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Honourable Member for Morris will permit a question.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly answer any questions, but I prefer to do it at the end of my presentation.

HON. A. MACKLING: You will leave me time then, will you?

MR. C. MANNES: I hope there will be, yes.

HON. A. MACKLING: All right.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: The third point of course, is the minimizing of the increase in rates due to inflation and, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a very contentious area. We all realize that.

I think the concept of building in some type of an inflationary factor is acceptable to a great number of farmers. Of course, it's how you define it. I would love to accept honestly, I can tell you, Senator Argue's approach; doubling of my rate and then freezing it into statute. In that case, do you know what it would mean

to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I pay 9 cents a bushel to ship some 60 pounds a week from my farm at Domain to Thunder Bay and doubling it would mean 18 cents. I would love to accept that but I don't believe it's realistic. I don't think it could happen.

I'd love to tie the rate of transportation to the price of grain in the world. I believe that's one of the favourite brain child's of our Minister of Transportation but that's not realistic today either. I don't believe that it would work, although hopefully some effort to blend some concept of that into a final proposal may work.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Tell us why it wouldn't work. Let's hear your logic.

MR. C. MANNESS: But regardless, 3 percent. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know these numbers are a little bit laborious at times and hard to follow, but the cost to me under the present proposal is some 3 percent over the next three years. That will take my cost of hauling grain from 9 cents to 10.35, not the 51.4-percent increase that the Member for St. James indicated yesterday; the 15-percent increase. So that's what will happen to me as a grain producer over the next three years. My rate will go from 9 cents a bushel to 10.35. I am prepared to pay that and many farmers are, but it's the open-endedness that concerns members opposite and concerns us also.

MR. A. ANSTETT: How about equal rates for equal . . .

MR. C. MANNESS: I find it a little strange that Manitoba Pool Elevators would make reference to a number which is doubling or tripling and to a variation. Does any member here know what I pay in a Manitoba Pool Elevator to elevate my grain up about 100 feet in the air and drop it into a car? Does anybody know what I pay? — (Interjection) — No.

Well, Mr. Speaker, seeing everybody is dying to know the answer . . .

MR. L. HYDE: Ask Billy, he'll know.

MR. C. MANNESS: I pay for a bushel of wheat, Mr. Deputy Speaker, 19 cents for that function of taking it up a leg and dropping it into a car and yet I pay 9 cents to ship it 500 miles to Thunder Bay. That's what it costs.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the comments coming forth, the inflationary aspect is a very important point and 6 percent in the years following '85-'86 is too high and probably 4.5 percent is too high also.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Does that include loading?

MR. C. MANNESS: So let's work together for a better percentage . . .

MR. R. DOERN: All for one and one for all.

MR. C. MANNESS: . . . because I can't see where we will be paying 5 times Crow in 1990. You almost have to assume the greatest changes possible, first of all in total production, in total exports and wild

inflationary factors but nevertheless, we realize agreements like this sometimes last 50 years and what decisions you do make today impact very profoundly on decisions made some 20 or 30 years hence.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, possibly another acceptable aspect of Pepin's plans could be in the area of the guarantee of service as offered by the railways. My sources tell me, Sir, that in fact, this particular area is fairly well covered off because of the proposed system whereby funds will be allocated to some beefed up transportation authority, who will only in turn reimburse those funds to the railways after service has been guaranteed. The people tell me that the legislation dealing with this matter will, in fact, guarantee fairly good service. But unfortunately, the very proposed system of guaranteeing service from the railways, namely the funnelling of these benefit funds through this enhanced GTA, becomes one of the major issues of discontents and that leads me, Sir, into the whole area of the proposals which must be addressed and changed within the present plan.

First of all, the lack of adequate cost protection for farmers - and that's indicated in one of the comments - 3 percent for three years; 4.5 percent after that is what Gilson had proposed. The government has countered with a 6 percent inflationary factor applied to farmers after the year '85-'86. That is unacceptable.

Doubling of rates in the next few years is acceptable if some stronger form of protection is offered. Open-ended agreements are out, particularly if the Federal Government believes that inflation is in their best interest and that's my concern. I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that was one of the reasons Dr. Gilson put in the 4.5 percent minimum because he wanted the Government of Canada to understand it was in their best interest to fight inflation and therefore, to reduce their contribution to the whole Crow benefit fund.

The second issue is the fact that not all prairie crops and their products are covered and as mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture, sunflowers and soya beans, which will become an emerging crop in Manitoba in time and others, are not included. That's one of the reasons why this resolution should have been drafted specifically for a Manitoba context.

The third point, the cap, the maximum of 31.1 million tons is unacceptable. Gilson probably felt that the limit would never be tested. I'm one that believes the limit will not be tested in this decade. I can't see any set of circumstances, personally, which would allow for a 31.1 million ton export figure to be tackled within the next number of years. But as I said before, these agreements last for years and quite conceivably in the 1990s, that number will be challenged, therefore it has to be increased. Let's work toward finding the proper cap for this type of agreement.

The fourth item makes no reference whatsoever to variable rates. We, in this party share the common concern of what variable rates may do, even though today there are variable rates and elevator tariffs and I've mentioned them to you before, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Today, Manitoba Pool Elevators are allowed to charge for the elevation of grain, 20.4 cents but they choose not to. They choose 19 cents a bushel. So they can select at any point, if they so wish to make the decision, to make a rate which is different than an existing rate elsewhere.

Today, Cargill and indeed any other company can choose to charge less at any point. Variable rates will ultimately come. They will come but they should not be encouraged until rationalization has probably taken its full course. Let that happen first before variable rates.

To restate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, item 4 makes no reference to variable rates which we are much opposed to.

The fifth point, the clearing of the air regarding the livestock issue and Western Canadian achieving a larger base. I agree with all those who say, we will not increase our market share in Eastern Canada. Certainly there is some prospect of increasing, I believe, some beef and pork sales into the northwest area of the USA, and possibly a more competitive stance in the way feed grains are priced would allow for that. But I can't see, under the present politics of this country, where there's any opportunity whatsoever for our livestock products to find a greater market share in Eastern Canada.

The sixth item, we often hear addressed as a consensus of western Canadians. I think we all agree that this is important and we should work towards this end. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, how do you define a consensus? If you are able to define it, how then do you measure it? Because in my view, it'll never occur. When you look at the makeup of our agricultural industry and you look at all the various sectors within agriculture, I say to you that a consensus, however defined, will be a very difficult goal. However, I do agree with those who state that we need a broader base of consensus than we have right now.

Sir, these are our major concerns with Pepin's proposals. You will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope, that our concerns follow logically from our approach and if you want to read what we said last year in our speeches when we addressed this resolution, I think the members opposite would not make those comments that we're not consistent; that we're inconsistent because we have followed a logical approach to this. If you want to characterize it, or if you want to call it, I think you can best name it as guarded acceptance to change, if change can be shown as benefiting Manitoba grain growers. That always has been our view and I don't think it will ever change and I say to you, Sir, that the Manitoba P.C. Party has been consistent.

We do not make unlearned or emotional statements like members opposite, who make the bold statements - I heard this and I quote - "Increases in grain transportation costs would cause a significant decline in net income." Of course, given a fixed volume of movement, increased costs mean less income. There's no doubt about that, Sir. But increased costs lead to better service or maintenance and can cause myself as a farmer to be much better off and I think members opposite too often lose sight of this.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, what the difference is of a 15 bushel and 25 bushel, what it means to my farm? Well, over 1,000 acres, it means the difference as to whether we sell into the world market 10,000 bushels, and that 10,000 bushels or \$40,000 worth of value maintained on my farm for one year represents an interest loss to my farm of \$4,800.00. Yet if the Crow rate tripled, went from 9 cents to 27 cents a bushel, the extra freight I would pay is \$1,800.00. I'd be some \$3,000 better off if that grain moves compared to

whether that grain stays on the farm and does not move for one year. There is a cost benefit to me.

Again, it is this logic that finds itself behind much of our thinking. However, in regard to Pepin's proposals, we find ourselves in opposition to many of the points and in addition would like to see the entire question of labour disputes, as indicated by the Member for Virden, also introduced into the whole topic and colleagues of mine again will address this later.

We would hope that the Federal Government would consider altering some of the proposals to guarantee more precisely the benefits under the existing statutory rate. In so wishing we would ask this Assembly to support our amended resolution, one which is, first of all, drafted more specifically to the concerns of Manitoba; secondly, takes into account Manitoba's concerns related to the movement of all - and I stress, Mr. Speaker - all Manitoba grain produced; and thirdly, it takes into account, or endeavours to lend the same broad support of the intention of major Western Canadian groups to cause a fairer Federal Government commitment to Western Canada.

The present Pepin plan is unacceptable. Let's work together to make it a better plan. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Assuming that there is time left, I would like to put a question to the honourable member. He said he would entertain a question at the end of his submission, if there is time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Morris whether or not, in light of his favourable comments about the Pool position, and the Pool position being one that is now opposed to variable rates and opposed to payments to producers, whether or not he agrees with the Pool position or the position of his honourable colleague, the Member for Pembina, who is in favour of incentive rates and in favour of payment to the producers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Speaker, I realize the intent of the question and certainly I was in the Assembly the other day when the Member for Pembina made his speech. He must have taken a different interpretation completely out of what that member said, because the Member for Pembina made it abundantly clear to me that in fact he did not support variable rates. In fact he said so. So I don't know what interpretation the Member for St. James wishes to interpret.

Secondly, he makes references to who should receive the payment. Well I can tell him that I, to a large degree, support the contention of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, that payments to farmers will be considered in the minds of many, a producer's subsidy, and that offends me, so I am concerned about the method of payment. To say that it's an issue whereby you can decide where the payment should go, I agree with what the former Minister of Agriculture said when he said, "Let's look

at the legislation, let's see if some orderly drafting method can be brought about whereby the funds can be taken to an authority like the GTA, whereby it can be dispersed in some orderly manner." To directly put it in the hands of farmers though is offensive to me and I'd have a hard time supporting that.

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

MR. C. MANNESS: Do you have a question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. If there is to be a question it can only be by leave of the House. (Agreed).

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question of the Honourable Member for Morris. His colleague from Pembina indicated that in distant-related freight rates, should you not allow the railway the opportunity, that given certain operating efficiencies along the line, that they could charge less than that distance-related freight rate which is fixed in statute? In my opinion that is variable rates. I'm just wanting to get a clearer answer from the member, if he wants to provide that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNESS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess we'll have to agree to disagree as to the interpretation we want to put on what the Member for Pembina said.

HON. P. ADAM: I was reading from Hansard, page 691.

MR. C. MANNESS: I guess I'll have to ask him the same question, Mr. Speaker, when he has an opportunity to speak on the Crow and I could pose the very same question, the terms of tariffs regarding elevation in elevators; under where the Canada Grain Commission today guarantees a fixed level over which nobody can charge a higher value for elevation. Yet some elevators, for some reason whatever it may be, have made the conscious decision to charge less; not only charge less between competitors within the same point but also have done so between elevators within the same company. In other words, a Pool at Domain may not charge the same thing as a Pool in Ste. Rose. Is there a Pool elevator there, I should ask? — (Interjection) — There isn't. Well, let's say at Dauphin. That's a conscious decision made by the company of the time.

Regarding freight rates, the Manitoba Pool says they're concerned that maybe some of the first rates will be issued as single car and in fact, after that time, unit trains may be brought into being that will allow discount from that charge rate.

To me, that type of system is nowhere variable at all because under that type of situation it's not an elevator company's decision because if there are elevator points everywhere along the line, the railway can't make the conscious decision as to how those elevator companies are going to order in their cars. They can't decide what type of business they're going to have; that's beyond the ability of the railways to make those types of decisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments. I don't think I should be too long. I would just like to refer specifically to some comments that were made today by the Honourable Member for Morris and in particular his conclusion and the theme that ran throughout his speech which really suggested I suppose, to members opposite, that in effect the opposition were resigned to the impending changes in the Crow and although they didn't welcome them necessarily with open arms, they felt that they could live with those changes.

I'm concerned that the Member for Morris has contradicted in some respects, the Member for Arthur, whom I will quote, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when he was speaking on the Crow debate, said as follows on Page 654. This is Thursday, March 10th, last week already.

Mr. Speaker, he said and I quote: "Mr. Speaker, I have to start from the position that we, as a Progressive Conservative Party, since getting into office in 1977, have been basically and very much consistent in our position, in what we've been wanting to accomplish in the development of the movement of western grain and of course following on that, the development of the Western Canadian economy, which in fact has a major impact on all of the economy of Canada." He goes on to say and this is where I think that there is some contradiction in what the Member for Arthur has said and the position that has been outlined today by the Member for Morris and outlined supposedly by their resolution, their amendment.

"Mr. Speaker, our position is, and I don't mind putting it on the record, because every time I've had a chance to speak and every member of this caucus when they've had an opportunity to speak say that they - and I'll put it in the proper terms - have not had any difficulty with discussions on the Crow rate as long as the benefits of the present Crow rate were retained for the farmers of Western Canada."

MR. J. PLOHMAN: Caucus position.

HON. J. STORIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that we could and we will quibble over whether the position taken by the Member for Morris adequately covers the concerns raised by the Member for Arthur. The question is, are the benefits going to be maintained? Mr. Speaker, our original intent in bringing this motion forward was, as suggested by the Member for Morris . . .

HON. J. PLOHMAN: That's a red herring.

HON. A. MACKLING: That's not even a red herring.

HON. J. STORIE: . . . to get co-operation and to be able to present a united front on this issue. From the reaction initially from members opposite to this resolution, you would have assumed that they would have been making some substantive amendments to the resolution. They've implied, through various speakers, that they were somehow going to amend the resolution to make it conform more accurately to the Manitoba position. I am afraid if that was their intention,

it's been a miserable failure if the resolution is to be any indication.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, that's right.

HON. J. STORIE: I will make some comments about the resolution specifically as I go on, but I would like to indicate that as the Member for Morris went through the various points that were established through the Saskatchewan resolution, I don't think that there were too many conflicts. We were in basic agreement that those items from Nos. 1 through 9 were some of the objections that there were and one could have to the Pepin proposal.

The first one, the proposal, No. 1 says, "The Pepin proposal do not recognize the principles of a statutory rate for grain," I suppose is the key one. While the Member for Morris in his speech was indicating that the Member for Pembina and others had not implicitly, or otherwise, supported the idea of variable rates, I suppose we could interpret his comments today then to mean that only if there is a statutory rate can we accept variable rates because if we have a statutory rate the variability will be beneath it. In other words, the farmers will be assured of a set rate and any variation to that rate will be, in effect, a saving to the farmer. — (Interjection) — That's right. In the example that you've had, we can accept that. The question is whether there needs to be a statutory rate.

The other points, I think the Member for Morris has indicated, he is in substantial support with the resolution as it is presented and I suppose that we are as well, so we have some agreement.

We recognize, as do members opposite, that our farmers are in a very competitive business and they compete ferociously for world markets and changes to the Crow rate, changes to the transportation costs are going to affect seriously whether they are able to compete. So that's been recognized.

The fact that the Pepin proposal does not provide sufficient performance guarantees for the future growth and development of all facets of prairie agriculture, that's been recognized. In fact, as the Minister of Agriculture pointed out, the government has already advertised extensively in the Province of Quebec indicating that their traditional benefits will be maintained; that their advantage will not be forsaken for a few farmers in Western Canada and implicitly that's the message that farmers in Western Canada have to receive from those advertisements placed by the Federal Government.

I suppose we agree as well on the unnecessary and unacceptable limitation of 31.1 million tonnes of subsidized shipments. As the Member for Morris has indicated, the outlook in the foreseeable future is that we will not exceed that number of tonnes. However, recognizing the innovativeness of the prairie farmer, it's certainly possible that at some point in the future we will have to confront that limitation if it's in trying. As well, the Member for Morris and I agree, as recognized, that once something like that once a limitation, once an upper limit is established, it becomes particularly hard and difficult for a Legislature, or any interest group, to remove that limitation.

I suppose as well - and this is something I'm sure that has spurred members opposite to contribute in a

constructive way to the passing of this resolution - is a recognition that there is a growing consensus in Western Canada amongst farmers and amongst legislatures, that the Pepin proposal is not acceptable. There is a consensus of opinion against that particular proposal.

I suppose what concerns me and what raises a number of questions in my mind is the amendment that has been introduced by the Honourable Member for Virden and seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris. They have indicated they brought this amendment forward to make it and give it a Manitoba perspective. I would ask how the addition of the two clauses, Nos. 10 and 11, purports to do that?

The first one, No. 10, says, "Do not express comprehensively the principle that grain freight rates shall continue to be distance-related." Perhaps we need to ask some questions about what, implicitly, this statement means. Does it mean that we want statutory rates which were, in effect, distance-related? Is that what members opposite want to imply? Or are they leaving the door open for variable rates? Because clearly, the Pepin proposal leaves the door open to the introduction of variable rates.

Members opposite might want to rethink that and perhaps when we hear from a number of other members on the amendments which they've introduced, they will outline more specifically what they foresee happening, if there are even any amendments to the statutory rates at all.

The question is, when they suggest as well in their amendment that we insert the word "present" between the words "the" and "Pepin." That suggests that their position - while maybe not fence-sitting - they've accepted what's happened so far, the Member for Morris indicates. We have to question why there would be any acceptance of the Pepin proposal when they have already recognized that the items number 1 to 9 which were presented in the Saskatchewan resolution clearly indicate that there are a tremendous number of negatives involved for western farmers. So now we're leaving the door open for sure.

I suppose the one that causes me the greatest concern - not necessarily concern - I find this difficult clause to relate to the topic and that is that Section number 11 which they've included, which says "have not been accompanied by concurrent undertakings by the Government of Canada to deal with labour-management disputes which have caused economic losses to Manitoba grain producers."

Mr. Speaker, I can understand their concern over the labour disputes that have occurred from time to time on both the west coast and Thunder Bay. I recognize that that has caused some deal of concern and some hardship in some instances. The question is that labour-management relationships and labour-management disputes are going to be ongoing whether or not the Pepin proposal is eventually invoked. The fact is that this is a total red herring, it is an attempt to — (Interjection) — a blue herring, pardon me. It is an attempt to fudge the real issue. There is no necessity of providing this kind of an amendment to the resolution because it has absolutely nothing to do with the fundamental issue and that is whether the statutory Crow rate remains or not.

MR. C. MANNES: What about the fuel prices in Saskatchewan?

HON. J. STORIE: The Member for Morris asks what the fuel prices, the unacceptably high taxation levels on farm fuels has to do with the resolution either. I would say that we accepted that resolution from Saskatchewan holus-bolus, not because of any particular love for each and every one of the sentiments expressed in it but the fact is that overall I think it's a very acceptable position, one which we hope members opposite would accept. I would say that substantially, they have accepted those conditions. The two clauses they have added, Mr. Speaker, do not change the tone or the direction of the resolution at all. In the first instance, I suppose they inject a note of uncertainty on the part of members opposite and in the second case, they have added something that is inexplicable in a way; it does not relate to the substantive issue of the Crow rate at all. I suppose it was done so in the hope that members on this side would take the bait and rally against that particular section of their amendment. I don't think there's any need to do that; I think it's clearly out of order; it has no bearing whatsoever on the true issue.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: I notice you didn't debate it even though you moved it.

HON. J. STORIE: I suppose that our objection to Pepin's proposal and our objection to the changes to the Crow rate in total, amount to the following, and that is that there are too few benefits to Manitobans, farmers or otherwise and there are too many costs associated with those changes and those costs fall, by and large, on the farmers of this province. That is, in sum and in total, the issue here.

Following on from the Member for Morris' speech; he made a number of points which he said were given with members opposite. Number one was that they support the idea of a compromise on the Crow rate issue; they support the continuing negotiations that have taken place through Mr. Gilson and through the various interest groups that have made representation to the Federal Government; they support the compromise that's being worked out. That clearly indicates that members opposite are willing to forego the traditional benefits; they're willing to let the farmer - on assumptions that they've made about some of the benefits that are coming - be left holding the bag.

Certainly they've indicated they share some concerns. The Member for Morris outlined the concerns that he has and I think his speech in itself was an indictment of the Pepin proposal. Yet when he's finished that and he's gone through the number of points he still maintains that there is room for compromise, that we're not going to sell the whole farm we're only going to sell half of it.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Wishful thinking.

HON. J. STORIE: One of his final comments, Mr. Speaker, was that the Crow is dying. It's a dead bird.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Only a turkey would say that.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, we don't feel that that's a foregone conclusion - it need not be a foregone

conclusion. That was one of the incentives for us to introduce this resolution which as the member has indicated is an adopted, if not bastardized, version of one that we introduced some months ago which, unfortunately, and for their own reasons members opposite refused to comment on, at least refused to comment in any detail on. However, the implication that the Crow is dying, again, I think is an indictment of the support that the members opposite have traditionally given to the farm community.

I would hope that we're not going to quibble at undue length over the amendments that have been suggested by members opposite because I don't think, in all honesty, that there is very much that has been added to the present resolution by them. I think the real issue is whether or not this Chamber is going to view the Crow statutory rates as a dying issue. If members opposite are willing concede that point at this juncture, then the people of this province, the farmers in particular, are in difficult straits, because there has been no irrefutable evidence produced to suggest that the long-term benefits of any changes that Mr. Pepin or his crew are about to embark upon are going to have any lasting benefits to this province.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if we were going to come to the crux of what separates the two sides on this issue - it's this issue. The issue is not that this side fundamentally opposes some changes to the transportation system that exists. The question is, if those changes come about, is there any necessity for a change to the Crow rate? The answer is no. Clearly, that when we're talking about upgrading the rail system, which is a desirable goal that we on this side recognize and acknowledge that fact; and we support any changes to the transportation system, any improvements that are to be made whether or not there are significant dollar benefits provided by that upgrading. The fact is that there is a need to do that upgrading. The question is, who pays? That's the key question.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Morris has clearly indicated to this Chamber today that he and his colleagues are prepared to have the farmers pay. That's what he said. He himself said, I would be prepared to have the Crow rate double, providing that was the end of it. I would have no problem with that at all.

Unfortunately, for members opposite, if changes come about and if the Pepin proposal is followed, the rates will not just double, but they'll triple. As a member in all honesty indicated, the difficulty is that there is no limit. We have a real problem there, because we don't feel the resolution and this side do not believe that the changes have any lasting benefits to the farmers of this province. We feel that the changes may be desirable, but the question of who pays for those changes is the fundamental question and one that our party has suggested there are alternatives to who pays. We don't feel that it is necessarily the farmer that has to come up with the payments to improve the transportation system in this country.

A MEMBER: That's right. Hear, hear!

HON. J. STORIE: There are three parties that we can look at to provide funds for these improvements. First, we can look to the public. Well, the public has been

supporting the railways by and large for any number of years. The farmer, through the statutory rate, has been, in some sense, isolated from the true costs. The third one is the CPR. Who can pay?

Mr. Speaker, members opposite and I recall any number of speakers on the government side who presented their case for who should pay. Believe me, it wasn't the farmer. Now we have a resolution which I'm hoping that both sides will take up which says, in effect, the same thing; that the Crow rate benefits have to be protected; the farmers have to be protected. The Member for Arthur said that in his speech on Thursday. He said the Crow rate benefits have to be maintained from the farmer.

My suggestion is before we continue to debate this resolution, debate these amendments, that the Member for Arthur and the Member for Morris get together and decide which of those is actually going to be the case; whether the farmers are going to have that benefit maintained for them and if it's to the benefit of this province, or whether, as the Member for Morris has suggested, it's okay if we let it slip away.

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

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the Member for Flin Flon withdraw those words because, in fact, I never ever did say we would "let the benefits of the Crow slip away."

A MEMBER: Withdraw, withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, having a great deal of regard for the decorum in this Chamber and respect for the debate, I will acknowledge to the Member for Morris that he did not use the words "let the benefits of the Crow rate slip away." He used some other words, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying that the Member for Morris did make the following remarks in summing up his argument. He said, and I paraphrase the member, that the railways have to be compensated. The railways have been involved in and had significant losses which was of concern to the member. He said that was one of the reasons why the Pepin proposal, although it may not be acceptable in its present form, had to be considered. So, clearly, the fact that the CPR, the poor CPR has not made a profit on its transportation section is of concern to members opposite. That's one.

The fact is, as well, he mentioned that there was a tremendous strain on the traffic; that there was legitimate concern, I will say, that on some occasions the farmers have had a difficult time transporting their grains to the markets. We're not opposing that. The question is when that system is improved, who pays?

I suppose the question is, where do we go from here? I would suggest that we should look closely at the amendments that have been introduced. I'd suggest the members opposite confer a little more closely and come out, in effect, with a joint position; that the Member for Morris review the Member for Arthur's speech and make sure that there is consistency there;

that we go ahead and we will deal with the amendments to the resolution and the resolution that we conclude by passing a unanimous resolution which we can present to the Federal Government and say that we don't want changes to the Crow rate based on the Pepin proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 4:30 - does the Honourable Member for Morris have a point of order?

MR. C. MANNES: I am wondering if I may be granted leave to ask one question of the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: Thank you. I'm wondering if the Minister of Housing, who appears to be such an expert in this whole issue, if he could define in dollars what the Crow rate benefit is. It hasn't been defined. I am wondering if he could do that, if he could define the Crow rate benefit in dollars. It has been defined. It is the basic building block behind this whole argument. I'm sure he would have command of that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please, order please.

The Honourable Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Speaker, I will just say to the honourable member that throughout this debate over the last year and a half, I, as I'm sure members opposite have found, that they are confronted by a confusing array of statistics about the benefits and the costs of the Crow rate, and to put an exact dollar figure on it, \$650 million, I've heard it is more than that. I was going to say \$930 million, but I'll say \$650 million. I'll defer to the Member for Morris if he wishes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Housing spoke for 25 minutes. Will he please indicate whether he has finished his remarks?

HON. J. STORIE: Yes, I've finished my remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The question on the amendment will remain open when we next reach the amendment in Private Members' Hour.

RES. 3 - RE FILM "IF YOU LOVE THIS PLANET"

MR. SPEAKER: On the assumption that it's the will of the House to leave Resolution No. 1 - Resolution No. 3, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, who has 10 minutes remaining.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, you indicate that I have 10 minutes left. I had pretty well made my case during the last time that I spoke on this resolution, and I think I made the same case that my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, had made that it's an absolute disgrace for this House to be requesting the CBC to

put on any program, let alone on prime time. The honourable members don't seem to realize that when this House passes a resolution, it's a resolution which is a direction of the government to the government, and the government would be giving direction to a publicly owned broadcasting system on what they should probably put on their system of broadcasting and also put it on during the prime time, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable members opposite haven't got the internal fortitude to come forward and put out the straightforward resolution on the debate of the arms race. They really want to do it through the back door, and doing it this way is a really disgusting sort of way of trying to do it, Mr. Speaker. The honourable members opposite that have spoken on this so far have gradually moved into the devastation of the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb and the nuclear weapons, etc., and using this resolution to get into that description of what an arms race should or shouldn't be, who should be in the arms race, and what kind of direction that the people should go in the arms race; but they haven't got the guts, Mr. Speaker, to come forward with a resolution which is straightforward to be discussed in this House and let them put their remarks officially on the record regarding that particular discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite keep talking about what they did last year. I don't recall a resolution in this House requesting the members to vote, to suggest to the CBC what they should put on, or what they should put on in prime time. I absolutely have no recollection of that whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, and then they also have brought in the arms race as far as this resolution is concerned. Nobody on this side of the House questions the devastation that can be caused by the weaponry that is available to the world today. Nobody will question that, and if they want to debate what each side, and I say each side, should be doing in this House, we'd be very glad to have the debate if they have the fortitude to bring the resolution forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hear from the other side of the House, "Bring yours forward." Mr. Speaker, we didn't, on this side of the House, try to bring it in the back way door. We on this side of the House didn't try to mislead by saying that we want to have a film shown in prime time. Mr. Speaker, just regarding the film, and I will end my remarks by saying what I said the last time and I think it's worth repeating. The Secretary of State, Gerald Regan, in Canada, the Canadian Secretary of State, believes that this film is in bad taste. He believes sincerely that the National Film Board should not have made this film using the President of the United States in the film.

As I said the last time, the person that made the film could have used any one of a dozen actors, could have used the shots from any one of a dozen war pictures but, no, they had to use the President of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I would say that just like Mr. Gerald Regan, the Secretary of State of Canada, I think that it's not only disgusting; I think that the people should be censured for embarrassing the people of Canada by making a film like that in our country and using the President of United States

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I'm having some difficulty in hearing the honourable member make his remarks.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . in the film. I'm sure honourable members didn't even think about it after we discussed this resolution the last time at what really was done. It's an insult to our neighbours, just the same, Mr. Speaker, if the United States or anybody in the United States had made a film down there and they have the capacity to make far more than we had, had Mr. Broadbent blithering off at the mouth, as he always does about something, and put it in a film such as this, these people would have complained their heads off. No question about it. It's the old story, Mr. Speaker. The reason why they don't seem to dislike the fact that they used this particular person or the President in the States, it's because they live by the rule over there. It all depends whose ox is being gored. If it happens to be somebody else, they're very happy. If it happens to be them, they squeal their heads off.

Mr. Speaker, that basis that this resolution has put forward to try and get into a discussion on the arms race, I repeat, if they want to do it, let them come forward straightforwardly and do it, let them put their position on the records and we'll debate it. But as far as asking the CBC, the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, to request them to put a film on, even request them to put a film on and put it on in prime time, as I said, is distasteful and disgusting and something that shouldn't be voted or supported in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Will the honourable member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek suggested that the people who produced the film should be censored because of the insult it is to our neighbours to the south. On the basis of that, I can only presume the member has seen the film. Could the member confirm that he has actually seen the film?

MR. J. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would read my remarks of last week he would have known that and I'll answer any question he wants when he tells me he didn't vote the last time there was a vote in this House.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, my second question, in view of the fact that the member, by evasion, has admitted he didn't see the film, is he familiar with the resolution moved last year, the resolved portion of which states that this House declares its positive moral commitment for world disarmament, and further endorses the goals and objectives of the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament and actively attempts to determine the possible actions it might take to hasten world disarmament on a global scale. He asked that such a resolution on disarmament be brought in. Does he not agree that that resolution was brought in and debated last year and passed unanimously by this House?

MR. J. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it was brought in last year and passed unanimously by this House and

the reading of the resolution is one that should be passed unanimously in this House, and it was.

This resolution is a back door. First of all, is a front door to tell the CBC what to do and a back door to get into another type of resolution again. I would like to remind the honourable member that this is this year and I would say to him if he wants to bring in another resolution, please request the member to do so. He seems to be giving the impression that he knows what happens or what should be done in this House or what shouldn't be done, and we have our doubts about that, but if he wants a resolution, Mr. Speaker, I say to the member, bring it in.

MR. SPEAKER: I hope that has clarified the issue. The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes it is indeed a pleasure to stand to support the motion from my honourable colleague, the Member for River East. I agree that there are three different issues that are involved in this: One is the autonomy of the CBC; the second is the content of the film; and the third is the arms race itself.

I'd like to deal with all three of those in context of the debate that has gone on so far on this resolution in the House.

In terms of the autonomy of the CBC, I'd like to read a couple of the statements that are in the principles and the program policy of the CBC. One is that the CBC be a balanced service of information, enlightenment and entertainment for people of different ages, interests and tastes covering the whole range of programming in fair proportion.

The other one is to contribute to the development of national unity and provide a continuing expression of Canadian identity. I think the issue in this case, in our request to the CBC to air this particular film, is that on this particular issue of nuclear disarmament by not airing this film and by calling it one-sided, they are not dealing with this issue in fair proportion.

I would like to refer to some statements that the Honourable Member for Lakeside made in this House on Wednesday, March 9. The Member for Lakeside is most concerned, as is the Member for Sturgeon Creek this afternoon, about interference with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation from a political body. In fact, the Member for Lakeside says that this Legislature or indeed the Parliament of Canada should be directing the public communications Crown Corporation as how to run their operation.

I think that throughout that particular debate we reminded the Member for Lakeside constantly that we were requesting not directing, however, I see where he says that requests can be seen as directions and he is most concerned that the role of the CBC is not to have it directed overtly by politicians of any stripe, and I'm quoting from Page 361. The member says well I find it totally offensive for myself as a legislator to be telling the CBC what they should and what they should not be putting on the radio, I wonder if he realizes that a film cannot be shown on the radio. He would not presume on how the public airwaves are going to be cluttered up, which to me indicates his view of the quality of this film. It seems very interesting that a

Member of this Legislature and of the Conservative Party would be so concerned about direction given to the CBC, even in the form of a request.

I have from the House of Commons Hansard, Page 23644 of Thursday, March 10, which was a day after the honourable member made her speech, under "Standing Orders" comments made by Ron Stewart the P.C. Member of Parliament for Simcoe South, who is also very concerned about interference with our public broadcasting media. In fact, he says "Our basic democratic freedom is rapidly being stifled and I view this situation with alarm." He uses an example of this stifling by the powers that be and refers to the Prime Minister as being the stifler. — (Interjection) — Thank you.

An example of this is the refusal by the CBC to sell air time to the Ontario Medical Association for an advertisement outlining the dangers of more state control in medicine. I also quote, "I would suggest to the media that obedience and freedom of the press are two entirely different things." I would agree with this member that obedience and freedom of the press are two entirely different things, but I wonder in this case, in the case of not showing 'If You Love This Planet' who the media is obeying. He is suggesting that the media is obeying the Prime Minister by not allowing derogatory comments made about socialized medicine and that in the opinion of this particular Member of Parliament is abhorrent.

What we're suggesting is not to curtail the freedom of the press or to curtail the behaviour of CBC, but to have CBC live up to its mandate which is to provide for fair proportion on every subject.

So, it seems to me that the Tory stand in terms of the autonomy of the CBC depends on the subject matter at hand. I'd like to move to the contents of this film. The rationale that the CBC has used is that it's one-sided and I'd like to know who makes this assessment that it's one-sided. Well, it's certainly not the Member for Lakeside. He is very, very clear about the contents of the film, even though he has not seen it either. He says, for instance, again on Page 631, "I think we ought to be disturbed that when a neighbour, a very important ally of ours, finds for whatever reason . . . 'and the member is not particularly concerned about the rationale for making the assessment it doesn't really matter to him, it's for whatever reason, 'if they term this particular film as political propaganda, then this should disturb us.'"

These, I want to remind the members, are the same people that in the McCarthy era blacklisted Charlie Chaplin, blacklisted Salt of the Earth, blacklisted Modern Times. — (Interjection) — Yes, Modern Times. In fact, I would think that the history of the NFB and the CBC should be the one that we hold up as an example of freedom of expression and not censorship, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek referred to, rather than the record of the American Government in terms of freedom of expression.

Then the Member for Lakeside went on to talk about the reason that he was disturbed. He says, for instance, on Page 632, even though he has accepted at face value the label that the American Government has put on this film, he says farther on, "But I do not accept at face value the credit that obviously the Honourable Member for River East is prepared to give it. I have

to say it bothers me that when a responsible government elected by free people labels it as propaganda directed against our major friend and trading partner that that should be of some concern to us Canadians".

It seems to me from this particular quote, that at face value the Member for Lakeside is willing to take the assessment of the Americans because he is saying that they are a responsible government elected by free people and he's willing to take their assessment of this film being political propaganda, but he's not willing to take at face value the assessment made by the Member for River East who, I presume, as a member of this responsible government elected by free people in this country should be able to . . . that his opinion should be held every bit as highly as the opinion of someone in the American State Department. I think this implies that the Member for Lakeside thinks very little of himself and his opinion as a member of a freely-elected responsible government. He thinks little of this Assembly and little of the opinion of people of Manitoba.

Let one think that the Member for Lakeside is the only one on the other side whose thought processes are clouded by American opinion, let me quote from another member of the opposition, on Page 636. Now, knowing and loving this member dearly and knowing that ordinarily things like this are said in jest, I'm sure this member would not have said this in any other way but in jest. However, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa said - regardless of what the opinion is of the Honourable Member for River East, "If the President of the United States doesn't like that film I don't like that film."

MR. R. DOERN: Bedtime for Bonzo.

MR. D. SCOTT: Bedtime for Dave.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Well, he will be happy to know that the Member for River East tells me that on Friday the CBC in Toronto called the National Film Board here in Winnipeg and said that if the movie wins the Academy Award, if it wins the Academy Award - in other words, the Americans tell us that after all this really is a very good film and not necessarily just political propaganda - then they will consider showing it. So perhaps the Member for Minnedosa will get his wish, if the President of the United States and the American Academy of Motion Pictures puts their Good Housekeeping seal of approval on this film maybe we in Manitoba will have the privilege of seeing it.

I'd like to get back to the issue of fair proportion, in fact, I think rather than this film being one-sided I think this film represents the other side. After decades and decades of war films that we have seen either in the theatres or on the TV screens in this province I think it's absolutely critical that the other side is shown and that CBC fulfills their mandate by showing the other side, namely, showing this film.

In fact almost every war in history has been turned into a film. I picked up the TV Guide for this weekend and I went through it and there are five war movies again this week. There's the American Civil War; the Vietnam War; the Korean War and two Second World War films in one week alone - and I didn't count M*A*S*H.

Now the members opposite say that they could support this resolution - they can't because we're suggesting that we interfere with the CBC - but if we were to deal with the subject matter. In fact, as the Member for Springfield brought to your attention a few moments ago we did deal with that very matter last Session and I will read the last two resolves from that resolution that we passed unanimously in that last Session: One was, "Therefore be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba expressly declare its positive moral commitment for world disarmament, and be it further resolved that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba fully endorse the goals and objectives of the United Nations Special Second Session on Disarmament and actively attempt to determine the possible actions that it might take to hasten world disarmament on a global scale."

This, in my mind, is a call for action and this resolution is but one small action that we, united, can proceed with in terms of public education, in terms of making the public aware of the importance of this particular motion. I'd also like to quote, not from a raving socialist magazine but from the Legion magazine put out monthly by the Royal Canadian Legion and I would like to quote from Earl Mountbatten, May 1979 - and I don't think the members opposite could quarrel with a statement made by him, I don't think they would put it aside as a raving socialist or a raving Marxist. The quote is, "As a military man who has given half-a-century of active service, I say in all sincerity that the nuclear arms race has no military purpose. Wars cannot be fought with nuclear weapons. Their existence only adds to our perils because of the illusions they have generated.

The resolution that we passed unanimously last year calls for all of us to move on with concrete action to assure that the nuclear arms race is halted. This issue is far too important for the kinds of apples equals fruit; oranges equals fruit; so therefore apples equals oranges; kind of first-year logic that I heard from both the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Sturgeon Creek. I won't even dignify the comments of the Member for Sturgeon Creek with a rebuttal other than pointing out on Page 635, where he says that a gun which was developed by men and people, I'm very glad that he didn't credit us women with developing guns or is it just certain men that developed guns or are men not people?

The members opposite have spent many many hours in this Legislature being concerned about universal farmer care, universal medicare, and universal calf care. I think it's about time they started putting their energy into saving the universe and so with sober second thoughts I hope that they will bring themselves to support this resolution, for, Mr. Speaker, the question in this resolution is not do you or do you not love the Americans or do you or do you not love the Russians or do you or do you not love the CBC, the question put forward in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is - Do you love this planet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to carry on too long on this resolution, just a few remarks. I don't think that the discussion here is

whether in fact we are in favour of nuclear arms or against nuclear arms or in favour of the arms race or against the arms race. I think that it goes without saying that we seem to be of one accord, that we are against nuclear armament and we are against nuclear war. There's just no doubt in my mind or the mind of anybody else in this Legislature that we seem to be in complete agreement. We are in complete agreement. — (Interjection) — That's not the problem; that's not what bothers me on this resolution, Mr. Speaker. — (Interjection) —

MR. F. JOHNSTON: If you want go outside in the hall and say that I'm for nuclear war, let's go out. You better bring your lawyer if you want to go out in the hall and say that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No guts. Make that statement publicly about me and you've got problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that cooler heads should prevail here and some of the remarks that are made between one another are strictly out of order and I would ask you to please bear with us and let's work towards the same goal and that is to see that nuclear arms and nuclear wars are a thing of the past and that we don't have to plan to destroy each other in the future. But that's not what this resolution brings to mind. I have been against censorship all my life. The freedom to read or to view anything that I want to has given me that freedom of no censorship and this resolution in effect is reverse censorship. It's reverse censorship.

A MEMBER: No way.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The reverse censorship I'm referring to is the request for the CBC to air a film. — (Interjection) — That's exactly what it is. It's reverse censorship and every bit as bad. Now it says "request." It says request in the resolution but when you get a request from the Provincial Government, whether it is a Provincial Government of the New Democratic Party or a Provincial Government of the Progressive Conservative Party, it is a demand, not a request. Do you remember getting an invitation saying the Premier of the Province requests the honour of your attendance at a certain - that's not a request, that's a demand and that is what this is. It's a demand for the CBC to play this film. — (Interjection) — Yes, sir, it certainly is, a demand for the CBC to play this film . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're afraid of Reagan, it's obvious. You're afraid of offending the United States. That's what you said.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Who has seen this film? There's been some remarks as to who seen this film. I can't think of too many people in this Chamber who have

seen the film. There's two or three people I would think might have seen the film and we are being asked to request the CBC to air this film.

The film happens to show nuclear war in a bad light. I agree. Let it show it in a bad light; I can't see how you can show it in a good light but it does show nuclear war and we abhor nuclear war. Now it also shows the President of the United States in a role that he played 40 years ago, making some remarks about the people that they were at war with at that time, the Japanese. He makes some remark and it's not to his credit to have made that remark but at the time it was completely acceptable because we were at war with Japan. It is now not acceptable.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: He hasn't changed his mind.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, he has. We keep running down the President of the United States and I'm not here to defend the President of the United States — (Interjection) — but it brings to mind, and I'm going to have to listen to the Member for Elmwood when he gets up to speak after me, when the Member for Elmwood made some remarks in the Legislature about some particular types of soldiers from some of the old Second World War film about how the soldiers were shown in a degrading manner, and I agree with him, but that was before. Let's stop all of that now. I don't see how the Member for Elmwood could possibly support a resolution of this kind and I hope he gets up to explain why he is either going to support it or why he is not going to support it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Would the member permit a question?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, through you, the member said he was against all form of censorship. Now is he telling us what should be censored from that film?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Une bonne question. Est ce que tu a une autre.

No, it was a good question and I'm certainly not suggesting that I'm in favour of censorship under any circumstances or reverse censorship. It's freedom of choice and that's the only thing that I've got against this resolution at this point, the subterfuge in bringing in the resolution under the guise that it's going to stop nuclear war, another resolution against nuclear war. Ah, bloody funny, I'm sure. But, you know, I get a little upset when I give the courtesy of listening to other people and I don't get that same courtesy back. Anyways, I just wanted to make those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, concerning the request to the CBC and under those circumstances, I cannot support a resolution that requests demand of the CBC to air or not air a film because I can see the danger of such a request. It could get out of hand. It could go further into the danger of what languages I can speak or not speak and some of the other rights that I have. I don't

want to lose those rights. By tampering with this type of thing and suggesting to the CBC that they will be requested to play a particular film is against everything that I believe in, in my censorship or noncensorship, and I would have to very strongly be against such a motion, such a resolution.

One other remark about how I was ridiculed because I watch Canadian content hockey and football rather than watching this type of a film, and the Honourable Member for Inkster did make some remarks concerning we are wasting out time watching hockey and football. I think that it will turn up in Hansard where I am right in my statement. I like hockey, I like football, and it is my choice whether I want to watch it or not. If it's on television

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, my choice, my choice. Well, the Honourable Member for Thompson says it's the same thing on whether this film is freedom of choice or not. It's not freedom of choice. It's requesting, demanding of the CBC to play this film, and I certainly have to vote against such a resolution that would take into effect that we demand from a Crown corporation to follow our whims, our rulings, because that's not what they are there for. They are independent, freedom of choice, and that's the reason why I cannot support his resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, will the member permit a question, the second question that he wanted. If for some reason, CBC and CTV would stop televising the game, would he support the motion here of suggesting and requesting CBC of airing the game, let's say, of the Winnipeg Jets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Would I support such a motion if they stopped showing it? It appears to be hypothetical, Mr. Speaker, because — (Interjection) — yes, hypothetical. If the Honourable Minister would pose a question that is not hypothetical, I would be certainly happy to answer such a question.

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

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could summarize what this resolution is all about, I would summarize it with one sentence; and that is, that it's trying to get people to think. It is trying to get them to think about the nuclear arms buildup, trying to get them to think about disarmament. That really, Mr. Speaker, is the only intention, or was the only intention of the Member for River East when he introduced this motion, to get people to think.

He did not come in here, as some have suggested, in an attempt to raise the issue of disarmament by the back door. We on this side don't need any back doors. Last year, we raised this issue in this House directly

by a private member's resolution and, I might add, a resolution that was supported unanimously by all members of this House. We'll do it again, Mr. Speaker, when it is our intention to raise that issue but, as I said, in this case really it is simply an attempt to get people to think. It was an attempt that was put forward in a nonpartisan way. Unfortunately, however, members opposite have rejected that approach. In doing so, I think they have shown that they are putting their heads in the sand on a very important issue. They put their heads in the sand on not just this resolution but the whole issue of disarmament.

I sat here, Mr. Speaker, listening to some of the comments and I simply can't resist responding to some of them because, quite frankly, I am amazed at the ignorance of this issue that has been shown by some of the members opposite; first of all, ignorance of the movie and what it's all about.

Perhaps, to edify the members opposite a bit more about what the movie is about, I could read some of the excerpts put out by the National Film Board of Canada as to exactly what the movie is about, what it's trying to say. I would quote from what the experts have put forward about this movie. Basically, it says and I quote, "If You Love this Planet warns us that time is running out, that unless we shake off our indifference and work to prevent nuclear war, we stand a slim chance of surviving the 20th century." It puts forward this basic concern both factually and both in terms of the views of people who have studied this matter and who have lived through it, survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It pointed out some staggering statistics; for example, the fact that the bomb dropped on Hiroshima was a small bomb. It was equivalent to only 13,000 tons of TNT, whereas today's 20-megaton nuclear bombs are equivalent to 20 million tons of TNT, which in turn is equivalent to four times all the bombs dropped during World War II.

It points out in the movie that the strategic arsenal of the U.S. contains enough weapons to overkill the Russians 40 times, whereas Russia's strategic arsenal is capable of overkilling each American 20 times. It is pretty staggering statistics. Some food for thought, Mr. Speaker.

It also, I think, as I said before, makes one think about exactly where we are headed. I think that is a wise indication, Mr. Speaker, of exactly what we should be doing because, for example, in 1975 American military leaders predicted a 50/50 chance of nuclear war by the mid 1980's, and this statistical probability was subsequently confirmed by Harvard University MIT. It's a major concern, Mr. Speaker, a major concern, and this movie is a major attempt at tackling this important issue.

I would quote in this regard the Reverend Dr. Clarke MacDonald, Senior Secretary of the Office of Church and Society, The United Church of Canada, who said that "If You Love This Planet" touches the mind and the heart. It appeals to the moral sensitivity in the political wheel. It is about whether or not we care if generations yet unborn will be born and will have this planet as their home. That's typical of the kind of comments that we've heard.

Similarly from George Ignatieff, National President of the United Nations Association in Canada, and he states that Dr. Caldicott, who was featured in the movie,

her narrative on the medical effects of nuclear war based on Hiroshima and Nagasaki proves an unquestionable base from which it is possible to extrapolate what would happen if Canada were to become involved in a nuclear exchange. If You Love This Planet is an important educational tool. It should be shown in schools and universities throughout Canada. I couldn't agree more, Mr. Speaker, because as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the key thing that we have to do on this issue is to educate, educate ourselves and educate others in society, but that's not what I've heard in reaction to the movie from members opposite, not at all. The first thing they did was start imputing motives to the Member for River East, suggesting that he was trying to bring in a discussion on disarmament via the back door. But as soon as they'd made that comment, Mr. Speaker, the first thing they did was start bringing all sorts of red herrings about the nuclear arms race, dragging them across the path of this debate. The first thing they did was debate the issues and debate it in the most cowardly way I could imagine. Those members opposite had the chance to debate disarmament last year when we proposed that motion on disarmament which has been referred to by other members in this House, but they didn't. I remember one or two members opposite standing to support it. I remember when the vote was taken, other members disappearing rather rapidly from the Chamber, and I suspect in seeing the way they've addressed this issue today that there was a good reason why they left the Chamber. It was because they did not support the motion.

I may stand corrected on that, Mr. Speaker. If members opposite want to stand up and indicate that was not the case, I will certainly be glad to see it. But by their actions in this debate, I suspect they're not quite as clear on the issue of disarmament as some in that party would have us believe.

There has been some reference on this side, Mr. Speaker, to my mentioning specific members who are less than clear on this issue. I think that's up to the members opposite; they should take a stand rather than hiding their heads. Really, Mr. Speaker, in looking at some of the comments that members have via the back door brought up about this particular issue, I'm absolutely amazed. I think perhaps the most amazing comment made by any of the members opposite was made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek in debate on Wednesday, March 9, in which, right at the beginning of his remarks, he attempted to state that, well, Mr. Speaker, there's no real difference between nuclear weapons and any other weapons.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is absolute nonsense; that is absolute and utter nonsense. I would quote in this regard from an article in the Legion magazine referred to by the Member for Wolseley in which it states quite clearly, to put things in perspective that "During the Second World War as much damage was done with one plane with 10 aircrew with a 12.5 kiloton bomb as the damage at Dresden with 1,800 planes and about 12,000 aircrew." Or let's put it another way. Today's common nuclear weapons range from 40 kilotons to 9 megatons. A one megaton bomb, which is 1/9 of the largest that exists today, would create an explosion 67 times that of the Hiroshima bomb, and it would be more powerful than all the bombs that the allies dropped on Germany in World War II.

So to suggest that nuclear weapons are a weapon like any other is absolute nonsense. As I've said before, we have the capability today in the world to destroy the world many times over. That capability has never existed before and that's why it's that much more urgent that we be concerned about this issue. If that wasn't amazing enough, Mr. Speaker, there's the remark of the Member for Minnedosa and I quote Page 636, "If the President of the United States doesn't like that film, I don't like the film."

I'm amazed, Mr. Speaker, I could imagine the caricature that is often painted by members opposite of the Soviet Union, for those members opposite would have the view that Soviet citizens would take the idea that if Yuri Andropov likes the film I like the film too. That's what I would imagine but, no, that's not what they're saying about the Soviet Union; that's what they're saying about themselves and the United States. Really, Mr. Speaker, are we, as free-thinking individuals, stooping as low as that, to suggest that if the President of the United States likes the film, we'll watch it, and if he doesn't like it, we won't watch it?

The Member for Sturgeon Creek went further, he did address the question of the Russians. He said basically if the Russians show it, we'll show it here. My God, Mr. Speaker, that's a Canadian movie. He says that we should show it only if the Russians show it. Well, we know how the Russians approach things like that; they approach it as a matter of propaganda. Perhaps that's the mentality the member opposite is in. I hope that he isn't; I give him the benefit of the doubt. I suspect that he said that in the typical knee-jerk, right-wing reactive view that if you talk about disarmament let's talk about the Russians. If you favour disarmament, you're either a neutralist or you are somehow expressed by the phrase "better Red than dead."

Well, that's nonsense, Mr. Speaker, absolute nonsense. Let's look — (Interjection) — I heard a member opposite once again get caught in his fixation with we're trying to drag red herrings and I use the term red herrings - not in quotes - I use it directly because that's exactly what members opposite often bring up. They're the ones who are throwing statements such as gulag justice, whatnot, into this House. When I look at them, when I see their attitude on this particular issue and see how concerned they are about freedom of information, freedom of thought, I really wonder if those members are against what they're talking about or whether in fact they're trying to emulate it. Let's ignore what the members opposite have to say on this issue; I think it's hardly worth more than a few passing comments.

Let's look at what other people are saying. Let's look, for example, at the Legion magazine, the magazine that represents the thousands of veterans in Canada saying, let's look at some of the statistics that they raised. This is what the editors raise, Mr. Speaker, in their most recent issue, they pointed out that between 1945 and 1981 there were 1,321 nuclear and atomic explosions in the world. The U.S. had 683; the USSR, 469; France, 108; United Kingdom, 34; China, 26; and India, 1. Let's look at their comments about the fact that there are presently five separate but linked sets of negotiations going on directed at reducing the risk of nuclear conventional war. As the Legion magazine states, Mr. Speaker, much to think about. Well, that's the Legion magazine.

Let's look at some of the other discussion that is taking place on this very important issue at the present time. I will quote from the Mennonite Reporter, March 7, 1983, and from the same paper December 27, 1982, two articles, and it's entitled "Two church statements on the Cruise Missile." The second says, "Six church leaders present Trudeau with statement on nuclear arms." Well, Mr. Speaker, those two separate magazines on the one hand and a newspaper on the other hand indicate clearly the spectrum of concern that there is on this particular issue. We have the veterans in Canada who are very concerned about this issue; we have church leaders who are very concerned about it.

My question then, Mr. Speaker, is why aren't the members opposite that concerned about it? — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, it goes beyond that, the concern about this particular issue has spread to perhaps the most surprising area of society and in particular with former military leaders. As the article in the Legion magazine - this is the February, 1983, issue by C.G. Gifford points out - why did Earl Mountbatten speak out? Why have 13 former senior NATO officers formed Generals for Peace calling for the removal of all nuclear weapons from Europe? Why have several retired American senior officers who commanded combat units in Korea and Vietnam and served at the very top of the NATO hierarchy taken up the cause of disarmament? Why is the leader of the British campaign for nuclear disarmament a retired Brigadier General who served in Italy in World War II and later in Aden and Cyprus? This is what the article asks, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to ask too, why has Admiral Hyman Rickover, who developed the US nuclear submarine force, recently told the US Senate Arms Services Committee that disarmament should be first priority, and I quote, "That we probably will blow ourselves up unless something is done about it." Why are these military men saying this? Why did Earl Mountbatten say, as a military man, "I can see no use for any nuclear weapons that would not end in escalation with consequences that no one can conceive."

Why are they saying that, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps it's because they've thought about this issue. Perhaps it's because they've thought about the major problem that we are really faced with today, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps they've looked at the statistics, those cold, hard statistics. Perhaps they've looked at the gap that has been between the major super powers for the last 25, 30, 40 years. Perhaps they've seen how certain recent events in the world have driven that gap wider. Perhaps they've looked at that, perhaps they've thought about it. Perhaps they're concerned, as many of the people I've spoken to on this particular issue. Perhaps they're concerned about the future of their children.

You know I've spoken to people who asked for nothing more than for the right for their children to live to the same age they are and I know what it's like, Mr. Speaker, as a new father. I sometimes wonder, when I look at the way we're headed in terms of the nuclear arms race, whether my daughter will live even as long as I do. Perhaps it's reasons like that.

Isn't it really the case though, Mr. Speaker, for whatever reason, that we have to think about this, that we have to look at it. Isn't it really the case that on issues such as this, we should encourage CBC, our

national broadcasting agency, to present this issue. I have nothing against football; I have nothing against hockey. I watch it like the member opposite. I watch it but really, Mr. Speaker, that is not my top priority at the present time.

I am really concerned about this issue. I would like to have the opportunity to see this film on the CBC. I would like other people to have that opportunity and I'd be quite happy, in the interests of equal time, to see what rebuttal there is to this particular movie. Members opposite seem to suggest that we're all in agreement. As I've said, there's some doubt about that but if we're not all in agreement let's have something from the opposing side.

I believe there's a new movement in the United States entitled, "Peace Through Strength." It's got another movie actor involved, not Ronald Reagan, but Charlton Heston. Perhaps they have some material. I'm quite happy with that, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the vast majority of people are really concerned about this issue. They are really concerned about the escalation that has taken place with nuclear weapons in recent years, and I would point in this regard to the results of referendums that have taken place throughout this country, referendums where anywhere between 60 and 98 percent of those who voted have indicated that they favour a nuclear freeze. If members opposite think of Manitoba as any different, they should watch for what happens when the government authorizes these kind of referendums. They should watch when communities across this province hold these referendums. I know what will happen because I've spoken to my constituents about this issue; I've listened to their concerns. They too will vote for a nuclear freeze. They will do what little they can to send a signal to the super powers, to those that are involved with this issue. They will send a signal that they, too, are concerned about nuclear arms.

So let's put aside, Mr. Speaker, all this talk of bringing issues in via the back door. If members want to have a debate on this, if they really think there is that much of a difference between their view and our view, let's have that debate. I'm quite happy to come here and state my concern, as I have today. I'm quite happy to talk to my constituents and pass their concerns on because I have already spoken to many of them and they've indicated this concern.

I sat in the plaza in Thompson this weekend and watched literally hundreds of people sign a petition put forward, not by a bunch of left-wing socialists, but by the Council of Churches in Thompson, Mr. Speaker, representing many denominations who are concerned about this issue. They're concerned about the future of humanity, this very important moral issue and I've seen their concern so let's put aside this partisan rhetoric; this attempt to discredit what was a very honest and honourable resolution, let's put aside that, Mr. Speaker.

All we're talking about in this debate today, really at the bottom line, is thinking and I would ask really that members opposite reconsider their previous negative attacks on this issue, maybe think about it overnight and really consider whether there's anything wrong in what is in there in requesting the CBC to allow people to have access to that film, allow them to see it and to think for themselves. I think upon reflection,

Monday, 14 March, 1983, 1983

upon talking to their constituents, they may find that their rhetoric as indicated in this debate, really doesn't represent what most people are saying today. Most people I think are saying, "Yes, we have a major problem. Let's think about it, let's talk about it. Maybe

we can come up with some solutions."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time being 5:30 p.m., I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 p.m.