



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. 33B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 24 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	Viriden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 24 March, 1983.

TIME - 8:00 p.m.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: Committee come to order. We are considering the Capital Supply Motion; 1983 Capital Authority requirements for non-budgetary programs.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The debate has been rather interesting, to date, on this motion. I suspect it could get a little more interesting. What would make it a little more interesting is the Minister of Natural Resources.

You know, here we have a Minister that last year moved into his Estimate process unaware that his department had sent out a letter to certain municipalities in the Red River Valley, requiring them to contribute Capital funds to the construction of dikes - something that hadn't happened before under the Lyon administration, under the Schreyer administration or any administration before that.

We have, in the Minister of Natural Resources, one who postures a great deal about how he, through his efforts, is going to save the Province of Manitoba from adverse effects of the Garrison Project. This is the Minister of Natural Resources who has seen the government not deliver on a permanent office to lobby against Garrison in Washington as was promised in the election. This is a Minister who, last year didn't tell us that the Americans had made some rather generous offers on the whole Garrison issue, namely, office space in North or South Dakota - I forget the details - and a number of other fairly important concessions and agreements between the two countries on Garrison.

In the last few months, this Minister has probably done more to assure that Manitobans are deluged with the worst effects of Garrison than any other Minister in any administration that's had to deal with the Garrison issue. He's done it, Sir, by flying over North Dakota to a meeting of a committee to save the Red River Valley, the membership of which we don't know too much detail of. All we know is that we had two Cabinet Ministers, I believe it was, from the Province of Manitoba there, a few American citizens and a whole lot of press. Although I understand they were invited, there were no elected representatives from the State of North Dakota, Minnesota or South Dakota. Yet this Minister saw it to be important enough to go down there and whilst he's flying over North Dakota to Crookston, Minnesota, he observes from his airplane that, hey, these Americans aren't good farmers. Therefore, me in my infinite wisdom, I am going to have to deliver a message to them on proper cultural practices. He goes down there as an invited guest to Crookston, Minnesota, and proceeds to chastise the American farmers for their cultural practices.

MR. A. BROWN: Manitoba expert.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, that may be acceptable if he knew what he was talking about and if he had factual information, but when we questioned him, he didn't have any. His observations were not based on a previously documented study that he had read and made himself knowledgeable on so he could properly critique their farming methods, no. His observations were made from 15,000 or 10,000 feet in the air as he's flying over it 250 miles an hour, and that kind of an incredible intrusion into the affairs of another country on a matter he has: No. 1, no knowledge on; No. 2, no authority to go down there and chastise them; and No. 3, wasn't the purpose of his visit in my estimation, and this is the Minister that is supposed to be favourably negotiating a halt to the Garrison Project on behalf of Manitobans.

I wonder what some of the elected representatives in Minnesota, North Dakota and South Dakota think of some elected individual from Manitoba flying over their farmland and then delivering a critical statement on how they are mismanaging their resource. I hardly think, Mr. Chairman, that would give too much credibility to that Minister when he goes down to Washington to try to stop Garrison. They're going to say that's the same ill-informed individual that criticized our farming practices.

Last night, Mr. Chairman, had to be the ultimate slap in the face to the concerned Americans who want to co-operate with this province and this country in bringing Garrison under control. The ultimate slap in the face is a smiling Minister of Natural Resources parading at a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate, which I understand, Mr. Chairman, you in your expatriot capacity were there as well along with a number of your colleagues, but here's the smiling Minister of Natural Resources gleefully participating in a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate at which the American flag is burnt. When the organizer is asked by the news media as to what purpose they had in being there and protesting Nicaragua he openly admits, well, no we can't talk about American involvement, we have no proof of that, there's no evidence of that, but we're just here because it's a good place to be, we could have demonstrated in front of Eatons, he said. Here is our Minister of Natural Resources at a demonstration . . .

A MEMBER: Is he the only Minister?

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . where an American flag is burned, and next week or the week after he's going to be going down to that same country that he's demonstrating in front of and try to persuade those people that Garrison will have adverse effects on this province, and hope to establish a semblance of credibility with the elected people down there.

A MEMBER: They should be ashamed of themselves.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Minister got up and he said, well, I was simply there as an individual, a concerned individual. Mr. Chairman, that may help to clear his rather fuzzy conscience on the matter, but I think I can speak with relative assurance that should a Congressman from North Dakota go to a demonstration parade in protest against the import of seed grain from Manitoba, and at that protest where seed grain is taking sales away from North Dakota farmers that Congressman in shown on television as a private individual, and some of the radicals in that group burned a Canadian flag and a Manitoba flag in protest of the importation of seed from Manitoba to North Dakota, I can assure that the first one on his hind legs howling would be the Minister of Natural Resources crying foul, that the American Legislators are interfering with the free trade of our farmers with North Dakota. He comes to this House today, clears his conscience saying, oh, I was at that flag burning demonstration, but certainly I was there only as an individual, not as a member of the Government of Manitoba, not as a Minister, and not as part of the Manitoba Government.

Mr. Chairman, that simply will not wash. We tend to believe, in Manitoba, that Cabinet Ministers should be responsible people and undertake responsible activities. Being at a demonstration where an American flag is burned, which has no correlation to the U.S. involvement in Nicaragua, which the organizer says they can't prove, is hardly a responsible position for a Cabinet Minister in this government to be undertaking. This Minister did it and this same Minister is going to come back, stand on his hind legs in this Legislature, and howl about how the Americans are not co-operating with him on his efforts to stop Garrison. He is going to have to search his soul sometime in the next three years and ask himself if some of his very foolish, ill-considered and stupid activities, such as marching in a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate, may have jeopardized all of the work of the Schreyer administration and the Lyon administration in co-operation with both sides of the House, with the Federal Government and with the American Congressmen if he hasn't jeopardized that by that very foolish action last night and the equally foolish action the other day when he flew to Crookston, Minnesota and delivered a damning speech against the farmers in North Dakota. This Minister is about to destroy all the previous efforts made on Garrison because of his very very narrow and silly and ill-considered actions last night in marching in front of the U.S. Consulate.

Mr. Chairman, this will be known as Black Wednesday in Manitoba when Garrison waters start coming down the sewers and the Red River, thanks to the present Minister of Natural Resources and the Member for St. James.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I thought there might be somebody on the government side of the House who might want to respond - and I'd be happy to make way for them - but they seem to be struck mute by the odour of what is coming back to them of the kind of damage that they have done collectively and

individually to the public interest of the people of Manitoba because of the unwavering loyalty that a number on that side of the House seem to have to any interest that is contrary to the national interest of this country; contrary to the interest of the United States which is our foremost ally and any interest which seems to be sycophantic to that of the Soviet Union of Cuba and of any of the other Iron Curtain countries. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that you're laughing. You are hardly in a position to laugh, if I may say so, given your background.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to talk tonight about remarks that were made this afternoon by the Opposition House Leader with respect to the kind of mismanagement of House affairs that we have been observing over the last 14 months, since the beginning of the tenure of this New Democratic Party come-what-ever government, but the provocation that was given during the course of the ill-considered remarks. I notice the honourable member for CUPE is leaving.

The provocation that was given by the House Leader in response to what the Member for Turtle Mountain said, causes all of us in this House, I think, to make some comment upon the state of degradation into which the order of business and the running of this House has fallen since the present government came to office. In a word, Sir, the order of business in this House is a shambles.

The job of government is to govern, and a government that can't govern should get out of office and make way for those that can. I say to you, Sir, that those in government across the way at the present time - they've been there some 14 or 15 months - they should be capable of knowing the House's rules and the House's habits and the House's traditions but, Mr. Chairman, they pay no attention to those whatsoever.

Do I hear some croaking voice from Ste. Rose that is soon to be extinguished in the next by-election or election? Because his association with the people opposite is going to be well known in the Town of Neepawa, the Town of Ste. Rose du Lac, the Town of McCreary, and others, where they know where their loyalties lie, even if the member doesn't. Maybe he'd like to go back and get out his branding iron again. He'd be more at home there, out on the pasture. — (Interjection) — Yes, it's a great profession when you're doing your own animals.

Mr. Chairman, those in government capable of knowing the House's rules and habits and traditions should take second place, have second place, or no voice at all in this House, given the actions of the present House Leader, the Attorney-General. The House Leader, the Attorney-General, is a new member to this House and there's nothing with that. All of us, at one time or another, were a new member in this House. Most of us, fortunately enough, had enough humility to realize for the first year or so that we had to learn a bit about the House, about its traditions, about its habits, and about its moods before we stood up on our hind legs and started declaiming, as did the Member for Fort Rouge when he was unfortunately appointed to this position.

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that we have tried in this House, and we have certainly tried privately as well, to impress upon members on the opposite side that

the House is not being well served by one whose arrogance, whose flippancy, whose unawareness of the traditions of the House and whose apparent inability to learn the traditions of this House are apparent . . .

MR. G. LECUYER: I sure didn't learn it from you.

HON. S. LYON: I need no Member for Radisson ever to tell me about the parliamentary system, particularly the present member. The present member, Mr. Chairman, is fortunate to be included in a parliamentary democracy. He should count himself lucky to be here.

Mr. Chairman, the House Leader, and I can speak with some knowledge of this because I was House Leader for the government side for some three years back in the '60s long before the present Acting House Leader and many others were here. One of the jobs of the House Leader is to have a genuine ability to meet and to discuss frankly and honestly - and may I doubly underline the word honestly because that's a word, Mr. Chairman, that is not in common parlance across the way - with the other side of the House and to come to agreements which can be abided by. House Leaders have to be able to take one another's word. I know, Mr. Chairman, that is a quality that is not too well known on the other side of the House as well.

I repeat what the House Leader of our side said today that when he, on behalf of our caucus, gives his word, gives his undertaking that we will for instance pass Bill 29 on the 28th day of March, then you can take that word, given publicly or given privately. Would that we could feel the same way, Mr. Chairman, about the word given by the House Leader, the Deputy House Leader and others on that side of the House. There are some in this House I know, Mr. Chairman, and I would not want to make and could not make, in fairness, a blanket condemnation and say that all NDPers are incapable of giving their word. I look at the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Minister of Transportation. If he gave me his word I would accept it without question because he's a person of honour and he's been in the House and he knows what the Rules of the House are.

All we're saying on this side of the House, Sir, is that there should be others among the ranks over there. It should not be a diminishing number, among whom a House Leader, a decent House Leader could be appointed, who could deal in an honest, an ethical and an aboveboard way with the official opposition in order that the Business of the House, in the interests of the people of Manitoba, might be moved forward.

Mr. Chairman, this House was called on the 24th of February of 1983 after a brief Session in December which dealt with the Throne Speech and the introduction of some bills. Since the House met on the 24th of February not one Standing Committee of the House has been called to meet, not one, and one must question seriously, Mr. Chairman, the intent of this government opposite, which always pretends of course to be a government that is open, which wants to give all of the information it can, one must question the motives of the government opposite when it sees fit not to call, for instance, the Public Accounts Committee, which is one of the most important committees of parliament, before the 17th of May, Mr. Chairman. That's after the House has been in Session for one month. This is a group which presumes to call itself a government!

Mr. Chairman, when we came into office, one of the first things we had to do was to regularize and to make accountable the reporting system for finance in Manitoba because of the abysmal record of the Schreyer NDP Government in keeping from the people of Manitoba the true state of their fiscal affairs. One of the other undertakings that we gave was this as a government, and we tried to carry it out, that we would get the public accounts of the Province of Manitoba out to the members as soon as they were printed and available to us from the Provincial Auditor, and that as soon as reasonable thereafter, we would call the Public Accounts Committee because it is a standing committee of the House, whether the House was sitting or not, in order that that very important committee of the House could get on with the examination as close to the fiscal year end as possible of the fiscal affairs of the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, we were not a perfect government. God knows.

Well, the Member for Wolseley laughs because she wouldn't know a perfect government if she saw one. She is ill-equipped in many respects, Mr. Chairman, to understand the workings of parliament or for that matter many other reasonable things. But, Mr. Chairman, I can merely say to her for her edification, that one of the things we had to do was to bring fiscal accountability to the fore because of the abysmal state in which the Schreyer NDP had left this province, prophesied \$25 million deficits in September of 1977, which in the hiatus period between the takeover of our government in October of 1977 was prophesied to be \$225 million if we had not applied Draconian measures. Yes, Draconian measures to stop the hemorrhage of public funds which the predecessor of this government was trying to conceal from the people of Manitoba. That's only one small example. Funny, I don't hear the Member for Wolseley laughing anymore.

Mr. Chairman, the House was called together on February 24th after this government made much of the fact that it wanted to have a Session in December so that it could advance the business of the people of Manitoba; instead of calling the House back around the 1st of February or the end of January, which most reasonable people would have thought proper. After all, they had been in office for a year. Surely, they could have gotten their act together by that time. No! They called it together on the 24th of February and we objected at that moment.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, during the course of the December Session, I stood in my place in the House and asked that the Public Utilities Committee be called during the December meeting of the House, and all the mornings were free during the December meeting, staff was here, everything could have been accomplished because the then president of Manitoba Hydro, whose contract was not being renewed by the NDP, was going to be gone from the province. Would it not be in the public interest to have that man make a report before he left the province and to give this House some idea as to why his contract was being terminated by this new Socialist Government that had come in? Well, Mr. Chairman, we were given short shrift about that. We were told: (a) not only would the Public Utilities Committee not be called in December; but (b) that when the Public Utilities Committee was called, said the Minister of Mines and Energy, the most

discredited Minister on that side of the House next only to the Minister of Finance, when that committee was called, he would give no undertaking that president would be summoned as a witness before the committee. — (Interjection) — Yes, well, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Finance in his mumbling way wants to make some comment later on, if he can get his act together long enough to make a credible connected speech, we will be happy to hear him. We'll be happy to hear him especially if he can stick to the truth, which he hasn't found very easy to do in his course in the House thus far. I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, it's because of his own incompetence, allied to that of the House Leader, that we are here tonight, because he hasn't got his act together.

So, Mr. Chairman, no committees were called; Public Utilities Committee not called, not about to be called until some time in April. Or is it May as well? Probably April for it. Mr. Chairman, Public Utilities, Public Accounts, two of the most important committees of the House, being just left to dangle in the wind by this group of incompetents across the way. They remind me, you know, of the first labour government that came into office in 1945 after the war under Mr. Attlee, and they had their group of radicals, of people who were not too concerned about the nation, the public interest of the country, but more concerned about advancing their particular doctrinaire philosophy. That was the group that said one day in the Legislature, in the House of Commons and the Mother of Parliaments, one of their front bench was heard to say, and you can hear it echoed every day in this House by someone on that side. Do you know what those words were? Those words that were born in envy and cupidity out of their philosophical belief - "We are the masters now."

Mr. Chairman, by implication or otherwise, everyday we hear these words spoken by somebody on the other side, because that is their view of life, that they are temporarily in office and, boy, are they going to be the masters for a while. Ordinarily, and as we've seen in the last 14 months, Mr. Chairman, either individually or collectively they couldn't run a peanut stand. Mr. Chairman, we have seen nothing to indicate that there's been any improvement in their administrative talents since this particular government has been in office. None whatsoever, and yet they are the masters now.

The only action that they haven't followed that the labour party carried through in 1945 in Britain was to stand up and to sing the Internationale. Well, they don't do that in the Legislature of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman. They just sponsor and pay for, with taxpayers' money, Marxist symposiums and go to them. They just engage in walk-a-thons in front of the U.S. Consulate and participate in group actions where burnings of the American flag take place. They don't have to sing the Internationale. No, not at all, Mr. Chairman. They act it out everyday. Let there be any misunderstanding among the people of Manitoba as to just what kind of a government we have in place, these recent actions of this government committing taxpayers' dollars and, albeit, it's a small amount, \$7,200.00, not a large amount, to a Marxist symposium at the University of Manitoba does not meet with the majority interest of the people of Manitoba. I tell you that.

No. 2, Mr. Chairman, and the chairman of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce said this in the face

of the Premier the other day: This government is creating an image for the Province of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba, which is contrary to and prejudicial to the best interests of our province in terms of business investment, in terms of getting new jobs for our people, in terms of the real reasons why we are here. We are not here to wave some red flag with a hammer and sickle, although members opposite, and a good number of them, not all of them, but a good number of them, Mr. Chairman, may feel that that is their dedicated purpose in life. Let me remind those members, particularly those who are on the front bench of this government, that there was nothing about that in the oath that they either swore to or affirmed to. There was an oath of loyalty there to Her Majesty, the Queen, first of all, to the head of government of this country. Implicit in that oath is an oath of loyalty and support to the people of Canada and to this great nation which we are proud to call our home. Implicit in that oath as well, Mr. Chairman, is an understanding that agreements and treaties and bargains arrived at with your friends and allies will be maintained.

Later on tonight, Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak a little bit about loyalty, because loyalty is what is at issue, not any of the red herrings that my honourable friends have tried to drag into the debate to save themselves, to distract attention from the kind of nefarious activities in which they get themselves involved because of their peculiar political philosophy. What's involved here more and more is a growing question of loyalty of a Provincial Government to the policy that is enunciated by the National Government of this country and to its allies and to those who, through their defence and armament make it possible for us in this country to live as free people against the ever present threat of those in the USSR, those beyond the Iron Curtain, those in Cuba, the Sandinistas and all of the other outposts of communism and Marxism in the world, which would try to deprive individual Manitobans and individual Canadians of their freedom.

So let's make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that a good number of Manitobans, including us on this side of the House, understand what the real world is all about. We understand that there is a question of loyalty to one's allies, to one's neighbours, to one's friends. There is a question about knowing who one's enemies are and who one's friends are. I say to the Honourable Father Malinowski, the Member for St. Johns, who has been a foremost defender of Solidarnosc in Poland - and what is he asking for?

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Still I am.

HON. S. LYON: He's asking for freedom for the Polish people, freedom and solidarity - from what? - from the same communist menace that members of the NDP walked in support of, Mr. Chairman, last evening in front of the United States Consulate. So, Mr. Chairman, the member, Father Malinowski, knows when I speak of freedom that it is freedom not from the United States; the people of Poland aren't being oppressed by the people of the United States; the people of Canada aren't being oppressed by the people of the United States; the people of Nicaragua aren't oppressed by the people of the United States. But the people of Poland and all

of the countries behind the Iron Curtain are being oppressed by that kind of rotten, putrid Marxism, totalitarian Marxism, which some of his colleagues on that side of the House apparently support. So, I ask him, Mr. Chairman, to consider his position as he sits among that group who walk with their signs, Mr. Chairman, saying . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: . . . talking about freedom in Nicaragua.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a point of order.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is accusing me of something - I don't know what he wants from me. I would like to put for the record, Mr. Chairman, I love freedom. For me it doesn't make any difference what colour oppression has; it might be blue, yellow or green or red, I am for freedom. I fought for freedom and I will do so regardless who - it might be Poland, it might be Nicaragua, whatever. I'm against any aggressor so don't you try to switch my point of view on it.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The Americans are your best friends. Why don't you stand with them? They stand with you.

A MEMBER: Instead of burning their flags.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Johns has the most telling word of the evening along with the Member for Springfield. The Member for Springfield knew this afternoon when he made his apologia to the House that that was a bad bunch with which to be associated, and he made his apologia, his apology, this afternoon. The Member for St. Johns, from his seat tonight said, I wasn't there. And we know you weren't there because if you are a true believer of freedom you wouldn't have been there. You wouldn't have been there.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance, let it be heard, is talking about Somoza. Obviously he knows more about Somoza than he does the fiscal affairs of the province because they're in a dreadful state under his guidance. I'm about, Mr. Chairman, to make a few comments that might even attract the attention of the member for wherever, the temporary Minister of Finance who is doing his best to denigrate the reputation of this province throughout the whole of the western world.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we know something about the honourable members opposite and their ability to run anything because the Member for Turtle Mountain spoke about that eloquently this afternoon and, may I say, that he was totally unrebuted. We have an incompetent House Leader and we've got to get rid of an incompetent Government House Leader and the sooner the members opposite realize that, the sooner we'll get more business done in this House. That's not a threat in any way at all. We've tried to co-operate with him; we can't co-operate with him; nobody can co-operate with him because he's too arrogant and too silly. He

doesn't understand parliament. How could he be expected to understand parliament?

Mr. Chairman, since the 1960s, our society has taken on some of the less sensible practices and public displays that we have seen on radio and seen on TV, particularly from Europe and from the United States. As recently as 1977 when we came into office, we saw organized demonstrations on the front steps of the Legislative Building in rapid order. The Member for Wolseley says she was in every one of them, she makes my point, Mr. Chairman, that they were rent-a-pickets. We know that she's capable of being rented — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, obviously the Leader of the Opposition is better at speaking than at listening. I did not say I was at every one, I said he scoffed at every one of them and he's still scoffing at legitimate demonstrations by the people of this province.

A MEMBER: Not of ordinary people - of Cabinet Ministers.

A MEMBER: She said she was at every one she could . . .

HON. S. LYON: Well, I dare say she was because, Mr. Chairman, in 1977 to 1981 there were a lot of unemployed left-wingers in Manitoba who had previously been on the public payroll, and whether she was one of them or not, I don't know. I don't know if the Chairman's indicating that he was one of the three, or whether there's three minutes left. I merely say to the Member for Wolseley that we understand that if she wasn't there in body, she was there in spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I remember one observer of these demonstrations saying to me, you know, isn't it a funny thing that the same faces show up at all of these demonstrations. There were demonstrations against tuition fees; demonstrations against God knows what else. There were demonstrations against anything you can think of.

The pair I can most often recall seeing - I'm sure they wouldn't mind their names being used because they were there publicly all the time - was the former Minister, a Mr. Turnbull and his wife Aleda. They were there for everything; whether it was day care or tuition fees, McKenzie Seeds. I daresay that the Minister of Cultural Affairs was wandering there with a placard too, because he was in that business at the time, and a number of others who had nothing much else to do with their time, except a little propagandizing on behalf of the left. They were there all the time.

If the Member for Wolseley said that I scoffed at them - I usually went out, Mr. Chairman, and spoke to them. Disregarding the full-time - I wouldn't use the word "paid" activist - activists who were there, who would carry a stick and a card for anything, such as the Member for Wolseley, Mr. Chairman, disregarding that kind, they would always grab into the vortex of their group; some otherwise well-meaning citizens who were

genuinely concerned - unlike the placard carriers - about some public issue in Manitoba, and who were there, really, to try to propagate some information.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I said, since the Sixties, our society has taken on some of these less sensible public displays. The unfortunate part is that in this province we can see that a good number of them are orchestrated; they are orchestrated by and large by the same people; they're orchestrated by people who are pretty well-known to the security services in Manitoba and in Canada. I daresay that some of the same people with whom the Minister of Resources walked so gaily - if I may use that term — (Interjection) — I use it in the best sense of that word - and that the Minister of Economic Development walked with, and the Chairman of the Committee tonight walked with. I daresay that there were some of those orchestrators and propagandists of the left involved in that demonstration last evening, just as there have been in most of them; whether it's anti-tuition fee, day care, anti-nuclear - you name it - those denizens of the left will be out there with their ever-present placards.

Mr. Chairman, all good Canadians should know that. I'm afraid that information, however, has been kept away from most Canadians because Canadians don't like to be manipulated. Manitobans don't like to be manipulated. They're only now just beginning to see, Mr. Chairman, some of the manipulation that's been carried on by placard-carrying rent-a-pickets, who are available at the drop of any left-wing hat, to come out for any cause no matter how good or bad in order to rail against Reagan; rail against the United States; rail against capitalism; rail against any of the other philosophical demons that they have in their narrow little minds, in order, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — Is Radisson trying to say something, Mr. Chairman, is he trying to say something to us? Would he mind standing on his feet and saying it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please.

HON. S. LYON: He'll have lots of opportunities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The member has expended his time.

HON. S. LYON: I'll be happy to resume, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: You've just invited a comment. I just said, in face of all these injustices, you're just prepared to shrug your shoulders and shut your eyes. So why should you accuse the others of doing something about them?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Member for Radisson for renewing my speech for another 30 minutes.

A MEMBER: Radisson for House Leader.

A MEMBER: That's called House Rules, fellas. Start to learn something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: You know, Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) — Does the Minister of Finance want to get into the debate for a change? He usually tries to shy away from debates. He's not equipped mentally to take part in too many of them. We know that.

Mr. Chairman, amongst those of the professional pickets, we're happy to see that one of them has now been made an Assistant Deputy Minister of Community Services, Mrs. Turnbull, on what we're told was a really tough Civil Service competition. I'll bet that was a tough competition. What do they do, measure the length of the picket sticks or what? What did they do?

Mr. Chairman, the technique is well-known to any observers of the left in this country. You get a bunch of people together; you inform the press ahead of time that they're going to be there; you have some cause that is real or imagined; you have a bunch of signs painted up. There is support that comes from sources that are never mentioned, of course, at all. There are usually more good people than there are organizers there because the good are sucked into the apparent goodness of the cause by the propagandizers. Mr. Chairman, as a result, you get press cameras on it and you will have important meetings taking place, whether in Ottawa, Washington, Winnipeg, Grand Forks - you name it. If there's a small left-wing dissident group out, it's guaranteed almost to get 30, 40 percent of the publicity for the gathering. That's the way the left works.

Mr. Chairman, I don't entirely condemn it. I think that they've learned how to manipulate and to use the media quite well. It's only a shame in a way that our friends in the media haven't learned that they're being manipulated and used quite well by the left but, Mr. Chairman, that's a problem that the media have.

Well, we heard last night and we saw repeated on television on CTV tonight at the 6 o'clock news, the pictures of the demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate last evening, presumably against American - I say this in quotation marks - "American intervention" in Nicaragua, or was it El Salvador, or where, God knows. In any case, it was a left-wing cause.

Well, who was front and centre? As I watched my T.V. set tonight in disbelief, who was front and centre, Mr. Chairman? The Minister of Natural Resources with a picket on his shoulder — (Interjection) — The Minister who's so interested in rules and order and co-operation and good will. Here he was out with some of the most hard-core leftists you can find this side of Moscow, walking around. The Minister of Education blanches when I say that. Does she not know the group she's among? Does she not know with whom she is associating?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. S. LYON: Look, I mean, all she has to do is look at her two seat mates — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: That's why she's wearing dark glasses.

HON. S. LYON: Well, Mr. Chairman, there was the Minister of Natural Resources carrying his little placard

- maybe he'll tell us later in the debate what was on the placard - and he was smiling. Then behind him I saw you, Mr. Chairman, and then I saw some other faces that were familiar from the other side of the House, the Member for The Pas. I didn't see the Minister of Cultural Affairs but he was there in spirit, we all know, because there would be a good number of his his old union there; we all know that.

The Member for St. John, I can honestly say I didn't see him there and, you know, I would have been surprised to have seen him there in any case because of the words that he spoke, I know, from his heart when his nomination was contested in St. Johns by the present Member for Fort Rouge and because of the words that he spoke from his heart about the danger of communism and how he won that nomination by making that speech in English and in Polish and he defeated the Member for Fort Rouge who was running in that seat by reminding the people of Manitoba and of St. Johns of the political antecedents of the Member for Fort Rouge. Now isn't that interesting, Mr. Chairman, because everytime that somebody on this side of the House mentions that now, it's called red-baiting, but when the Member for St. Johns mentioned it at his nomination meeting that's how he won.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, we might be able to get the clipping of what the Member for St. Johns said at that meeting that night. — (Interjection) — Oh no, if the Member for St. Johns wants to start moving away from that, he's imperilling his position with Solidarnosc and other groups that understand him as a true believer of freedom. We remember, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for St. Johns, amongst others on that side of the House, shares the concern that many people in this province and in this House have concerning the political antecedents of some of the colleagues with whom he must sit across the way, and we know that in due course his conscience will probably point the right way for him to move. Now, Mr. Chairman, that's why we know he wasn't there last night, because one who had spoken in the fervent terms that he had about the danger of Marxism, and so on, could never associate himself with that gang that were in front of the Consulate last evening.

Mr. Chairman, the NDP, if they were honest people, should make bold of the fact that they are a legitimate party of the left, that they are socialists. That's not a term necessarily of opprobrium. Well, the Member for St. James, the Minister of Resources, says he hopes not. He's been a pretty much up-front socialist since I've known him, since he was prating his nonsense at age 18 at United College as it then was.

MR. L. SHERMAN: He wouldn't know opprobrium if he stepped in it.

HON. S. LYON: When I look at the Minister of Resources, Mr. Chairman, I'm reminded of that wonderful statement that's attributed to Churchill, although I'm sure it was spoken by others before him, that every person is a socialist at 20 and usually a Tory at 30; that is, if he has any brains. My honourable friend never quite got through the 20 barrier; that's his problem. I've had the pleasure, and I say that in a genuine sense, of knowing him since he was a young

student just as addicted as he is today to some of the nonsensical theories that he still espouses, which cause him to grab four-foot pieces of wood, and here he is a grown man, and parade around on the public street, blocking the Queen's Highway and so on from normal people who want to pass it.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that if you had moved beyond the Churchillian level at age 20, you know, normal people after they reach 30 don't walk around with sticks and signs on. They find better things to do with their time. Mr. Chairman, in any event, there was the Minister of Resources up front and centre, carrying his stick with whatever sign on it. The NDP, being a party of the left which has strayed - and I'm not a student of the CCF or of the Canadian Commonwealth Federation, the Regina Manifesto - I've read of it and so on. I'm not a student of that early government but, Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the old CCFers, people for whom I had a fair measure of respect, the M. J. Coldwells, whom I had the pleasure to meet and to know and to have respect for, I don't think that the M. J. Coldwells of the CCF would have been in front of the American Consulate last night and participating in a demonstration where the United States flag was burned. No. If I know the tradition of the CCF, which is a tradition with a strong spiritual and Christian background to it, that tradition is foreign to the kind of Marxist tradition that we're seeing now gradually enveloping the NDP across the way. The old CCF would have shunned the active kind of Soviet apologia that we hear now from people like the Minister of Agriculture who said only last year - and I'm glad he reminded me by speaking up; I wish others would do that so they would remind me of their transgressions - the Minister of Agriculture last year was the one who stood in the House and said that we were moving toward a Soviet system of land tenure in this country. He holds his head in despair and disgrace because that's what he said and those words will live to haunt him to his grave.

We know, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Agriculture is anti-ownership; we know he's anti-private ownership. All you have to do is read the bill that's in the House under his name, to which he said today he was not bringing any substantive amendments. Well, Canadians can't own farmland in Manitoba and he tries to pretend that he's an inheritor of the old CCF Party in this province. No, he's an inheritor of the mid-European Marxism which is gradually taking over the NDP.

Mr. Chairman, those are not my words; those are the words of Sid Green who was an inheritor of the old CCF Party and who left the New Democratic Party that my honourable friends sit in opposite, because he said it was being taken over by the Manitoba Federation of Labour and was going to become a plaything of organized labour bosses in Manitoba, which it has become. Some of his candidates said as well that the New Democratic Party in Manitoba, the former chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, Mr. Sims, said that the New Democratic Party - the former President of the New Democratic Party - under Howard Pawley it was being taken over by hard core communist elements in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, I make no allegations because I don't know how hard core these people are. I can only judge their belief by their actions. I can only judge a

government that would give \$7,200 to a Marxist symposium at a time when it's cutting 4-H Programs in Manitoba; that's the only kind of judgment I can make. I can only judge a government that is alleged to have said to a Kinsmen Regional Convention in Manitoba, we won't give you any hospitality grant but we'll sure give one to the Marxist symposium when it comes to Manitoba; we can only judge a government on the basis of those actions of the government. And I wonder how comfortably the Member for St. Johns, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Economic Development - and I'll come to her a little bit later - I wonder how comfortably they can feel among this group of growing left-wing radicals who are taking over the NDP in Manitoba, and who are causing these kinds of manifestations of support for the enemies of my country that I do not like to see, and that Canadians like to see, and that the vast majority of Manitobans do not like to see.

Mr. Chairman, the NDP, under the old CCF, had a legitimate heritage of pacifism which came to it from the old Fabian Society. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I don't the Member for Ste. Rose could even spell pacifism, let alone understand what it means.

MR. H. ENNS: I'll tell you one thing, they didn't desert their country in time of need.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'll tell you one thing, Pete, they got Main Street moving.

HON. S. LYON: What some would call, Mr. Chairman, the fuddy-duddy Fabianists had quite an influence on the early CCF in Canada, and all Canadians, I think, hold in some degree of respect, the work that was done by J. S. Woodsworth, the founder of the CCF Party, who was animated by his Christian belief to do things on behalf of his fellow man and woman that he thought were right. I do not feel, Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with his motivations in the sense that I think that what he wanted to accomplish for men and women in Canada could be better accomplished under a different system, but I grant him, certainly, the respect of the strong ethical belief that he had in the rightness of his cause. He was animated, not by Marx, not by revolution, not by the kooky kind of left-wing nonsense that we saw demonstrated yesterday in front of the American Consulate; he wouldn't have gone to a Marxist symposium at the University of Manitoba, not in a long shot, because he knew that he was a loyal Canadian and that those people, by and large, were animated by a philosophy which was meant to subvert freedom and democracy in this country; that's why he wouldn't be there, and I can presume to speak for J. S. Woodsworth, but I do have more than a passing respect for that man and for what he did for the CCF and for our country.

Mr. Chairman, he was animated by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and would that all of us who adhere to that faith could be animated in the same way that he was. Mr. Chairman, Canadians, therefore, could understand, with that strong streak of Fabianism and with that strong animation of the Gospel in him, that when it came time for Canada to declare war against the oppression of Nazi Germany J. S. Woodsworth was

the, as I recall it, the lone Member of Parliament. The Leader of the CCF, but the lone Member of Parliament who voted against Canada going into the Second World War against the oppression of Hitler. I say that, Mr. Chairman, not by way of indictment of the late J. S. Woodsworth because I think anyone who know how he was animated, and what animated him, would understand how overwhelming was that streak and strain of pacifism in his mind.

Mr. Chairman, that doesn't mean that he was right; it means, however, that his vote against going into the war, the one man in the House of Commons in 1939, his belief was founded on principle. Critics will say that that belief was silly and naive and unrealistic, and I believe all three. I believe it was a silly approach, I believe it was naive, I believe it was unrealistic because Canada had no alternative, but nobody would fault J. S. Woodsworth, Mr. Chairman, for the purity of principle which animated him into that vote. May I say, for the bravery that it took to stand up in the House of Commons, in the face of those experiences - and the Member for Kildonan is old enough to remember, as are a few of us here - of what the mood of the country was at that time. That is the true heritage of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba and in Canada. The true heritage of principle and belief, and ethical belief, in something that, while we may not agree with it, is at the same time consonant with loyalty to this nation and to our beliefs in democracy and individual freedom, and not to be picking on our allies, not to be burning their flag, and not to be saying that any country is superior to the United States, and not to be taking the pro-Soviet view, when the pro-Soviet view is the un-Canadian view.

What we have at issue, Mr. Chairman, is much greater than the incident that occurs in front of the American Consulate, it is the question of citizenship. It is a question of where this party, or at least some of this party, which temporarily has the honour to form the government in this province, where some of this party are drifting, where they have become wayward in that kind of integrity that they should be displaying toward loyalty to their own country and to that country's allies. That is what is at the bottom of our concern about \$7,200 grants to Marxist symposium and about Cabinet Ministers who are sworn to a special oath of loyalty parading up and down in front of the U. S. Consulate against the best interest of the greatest friend, and the greatest ally, and the greatest protector that the national interest of this country has; that's where our concern stems from. Mr. Chairman, the party of the NDP that we see today is a far cry from that party of ethical and principle belief founded on the Gospel of Jesus Christ which animated the original CCF. That's part of the tragedy of politics in this House and in this country today, that's part of the tragedy of politics. God knows that people on this side of the House are far from being perfect, we are not perfect, we do not live up, either in our individual deportment or in our deportment as a group, to all of those ideals and to all of those ethical precepts that we think are the best and I know that many members on the other side think are the best; we failed because all men are imperfect.

But I am truly concerned about the straying, the waywardness, and the straying away from belief in this country that I see manifested by such actions as we

saw yesterday. Mr. Chairman, this party, in some respects, has come to degenerate into a hollow echo of the worst elements of the radical left as some, Sid Green and others, said it would. Mr. Chairman, how can this party be blind to the history of the Labour Party in Great Britain? Look at the transformation that is taking place in Britain today. A Labour party, a once noble party, under Ramsay MacDonald, under Clement Attlee, under Aneurin Bevan, men of great stature in the western world; great patriots of their own country - Laborites, yes, but patriots first. Patriots first. Let's get our priorities in place.

What has happened to that party? Well, they let the left move in, they let the Marxian left from the labour movement move in. The Trotskyites, the Maoists, the Leninists and all of the other gatherings that we see nowadays whose main purpose in life to subvert decent, ordered, free, democratic government in the western world. They let them move in and they took over, the Tribune group and all of that. And there was a history to be read and still to be read today - I've read it - of what can happen to a decent party of the left when it allows those forces of evil which repose in the far left to take command of the party.

Mr. Chairman, one would have to be blind to history to be unaware of the dangers that can occur to a true social democratic party. Now, today, we find those people who still retain their fealty and loyalty to their country. Those people from the Labour Party are joining and making common cause with the people of the Liberal Party into what they've called a New Social Democratic Party. That party is winning by-elections here and there from the Labour Party and God knows if they're going to be successful in displacing the Labour Party as Opposition in the next general election. They certainly won't become government. But, Mr. Chairman, you can see a transformation and a renewal taking place in Great Britain today because of the evils that had overcome the old traditional Labour Party because of the infiltration and ultimate takeover by the hard left of that party in Great Britain.

I ask the question, Mr. Chairman, I do not make the indictment, but I ask the question: is not the modern New Democratic Party in Canada subject to the same kind of aggrandizement from the left that has taken place in Great Britain? I think that is a legitimate question that every member on the government side should be asking himself or herself. To what extent is he or she becoming a manipulated tool of the hard-core left in this country who do not care for Canada as a free country at all, but who care more for the new world order, for the revolution or all of the other buzz words and knee-jerk slogans that they pass around so blithely in order to bring to their ranks those who are looking for a better day.

Well, Mr. Chairman, one would have to blind not to know that that is the danger that faces my honourable friends opposite. That is the danger that we saw manifested yesterday in front of the U.S. Consulate; that is the danger that we see manifested by grants to the Marxist Symposium; that is the danger we see when we read an Order-in-Council that was passed by the Cabinet of this government only a week or two weeks ago giving, I think it was \$4,000 - I am subject to correction on the figure, I can get the figure, members of the Cabinet will know because they passed it - a

grant to the Salvadore Allende Society, presumably of Manitoba, which I presume is a group of displaced Chileans of the left who are in Manitoba - God knows why, but are in Manitoba at this time and who are soul mates, presumably, of the hard left in this province.

I wonder how many taxpayers in Manitoba want to see that kind of grant being made either to the Salvador Allende Society or to the Marxist Symposium, or want to see their Cabinet Ministers marching with plaques and plaquers in front of the U.S. Consulate denouncing our greatest friend and our greatest ally and our greatest protector. I wonder how many Manitobans and Canadians really want to see their government doing that.

A MEMBER: Not very many.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying at the bottom of it all is the question of loyalty; loyalty to one's country; loyalty to one's beliefs; loyalty to individual freedom; loyalty to human freedom everywhere. I pick up the theme, Mr. Chairman, that was mentioned, I believe, by the Member for Ste. Rose, when he said, and I think this is a feeling that is shared on all sides of the House. "I know of no member in this House who is not opposed to the oppression of individual freedom wherever it occurs on the face of the earth, regardless of what kind of government or state apparatus is imposing it, whether it's of the right, or the centre, or the left."

So, my honourable friend has no monopoly on concern for individual oppression. But some of us, Mr. Chairman, have a keener understanding that those from the left who are causing this oppression are the ones who would do the same to us. Those in Poland would do the same to us, and the Member for St. Johns nods because he knows. They would do the same to us because they believe that they should conquer the world and impose their belief upon the rest of the world.

Somebody across the way mentioned Somoza. I don't even know, I can't recall quickly offhand which country Somoza was from. My recollection is he was a right wing dictator of some sort. All I know, Mr. Chairman, is that Somoza never represented in himself or in his ideology, any threat to the freedom of any Canadian. But, I know that Fidel Castro does; I know that General Jaruzelski does, and I know that Commisar Andropov does. I know that all of these people behind the Iron Curtain would like to impose their kind of oppressive government, anti-individual freedom government upon us.

But the Member for St. Johns and all other Canadians will not let them do it. That's true. That's why we can't be constantly taking the pro-Soviet side; the pro-Soviet side with respect to Nicaragua, with respect to Cuba, with respect to Chile or whatever. Mr. Chairman, we must be bigger, and my honourable friend from Radisson can correct me if I am wrong. What is the expression? - la gauche est n'a pas faux - the left is never wrong, eh. My honourable friends, some of them, opposite, are addicted to that view; the left can't be wrong. If it's pro-Soviet, if it's pro-Marxist, it's got to be right. Those who marched in front of that Consulate last night, Mr. Chairman, demonstrated or manifested that they believe that. That's not a new theory; we see

it all the time. There are those in American society, British society, Canadian society who can't see anything good about the United States; can't see anything good about Canada or Britain. Oh, but they can disregard the horrors of Russia; they can disregard the horrors since 1917 of the USSR; they can disregard the invasion of Afghanistan because that of course was only be done to protect the flank of the USSR; they can disregard the genocide that has taken place in Kumpachia, because that's being done by the left.

But, Mr. Chairman, decent human beings, regardless of their being from the left or the right, can't disregard that kind oppression, that kind of genocide, that kind of murder and as Solzhenitsyn says, the terror which has afflicted Russia since 1917 is something that the world has never seen or known before. There is no fibre of my being - and I speak, Mr. Chairman, for myself and my party I know is associated with these feelings, but they can speak for themselves - every fibre of my being is opposed to the ideology which actuates and animates the kind of oppression that we see in Soviet Russia today. Mr. Chairman, there are thousands, there are millions in this country who are prepared to stand and defend this country from them, from that kind of oppression. Mr. Chairman, that may not find favour with the Member for Wolseley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. S. LYON: But she will be in a position to speak for herself. I've got two minutes to conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes. The Leader of the Opposition.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Chairman, I close by saying that the position of the majority of Canadians was not expressed by the Minister of Economic Development and by the Minister of Natural Resources and by their colleagues from this government caucus, who walked in front of the U.S. Consulate last evening.

To all within sound of my voice, and particularly to the people of Manitoba and to the people of Canada and to the people of the United States, I want them to know that they represented a narrow, mean fringe of our society, and not the broad uplands of our thinking in this province or in this country at all.

Mr. Chairman, I was told today - there will be an opportunity to question this further tomorrow - that the participation of the Minister of Economic Development and the other members of the caucus of the government of the NDP was caucused by them. I'm told, and the Minister is able to stand in her place and say it, whether it's true or not, that she was actually there representing the Premier of Manitoba. If that be the case, I want her to stand in her place tonight and say it because that's not what the Minister of Health said today, but that is what is reported to the press.

Mr. Chairman, this matter is not going to die overnight. This matter goes, as I've tried to indicate, much more deeply than any kind of temporary hooliganism that may be perpetrated on the street as a gesture of solidarity or whatever, with whatever group, against whatever country and against whatever movement. It's bigger than that.

I merely wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that those on this side of the House disassociate themselves with the actions of the members of the government caucus; that we, on behalf of this Legislature and the people of Manitoba, apologize to the Government of the United States for the actions that were taken by some of our colleagues yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I rise to address a few remarks, to follow what I consider to be a well-delivered, but ill-tempered and very, very poorly thought out and illogical speech on the part of the Leader of the Opposition.

While in some portions of his speech he did indicate some understanding of the democratic socialist base, well-founded in the precepts of Jesus Christ, yet, he seemed to stray completely from an understanding of democratic socialist philosophy. He does what Conservatives in this country have done for a hundred years. They say that if you're against capitalism, you're communist; if you're against the worst evils of the capitalist system, then you're something dirty. You're something of the left, and you're something unclean. It's that tunnel vision that Conservatives have as to democratic socialism that is hard to understand.

The Leader of the Opposition's been around for just about the same time I have. He referred to his roots, early years in university. Maybe he has become more ultraconservative and almost more fanatic in his defense of capitalism because he used to call them red. They used to call the Honourable Member for Fort Garry red. I suppose he's reacted violently from that nickname.

You know, Mr. Chairman, at one time, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was Attorney-General under the regime of Senator Duff Roblin, former Premier Roblin. That regime was recognized throughout Canada as being a reasonably progressive group because they replaced a Liberal Party government that really was conservative. So the Honourable Leader of the Opposition developed a reputation for being a red Tory.

I suppose it's because of a reaction against that extreme attitude towards anything of the left, that he has become so ingrained, so twisted in his thinking about anyone who has anything critical to say about the capitalist system. They're all damned under his philosophy.

Let me indicate, Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition - the hooliganism on the street that he refers to - that's the kind of thing that in the Soviet Union, they put people in jail for. That's the kind of thinking that the honourable member has. If someone stands up in free society and indicates their hostility to oppression, then that's hooliganism and you put people in jail for that in the Soviet Union. We have a free country here. We have a free country in the United States, an excellent country where young men and women and older men and women protested - yes, marched with placards; marched in front of the White House - against an oppressive attack in Vietnam. They had that war ended because they demonstrated in the streets. It wasn't the politicians in Washington that stopped the war. It was the demonstrators, the American people that convinced that government that they had to stop that inhumane and unjust war.

Now, Mr. Chairman, — (Interjection) — the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would try to suggest that our great neighbour to the south is blameless of any fault. You know, Mr. Chairman, it's a matter of public record within the United States itself that the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States schemed and developed the insurrection in Chile, armed those people that overthrew a democratically elected government, assassinated its leader. That is not a figment of someone's imagination; that is testimony in the United States of America. They're ashamed of it. The people of the United States are ashamed of that.

Mr. Chairman, free men in the United States and in Canada are not afraid to express their opinion. They're not muzzled by the idea that if they speak out, they are huzzled and would be put in jail.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition says I was seen on television carrying a placard. I carried nothing, Mr. Chairman. Just like some honourable member is suggesting that I burnt a flag. That is a disgrace. I would never do such a demeaning thing. I believe that free men and women everywhere have a right to present their view free from intimidation that they're going to be thrown in jail if they protest.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition talks about the democratic socialist left in this province. Yes, it had its beginnings in 1919 when hundreds and hundreds of people, citizens in Manitoba, armed servicemen who came back from the war, without jobs, oppressed, went out on general strike. What happened? J. S. Woodsworth was put in jail. A. E. Heaps was put in jail. For what? They were alleged to be Bolsheviks, Mr. Chairman.

An armed insurrection; there was no armed insurrection. Historians have proved without any shadow of a doubt that there was no conspiracy to overthrow legitimate government in Winnipeg or in Manitoba but that fanatic zeal to protect the status quo put decent, honourable men, men that believed in Jesus Christ, men that believed in the brotherhood of man, they put them in jail because they spoke out for reform. They spoke out against repression of the working man and, Mr. Chairman, people all over the world now are taking heart. They realize that with the nuclear threat that exists in this world, we may not have long to see a development of the brotherhood of man and woman, not much time, Mr. Chairman. Should we not dare to save and improve the lot of citizens everywhere? There's no question.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition really didn't know who Somoza was. They don't know who Somoza was. Somoza was a vicious tyrant in Nicaragua. Those people, like the people of the United States of America who fought for their freedom, those people in Nicaragua fought for their freedom, died for their freedom. Roman Catholic Priests stood up and fought Somoza. Yes, Roman Catholic Priests have been shot and killed in El Salvador because they are fighting for the little people, but what's happening? The Monroe Doctrine says that there shall be no change in governments in the North American hemisphere, any change that would weaken and destabilize the American system, so they send in their money and if their money doesn't help, they send in advisors and they undermine democratically elected governments and destroy them. That is what people in Canada are opposed to, that

is what people in the United States of America are opposed to and they will continue to fight that kind of oppression.

The honourable member talks about Russia. He talks about the Soviet Union. The honourable members are of that ilk who think the way you treat communism is you out-lie. That's what Conservatives have said in Ottawa. That's what Conservatives said in this province. You know, democratic socialists have been fighting communism since the very beginning of political history and the record is clear, Mr. Chairman. Where we have democratic socialist movements, whether it be in Australia, in New Zealand, in England, in Denmark, in Norway, in Sweden, wherever, democratic socialist governments have fought communist parties and won, because we're not the same. We're not the same, Mr. Chairman. We believe in the democratic tradition, and the honourable members over there refuse to accept that there can be people who are committed, committed to social and economic change and justice in this world, unless they are revolutionaries and they're prepared to kill people, that isn't the way, Mr. Chairman. The democratic socialists have fought and worked for 100 years.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition makes it dirty to stand for peace, makes it dirty to stand out and protest oppression and the result of that kind of effort that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is working on, is to condemn everyone who is critical about the capitalist system, to be a communist. That's the way it is. Anyone who stands up for peace is a communist in their thinking.

Mr. Chairman, there was an era in the United States of America that the people of that country were called to their dismay and their chagrin. That was a day when you couldn't be associated with anything of the democratic left or you were communist, there was a witch hunt. People were accused, condemned and humiliated because they stood for reform in society. They had to conform to the rule of the capitalist system then, unchanged. That was the kind of system but people in the United States of America protested. Yes, they carried placards, yes they fought that system and I think the United States of America is a marvellous tradition of democracy and we on this side respect that nation. We respect those people just as we expect them to respect our right to indicate, as a good neighbour, when they do anything wrong.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable members over there seem to think that good friends never suggest to one another that they have done anything wrong. That isn't the basis for friendship. Good friends, Mr. Chairman, will frankly tell one another when they have done something wrong and we as good friends of the United States are prepared - I know I am - to indicate when I disagree with them. I also am very happy to indicate when I do agree with them.

Mr. Chairman, honourable members opposite have engaged at the start of this Session, in the kind of obstructionism, the kind of negative attitude towards government and it's been planned. The attacks on the House Leader, sure he's a new House Leader, but these attacks are calculated, calculated to disrupt government. Why, Mr. Chairman? Why, because they haven't got alternative policies. On the one hand they criticize for our spending and on the other hand they

want us to spend more. When we stand, during the course of the Budget Debate and say, "Where do you want us to cut?" What constructive advice have they given? Only the Member for Fort Garry says, "Well, bring in a new Budget." That's the kind of suggestion they had. They had no alternative policy.

When we talk about the one problem in Manitoba, the most serious problem in Manitoba, jobs, they belittle our efforts with the Jobs Fund. What would they do, Mr. Chairman? They ignore the problem. It's because their opposition is so hollow, so inept, that what they are doing tonight is characteristic of what they've done all Session, obstruct, argue, find fault on technical House procedure. That's the kind of thing. Now they laugh, Mr. Chairman. They're talking about moving forward into Committees. They have — (Interjection)

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

MR. D. ORCHARD: No I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. Would you permit a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I will allow the member to get up and ask a question if that gives me another 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says that those who walked in front of the U.S. Consulate walked in support of communism. How naive, how inept. Anyone who stands out now stands up, in protest to inhumanity anywhere, apparently is a communist. That is a sick, confused, befuddled approach to protest in our society. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, honourable members over there babble because they really haven't got anything constructive to say. Mr. Chairman, we know that the honourable members have difficulty, they have difficulty because they don't understand democratic socialism.

HON. S. LYON: We know the difference between right and wrong.

HON. A. MACKLING: They don't understand the difference between communism and socialism, they don't care to understand. Mr. Chairman, we on this side, will continue to work and fight for peace and justice, not only for the people of Manitoba but we will be prepared to stand up and be counted and speak out against oppression. As the Honourable Member for St. Johns indicated, oppression anywhere, whether it be in the Soviet Union, whether it be in Papa Doc Haiti, whether it be in Honduras, or El Salvador, we won't be afraid to stand up and criticize because we know we're standing up on the side of small people who have fought and are continuing to fight for liberty and justice in their own countries.

The American people went through that, Mr. Chairman, they are a marvelous people. They fought for liberty; they attained that liberty. Unfortunately they had a fantastically difficult time during the Civil War when that country had a protracted period of anguish. That country is no stranger to difficult resolution of

economic and political problems. So, Mr. Chairman, they should understand the agonies of the development of democracy in other parts of the world. — (Interjection) —

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry is babbling on to the point where I can hardly hear the words that I make, echo in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Let the records show that the Member for Fort Garry in his usually intemperate way is now calling me an idiot. That, Mr. Chairman, indicates the kind of temperament of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry . . .

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

MR. H. ENNS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There was some disturbance in the House, I want to make it very clear that the record does show that the honourable member now speaking is an idiot.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I know what Beauchesne says about the use of that word but it will just indicate for the record how low and how inept and how naive and how childlike are the members opposite who use those words. Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity in 1975 to visit Cuba in the company of a couple, Mr. & Mrs. Frith, who lived in Onanole, Manitoba. They had been down there one year before the revolution when someone by the name of Batista controlled Cuba. Mr. Chairman, at the time that Mr. Batista was in power in Cuba the mafia controlled most of Cuba. They operated brothels, large casinos, they were building on the Isle of Pines a mammoth casino and Cuba was being operated as playland for the gamblers and the wealthy from the United States. When the Friths walked the streets of Havana they indicated to me that they were overwhelmed by seeing the children all dressed with shoes on their feet. When they were there the year before the revolution the children had bare feet and were in rags begging, hundreds of them.

Mr. Chairman, I don't approve of the communist system. I don't approve of the regimentation, the limitation of freedom that the communist system brings in the society which it controls. But, Mr. Chairman, I do respect the fact that some people throughout the world look to that form of government organization because they find some relief from the oppression of poverty, nakedness and lack of shelter in society. I don't condemn them for reaching out to try and find help, Mr. Chairman. Although I don't believe in that system I don't condemn people who have adopted, that either in a democratic way or have fought with their own weapons to attain that freedom.

Mr. Chairman, the idiosyncrasy of the members opposite is, that while they hate communism, they like communist money. In China before the revolution, before 1949, there was no unity of purpose. There were warlords, they fought over grain, but today, Mr. Chairman, an organized government, one that I don't support, one that I don't want to see emulated anywhere, but at least a government there feeds its people. They buy their grain from Canada, we're happy to sell them grain. If we took the attitude of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition we wouldn't have any dealings with China because we don't like their form of government.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we have to learn is to be able to meet and talk with friends, friends we don't agree with. I don't agree with the political philosophy of the member opposite but I will not call him names as some of his members have called me names tonight. I will not do that. I will always recognize in honourable members opposite the dignity of the human race and the hope, Mr. Chairman, that with intelligent thinking they will share with me some of the concerns I have for a better society.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, asking over-much but I continue to have faith in the human race and I even have faith that the honourable members opposite can have some understanding and sympathy for the causes of oppressed people everywhere, and they, themselves, would be prepared to speak out in opposition to it and, yes, demonstrate against it because that is the way that free men and free women throughout the world have indicated their protest to systems that are corrupt in society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I just heard the words from the Honourable Minister of Resources that good friends won't tell one another when have done something wrong. Those were the words that he said during his speech. He said, good friends won't tell one another when they have done something wrong.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just want the record to be correct. If the honourable member is going to quote me let him quote me correctly. I said that good friends are prepared to tell one another when they had done something wrong.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'll accept the Minister's statement and I'll accept his statement very well. I've just listened to a person that I have known as a good friend for a lot of my life but I don't understand him at the present time. In fact, he's a complete stranger.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that when the honourable member and I were members of the St. James, and later the St. James-Assiniboia, Council together, that the honourable member regarded the fact that he was a councillor as something that I would say the way I felt, that is something sacred and I make that point because I don't think that he seems to believe or realizes the fact that he's a Minister of the Crown in the Province

of Manitoba as something as sacred as he did when he was an alderman.

Mr. Chairman, I would have never believed in my life that the Member for St. James, while he was a councillor for St. James, and at one time was the Deputy Mayor of St. James as I was, that he would have gone out and demonstrated as he did last night on the basis of what he spoke about just now.

The Minister uses the excuse for demonstrating about oppression, etc. within the world today and that's his privilege. Mr. Chairman, if he was, as Deputy Mayor of the St. James-Assiniboia, walking down the street demonstrating then, when I knew him then, he would have realized that, as an alderman, he was representing the City of St. James-Assiniboia. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation where the member has taken an oath to be a Minister of the Crown of the Province of Manitoba, part of Treasury Bench, who stood out there in those halls and took an oath to be a Minister for the Crown, for the Province of Manitoba, the same oath that I took. Strangely enough we were both councillors and both Deputy Mayors at one time in the City of St. James-Assiniboia. The Minister now believes, as he didn't believe then, that he can eliminate the fact that he took that oath, he can eliminate the fact that he's part of Treasury Bench, he can eliminate the fact that when a Minister goes out and speaks in this province that he does not speak for the government, he now speaks as an individualist.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend that I don't understand anymore. I say to my friend that I don't understand anymore, why does he now take an attitude that he never had before? Mr. Chairman, the Minister is a member of the Treasury Bench of this province just the same as the Minister of Economic Development is Treasury Bench in this province, and not just Treasury Bench, is the Deputy Premier of this province. When the Premier . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: The finest one we've ever had.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: . . . cannot make a meeting and the Deputy Premier attends, the Deputy Premier is representing the Province of Manitoba.

Now, how can members on the Treasury Bench of the other side truly justify the fact that they went out last night and demonstrated against the policy of our neighbours, the United States, and then stand up and say that we were doing it as individuals. Do you really believe that you can take the oath that you took out there on those front steps as members of Treasury Bench and now say that I am no longer a member, I disregard that oath, I am now an individual and I can speak for myself? That really doesn't happen.

That really doesn't happen, Mr. Chairman, because as an alderman or an MLA or an M.P. and I might say, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education, who was the chairman of a school board, represented the people that they were elected to represent and as the chairman of the school board was there because the elected members of the school board put them there. Now, all of a sudden, in this House the honourable members opposite say that the oath that I took for Treasury Board, it doesn't mean anything anymore. Mr. Chairman, does it really mean anything when you go to the community

clubs within your area, when you go to the churches within your area, when you visit anybody within your area? Do they walk up to you and they say, well, I have a problem, I have something to say to you about the government operation of this province and you say to them well, believe me, I have my own personal opinions but as an MLA I have another opinion? Do you ever find any of your constituency segregating you away from the fact that they elected you? No, you don't have them segregate the fact you are representatives of the people of Manitoba and treasury bench is far more important because the Treasury Bench, the Cabinet, actually sits there and they make the decisions regarding the policy of this province.

When a Minister, and when the Deputy Premier of this province walks out and stops and goes on a demonstration and the Deputy Premier takes a microphone and starts to talk in front of a group of 400 people, is that not regarded as the opinion of the Province of Manitoba? If it is not the decision of the Province of Manitoba, the Minister of Resources and the Deputy Premier of this province should resign, because they accepted the positions that they're in at the present time. They accepted them and they stood up and were very proud to accept them. Now, they can walk down the street; now, they can stand in front of another embassy, whatever embassy it may be, and actually expound a policy which I don't know is the policy of the present government in Manitoba, but when I hear it expounded, when I hear it put it forward by Ministers of the Crown, I have to accept it as government policy.

The Minister of Resources well knows through his experience of many, many years in public life, that is the fact. If he is now about to disregard the honour that was placed upon him to represent the people of Manitoba and be part of Treasury Board by saying that I am speaking as an individual, then I say the Minister should resign. There is no question in my mind that's the way the ball bounces unless, Mr. Chairman, you want to disregard the whole democratic system that we presently have.

The Minister stands up and he started to refer to the Budget debate, which was mainly a way of getting off the subject that we're on tonight. He talked about this House by putting obstacles in front of this House so that the proper democratic system could not be taken care of. Mr. Chairman, I called the Minister yesterday a twerp. If he goes to the Webster Dictionary, it says, "silly and contemptible person." I have never known anybody that was more contemptible than he was yesterday from trying to muzzle speech in this House. Then, he turns around and walks down the street saying I am a Minister but I don't have to take that responsibility; I can throw the coat off my shoulders. I don't have to have any regard of the oath that I took on those front steps and I can speak any way I like.

The other members on the opposite side say you can't have it both ways, and I say to the Minister of Resources, you can't have it both ways. You never used to have it both ways when you were an alderman in St. James and when you were Deputy Mayor. You had more damned courtesy than you are presenting at the present time when I knew you. So when we talk about good friends, I can say to you that this person that I knew has a completely different idea of what an elected

member is at the present time, completely different in that he can say at any time that he can do what he likes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have a group of Treasury Board on the other side. We have an American Consul which is resident within this city. Would that you, as Treasury Board, the right thing to do would be to sit in Cabinet and say, Mr. Premier, we don't really believe that what the United States is doing is the proper thing to do and we think that there should be some protest against it. As members of Treasury Board or in Cabinet, you should have said to your Premier, will you make representation to the American Consul in Manitoba? Will you tell him or her my concerns? Was that done? No! We had a group of Ministers. We had the Deputy Premier of this province walk out on a demonstration in front of the America Consulate in Manitoba and make a display of themselves which was dishonouring the position that they have been given in this province.

Mr. Chairman, how can the members on the other side justify what they did last night and what they want to continue to do? How can you justify the fact that, as Cabinet Ministers, you didn't say to your Premier that this is not something that is the economic development of the Province of Manitoba; this is not something of education of Manitoba; this is not something of creating jobs in Manitoba; but we have a concern and say, Mr. Premier, would you make representation to the American Consul in the City of Winnipeg in the Province of Manitoba. Was that done? Well, I would say it wasn't done, and I would say that's a disgrace that anybody that took the oath as a Cabinet Minister in this province, and if you really believe that the democratic system that the Member for St. James just expounded, if he really believes that he thinks that United States is a good neighbour, if he really believes that they have a democratic system that he respects, wouldn't he, as a member of Treasury Board or the Deputy Premier of this province, make representation through the Premier to the American Consul in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just don't really understand. The members on the other side get up and they talk about oppression, they talk about all of these things. The members on this side, we're aware, we know what's going on. Do you believe that the Treasury Board, Ministers that took an oath in this province, can now go out as individualists?

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the members of Treasury Board have been influenced by the new Member for St. John. I would believe that they have been maybe influenced, and all due respect, by Mr. Chairman; I would believe that they have been influenced by people maybe in the backbench; and several of them on Treasury Board to say we have to go out and we have to demonstrate against our neighbour, which is the finest neighbour in the world, and all of a sudden we have Ministers in Manitoba who have a vehicle to do what they want to do in the proper procedures, decide that we're not Ministers anymore, at 5 o'clock tonight we're no longer Ministers, we'll go out and we will demonstrate. The Deputy Premier of this province, with a speaker in front of her espousing her views, and as Deputy Premier of this province, has to be the policy of this province. Is the Premier, when he finally sits in his seat, going to say to his Ministers

that I disagree with what you did? Are the Ministers of this province responsible to the Premier or are they responsible to themselves? Are they responsible to the people or aren't they? Because when you get up as Ministers, you are responsible, very responsible, because you took an oath as Ministers.

And I say to the Member for St. James, I don't know him anymore because he would never - he might have done it before; as my leader said, he might have done it before when he was 18, I didn't know him then - but I knew him as a councillor in St. James, as a Deputy Mayor in St. James, and on no circumstances would he have done that at that time. Now he takes a far greater oath than he did as a councillor. He takes an oath to be a Minister of this province, a member of Treasury Board and, I might say, previously was an Attorney-General of this province, and decides that he can throw his coat off as many members of his caucus did and as many members of Treasury Board did and say it doesn't mean anything anymore.

Mr. Chairman, if we are dealing with a Cabinet that has decided they can throw their coat off one day and be one thing, put it back on the next day and be something else, or speak out of this House one way and speak in this House another way, we are dealing with a very serious situation in this province and we are dealing with something that is going to be a disaster for this province if our Treasury Board has that attitude. So, Mr. Chairman, I just say that I had a good friend . . .

MR. H. ENNS: He's now a stranger to you!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right, I don't know him when he does things like this. I'm very surprised at the Deputy Premier of this province, and I would like any member of the Treasury Bench on the other side or any caucus member to stand up and say that the members of Cabinet that took an oath to be part of Cabinet, which is the group that decides the policy of this province, and say to me that I can throw that responsibility off anytime I want to, would they please stand up and tell me that.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, he's inviting me to stand up and say something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister of Natural Resources had a point or a question. — (Interjection) — No, did you have a point or a question, because I don't want to preempt . . .

HON. A. MACKLING: Let the record show that I am prevented from answering . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, let the record also show that four minutes after ten or three minutes after ten that we were dealing with business here tonight that is keeping various members of the Committee, and indeed the committee in general, in their places unnecessarily; that if in fact the business of the House had been handled properly by the Government House Leader, by the Minister of Finance, that this item of

House business would have been dealt with and dispensed with last Friday, and that we would not be here debating at this hour of the night, not that any of us, I presume, has any objection to debating at this hour of the night; but if members opposite are concerned in any way about the lateness of the hour and if the Member for Springfield is beginning to sag in his seat, let him just remind himself that it's due to the conduct of the affairs of the House by his House Leader and his Minister of Finance and his government that we are here at four minutes past ten debating the Loan Bill when it could have been cleaned up during the period we were dealing with Interim Supply.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that in my experience one of the great lines of English literature occurs in Joseph Conrad's novel, *Lord Jim*, in which near the end of the novel, the protagonist Lord Jim says, "I am come in sorrow." I believe that those words, which I studied in the context of study of a major English language novelist many years ago, elicit and evoke for me a profound observation on many aspects of life. I believe that those words are very fitting for participation in this debate tonight because, in my experience, I enter this debate in sorrow. I would not have thought that it would have been necessary for a Manitoban, a Western Canadian, a Canadian of whatever political persuasion, Progressive Conservative, New Democrat, Liberal, Social Credit, of whatever political persuasion, to stand in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and redress on behalf of one's friends and one's allies the kind of insult and the kind of outrage that has been perpetrated by two members of the Treasury Bench of this province in the last 24 hours.

Mr. Chairman, I do come into this debate in sorrow, because I find it extremely embarrassing and humiliating that as a Manitoban one should have to defend one's province, one's people, one's Legislature, one's constituents, one's colleagues, against the foolish action of a couple of Cabinet Ministers who know not of their responsibilities and, obviously, have no concept of a sense of honour as it relates to Cabinet, its collective responsibility, its oath of allegiance to the Crown, its oath of allegiance by implication to the Crown's allies, to our friends, colleagues and allies in this world, and not only that, but to the sense of propriety and decency of the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister of Natural Resources understands the sense of outrage and disappointment that the majority of Manitobans will feel as a consequence of the action that took place in the last 24 hours involving him and his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development. And I am extremely sorry that the Minister of Economic Development was involved because I give her, in my own mind and my own heart, credit for much greater common sense than was manifested by her participation in that event. I don't give the Minister of Natural Resources credit for that kind of common sense, obviously he is a highly emotional, high-strung person who reacts emotionally to difficult situations and often reacts irrationally, does not take into account his sense of responsibility as a Member of the Treasury Benches and as a sworn Minister of the Crown, but I had really expected more of the Minister of Economic Development and I am deeply disappointed. I can say that the Constituency of Fort Garry, for whom I have the honour and privilege

to speak, would be, in large part, Sir, in large part - I don't claim to speak for everybody in Fort Garry, obviously there were many in Fort Garry who did not vote for me, but the majority did and I can speak for the majority in Fort Garry - and I can assure you, Sir, that they will be deeply disappointed in the actions of the Minister of Economic Development, and dismayed by, perhaps not surprised but dismayed by the actions of the Minister of Natural Resources.

I wish, Sir, to add my support to the plea, in fact the demand, of my leader earlier today, that the First Minister of our province, our First Minister, every Manitoban's First Minister, issue an official, formal and public apology to the President of the United States of America, not to the Consul General of the United States of America in Winnipeg, but to the President of the United States of America, for the foolish attendance and participation of two of his Cabinet Minister on Wednesday evening of this week in Winnipeg, at an anti-American demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate, a demonstration that had no support in terms of justification whatsoever, no justifiable rationale whatsoever, and even its organizers said so.

I have to ask the Minister of Natural Resources, who apparently has found other pressing commitments to attend to at the present time . . .

A MEMBER: No, he's hiding in the corner.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, I apologize, Mr. Chairman, I apologize. The Minister of Natural Resources is here in the Chamber. I thought he, perhaps, had repaired to his office to attend to other matters of pressing ministerial business.

A MEMBER: Write out his apology.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I have to ask the Minister of Natural Resources, what was he demonstrating against? Why was he there? Even the organizers of the demonstration don't know and are quoted in the Winnipeg Free Press of Thursday, March 24th, as saying they don't know. "It's a protest against the invasion of Nicaragua. We probably could have protested in front of Eaton's." Well, what does that say, Mr. Chairman, for a sworn Minister of the Crown, a representative not only of the great Constituency of St. James, but a representative of the people of Manitoba who is serving in a ministerial capacity in the Executive Council of this Government. I see the Minister of Natural Resources is on his feet; I believe I have the floor, but I will defer to him if he has a question. For the moment I am not yielding the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I took it that the honourable member was asking a question.

A MEMBER: In his speech we ask a lot of questions.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, . . .

A MEMBER: You'll have a chance to speak, again.

HON. A. MACKLING: If you like I will answer your question, or do you not wish an answer.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources is perfectly correct. I am asking him a question, but I am asking him a rhetorical question. — (Interjection) — He's had 30 minutes in this debate; he'll have another 30. I'm asking him a rhetorical question, perhaps he'll take a mental note of it. I am asking him, what did he think he was demonstrating against, or for, and why in his capacity as a member of Treasury Bench, Executive Council, he would be out participating, in any event, in a demonstration of that kind?

Mr. Chairman, it boggles the mind that the organizer of that demonstration could say what he has said, what I've just read into the record from today's interview in the Free Press, and two of the Cabinet Ministers of this province could participate in that kind of a nonsensical, irrational, undirected, disorganized action, simply for the sake, I suppose, of showing that they don't think very much of the United States of America. I presume that's the reason they were out there, otherwise why would they demonstrate when they knew not what they were demonstrating for or against, and why would they do it in front of the United States Consulate. I suppose it's fair game to pull the eagle's feathers, and whenever you can try to cause embarrassment to the United States of America. So we have two of our Cabinet Ministers in this province participating in that kind of travesty, in that kind of totally unacceptable, dishonourable action. And the only term one can apply to it is dishonourable, Sir.

Now, I know that there were eight members of the government caucus who participated in the event, and I don't think very much credit can be directed toward any of the eight. I certainly don't think that any of the other six stand to receive much in the way of compliment or praise for participating in that kind of a foolish event, but at least the other six have the justification and the protection of being members of the government caucus in a lesser capacity than those whom I have mentioned earlier, namely, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development. So I think one can say, with respect to the other six, Sir, Father forgive them for they know not what they do; and they knew not what they did. In any event, they were backbenchers, they are entitled to operate as individuals and I do not criticize their decision to express their opinions in an individual way. I don't think that it casts any honour, or brings any praise, or brings any credit to the Government of Manitoba, and it certainly is a discredit to the people of Manitoba which that government is supposed to be representing, that they should be out there participating in that kind of dishonourable, disorganized, irrational, inexplicable action. But, at least they are backbenchers; at least they did not take an oath of allegiance to the Crown; at least they can be forgiven, perhaps, on the grounds that they didn't know what they were doing; at least they can be entitled, I suppose, to operate, to a certain extent, as individuals. But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Economic Development, any other member of the Executive Council, any other member of the Treasury Benches cannot, under our system,

operate as an individual unless he or she want to resign from the Cabinet.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. L. SHERMAN: If those two ministers want to operate as individuals, let them quit the Cabinet or let the First Minister fire them from the Cabinet, and then let them go out and participate in all the willy-nilly nonsense that they want to, but today, as members of the Treasury Bench and members of the Cabinet, they stand for and speak for and represent the people of Manitoba. I want to tell those two Ministers that the vast majority of the people of Manitoba do not agree; in fact, are outraged by that kind of show of dishonour and unfriendliness and enmity and foolishness, nigh stupidity towards the greatest friends and allies that we have in the world. Not always right the Americans, but are we always right in Canada, but the greatest friends and allies that we have in this world and, in fact, the greatest friends and allies that free men and women everywhere on the face of this earth have.

The Minister of Natural Resources talked about Vietnam and the agony of Vietnam, and the fact that many Americans demonstrated against Vietnam, and the fact that there was a great outcry against American participation in Vietnam, as though he was informing us of something that we didn't know. Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very easy to sit back in the safety and the sanctity of St. James or Fort Garry or Sturgeon Creek or any other constituency in the Province of Manitoba, and pontificate about the responsibilities of the leaders of the free world and the responsibilities that the United States of America had in Vietnam, or had in Korea, or has in Central America, or Latin American, or has in Asia, or has in Eastern Europe, or has anywhere on the face of this earth, very easy to sit comfortably in St. James where the Minister of Natural Resources sits, or comfortably in Fort Garry where I happen to sit, and criticize people who carry an enormous burden of responsibility. Nobody on this side of the House is suggesting for one moment that the United States of America, that Washington, is always right; nobody is suggesting that, but is the Minister of Natural Resources suggesting that if we carried that burden, if we had those problems and challenges and responsibilities that we would always be right, that we would always do the divine thing, that we sit on the right hand of God and know all the answers.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that has really embarrassed me as a Canadian for many years - and I don't mind saying so and my colleague the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I have talked about this in this House for 14 years - the thing that has embarrassed my colleague, the Honourable Member for Lakeside and me, as Canadians, for some considerable time has been the juvenile, adolescent posturing and pontificating of a number of pretentious Canadians about what the Americans should be doing, and what they shouldn't be doing, and how wrong the Americans are when, in most cases, many of us with a sense of honour in Canada are somewhat embarrassed about the fact that Canada itself has not met its international responsibilities, has not lived up to some of the responsibilities that we have in terms of defending the

freedoms of this world since World War II - since Korea, I might say, since Korea - I won't say since World War II because certainly Canada participated with vigor and commitment in Korea.

The Member for Lakeside and I have often talked about that in this House and I really think it is unseemly of people like the Minister of Natural Resources to sit over there and participate in demonstrations against the Americans, and criticize the Americans for things that they do or don't do or haven't done or failed to live up to when he is a member of a country, Canada, of which we're all proud, but towards which we must all look inwardly and introspectively, and in self-evaluation ask ourselves, are we meeting all our commitments, are we doing all that we can to ensure that the spark of freedom, which is constantly threatened around this globe, is properly preserved and defended?

Mr. Chairman, I think it ill behoves a member of the Treasury Benches, a sworn Minister of the Crown, and I keep coming back to that phrase because that's important, a sworn Minister of the Crown, whether it's the Minister of Natural Resources or the Minister of Economic Development, to engage in that kind of picayune, embarrassing, irrational, unjustifiable, nit-picking with the Crown's allies, with our country's greatest allies. If they've got something to say let them stand up and say it but, for heaven's sake, Mr. Chairman, let us not always be nit-picking at a country and at an ally that has one of the most difficult tasks in this world, to try to meet the balance between responsible armament, responsible defense, responsible security, and the widest possible operation of freedom and pursuit of peace. That is a very difficult mission to be about and for the Member of the Legislature from St. James, or anywhere else, to treat it superficially and to think that it can be dealt with the same way that some issue relative to a community club in a neighbourhood of Winnipeg can be dealt with simply misses the entire point of responsibility and urgency and real politics in the world today.

Mr. Chairman, I can't express a greater sense of outrage in words, other than those that I have used, insofar as the present incident is concerned. I was completely appalled, completely outraged, when I heard that two Ministers of my province, two Cabinet Ministers of my province, had participated in that kind of a dishonourable activity where our greatest friends and allies are concerned. They have a responsibility. If they don't understand the difference between being a member of the opposition or being a backbencher or being a private citizen and being a Minister of the Crown then they shouldn't be Ministers of the Crown, then they shouldn't be on the Treasury Benches. There is a distinct responsibility, and surely the Minister of Natural Resources understands it, he was here before he was a Minister of the Crown in the 1969-1973 period under a former NDP Premier, the Honourable Edward Schreyer. I am certain that any strong Premier, and I think that the Honourable Mr. Schreyer was one, would not have permitted, would not have tolerated for one moment the attendance and participation of two, or any of his Cabinet Ministers, at that rag-tag demonstration last night in front of the United States Embassy.

Mr. Chairman, I just don't think that the Minister of Natural Resources understands or grasps the question

for one moment. He has stood in his place and he's talked about the right of individual Manitobans to express themselves; he's drawn every kind of red herring and blue herring and green herring across the path that he can. He talked about it in question period and he talked about it again tonight. He and his colleagues have said that that great party, the New Democratic Party, the New Democratic Government of this province, is unwilling to muzzle individual expression, they are not going to stop individuals from speaking out. Mr. Chairman, what a sham.

MR. A. RANSOM: You would never have let this happen, Sam.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'll wait till the Member for Wolseley finishes with the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources because I'm addressing the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman. I'm addressing, through you, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and I don't wish to have the conversation diverted by somebody else. The Minister of Natural . . . I'll wait until the Member for Wolseley finishes with the Minister of Natural Resources and I will hold the floor until she does.

The Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman, who has served in this House for some time and who was a colleague of mine and many of ours from 1969 to 1973, has spoken about the rights of individual Manitobans to express themselves. No one - I'll wait, Mr. Chairman, I've got lots of time because I intend to go again at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I've got - I am speaking to the Minister of Natural Resources directly as a colleague in this House, Mr. Chairman, through you.

HON. A. MACKLING: I don't have to sit here and listen to you.

MR. L. SHERMAN: You don't have to. I am asking you for your courtesy. I listened to you. I can wait.

Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that I have some things that I would like the Minister of Natural Resources to pay some attention to. That as long as his attention is being diverted by conversation by the Member for Wolesley or anybody else, I will simply stand in my place and wait until he's prepared to listen.

Now, the Minister of Natural Resources apparently is leaving his seat. I would ask him out of courtesy, whether he would listen to a point that I am trying to make to him.

HON. A. MACKLING: Grow up.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Chairman, no one has to listen to me, but we have listened to the Minister of Natural Resources day after day in question period, we listened to the Minister of Natural Resources in his capacity as Deputy Government House Leader on his feet complaining about the abuse of the rules, complaining about preambles to questions, complaining about the abuse and manipulation of the different procedures of the House.

HON. A. MACKLING: You're the worst example.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly the Minister of Natural Resources seems to feel very strongly about that sort of a thing. I want to say to him that the people of Manitoba are much less concerned about perhaps some extension, or some expansion of the rules or some twisting of the rules in question period, much less concerned about that than they are about honour, integrity and responsibility to the people of Manitoba, to the country that we live in and to our allies. They're much less concerned about a little sort of extension or expansion of the rules, a little exaggeration of the rules, perhaps even a little abuse of the rules. When the opposition is trying to obtain answers, trying to get at the truth and trying to hold this government to some sense of accountability and honour and responsibility, I suggest that the people of Manitoba are much more concerned with that other issue than with the question of the rules.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has raised the point that he thinks that this government is a great champion and defender of individual expression, that individuals should be able to express themselves and nobody should muzzle them and that this government does not intend to muzzle them. There is no argument with that principle. Nobody on this side has said that individual Manitobans should not be able to go out and demonstrate against the United States or against anybody else. Nobody has suggested that for one moment. What we have said is that Members of the Treasury Bench, sworn Ministers of the Crown, who represent the government and therefore the people of the Province of Manitoba, should be conscience of the fact that when they do that, and their colleagues should be conscience of the fact, that when they do that they are not individuals, they are acting for, speaking for, and representing the people of the Province of Manitoba and they had better be prepared to answer for it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if they want to act as individuals, the First Minister of the province has to address the question as to whether his Cabinet is a collection of individuals or whether in the parliamentary tradition, which we have inherited and which we have always observed, there is a sense of responsibility that extends across the Cabinet and meets the needs of the people of Manitoba in a sense of collective responsibility. Now, if the members opposite in their Cabinet positions, the two Cabinet Ministers in this case, cannot live with that and the First Minister cannot live with that, then they should resign. They can be individuals. No one is saying that individuals can't go out and demonstrate against the United States, but the Minister of Natural Resources has no right to operate as an individual under our Parliamentary system as long as he's a Minister of the Crown. He cannot do that. That is the sense of honour and responsibility which the Minister of Natural Resources keeps trying to obscure.

He raises questions about individual freedom. No one is challenging individual freedom. If he wants to be an individual, let him get out of politics. He ran for public office and he took on the responsibility of representing people. He accepted an appointment to the Treasury Bench and he took an oath of office to the Crown. He accepted a collective responsibility in terms of addressing the needs of the Province of Manitoba and serving the people of Manitoba. He has

no right to operate as an individual unless he resigns that position and that is the challenge to the First Minister, if those two Cabinet Ministers, the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development have not got the courage and intestinal fortitude to face that issue, than that is the challenge to the First Minister, that is what lay behind my question in question period today. Is the First Minister going to demand the resignations of those two Ministers?

Well, Mr. Chairman, what we are faced with here, what we are dealing with here is parliamentary responsibility, honour, and the whole system which we have inherited and under which we live and that Minister does not have the right to go out tonight and just carry on in some sort of shenanigan down a back alley somewhere.

He has to understand that he represents a government. Whether he likes it or not, he represents a people, he represents a government, he represents a province and he represents a posture and he doesn't seem to understand that he brings dishonour and discredit to the people of Manitoba when he carries on that way, vis-a-vis our best friends and allies. That just brings discredit and dishonour on Manitobans and most Manitobans will be outraged at that kind of action. If he hasn't got that sense of understanding and knowledge and honour, no one can give it to him.

But I intend in these few words, Mr. Chairman, to let him know that we feel that way and most Manitobans feel that way and this issue is not over. This issue is not finished. We are very disappointed in both those Ministers for having done that, engaged in that kind of dishonourable, irresponsible conduct. If they want to do that, they're welcome to do it, but let them resign from the Cabinet. They cannot go out and represent me as a Manitoban and do it. I didn't give them the right to do that. Nobody gave them the right to do that. The Americans are our friends and allies. Let them stand up and speak to them honestly or let them stand up and speak to their First Minister honestly— (Interjection) — well, that's fine, but it takes a great deal of saying of it to get it through to the Minister of Natural Resources, obviously.

So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude — (Interjection) — that I come into this debate in considerable sorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We have heard every kind of rationalization and justification from that Minister opposite, both in question period and elsewhere, that could possibly be conceived. At every turn he concocts some kind of rationalization and justification for his actions. It is a clear case, Sir, a clear case of trying to defend the indefensible, and Manitobans will give him his answer on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I find it kind of sad to be pressured in a way into rising to speak on this issue.

Basically, the message that I would like to put across to the members of the Assembly is the reason that we, as individual members representing constituencies,

individual members of the Legislature, went last night to participate in a demonstration that was centered around an invasion last weekend, of which most of the news has been blacked out on, of former forces primarily ex-Somozas; of a regime that was kicked out of that country of Nicaragua some two years ago. One of the most vicious regimes in Central America with a death record that as other nations, Guatamala, is perhaps trying to emulate now, but which had a death rate and a lack of any kind of respect for the human being. It had a president in Somoza who left the country after the people had risen against him and forced him out. He left the country with somewhat - the estimates were close to \$4 billion.

That was a country, Mr. Chairman, that was in abject poverty. It is a country in a region that has had intervention from outside countries and unfortunately, in particular, our great neighbour to the south, of seeing the region of Latin America, Central American, the Caribbean, and South America in the term of Latin America, as being an area which they must control, that they must dictate what form of government those people are going to be subjected to.

Now, our party, as a social democratic party, has a history going back, as was related earlier, both by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, and others here as well, has been a party that has not been embarrassed, and has gone out of its way, I might say, to stand up for basic human dignity.

It appalls us as individuals to see a government that is so wilfully intent in the destruction of any kind of civil liberties and human rights of people throughout the Latin American continent. If anybody tends to rise, gets on their feet to protest the oppression of the government - and you can go through the governments, it's just like walking through pictures that you see of Latin America today in many of the regimes - is no different than what you saw in Spain under Franco, or in Nazi Germany, no difference; the goose steps, the military services throughout the country. You go there as a tourist, which I have not had the opportunity to do, but which I've talked to many many people that have. I've talked to people that have come out of regimes, particularly out of Chile, but I've also talked to a number of people from El Salvador and from neighbouring countries of even Brazil - not that close of a neighbour - but still under the same sorts of pressures by the government against the human beings living in their state.

We have this constant drive of the great nation which, really, I do not understand why it lowers itself to get itself tangled up in the miseries of those nations, and perpetuating the miseries of those nations, by going to incredible lengths to prop up governments which have no popular support, other than perhaps a few industrialists or the principle landowners, which is usually 2.5 percent to 3 percent of the population control in excess of 80 percent, and sometimes 90 percent of the arable land, where the peasants of those countries are employed for wages that are so darn small and so darn low that we can't even comprehend, yet they still have to try and eke out a bit of a living for their own families and for themselves to exist.

These people are being forced to climb the mountainsides trying to cultivate land because all the

good land of the country is taken up with cash crops, bananas, dessert crops — (Interjection) — taking the land that should be growing sustenance for the people is being used for the dessert economy of the rest of the world.

Be it here in Canada; be it in the U.S.; be it in Europe, the economy is there, the people are subjected, forced to work in many of the areas, in the mines. They have no choice about going down in the mines. If you don't go down in the mine, you're cut off your rations. In many instances, you're taken out and shot. It is like Siberia. It's much worse than Siberia, I would venture to say. Neither of them being states or circumstances which any of us - and I'd like to equate both sides of this House as decent human beings - both would want to live under, or would want to have anything to do in associating with those regimes.

That is why we, as individuals, go out and participate in a public demonstration in front of the U.S. Embassy, or the U.S. Consulate Office in this case. — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the Member for La Verendrye is bellyaching that I haven't been there. I don't have to go to a country to see, not only the news coverage, but to associate with people from those countries who have been lucky enough to escape and come to Canada. To tell me in Chile in a regime, which the Government of the United States directly one year after an elected government came to office, and they had the oldest history of democratic government in Latin America, some 80 years of democratically elected governments in Chile. The people made a mistake, the U.S. said. They left a communist as their president. One year, less one week, after that election, the U.S. — (Interjection) — motivated, supplied the military with the intelligence of how to take over, to destroy a democratic country. It is something that I, at that time, participated in demonstrations, in 1973. I'm proud to have shown myself at that point in time to stand up and be appalled at a democratically elected, very wealthy country in a northern hemisphere, sending its military might and its military expertise to overthrow a democratically elected government. They have maintained that status in moving into other areas as well. They are now trying in Honduras - it hasn't been a Guatemala or an El Salvador or a Nicaragua under Somoza, it hasn't been a regime with an incredible human rights record, but it's moving in that direction once again, following other countries.

The U.S. has put in a fellow by the name of Negroonte as the U.S. Ambassador to the country and that man, and the influence that he has had, has led to the militarization of the country like it's never seen before, the amount of military aid going into that country and in another country, the only democratically elected country of the whole Central American region, which is Costa Rica, which happens to be a nation without a military; it has no army.

In the past two years, the current U.S. administration has been tying any kind of aid to that country to then developing a military presence. By this perverted and twisted sense of economic and military subjugation of a nation, they make the nation dependent on them for the military. They make the nation dependent upon them for their aid because they have to take military assistance along with it, whether they want it or not, and clearly Cost Rica has not wanted it and yet, why

do they go after it. It is because of the border nations that Costa Rica and Honduras edge upon. El Salvador and Nicaragua, particularly, in both cases have the longest running borders between those nations.

We, as social democrats, as people of Christian upbringing, as people that have a touch of moral sense, Mr. Chairman, are proud of the examples that the Leader of the Opposition raised earlier this evening of J.S. Woodsworth as a Christian pacifist, as a socialist pacifist; that the man who stood up to be counted, didn't hide, stood up to be counted on issues both within our country and also external issues that he believed in very deeply. He, as we, believed in basic human dignity and when we see basic human dignity being eroded by the powers of other nations, we feel that we have a responsibility to stand and take a position to demonstrate to that nation, which is a friendly nation in the case of the United States and a nation which we cherish in most instances, to demonstrate to them clearly our disapproval of their movement once again into another military incursion, another regime or another attack, the same - and I stand to be corrected on this but I believe from the film, "Missing", and if the members opposite or the members of the House have not seen this film yet, I would plead with them to go and see this film.

I met the lady - not who starred in the film but who the film was about - just this past fall. The woman is a brilliant lady to say the least. She has her own computer company in New York City at the time being. She and her former husband had gone to Chile as young Americans, looking at a country which was still a democratic regime, which had just elected a new government and had taken an interest in the people and watched the people move away from a society which was controlled by a very small elite of the population and move toward land reform, move towards, as they have in Nicaragua - Nicaragua is the most demonstrable example of land reform in Latin America, of giving lands so the people can grow their sustenance crops so that they can fill their bellies, so they don't have to climb up on the edge of mountains to try and cultivate an area which in a first rainstorm wipes the soil off the mountain, fills their streams with sediment and destroys, not only the ecology of the area but the potential for that area to ever be a food-producing region.

They went as young Americans went to Chile to watch and to participate in, from a very great distance, mostly in writing and writing things back to the U.S. and doing some film work of the area. The U.S. Government was so appalled by their participation there that, according to the allegations of the film, which have not been denied, which the U.S. has not officially taken a stand on, they tried to blacklist that film like they have films made in Canada that are currently shown in the U.S., they actually appeared to have given the sanction of the Government of Chile to murder that young man and then they ended up burying him in a cement wall along with numerous other people they didn't want anyone to find. It sounds like Jimmy Hoffa. You bet it does.

It's a sick, sick, sick society that would participate in that sort of activity and the people of the United States have certainly been appalled with the revealing that the film has and that the book "Missing" gave

earlier, of the activities that took place at that time in Chile and are now taking place once again. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, taking place in Latin America, in the country of Nicaragua.

Last night many of you probably saw the news clips of the President of the United States asking for a couple of trillion dollars more money dedicated to military destruction and him stating and using examples, justifying the incursions of the United States into Latin America and showing, in the country of Grenada, a tiny little poverty-stricken island in the Caribbean, another state which has overthrown a leader by name of Eric Gairy who was more interested in UFOs than people, who stood by and watched his people die of starvation, subjugated them to torture, to imprisonment and one thing and another. He has had a government overthrown and you have a government there that is in many ways more democratic than our government or the government in the United States. They are trying to build an international airport. We've heard of this international airport for years ever since the New Jewel Movement has come into power.

Last night, the President of the United States showing this top secret information, showed a picture of this, calling it a strategic military airport in Granada. I mean, how could someone try and mislead their people to such a degree, that when a country has actually gone to them and asked for money to help in the construction of this airport, so that a jet plane, a 737 or a DC9 could land on that island for promotion of tourism, which they're trying to develop. They had the gall to try and mislead the rest of the world, or the American citizens in particular, in calling this a strategic Soviet military air force base. I just cannot fathom it.

As a matter of fact, the Government of Canada, along with democratic nations in Western Europe, have actually contributed funding towards this airport and yet, it is a Soviet airport. It is that kind of red-baiting, that kind of simple-mindedness that pervaded the United States, moved over into Canada in the 50s with the Joe McCarthy era and I'm afraid, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, that it continues to pervade the minds of the members opposite.

We have called last night's demonstration, and a good number of the people who were there were people who have come to Canada as a land of freedom; who have come to Canada from Latin America; who have come as refugees, a good number of them and they were there trying to demonstrate with their feelings towards the people in their own homelands; the Spanish speaking people and the Indian people of that hemisphere. Oh, it is the issue.

The Member for Fort Garry referred to these people as a rag-tag bunch of demonstrators. I do not consider people who are down demonstrating, who have seen and felt the oppression, in many cases have been tortured, and yet you call them a bunch of rag-tag demonstrators. These are people who were demonstrating, having felt the misery, having felt the pressures and family members, many of them, being executed in their so-called death squads which run rampant in those countries.

We, as J.S. Woodsworth, stood yesterday; I've stood several times starting back in Ottawa where I met and listened to the wife and the daughter of Mr. Allende, the assassinated President of Chile. I've heard and I've

studied with people from Chile; with people from nations throughout the Latin American region. I've been involved with CUSO, and talked to volunteers, seen numerous presentations. I happen to watch the news and don't turn the news off as soon as something comes on about Latin America and the incursions of the United States into the area.

Just a couple of months ago the program, The Journal, did a special documentary on the movements that were taking place along the borders of Nicaragua in Honduras. It was called Operation Big Pine. They sent some 1,600 U.S. troops, along with 5,000 Honduran troops in this basically a threat along the borders. The State of Nicaragua declared a state of emergency at the time and the state of emergency, I think, is still in place and has certainly been justified in their calling it.

With the latest incursions into the border of U.S. armed and trained troops, they've called in the United Nations as of yesterday, or earlier in this week, at least, for a full debate on the issue. I would implore that we in Canada, that our Government in Canada has enough strength and conviction as an independent nation to stand up and condemn those sorts of incursions of our neighbours to the south, in other countries.

We have to recognize - especially the autocratic governments - when they are overthrown that it takes some period of time to establish a democratic state in our eyes. I forget the exact quotes that Lincoln had used of the different stages of democracy and the different forms of democracy, and certainly in many of these nations where they - Nicaragua in particular - have a popular government; where they've raised the literacy rate up to some 87 percent from down around 50 percent when they took over; where they've been working and developing health services for their people, something that was never even dreamt of before, and isn't dreamt of in most Latin American countries.

They have brought a touch of common dignity to the people in recognizing the value of human life. Yet we, when we stand up to defend a struggling government, to defend a government that is trying to give some basic services to its people of food and of health, of education, for the first time that they've ever even contemplated; they've never even dreamt of being able to receive these sorts of things before. But because of a government that has more volunteers than it has permanent civil servants; that because a government that is trying its utmost to be able to develop their country; to give their people some touch of economic future that we take for granted in this country; that we, when we stand to defend these people, that we are condemned.

The Leader of the Opposition, earlier this evening, made the comment on J. S. Woodsworth and having respected him as a man who stood up for his principles, whether he agreed with his principles or not he respected the man for standing up for his principles. I would like to know why, Mr. Chairman, the members opposite in this House cannot give and cannot recognize that same basic goodness; that same basic desire in goodness in humanity that J. S. Woodsworth had and that our other predecessors in this party have had, why they cannot give us the same respect they gave that man. At least, they claim now that they would give that man an historical perspective. Why can they not give

that to the members; to the Minister of Natural Resources; to the Minister of Economic Development; to the other six members, I believe of us, who were out at that demonstration; of people having the fortitude to stand up and say, what you are doing is something wrong.

We should have respect for human dignity. You're the most powerful nation in the world. We expect you to lead the world, and to lead the world and lead the movement towards human dignity, not towards oppression. Why can the Member for Fort Garry not recognize, and the Leader of the Opposition who chose to leave soon after his speech, and other members as well, not recognize the basic goodness, the basic desire and the wishes that we have as individual human beings, for human dignity and the freedom and the people in Central America.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, in German we have an expression, "mit gegangen, mit gefangen, mit gehangen." I'll let Hansard translate that tomorrow if they will.

Mr. Chairman, let me once again remind honourable members opposite and let me, indeed, refer them to Hansard, Friday the 18, Page 882, when the matter of Interim Supply was introduced, and remind them that it is usual and customary to introduce this same bill at the same time and that we then accommodated the government. Aside from the Minister taking a somewhat undue length of time in speaking to his own Interim Supply Bill, the members will note by pursuing Hansard that it was we who accommodated them in passing it into first reading stage, in and out of Committee, into second reading stage and we would have done the same as has, in fact, been the practice in this House with this bill, unlike, I might remind honourable members opposite, when they were opposition, they took seven days to debate on this particular bill at this stage. So if any members opposite feel hard pressed or put upon because some time is taken at this time, let them check the records, Mr. Chairman. Again, if out of their wilfulness they will not accept any direction or any attempt to learn how to operate in this House then, of course, they will have to suffer the consequences from time to time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the honourable member who just spoke, I say this quietly, sincerely to him, I believe he means every word that he says. I want him to believe that it gave me no comfort, in fact, just heightened my concern and my very great concern about what this whole debate is all about. I say that very sincerely to the Honourable Member for Inkster. Mr. Chairman, I won't describe or talk the litany that could well be put on the record about the matter of oppressed peoples around the globe, but let me simply and flatly state that if you put together all the military dictatorships of the right, all the holy wars that were fought for different causes, all the pestilence that has ever been visited on this earth and all the wars for nationalistic reasons that have been visited on this earth, they would not match up to 50 years of oppression that the Marxist system of government has imposed

on the people on this planet Earth during the last 50 years. Mr. Chairman, I say that flatly, international tribunals have recorded that millions, countless millions, of people . . . Mr. Chairman, I'm a first-generation Canadian. By the admission of the then leader of that country in peacetime, as a result of government policy, they were prepared to see through famine and other means, the wiping out of some 20 million of people, a whole class, the landed peasants, the "kulaks" as they called them - that was done in peacetime, not in war. Mr. Chairman, the honourable members don't want to refer to that.

Mr. Chairman, as I said to you, I'm not going to recite that litany of oppression and horror that could be recited at this time in response to the appeal, in response to the speech just made by the Honourable Member for Inkster. What probably bothers me the most about the exchange in the last little while on this issue was the earlier exchange with the intervention of the Minister of Cultural Affairs, a relationship was put together between the two flags - the USSR flag and the United States flag. The impression distinctly coming to us from this side of the House, well, okay so flag-burning isn't the best of manners at any time, but so what? A USSR flag was burned; an American flag was burned. Mr. Chairman, if members opposite don't understand the difference between those two flags then, of course, they've missed the whole purport of why we're upset on this side of the House and why I know for sure a vast majority of Manitobans are upset as I know they will be upset when I get my video cassette tape recording of the demonstration, copies of which I will make available to my colleagues because I know my people at my meetings will want to see how Ministers of their government conduct themselves as their representatives, as the representatives of the people of Manitoba. Yes, they will want to see that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let me speak about the two flags a little bit. It was the same flag that the Minister of Cultural Affairs introduced into the debate that marched along only from the other side along with the Nazi swastika, when they decided, those two socialist dictators, to carve up Poland. It was only . . . yes, this party was called the Nationale Sozialistes Arbeiten Partei of Deutschland . . . Certainly, he called himself a socialist. It was only when there was a falling out between those two vicious dictators, that members of the left, Communist Party in Canada, all of a sudden found it patriotic to engage in that war, Mr. Chairman. It was the hammer and sickle of the Soviet Union that fluttered from the tanks as they rode through the streets of Budapest in Hungary in 1956, when that nation tried valiantly for some expression of freedom that the Member for Inkster spoke so eloquently about just a few moments ago. We know precious little, I might say, and we in the west did precious little, all of us did precious little. We opened up our doors to many fine Hungarian citizens to this country who are making contributions to this country. Mr. Chairman, it was the same hammer and sickle flag that fluttered from the tanks that rolled through the streets of Prague in 1968, that put out that brief spring of liberal thought in that country even under its circumstance, even though they didn't want to change their system of government, their communist system of government, they simply wanted

to be a little freer, wanted to allow for a little bit of individual expression of hope and of ambition.

Mr. Chairman, I find it extremely worrisome when members opposite, when a Minister of the Crown opposite, cannot see the difference between the American flag and the flag of the USSR. Mr. Chairman, I can't recall any President of the United States ever addressing an international body forcibly, as Krushchev did, taking his shoe off to make the point, to tell the world, "We will bury you in 20 or 30 years." I can't recall even that so-called militant President Reagan now making any territorial expressions that could in any way be interpreted of wishing to acquire, extend, more territorial control for and by the United States. But, Mr. Chairman, we have, certainly of our generation, decades of watching that happen by the government that is represented by the flag of the USSR.

Mr. Chairman, I don't deny; I won't get into an argument with members opposite when they tell us about the fact that, yes, in Cuba children are better clothed or they are indeed getting better education than they perhaps had under Batista. I don't deny that at all, that perhaps some conditions can be improved in some of the other countries under that form of government, but I suppose that's what really separates them from us and that's the most worrisome thing of all. Does any member here remember the last time there was an election, a free election in Cuba? Does any member here suggest that there's going to be an election in Nicaragua? Mr. Chairman, when there are elections as there were in El Salvadore under difficult conditions, maybe perhaps not acceptable to honourable members opposite but, you know, that's the problem with Marxism. It has within it the methodology of violence if it cannot pursue its aims in a peaceful way, and that's acceptable to everyone; that's federal. Yes, there's very little difference between them. That's why I lump Stalin and Hitler in the same camp but, Mr. Chairman, we don't want to operate under that system. We don't ever want to operate under the system that is operating now in Cuba. Do we? I am asking a rhetorical question.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that's seems to be a point that is being totally missed opposite. Because, Mr. Chairman, I will say to you that in the long pull, the free unfettered spirit, the importance of the individual in society far outweighs the availability of shoes or the need for better clothing or the need for better food. History has proven that, Mr. Chairman. So when honourable members opposite suggest to me that because a USSR flag was burnt by a group of people who are facing serious oppression right now, that have the largest occupying army in their midst, speaking about Poland - this is 1983 - and the government cannot move one way or another without getting the approval of the USSR . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. ENNS: That's right . . .

A MEMBER: Were you there to demonstrate against them?

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, I was; oh yes, I was. I was there. Well, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it's true that when we

attend demonstrations, we do not find it necessary to carry placards, or we do not find it necessary to burn flags. We certainly don't find it necessary to handle ourselves and behave and portray ourselves in the manner and way that honourable members do when they attend these kinds of demonstrations.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a supply bill. We are talking about the effects that our relationship with the United States has on our economy, and that argument seems to have absolutely no consideration by members opposite. The members want to rail and rant about doing our own thing and, of course, we'll do our own thing, but let's not fool ourselves for one moment about the importance of the relationship between our two countries. Just the other day, action taken by the American farmers to voluntarily reduce their grain acreage has put more money into the hands of Manitoba farmers than any government program has in the last five or six months. The former Minister of Agriculture has acknowledged that. That is a voluntary action taken by responsible American farmers to help with the supply situation in grains, and this is happening at the time when our Minister of Natural Resources is lecturing American farmers how to look after their affairs.

Mr. Chairman, we in Manitoba have so many issues that we need the co-operation of the Americans with. I simply can't understand the irresponsible behaviour of the members of this government in their actions in the last 24 hours. I simply can't understand it. Mr. Chairman, the honourable member speaks - and I know there are some here that I suppose are here because of the Vietnam situation - well, I will make that bald statement to them that despite the horrors of a decade of war in Vietnam, the casualty figures inflicted during those ten years pales into insignificance with what's happened since the American withdrawal from Vietnam. Genocide practised in Kumpachia where hundreds and thousands of people were layered with leaves put in-between so that they would rot faster and they could be used as fertilizer. That all happened after the American withdrawal from South East Asia.

If we want to measure in terms of human lives, if we want to measure in terms of human suffering, then let's have some fairness in balancing the scale. Again, I believe that for the aid that the North Vietnam received in their struggle against the south, they are now paying in human flesh. I believe reports, again by responsible international tribunals, that they are offering up some - I don't know, I don't want to use the wrong figures - many thousands of Vietnamese labourers to work on the natural pipeline that is currently being constructed in Russia. That kind of trade in human flesh, of course, doesn't bother the sensibilities of the Member for Inkster. That doesn't bother him at all because I don't find him demonstrating about it. I don't find him raising his voice about it. I don't hear anybody . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please.
The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to have the Member for Lakeside imputing values that he may have in his perverted mind towards how I may perceive things of governments around the world repressing

human rights and civil dignity and civil liberties and human dignity. I have throughout my life condemned them; I shall continue. I don't care if a government is left or right. I see no difference to the Member for Lakeside who addressed this; I see absolutely no difference at all towards a left-wing reactionary and fascist state or a right-wing fascist state. They're both the same to me, whether one calls himself a democratic state, and the other calls himself a communist state or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, again it's such a noble sentiment expressed, except that it is not truthful, or his reaction to it is not truthful, by any measure that you want to take. On a scale of 1 to 10, if you wanted to talk about oppression as exercised by the two super powers. Then, the U.S. would come in at maybe .8 or 1 and the Russians at 14 and 15 - by any measure.

If he even suggests that perhaps I'm right, then I should at least be hearing him speaking out against communist oppression 14 times before I hear him speaking out against American oppression. I'm not suggesting there isn't American oppression, but not anywhere near this kind.

The organizers, that's not the game. This is the viciousness, Mr. Chairman, of the kind of propaganda we're facing. They're saying, it's an even ballgame. Americans are bad, the Russians are bad. That is not the case, Mr. Chairman. There is not another nation in this world, there's not another superpower in this world that has shown its generosity in a more demonstrable way at any time in man's living history, that has been more benevolent to its foes after vanquishing them in conquest, wars that they did not start. I remind you that the American nation in both instances in our living memory, entered the wars lately; had to be pushed, dragged, squealing in to help the cause of freedom in this world. It happened in the First World War; they didn't enter till 1917, after three years of vicious conflict. It didn't happen in the Second World War until they were attacked at Pearl Harbour, despite the tremendous suffering that was going on in Europe under the heels of Nazism. Mr. Chairman, where does this talk emanate from that America is an aggressive, warlike nation?

The fact that it has been pushed, you might say, into the role of world leadership in defending the freedoms of free-thinking people; the fact that it has been asked to help certain governments, not necessarily always the kind of governments that we would like to have or we would support, but that is still a tremendous difference from the kind of action that is taking place right now in Afghanistan.

In this whole debate, I heard 30 minutes of discussion about the oppression in Central America or in other parts of the world, but we have right now, 200,000 troops, by their own admission, in Afghanistan in one of the brashest, most callous examples of USSR attacking a relatively defenseless neighbour in Afghanistan. "Afghanistan" has not crossed the lips of any members opposite.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is the point that I say my leader made rather eloquently tonight. There is at least

within the Conservative party, a very fundamental belief in the kind of freedoms that parliamentary democracy means to us. There's a very strong belief in the kind of obligations that places on those who serve that system; our Ministers. Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no doubt in our mind that the kind of governments that are acceptable to members opposite are not acceptable to us, even if it means better clothes, or better shoes, or better schools for the short period.

While those Cuban children are better dressed, 10,000, 12,000, 15,000 surrogate soldiers are fighting Russia's wars in Africa as a pricetag for part of that. That kind of trading in human flesh again, is acceptable to honourable members opposite. It isn't acceptable to us.

Well, Mr. Chairman, in this debate we've had a wide-ranging debate. We've had a long list of oppressive acts that are being carried out by the American Government. I've yet to find from any members opposite, a recognition of who the real and true oppressor is. I have no trouble agreeing with President Reagan's flat and simple statement that international communism is evil. You gentleman have, you obviously have. That's fair game. That's what this debate is bringing out. International communism is evil, period.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, yes, I have no trouble with that.

MR. H. ENNS: Never mind conditioning it, I'm talking now about international communism. It is evil, and when the President of the United States says so, I believe him. It's that simple.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I must tell honourable members opposite, those of you who are true social democrats - I believe there are some - that as my leader pointed out in using the example of the Labour Party in Britain, danger to your party and the future of your party lies more seriously within your own group than it does from us, quite frankly. Your future existence as an acceptable political entity and a political party in the Province of Manitoba is endangered, has been put in jeopardy by the actions that too many of your members took in the last 24 hours.

Well, Mr. Chairman, time will tell. But I know one thing, that we can hardly expect the kind of co-operation from our immediate American friends when they see the government Ministers acting in this fashion - and we have so many pressing issues that we need their co-operation on.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time spent on raising this issue has been extremely worthwhile. It's not very often that we get the opportunity to debate some of these fundamental issues. The honourable members try to bring in that kind of debate, I suppose, with that resolution on "This Planet Earth." You know, a chance to bash the Yankees again.

So, from our point of view, all of this couldn't come in a more timely progression of events, denying the Kinsmen Service Club in the Province of Manitoba and Canada a hospitality grant that they should be entitled to, but giving it to the Marxists; parading in front of the U.S. Consulate and allowing yourself to present while their flag is being burned.

They have a cumulative effect out on the general population; a little bit like the Chinese water torture

treatment - drip, drip, drip at a time. I only welcome the opportunities that all members opposite, such as the Minister of Cultural Affairs, when they exposed themselves by equating the American flag to that of the hammer and sickle of the USSR. My people in my constituency will understand the difference.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the Member for Lakeside mentioned in his remarks, it's not very often in this Legislature that we get an opportunity to speak on a subject that is close to many of us and is dear to the hearts of many of us. I guess one of the things that prompts me to speak in this particular debate is the growing concern that I have had and many of my colleagues have had over the last number of years, with the American-bashing syndrome that has gripped the Canadian people and in particular, Mr. Chairman, the American-bashing syndrome which has really come to a head, and we've seen it come to a head in the last couple of days.

Mr. Chairman, what prompts me to speak here today is the fact that even the organizer of the particular function really didn't know what it was all about. We had members of the NDP caucus and we had two Cabinet Ministers, including the Deputy Minister, at a protest, Mr. Chairman; the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Economic Development who is trying to attract industry to this province, at a demonstration in front of the U.S. Embassy where the organizer said - it's not my words - but the organizer conceded in an interview that there was absolutely no proof at the moment of U.S. involvement in military action. He says, "I don't know, it's a protest against the invasion of Nicaragua. We probably could have protested in front of Eaton's." Mr. Chairman, what was the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister in charge of Economic Development doing protesting in front of the U.S. Embassy, U.S.-bashing, when the organizer himself admits that they could have been protesting in front of Eaton's? What were the members opposite doing? And this is the concern that many of the people in my area are starting to have about this particular government. First of all, they give the Marxists \$7,200 and then you see a whole bunch of NDP members in front of the U.S. Embassy, the organizer doesn't even know what they're doing there and they're involved in burning U.S. flags.

A MEMBER: Who is? Who's involved in burning flags?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, at the same demonstration, the organizer of the event - if you want to call it that, or the fiasco - says that they might as well have protested in front of Eaton's. There they are, the organizer and the people around him including the Cabinet Ministers and several of the members opposite, involved in a demonstration and they don't really know what it's all about. I guess to put it quite bluntly, the Member for Inkster put his finger on it, it's this business - in the sports world we call it armchair quarterbacking - but we have here is a classic case of armchair international experts. The members opposite suddenly

know what ails the society outside of our jurisdiction and outside of our boundaries. The Member for Inkster admitted he'd never been in any of these countries.

Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you I've been in most of these countries; I've been there and I don't profess to know what the ins and outs of the politics of those countries are. But let me tell you, here you have a member who sits in this Legislature; has enough to eat; has a car to drive; has a warm, comfortable home and he can sit there very piously and say all these beautiful things and do American-bashing.

Well I want to tell him something, that the constituency I represent versus his, gives more per capita to alleviate the suffering and pains of the Third World countries than his ever has or ever will. My people, through different organizations in my riding, even though he might consider them "capitalistic pigs" in his terminology, give more to help their fellow man than he has ever given.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would request that the member withdraw that comment and identify who, in his constituency, if he's referring to the Mennonite Central Committee as "capitalist pigs" - that's his words; they are not my words. I, as a matter of fact, give money to the Mennonite Central Committee of Manitoba and I shall continue to, because that is an organization that stands up in El Salvador to be counted, stands up on the issues in Nicaragua to be counted to assist those people and has been very very active working in those countries trying to bring a touch of dignity to the people. I wish the man who claims to be their representative had half the touch of dignity the organizers do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's interesting to note, and I'm happy that the member is donating to that group because the success of MCC has not been American-bashing, Nicaragua government-bashing. The success of MCC, dating back to the Twenties has been — (Interjection) —

MR. D. SCOTT: Why are you bashing?

MR. R. BANMAN: I'm not bashing, Mr. Chairman, and the Member for Inkster has to realize the difference. The difference is that those people have helped people in need. They have helped them in need. They haven't gone in there and said, you've got to have this type of government; it's bad what these people are doing, it's bad what they're doing. They have said to the people, we are there to help you; you are underprivileged; you have problems; there is a disaster and we will help you. The success of that particular group has been that any government of any political stripe, whether left, right, middle or whatever has let that particular group in because they have not attacked its Government of the Day. They have gone out to help those people. What the member has done here today, in his speech, the Member for Inkster, is he has done a beautiful job of bashing the Americans again and they're developing a beautiful technique.

Mr. Chairman, all we have to do is look at what has happened in a number of countries where the so-called

leaders of the day were overthrown by what was supposed to be a new regime that was going to bring new light, and need we talk about any other country than Iran. The Shah was a terrible man. The persecution, the torture; Amnesty International went in and condemned the Shah. What a terrible thing was happening, the Americans were being held hostage while the Americans had supported the Shah. What a terrible thing to do.

Now the reports are coming out. The slaughter between Iran and Iraq and the internal strife in Iran far outstrips anything that the Shah ever did. And do we see anything on TV about it? Do we hear the members opposite complaining about it? No we don't, Mr. Chairman, because it's not fashionable; it's not American-bashing; the Americans are out of it. What's happening in Nigeria? Terrible things are happening there. Do we hear anything from the members opposite? No.

And the point made by the Member for Inkster is well taken. For every one indiscretion that the United States is involved in, you've got at least 14 involved by the communists countries. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I have to correct that, the Member for Inkster would never do that, not the current member. The Member for Lakeside said that and I have to agree with him on that, because what we have seen over the last little while, and yesterday highlighted the thing in a beautiful way, because the people of Manitoba have suddenly realized what we're faced with over here. We are dealing with a group of individuals who are not being responsible to the people of Manitoba and carrying out the wishes of the majority of the people in Manitoba.

My constituents don't want to give the Marxists \$7,000; they don't want to see their Deputy Premier in front of a blow-horn in front of the U.S. Embassy protesting at something which even the organizer doesn't really know what they're talking about. They don't want to see this government U.S. bashing constantly. I want to say to the members opposite that I am, in a way, somewhat relieved that this particular thing happened yesterday because it has allowed us to highlight the particular problem that this particular government has.

MR. H. ENNS: True colors come out.

MR. R. BANMAN: That's right, Mr. Chairman, their true colours have been shown.

A MEMBER: And the ineptness of their House Leader gave us the opportunity.

MR. R. BANMAN: The thing that I want to close with, Mr. Chairman, is that the members opposite talk about freedom, talk about liberty, they talk about all the wonderful things that they would like to see happen. They believe that socialism, Mr. Chairman, is social conscience; they equate socialism with social conscience. Well, I want to tell you that the area that I represent is not confusing that terminology, they might have hoodwinked a lot of people in this province into believing that socialism is social conscience, but I want to tell them that the area that I represent realizes what socialism really is, where it leads inevitably, and if you

talk about social conscience I challenge any members opposite to stack up the social conscience in their particular ridings to mine.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: After 40 years in Sweden.

MR. R. BANMAN: Social Conscience does not mean socialism and I know the people of Manitoba, with the example of the \$7000 to the Marxists and the anti-U.S. for virtually no reason at all, yesterday, highlighted by the two Ministers and the members opposite who were involved, will again demonstrate to the people of Manitoba that this particular government, in its dealings with the people, is not in a position to deal with them fairly, forthrightly, in a way that most of the people want them to deal with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this particular bill, or to take the opportunity to speak, and I will not cover some of the ground that my colleagues have covered, particularly, dealing with the . . .

MR. H. ENNS: Go right ahead, it's worth repeating, every word of it.

MR. J. DOWNEY: . . . reason why we are debating it, the fact that the House has been so terribly unorganized by the Government House Leader and the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we will be sitting here for several months and as we sit here there will be, I'm sure, many opportunities to discuss and debate the inability of this government to govern and to control and to manage the affairs of this Assembly which is the eye of the overall democratic system in this province.

On this particular issue, Mr. Chairman, I want to open my comments by summing it up. From how I've seen it is that the present government that we have in the Province of Manitoba feel that there is a certain need at a certain time to use people to their advantage, like our neighbours the United States, when it's a matter of borrowing funds from them, whether it's a matter of selling products to them, whether they are skills, whether they be manufactured goods, whether they be agricultural commodities or, Mr. Chairman, when it's a matter of needing to take a kick at someone in society who does not believe in the same philosophical approach as they do, that there's a golden opportunity to just have a good swing at them and that they feel, because they're sitting in the middle of Manitoba in the Legislative Assembly, that noone outside this Assembly pays that much attention to them when they do take a swing at them by burning the American flag in front of the U.S. Embassy, or being a part of a group that would participate in such activist organization against a friendly nation.

Mr. Chairman, where do I come from? I come from the constituency, as my colleague from Turtle Mountain does, that borders on the United States. Mr. Chairman, I come from a constituency where the United States of America, if it hadn't been for the doctors and nurses that were in the United States of America a lot of our children would not have been alive today who were born in the southwest corner of the province because

there wasn't the medical services provided in Canada. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I feel so deeply about this because I have many members of my family who are Americans and they're proud people. I have a brother, Mr. Chairman, who was born in the United States of America. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud, in fact, that I have friends, such as the people of the United States.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the constituency that I represent I not only have friends and relations on both sides of the border, but I have good constituents who have moved up from the United States and have become a part of my constituency. What do they look at in this Legislative Assembly, a part of an Assembly that I am part of; they don't really identify us as party politicians in Canada, as we are, compared to what they have in the States. They don't identify us, Mr. Chairman, precisely as that; they identify this as the governing unit for the Province of Manitoba, that I am implicated by what the government does because I am one of those government people.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have to go home and face people whose homeland is the United States of America and these people were associated with a group of activists that burned the American flag right here in this city. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's what I have to face when I go home. I'll tell you something else, Mr. Chairman, that annually in my constituency there is an organization known as the Pioneer Picnic Organization and there is a small park on a creek where people from both sides of the border join, and above the gateway of that park, Mr. Chairman, are two flags, one Canadian flag and one American flag. Every sports day that you go to in the southern fringe of this country there are two flags flying, an American and a Canadian flag. It's the same thing on the other side of the border, but because these people were associated with a group who would burn their pride and their flag and their love for their country have now put me to shame. Yes, as a Manitoban and a Canadian I am shamed by their actions. I have to face that, Mr. Chairman, and I feel very personal about this, I really do. I've sat here and listened to all the arguments and all the compassion that we have for South America and all those poor people. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, and it's been pointed out many times that there are many more people on this side concerned about hungry and poor and weak children and starving people than there ever was on that side because we believe, Mr. Chairman, it is our responsibility to do it as personal individuals, not the instrument of government doing it through control mechanisms, because you don't grow food with government, you grow food by desire and the will of the people to do it for one another, and see that it's distributed through a system that has proven that it can work.

Mr. Chairman, that's what we're talking about; we're talking about what motivates people and what provides that kind of social care that we all care so much about. I am disgusted with the — (Interjection) — . . . from the members opposite, because it's nothing more than political posturing for the public. Take a kick at the U.S. today so we can pretend we're helping South America tomorrow. Take a kick at them today because we want to help somebody else.

There is some other thing that I have to bring up at this point, Mr. Chairman. Recently at the Outlook

Conference in Manitoba, this Minister of Agriculture thought it was fair game to take a political swipe at the U.S. Government because they asked Canada to try and restrict some of the supplies of grain going into the trade so that it would help increase the world price. But, what did this Minister of Agriculture tell the United States people? He said, tell them to mind their own business; we don't want to talk to them; they can't tell us what to do. That's what he said. It's headlined in the Brandon Sun. That's precisely what he said. He said, tell them to mind their own business. It was cheap politics. But what happened today? Is the Minister of Agriculture going to stand up and say, these damn Yankees, they've put the price of our grain up because they restricted their acreage by some one third; by 83 million acres they reduced their acreage. The price of our grain has increased because they have spent money and have cut back. That's helping Canadians. It's helping Manitoba farmers. His colleagues - and I ask him - does he associate himself with the Minister of Natural Resources and the Deputy Premier who were a part of an organization that burnt a flag in front of the American Embassy last night? Does he associate himself with his Cabinet colleagues? Because it has been pretty well pointed out by my colleagues what it means when you sign an oath. Is he a member of that Cabinet? Is he associated with them or is he not?

He sits there and says, hmm. Mr. Chairman, again he's one of those political posturers who, when it's convenient to take a swipe at the Americans, he does so. If it's convenient for his own political gain, he takes a swipe at them. Well, I would have hoped, Mr. Chairman, that he's man enough to stand up and say that the policies that have been recently introduced, the Product In Kind Program that has just been introduced by the United States has helped the Manitoba farmers through the price increase in their grains. I hope he's man enough to stand up and say it.

Mr. Chairman, there's another issue that I want to lay before this Assembly. Recently, I sent a letter to the First Minister of this province, asking that he participate with the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Governor of North Dakota in a committee, a citizens committee or a governmental committee, to deal with issues that can be dealt with on a one-on-one basis that affect the three jurisdictions. I know it's national and I know it's the United States Government that should deal with the Canadian Government in the larger sense, but on an informal basis, I asked him and requested him and I also copied a letter to the Saskatchewan Premier and to the Governor of the State of North Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, one of the specific issues that I wanted to have dealt with was the flood problems on the Souris River, the sewage dumps that come out of Minot, and I thought it was a good opportunity to work with the two jurisdictions, and if Manitoba would participate through the Minister of Natural Resources who went and participated with an organization or a group that burnt the American flag last night in front of the American Embassy because waters within his jurisdiction - that somebody could participate in that committee.

Yesterday I received a phone call, Mr. Chairman, that there is now legislation in the United States in North

Dakota, and Saskatchewan, that is accommodating those two jurisdictions and they are chaired by the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Governor of North Dakota. The state representative from just across the border from me who I know very well, Orland Hanson, phoned me and asked me if I would encourage the Premier of Manitoba and ask him again to participate in this committee so that we could resolve some of the difficulties. I haven't had an opportunity to do so yet, but as well, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there is a reluctance to phone a Premier of a province, whose Cabinet members burn the American flag in front of their Embassy are a part of that group. Wouldn't you feel reluctant to do that with somebody who insisted on the kinds of activities that you did?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: I rise on a point of privilege. Mr. Chairman, I just heard the Honourable Member for Arthur accuse Cabinet Members on this side who burnt the American flag in front of the American Embassy. I ask the member to withdraw the statement because the statement is not factual, Mr. Chairman. If he has those facts, let him bring them forward.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem in making it very clear that it was members of this Premier's Cabinet were a member of a group that burnt the American flag. I will withdraw what I said. I am correcting it and I am saying that it was his Cabinet members that were a member of a group that burnt the American flag in front of the Embassy. I think that the Governor, and I am talking about the Governor of the State of North Dakota . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the matter of privilege once again. I asked the member to inform this House which members of Cabinet were members of this group that he's talking about.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it's on the record and it's been on the record. The Minister of Natural Resources, the Minister of Economic Development, we know were part of that group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I would like it on the record that I attended a demonstration. At no time did I see an American flag, let alone seeing one being burnt. I would never do such a thing. I don't think it's an appropriate way to demonstrate. I regret that it occurred, but I do not feel responsible for what an individual citizen chose to do.

I repeat, I never saw an American flag, let alone saw one burnt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I was told earlier today by the - I don't think there's any secret that there was a flag burnt. The Minister of Natural Resources saw it. I again repeat what I said, and what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is quite accurate. It took place last night at the American Embassy. There was an American flag burnt, of which there is reported that during that particular happening members of this Provincial Cabinet were present, were part of that group that were demonstrating.

Mr. Chairman, let me continue. This First Minister was going to be and is invited to participate in that working group with Saskatchewan and North Dakota. I am somewhat reluctant and embarrassed to tell the Governor of the State of North Dakota what has happened and recommend that I don't think, unless there is a formal apology comes from this Premier, they should be involved in that kind of a relationship. How can we, Mr. Chairman, have a working relationship that is of any meaning when this group of people demean the people of the United States and belittle them? Mr. Chairman, it cannot be a good working relationship.

I, as well, Mr. Chairman, was invited to speak to a group of people in Minot, North Dakota, on the 9th of April, and I was pleased to be able to at one point consider going. Today, Mr. Chairman, I have to reconsider my desire to go to that particular country and be as proud a Canadian as I should be for those actions that were taken by people from this same Legislative Assembly that I sit in, Mr. Chairman. I'm ashamed. I'll have to give it a lot of thought, Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to do that. I think the worst thing that we could do better ourselves and better our relationship, is to continue to take a cheap swipe, for political purposes or other purposes, at people who have given us the kind of trade relationship we've had; given us the kind of backup support we've needed in our economic activities; 220,000,000 people whom we have been selling to for the last hundred years, and these people want to keep throwing dirt at them. Throwing dirt at them is what they're doing, Mr. Chairman. It has to stop.

I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, we won't have to worry about stopping it on this side. It'll dry up pretty quick. They'll let us know where we're at. They'll let us know pretty darn quick where we're at. These people over here think we have a bad economy right now. Well, just wait until they take some change of attitudes toward purchasing goods, buses or whatever they are from Manitoba.

Again, the First Minister goes to California and he talks about great trade relationship and what a wonderful people they are down there. What kind of people do we have governing Manitoba, when they can do that, Mr. Chairman? I hope he comes to this House. I challenge the Premier of Manitoba to come to this House and give a full explanatory reason why his caucus members were doing such a thing and openly apologize to the people of the United States. If he doesn't, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly recommend that a resolution go from this side that requests it, because I think it's imperative if we're ever going to get back on friendly relationship; so we can stop the Garrison Dam; so we can develop the water systems between the two countries that are flooding us from the Minot sewage lagoons; that we can have a co-operative relationship.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are some things that can be done that I think are positive. But we can't if we continue to throw dirt in those people's faces if we want to co-operate with. It is just plain cheap politics and it doesn't wash.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that in the last two weeks what this government has done, has given us more support in getting re-elected in the next election in the Province of Manitoba than anything else. If they continue to do so, Mr. Chairman, we will have to do nothing but continue to display the kind of irresponsible actions that they are taking, whether it's dealing with the people of Manitoba and the economy of Manitoba, or the relationships that we're having with the United States of America.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they see the light and do apologize to those people whom they are going to depend on so heavily. The Minister of Finance the other night admitted that part of the reason for some of the recovery that could be coming is because of the Reagan policies in the United States. That's what he said, Mr. Chairman. It came right down to it. He had to admit some of the policies were going to help our economic recovery.

Well, Mr. Chairman, you don't help your relationship with somebody by kicking them in the shins every time you have a chance just to make cheap political tricks. That's what they've been doing, Mr. Chairman. I fully deplore anybody that would associate themselves with the burning of any flag in front of any embassy in this country, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Point of order. The honourable member is suggesting that members of this caucus who were present associated themselves with the burning. In that word, he's suggesting that it was condoned or approved by members of this caucus who were there. That is not the case and he knows that, because we have stated categorically that we did not approve. As a matter of fact, we are troubled by it, and we are opposed to that sort of conduct. We've made that clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Natural Resources has once again, through his ineptitude, caused us to stay here for a little while longer. — (Interjection) — I am addressing the matter before the House, in case the Member for Inkster wants to listen.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard very little justification for why the government caucus was at that demonstration last night. No one has offered the slightest . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: I don't have to justify anything to you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The MLA for Wolseley says she doesn't have to justify anything to me, and I assume to my colleagues. She may be absolutely right. She has to justify to the people of Manitoba why the Minister of Natural Resources and the Deputy Premier of this

province, and the Deputy Premier was there addressing that demonstration, why they were there in a role, that despite all their protestations, will be conceived as a role and a position of the Government of Manitoba. Not one soul on that side has given us one single justification for why they were there.

The Member for Inkster tried to justify it as being a protest against aggression and oppression, etc., etc., etc. But he did not justify in one word, one idea, in one single word he said, he didn't justify why the demonstration was in front of the United States Consulate. Why was the demonstration in front of the United States Consulate — (Interjection) — Now, from his seat, the MLA for Inkster says, it was because the United States . . .

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

MR. D. SCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I made it very clear in my statement to the House earlier this evening, that the reason we were in front of there, was protesting the U.S. implications in the invasion of Nicaragua; of the training that took place just a couple of months previous, and has gone on continuously ever since, I believe his name is John Negrebonte, was appointed as the Ambassador in Honduras; of activating Honduran troops, the Government of Honduras; of developing a military force in Costa Rica, which has never had a military force in recent history and the Operation Big Pine. I made these things very clear. I do not know what is wrong with the Member for Pembina in his thick head that he cannot accept that when people go to demonstrate or to express our point of disagreement with another nation in their aggressive role in creating revolution and creating murder and creating a continuation of oppression in a country, instead of letting that country take its own order; it's own form of government; why they have to be continually interfering.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The MLA for Inkster is our pride and joy in this House, because through his inherent stupidity, he always puts his foot in his mouth and embarrasses the government.

Mr. Chairman, we were under the impression here that this whole demonstration and the participation and the representation by the Deputy Premier of the Province of Manitoba on behalf of the NDP caucus as a formal body in the Government of Manitoba were there. We were under the naive impression up until this last couple of minutes that they were there simply as a place to gather, not as a protest against the U.S. — it just so happened it was in front of the Consulate. We also believe that they were there to demonstrate against the oppression of people in Nicaragua. But the Member for Inkster says they were there to protest specifically against the United States hence the justification for that demonstrator, him being part of it, burning the flag of the United States. Now it all comes out. It's because the United States are, without doubt, supplying arms, etc., etc., according to the Member for Inkster. Yet the organizer of the demonstration, one Casper Shade, said, "There is absolutely no proof at the moment of U.S. involvement in the military action." That's the end of the quote.

But yet the Member for Inkster has knowledge that no one else has, and what turned out to be just an ordinary demonstration against oppression has turned into American-bashing, to more demonstration by the NDP of their disdain and hatred for the American public and, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out earlier, that presents some problems for the people opposite in their negotiations on Garrison, in their negotiations on future trade, tourism with the Americans - it gives them a lot of problems.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, what baffles me even more is I can't understand, I just can't conceive of the circumstance of a person growing up in a nation, being fed and clothed by the wealth of that nation, being educated by the wealth of that nation, being given freedom in a democracy of that nation in which they were born, to develop the kind of hatred that some of the ex-patriot American MLAs of this House have for the United States. I can't conceive of the hatred they hold for the country in which they were born, raised and educated. I can't conceive of what kind of a mindset it would take to develop that kind of hatred.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Chairman, as I look around me I'm not too sure how many others might have been born in the United States. I think I am the only one and I regret that the member who was speaking is impugning something to me that certainly does not exist. I am very proud of my native land; I love that land; my parents and my family still live in that land. They share my feelings. They chose their way to fight the kind of oppression that we are speaking about tonight, I chose mine.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then I'm certainly pleased to hear from one ex-patriot member of the New Democratic Government. Maybe we'll hear from others as time goes on. Now . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: What were they, Minister of Agriculture, what were they? Now, I take it by the statements of the Minister of Labour that she has now completely disassociated herself with the caucus decision that was made.

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Order please.

MR. P. EYLER: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the comments from the Member for Pembina and I must take offence to any insinuations that, having been born in the United States, I have conceived some hatred for that country. Mr. Chairman, my parents live there; my family lives there; I love my parents; I love my family. More than anyone on that side of the House I know what the United States is, what it stands for, what the people are like and I don't need them to tell me what they are, who they are and how nice they are. Americans, as individuals, are wonderful people, but that doesn't mean that the leadership of that country does not at times make mistakes in national policy and international relations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that at some point in time during the night that the MLA for - where's he from? - River East, might take the opportunity to explain his great love for the American people and what I detect to be his great hatred for the American Government. Maybe he'll take that opportunity later on tonight. It's interesting to see, now, the Minister of Labour indicating that she now is disassociating herself from the collective caucus decision to demonstrate . . .

HON. M. DOLIN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I do not disassociate myself from my colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a point of order?

HON. A. ADAM: Yes. The Member for Pembina indicated that there was a caucus decision to participate in a demonstration. Mr. Chairman, I'm a member of the caucus and I'm unaware that there ever was a decision made to attend a demonstration of any kind. My understanding is that there were some individuals who attended a demonstration on their own in a free country, Mr. Chairman, and I have asked the members to not impute things that are not true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. That is an explanation, that's not a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm certainly pleased to see now that the Minister of Labour is disassociating herself, Mr. Chairman, from the actions of her seat mate, the Deputy Premier of this Province, the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, is disassociating herself . . .

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Chairman, at no time did I indicate that I was not in full support of any and all of my colleagues and their right to demonstrate for whatever reason they believe. One of the reasons that I was not involved in that particular demonstration is that I had another commitment, let that be known.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now I really am confused, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I thought she was distancing herself from the demonstration in which the demonstrators, eight of her colleagues being among them, burned an American flag, I thought she was disassociating herself from that. Now she seems to leave the impression that she would have been there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. G. LECUYER: I just heard the Member for Pembina say that eight of her colleagues burned the American flag.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Not so.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. LECUYER: I distinctly heard the Member for Pembina say that eight of her colleagues burned the American flag. Let them look at the record, my friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I will continue, before I was so rudely interrupted by the MLA for Radisson who cannot hear properly, that the eighth of the New Democratic caucus were demonstrators last night in front of the U.S. Embassy and those demonstrators burned the American flag. They can't argue with that. They were part of the group of demonstrators that burned an American flag.

Anybody who denies that is not quite truthful to themselves or to the people of Manitoba — (Interjection) — and, Mr. Chairman, the person who is yelling from his seat right now, the Minister of Natural Resources, is protesting quite loudly because he knows now, in retrospect, that the decision he made to be in front of the United States Consulate, in a demonstration which had nothing to do, by the organizers' own admission, with United States involvement in Nicaragua, was indeed a mistake. That's what the Minister of Natural Resources is protesting now. It was a mistake.

And it's a mistake, Mr. Chairman, that we intend not to let them forget because on this side of the House we happen to respect our neighbour to the south, we happen to respect the way in which the American people have the right to exercise the vote and elect a government that they wish to represent them.

The MLA for River East may not respect the right of the American people to elect their governments but we happen to believe that it's a pretty democratic election process down there and we happen to respect the decisions made by those people. But now all of a sudden we find a full one-quarter of the New Democratic caucus present at a demonstration - the organizers say it has nothing to do with the United States but they're there, in front of the United States Consulate, protesting and we have a great deal of difficulty in correlating the logical presence of these government members and caucus there.

The Member for Inkster talks about oppression and he talks about all of the hardships, the suffering and the anguish of certain peoples in certain parts of the world. I don't hear the Member for Inkster talking about the plight of the people of Afghanistan for instance. The Soviet Union has invaded that country. Their military aggression has killed many innocent Afghanists whose only reason for dying is that they don't want the Russians in there. They don't want a foreign army in their country and they're resisting it and they're dying for that resistance and the way they're dying, Mr. Chairman, is a lot more despicable than anything that the MLA for Inkster has made reference to tonight.

One group of villagers got herded - didn't get herded, they hid in an enclosed drainage ditch. The Soviet army found out they were in there, blocked the other end, raised the water so it was about waist high, we are told, flooded it with gasoline and diesel fuel which would float on top of the water and threw a match on it and 140 to 150 people died in that particular village. — (Interjection) —

No, no, no, no. The Member for Ste. Rose has two different things. That was in a tunnel; that was an entirely different incident. This was innocent villagers who were hiding from the Soviet army. There are also very very

strong indications, Mr. Chairman, that the Russians are using chemical and germ warfare against Afghani villages and children are dying from drinking treated, poisoned water, poisoned by the Soviet Union's army in Afghanistan.

The MLA for Inkster doesn't seem to really want to put those on the record but he's willing to go down there and demonstrate and participate in a demonstration before the United States Consulate last night when the organizer says there's no connection to the U.S., but in his twisted, illogical mind he has made a connection that justifies his being there as part of a group of demonstrators who burn the American flag. Yet he cares naught for the Afghani villagers; he never mentions them but he drags up some illogical reason to show his hatred again to the United States of America by being at a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate.

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: Order please. The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, what we are debating here this evening is an issue that has happened in relation to Latin America. If the members opposite, and if there was a USSR Consulate in Manitoba, I can assure you we would have been expressing our concern and would have many times over on Afghanistan, but for him to try and say, as I have clearly pointed this evening, to bring this point of distinction to his little mind but you can't get through it, is that I don't give a darn what kind of government, if it is right-wing, left-wing, it makes no difference. When they are a Fascist Government and they have no respect for human rights, that is when I will express my opinion and that's when I will condemn them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I thank the Member for Inkster for his observations on the nature of the debate. It's my opinion we're discussing Capital Supply. The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Inkster keeps trying to bail himself out of a very difficult situation. I think even by now he realizes, as the Natural Resources Minister now realizes, that he shouldn't have been there.

Mr. Chairman, the one thing that I've been thinking about tonight that is indeed a small blessing in this whole exercise, is that we are fortunate in Winnipeg only to have a U.S. Consulate office complex here because, as the Minister of Natural Resources made reference to here, if we had a Soviet, a USSR Consulate Office here, it might be across the street from the U.S. Consulate and demonstrators, the likes of the Member for Inkster, would be greatly embarrassed when they would have tea at the Russian Embassy and then burn a flag in front of the American Embassy and it would be a little embarrassing for the television cameras to catch them coming across the street from having tea with the Russians, to demonstrating, participating in a demonstration where a U.S. flag is burned.

It is rather fortunate that we only have one Consulate, namely, the U.S. Consulate in Winnipeg. Maybe the MLA for Inkster, if he has enough influence on the

Attorney-General, we might be able to persuade the USSR to locate their embassy here. He certainly has a background that might give him good relations in those kinds of negotiations. It's for certain that the Minister of Natural Resources has greatly worsened his ability to deal with the Americans after his very dishonourable participation in the demonstration last night. I only hope, Mr. Chairman, that the repercussions of that do not cost all Manitobans dearly.

I think, Mr. Chairman, even you might want to hope that. But given the record of that Minister and his inability to deal forthrightly with the Garrison Project, this could well be the last straw that the proponents of Garrison need to push it through. Because American congressmen, I don't believe are going to view the present Manitoba Government as being terribly helpful in the whole Garrison debate when the Minister of Natural Resources is part of a group of demonstrators that burns an American flag. It's not going to help, Mr. Chairman, and the losers are Manitobans.

That is unfortunate that members appointed to the Treasury Bench of this province, including the Deputy Premier of this province, did not have the common sense and the intelligence to realize the implications of what they were doing by being part of that demonstration last night.

That lack of common sense, that lack of discretion, that lack of reasoning power, as demonstrated by the Minister of Natural Resources and the Deputy Premier of this province is sad. It is unfortunate and it may cost Manitobans an awful high price in the future, and that is sad, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I have some concerns about the debate that I've heard tonight in this Chamber. I must say though that I listened with some interest and some respect for the comments of the Leader of the Opposition just after we returned from the supper adjournment.

I was also pleased to listen to the remarks of the Member for Lakeside, because of some of the things he had to say about what this issue was all about. I was also pleased to listen to the remarks of the Member for La Verendrye, because I think he addressed some of the issues. I may not necessarily agree with the remarks of my colleagues on the other side of the Chamber, but I do have some respect for the point of view they have. I can't say that for the last contribution from the Member for Pembina, which was basically just a diatribe about the incident that occurred yesterday.

I see the issue that we're debating is exactly the issue that the Member for La Verendrye defined it as in limited terms, although he was prepared to say it was much larger than that. The Member for Inkster made the same suggestion.

The issue we're discussing here tonight is an issue of human rights. It's an issue of social and economic justice for everybody in the world. I share the pride, and I feel that pride just as deeply as members opposite in the democratic system and in the institutions that we're here to protect, and that we're entrusted to care for, and to return in at least the condition we found it to future generations. I won't welch from that or move

away from that for a moment. In fact, I tell all members in this Chamber that I view those principles and hold those principles both more dearly and more importantly than any principles regarding political systems, political philosophy, social conscience, or any of the other things that have been tossed around tonight very loosely and almost grandiosely at some times. But the basic institution that we're here to talk about and that we're here to protect is far more important than any of those other things.

I think some members opposite, and I suspect not for any baser motive, but in a very altruistic and sensitive purpose, have for a long time suspected the people on this side don't share those same high opinions of the system, don't share those convictions about democracy. I'm sure there are members on this side who have the same feeling about members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, there's very little difference between us when we measure the depth of difference, the tremendous gulf that exists between free-world democracies and the totalitarian regimes that exist in the rest of the world. We're much closer than the debate tonight would appear to allow us to agree. We're really not that far apart.

I believe, that without exception, every member in this Chamber is committed to those democratic institutions and would put them ahead of any partisan political opinions that any member in this Chamber has. I daresay that if that weren't the case, I could not respect the member who could not make that statement.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear the regime that was headed by Adolph Hitler described as a socialist regime, when my mother lived under the tyranny of that regime and fought to protect the oppressed people, particularly the people of Jewish faith, and had to work in the underground to protect them, I'm appalled when I find people who are trying to protect democracy, trying to place that kind of label and describe a regime which could never be called social democratic, could never be called socialist, but was certainly one of the most vicious totalitarian regimes in the history of man, as something akin to the political philosophy of people on this side. That's an affront to all members in this Chamber, because that's a denial that members opposite have done their job, their primary job to protect basic democratic institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the debate is about the fact that oppression does take place in the world and that we have a treasure here in democracy. Some members on this side have chosen to speak out about that, not to speak out viciously, not to speak out in a disruptive or obstructionist way, but to speak out on what they thought was a positive way.

Mr. Chairman, members have talked about the Shah of Iran; Ayatollah Khomeini; Stalin; Yuri Andropov, a whole variety of dictators, old and new; Pinochet in Chile; Batista used to be in Cuba; Somoza recently out of Nicaragua. What do these people have in common? Certainly not their political philosophy. Some were of the right, so described; some were fascists, so described; some were communist totalitarian regimes of the left. They certainly didn't have anything in common in terms of the commitment to democratic institutions that all members in this Chamber share. But what they did have in common was an oppressive

totalitarian regime which they used to oppress the people in their countries.

The Member for Lakeside asked for a member on this side to state unequivocally that the international communist conspiracy is evil. I'll make that statement. I don't hesitate for a moment to suggest that any totalitarian regime which seeks, through military police state methods, to oppress the people of that country and deny basic democratic institutions from either flourishing or developing, because in many of these countries they've never even had a chance to develop, that regime is evil, and the international communist conspiracy which certainly seeks to promote that type of totalitarian regime is evil, but it is no less evil than those governments of the right which do the same. But to suggest that Hitler, as a socialist, is somehow tainted because he named a party that was basically fascist, socialist, has somehow tainted social democratic governments around the world, is just as ludicrous as to decide to say that because certain members opposite believe in what is often called the free enterprise capitalist system, that by definition they're fascists.

The Member for Niakwa would be appalled if I described him as a fascist and yet certain members on his side think it's perfectly in order to describe me, because I claim to be a social democrat or a socialist, as being a totalitarian communist or of leaning that way and that's the only place we can go. I'm not suggesting the Member for Fort Garry said that, but certain members on his side made that allegation tonight. I don't say that. I don't describe — (Interjection) — The Member for Lakeside suggested that there was no place for socialism and social democratic parties to go but to communism, that's what he said. I don't suggest that the only place capitalism can go is to fascism, that would be ludicrous, because I believe there is a finer tie that binds, and that's a belief in democratic institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion that communism comes from socialism is perhaps repudiated by history. I would challenge any member opposite to give me one example of a nation anywhere in the world that has moved from socialism, or from social democratic institutions, or even from parliamentary democratic institutions that were firmly established in that nation, to communism. Communism has always sprung from military or political police state dictatorships generally of the right and sometimes of the centre. There's only been one democratically elected government in Latin American which was even vaguely described as being communist and that was the Allende regime in Chile and it did not describe itself as a communist regime. In fact, just the opposite has been true repeatedly.

Mr. Chairman, I have some problem with the arguments that are being advanced tonight because I know that most members opposite share with me that very deep conviction that the primary purpose of our being here, far and above the purpose of governing the Province of Manitoba, is to protect the institutions that we have. Mr. Chairman, I'm even more saddened by the suggestion by some members opposite, that despite the statements made by members on this side in this House today, or yesterday I guess it is now, that we carried placards at a demonstration yesterday. That wasn't the case. No member on this side carried a placard. No member on this side was associated with,

in any way, shape or form, the burning of a flag or an American flag. I still have not had it confirmed that the flag was actually an American flag, although I think that's not an unreasonable assumption considering the makeup of the protest. I understand from some people who were there that they saw one individual involved in the burning of a flag. I don't know if that individual was part of the protest; I don't know what he was there to do, but he certainly was in no way associated with the members on this side. I believe every member on this side would willingly — (Interjection) — I'd rather not have help from my colleagues. I don't believe that any member on this side is willing to be associated with that irresponsible and reprehensible action and I believe every member on this side, given the opportunity, would willingly disassociate himself or herself with that action.

Mr. Chairman, the real problem we're addressing here is the peculiar feature of international third world totalitarianism. It's a totalitarianism that's sustained by the arms suppliers of the world; it's a totalitarianism that's sustained by a military industrial complex that is worldwide. The major arms suppliers in the third world are the USSR, the USA, France and Israel, a pretty formidable group of nations. The most peculiar feature of the largest part of their international arms sales is that they are all to totalitarian regimes, the largest part of them, close to 75 percent go to regimes that are fully totalitarian in character. They're not of one political spectrum, some are of the right, some are of the left. In fact, the United States sells arms to regimes that are of the left and the USSR sells arms, when it's convenient, to regimes that politically are on the right. I'm not totally conversant in the arms sales of our country but we certainly have been in the market in the past. We're not a major actor, we're not a major supplier in that area, we're not even competitive on an international per capita basis.

So, Mr. Chairman, the protest yesterday had a great deal to do with the United States regardless of what one of the organizers was quoted as saying in today's Free Press. The protest had a great deal to do with the fact that the United States of America has been a supplier of arms and munitions and other forms of aid throughout Central America and has been a sustaining agency in the support of totalitarian regimes of the right in that area. There is no question that the United States has been involved in the support of the Honduran Regime and the El Salvadoran Regime which are both currently involved and agents in the problems that are facing Nicaragua.

So for the benefit of the Member for Fort Garry, that's why I was there, regardless of what an organizer was quoted as saying. I believe that that kind of activity is wrong in principle. Mr. Chairman, I was also there to protest the actions of the USSR and the totalitarian regime headquartered in Warsaw against the people of Poland. I don't know if there were any flags burned there, but if there were I would find that just as reprehensible and irresponsible. I would have protested silently. I would have held a candle. I would not have shouted or yelled or paraded with a placard, but I would have stated my opposition to that regime and to what was happening, and the way people were being oppressed, and the way democratic institutions and the development of those institutions, particularly in Poland, was being denied.

I am just as strongly opposed to the Cuban intervention in Angola and the use of Cuban mercenaries in Ethiopia to sustain oppressive military regimes of the left, as I am to the use of foreign troops in other parts of the world where countries who claim to support democracy are using those forces to prevent the free development of democratic institutions.

A short time ago, I participated in sponsoring an advertisement in the Globe and Mail, requesting the freedom of Anatole Shcharansky in a Soviet prison camp. I don't know how many members opposite participated in that ad. I didn't see their names in the columns of contributors from across Canada that appeared with that ad in the Globe and Mail. So, Mr. Chairman, when it is suggested that members on this side, and I am sure that many of my colleagues can give many more examples, don't speak out against the kind of injustice and affronts to democratic institutions that are occurring around the world regardless of the political strike, left or right, of the regimes which are involved in those activities, then, Mr. Chairman, I cry foul, because actions speak louder than words. Members on this side have willingly and often voiced their dissent with those activities. They have not done it against one nation, they have done it against all nations who have been guilty of these kinds of transgressions.

Mr. Chairman, I have a problem in understanding the objections of members opposite certainly to my attendance and to the opposition of members on this side at a protest yesterday, to decry the involvement of one of the great democracies of the free world in the affairs of another country. I have a problem that members opposite would find some offence in voices on this side crying out for recognition of that fundamental principle in the United Nations Charter which guarantees nonintervention in the affairs of other nations.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have a problem though acknowledging that members on both sides, and I believe this strongly, will put democracy first, will respect the United States of America as one of the finest democratic countries in the world, will respect the institutions it's developed, will respect the free electoral system which it has. It may not necessarily want to get involved in its primary system and some of the other aberrations that we don't adopt in this country but are part of a different kind of heritage and a different democratic development, but respect those institutions and look to them as a model for others to follow. But, to follow, Mr. Chairman, not to be imposed upon. I would willingly see every other country in the world have that freedom of choice. Mr. Chairman, I will speak for that freedom and I will not consider the criticism of members opposite as any restraint on my ability to tell the Soviet Union to get the hell out of Afghanistan; to tell the Warsaw pact to stop their interference in Poland; to ask the American Government to grant the people of Central America the right to choose their own future and to choose the form of democratic institutions that they need to meet their needs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the long run that every nation and every human being will choose freedom if they are given that opportunity. I do not believe that any nation will choose any system that is thrust down its throat. That is why people resist to totalitarian

regimes and that is why I will always oppose them myself.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I arrived back in the vicinity to some surprise and saw the lights in the tower still signaling that the House was still in session. I felt there must be some urgent business being conducted here so I should present myself in the Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of speechmaking apparently before I came to participate in debate, but it seems obvious from what I have been able to gather from my colleagues that the lesson that was delivered to the opposition benches this afternoon by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, fell on deaf ears, on the government benches at least.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Member for Springfield talk about his affection for our good neighbours to the south and I assure him that I share his feelings if they are genuine, but I cannot condone whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, any member of this Chamber, regardless of how free thinking, how activist he may think he is, participating in the demonstration such as members opposite took part in last evening and more especially, Members of the Cabinet and particularly the Deputy-Premier of this province.

I realize the members opposite say we had no part in the flag burning. We didn't know it happened. But if you travel in those circles, Mr. Chairman, you are going to be branded with the people that organized it and the people that are going to be branded. — (Interjection) — I don't know, we have members opposite whose homeland was the United States, our neighbour to the south. What on earth happened to those people in their country before they came to Canada is beyond me, because they seem bent on kicking it at every turn and every chance they can possibly get, to take a whack at the regime to the south of us.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you unequivocally that I can't associate myself with those kinds of views. I would state right here that I am in favour of testing the Cruise missile in Canada and I think this government should urge the Federal Government to get on with their message to the United States to allow the testing of that missile. They are the only defence that we have against - you know who we're defending ourselves against or who we're going to have to prepare to defend ourselves against - it has happened before. We know they cannot be trusted. I see no reason to sit by and allow ourselves to be lulled into a feeling of comfort and all is going to be at peace, when they continually build up arms that are possibly going to surpass our armament if we don't build an equivalent arsenal to protect this country, and the only protection Canada has is our good neighbour to the south.

I just can't condone the bashing that takes place from members opposite who claim loud and strong that they want to trade with them, they want to embrace them as brothers and anything they say or any actions they might undertake has nothing to detract from the affection and the esteem that they hold the people from the United States in.

Mr. Chairman, that's just not going to wash when demonstrations such as we have seen are carried on by members opposite. History is going to show that half of the peace marches and the demonstrations that you see throughout our land are financed, agitated and organized by members of the regime that we live in constant fear of, I would say the only regime probably that we're in fear of throughout the world. And, Mr. Chairman, they can stand up and talk as they will but there is nothing going to take away from the fact that they took part in a demonstration that's going to be construed, whether they like it or not, as a demonstration against the United States. I want to see the Member for Springfield and the Member for Radisson defend their actions in their constituencies. It's just not going to stand up, Mr. Chairman.

We heard the Member for Springfield mention the Ayatollah Khomeini, the leader of Iran, which brought to mind a speaker that I heard in Brandon last Friday evening that claimed with all of the bodyguards and protection that he had around him that on a very warm day, with the fans swirling in his palace, that his turban was caught up in one of the fans and he was whirled into the air and one of his guards shot him for a whirling dervish. When they untangled him from the fan they decided that the brain damage wasn't sufficient to interrupt his rule or affect his rule. But I don't know, Mr. Chairman, what that particular country has to do with the actions that our friends across the way took last evening.

Mr. Chairman, the neighbours to the south are our biggest trading partner, something like \$70 billion a year I think we do in trade with the United States. We had the Prime Minister of this country off on a jaunt not too long ago visiting 13 countries that bought something like \$500 million worth of goods from us. He spent 13 days there. If he'd have spent a week maybe across the line to the south of us doing the same kind of a trade mission, I'm sure the results would have been far more beneficial to this country than the trip that he took and he probably visited a great number of the countries that our friends across the way seem to be so concerned about protecting the rights of.

A great many of these ideals and lofty positions that are taken by members across the way, Mr. Chairman, may be commendable but we have so many problems right here in our own country that I think they could direct their attention and their energy to looking after some of the problems that we face here, such as looking after some of our unemployed instead of wandering around on great flag-burning demonstrations in front of the American Embassy because our finances are in disarray, our finances are in a shambles, Mr. Chairman, not only in this province but in Canada by and large. We're not going to cure any of those ills by demonstrating against those who trade with us and those who we have to have as friends because we have no other friends as strong and as protective as our neighbours to the south.

There's been a great deal of talk about free world democracy and tyranny, Mr. Chairman, and we all know the problems with regimes that have come about by Lord-knows-what political process that led up to them becoming that way. I suspect how some of them may have gotten into that position but those are problems that can be solved outside of this Chamber. We are

not going to solve them in here and the members in here I think are elected by their constituents to do a job for Manitobans, not to go running around trying to protect some wild-eyed interest away off in Nicaragua or God-knows-where, whatever they were protesting against last night. I doubt if the members opposite have a very good idea of where it is or what type of regime they have there. There apparently is no solid proof that our neighbours to the south are involved in supplying whatever they're accused of supplying to that country.

It was mentioned earlier on that no one protested the USSR invasion of Afghanistan and God knows what atrocities have been created there or that have been perpetrated on that nation.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier peace marches, when you can organize peace marches such as we see in this country, as strong in the USSR as we allow in this country, then maybe you might convince me that I should take part in a peace march.

Mr. Chairman, we know, and we're seeing more and more of it each day, who the real radicals are on that side of the House and unfortunately it would appear that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is going to be in that class and he has as his Legislative Assistant, a wild-eyed revolutionary, apparently, who knows all of the trouble spots in the world and knows how to cure them. Well I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that's going to bring nothing but trouble and discredit down around the head of the Minister if he hasn't already had enough of it down on his shoulders the past while.

Mr. Chairman, it can be taken lightly and they can ridicule this side of the House for taking the stand that we have taken on this incident all they like, but it's not going to sell out there in their constituencies. The people of Manitoba are proud people. They like to think that they elect members to this Legislature to do their job in here and to do it for the constituents and for the people of Manitoba and I don't think they want them off gerrymandering around the streets of Winnipeg, especially in front of the U.S. Embassy, knocking and dragging down our neighbours to the south.

Mr. Chairman, I started my remarks by saying that there was a very strong and emphatic lesson delivered to the members across the way, particularly the Treasury Benches this afternoon, particularly my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, on the passage of the Supply Bill and apparently they haven't headed it and whether their Supply Bill gets passed or not will depend on members opposite. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late, members on both sides of the House are weary but we're never too weary to stand up and speak out on what we believe is fair and just in this world, whether the members across the way like it or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Radisson.

MR. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure you that I will not make my comments long, but seeing that I pretty well have been invited by the last speaker to put some comments on the record, I would like to do so.

You will have to wait to read what I will have to say because I will say it in my own language.

Monsieur le président, j'ai dû subir toutes sortes de dénues d'interprétation pendant des heures ce soir, et je voudrais, je ne voudrais pas manquer cette occasion, d'expliquer le geste dans lequel j'ai participé.

Si j'ai participé à cette démonstration, je l'ai fait dans un geste de solidarité pour les gens de l'Amérique Centrale, plus particulièrement pour le Nicaragua. Comme je l'ai fait aussi pour les gens de la Pologne qui sont opprimés par la Russie, comme je l'ai fait pour les gens du Chili en 73, comme j'ai participé à des démonstrations en faveur de la paix, oui, et je participerai encore dans ces genres de gestes en faveur de la paix. Il y a de mes collègues en face, dans l'opposition qui disent: "Nous, on n'y pensera quand nos confrères en Russie, auront la liberté de faire la même chose." Moi je dis, si réellement nous croyons qu'il y a un différent ou une différence dans la société dans laquelle on vit, si vraiment on croit à la démocratie, c'est que justement on a l'occasion de participer, de s'exprimer, on a cette liberté. Eux ne l'ont pas. C'est nous qui avons la liberté dans ce système démocratique. N'agissons jamais pour montrer justement la valeur et l'avantage de notre système sur le leur. Comment peut-on s'attendre que nous serons un exemple pour eux.

Oui, les Etats-Unis sont nos amis, sont nos voisins, sont nos partenaires. Mais, cela n'empêche pas qu'ils n'ont pas toujours raison. Eux aussi, comme nous d'ailleurs, ici au Canada, nous pratiquons parfois l'oppression envers les aborigènes de notre société, eux aussi l'ont fait chez eux et le font ailleurs. Alors, ce n'est pas seulement une occasion que nous avons de participer dans un geste de solidarité, je dirais que c'est un devoir.

Un peu plus tôt ce soir, j'ai entendu le chef de l'opposition, et le représentant, le député de Fort Garry, un peu citer des paroles de Jesus Christ. Je me souviens d'avoir entendu dire, avoir entendu le député de Saint Norbert, pas de Saint Norbert de Fort Garry, dire: "Seigneur, pardonnez-leur car ils ne savent ce qu'ils font.". Il semble avoir oublié que justement lorsque Jesus Christ a employé ces paroles dans l'Evangile lorsqu'il était sur la croix; ces paroles, il les adressait justement à ceux qui l'avait mis en croix, à ceux qui l'avait opprimé, à ceux qui venait de lui donner la mort. Alors je pense que le député de Fort Garry s'est un peu trompé lorsqu'il citait ces paroles.

Tout récemment, les évêques canadiens ont publié au début de l'année 83, un article qu'ils adressaient à la population canadienne leur demandant de prendre position et demandant au gouvernement canadien et à tous les gouvernements, de prendre position, en faveur des chômeurs, en faveur des opprimés, en faveur de ceux qui sont sans emploi, en faveur de ceux envers lesquels on bafoue les droits. Alors, ce n'est pas seulement une occasion que nous avons lorsqu'il y a des démonstrations de ce genre, des occasions que nous avons d'exprimer notre solidarité, mais c'est un devoir. Alors quand les membres de l'opposition essaient de faire du théâtre, oui du théâtre politique, avec une question comme celle-ci, moi je dis qu'ils agissent comme des Phariséens, qu'ils agissent, comme des sépulchre blanchies.

Le député de Pembina, dont l'esprit est tordu, dont l'esprit est simpliste, qui a tenté tout au long de la soirée et tout à l'heure lorsqu'il s'est levé pour parler d'imputer toutes sortes d'intentions, d'imputer toutes

sortes de paroles à ceux de nous qui avons parlé, à ceux de nous qui avons pratiqué ou participé dans ce geste de solidarité, et bien moi je dis qu'il écoute s'il peut comprendre, et je le répète, mon geste hier soir était un geste de solidarité.

S'il y a eu un drapeau de brûlé, s'il y a eu un drapeau de brûlé, et je dis bien s'il y a eu, chose que je n'ai pas vu, ni hier soir, ni pendant, ni avant, ni après cette démonstration. Je n'ai pas vu un de mes collègues porter un placard, je n'ai pas vu un de mes collègues participer d'aucune façon à brûler un drapeau, s'il y en a eu un, et qui sait s'il y en a eu un, est-ce que c'était quelqu'un qui, est-ce que c'était un participant à cette démonstration qui a réellement mis ce feu ou est-ce que c'était tout simplement un autre tordu qui est venu s'ingérer ou peut-être quelqu'un de planté pour faire ce geste, pour donner à ce geste des intentions qu'il ne devait pas y avoir.

Ce que j'ai dit cette après-midi, je le répète; je ne supporte pas cette action; je ne l'ai jamais supporté, et je ne supporte qu'on brûle aucun drapeau.

Ni moi, et ni aucun de mes collègues, j'en suis sûr, n'était au courant qu'on allait à cette démonstration brûler un drapeau. Et je suis sûr, avoir été au courant, nous n'aurions pas participé à ce geste.

Je suis contre l'oppression peu importe où elle propage peu importe par quel régime totalitaire, peu importe dans quel pays du monde. On a cité ce soir pendant les nombreux discours qui ont été prononcés, à peu près toute la gamme des pays dans le monde où l'oppression est pratiquée. Et bien que ce soit dans un pays communiste, ou que ce soit dans un pays totalitaire de l'Amérique Latine, et bien, dans l'un et l'autre de ces cas, c'est tout à fait aussi mal que dans, c'est aussi mal dans un endroit que dans l'autre.

Je crois que c'est de notre devoir de se lever debout, comme citoyen canadien qui avons justement des droits à la liberté, la liberté de s'exprimer, la liberté de se réunir en geste de solidarité, et bien nous avons ce devoir de se lever debout et dire non à l'injustice; nous avons le devoir de se lever debout et dire non à l'oppression; car si nous ne le faisons pas d'une certaine façon nous donnons notre support. Alors, que les gens en face, les membres de l'opposition disent et bien que l'oppression dans les pays communistes est plus sérieuse, ou quatorze fois plus sérieuse a dit le député de Lakeside, bien moi je dis, l'oppression peu importe où elle se pratique, lorsqu'elle entrave la liberté dans toutes ces façons, lorsqu'elle entrave la liberté, lorsqu'elle cause la mort de nos confrères hommes, cette oppression est aussi mauvaise dans un cas que dans l'autre.

Et lorsque l'occasion se présentera à nouveau à l'avenir, je pratiquerai encore ce droit de liberté qui est le mien, de me lever debout, par devoir, pour exprimer mon opposition à toute oppression. Et si les collègues de l'opposition, un jour, veulent bien, eux aussi, initier un geste de démonstration contre l'oppression, je serai tout à fait heureux de me joindre et de participer à ce geste.

Merci, Monsieur le président.

(Translation)

Mr. Speaker, I have had to listen to all kinds of innuendo and interpretations for hours upon end this evening and I would not forfeit this opportunity to

explain my personal participation in this matter. My part in this demonstration was purely a gesture of solidarity for the people of Central America and, more specifically, Nicaragua - just as I demonstrated for the people of Poland who are oppressed by Russia, and just as I demonstrated for the people of Chile in 1973, and just as I have participated in peace demonstrations, and would indeed again participate in this kind of gesture to promote peace.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the House, members of the opposition, say they would be ready to think of similar action when our counterparts in Russia have the freedom to do the same thing. I say that if we really believe that there is a difference in the society in which we live, if we really believe in democracy, it is precisely because we have this freedom to participate, to express ourselves. They do not. If we, who have this liberty in a democratic system, never take action to demonstrate the value and the advantage of our system over theirs, how can we ever expect to be an example to them.

Yes, the United States is our friend and our neighbour and partner, but it does not follow that it is always right. Moreover, just as we in Canada have sometimes been guilty of oppressing the native people, so they have also done both at home and abroad. Therefore, it is not only an opportunity for us to participate in a gesture of solidarity; I would say it is a duty.

A little earlier this evening I heard the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Fort Garry quote some of the words of Jesus Christ. I recall the member for St. Norbert - not St. Norbert but Fort Garry say: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." They seem to have forgotten that when Jesus spoke those words, taken from the Gospel, when on the cross, he referred to those who were about to put him to death. I believe therefore that the member was slightly mistaken in using this quotation. Just recently the Canadian bishops published an article intended for the Canadian people asking them to take position, and asking the Canadian government and all governments to take position on behalf of the unemployed, the oppressed, all those who are out of work, and on behalf of those whose rights are flouted.

A demonstration of this nature is therefore not only an opportunity for us to express our solidarity, it is a duty. When members of the opposition seek to indulge in histrionics, yes, political play-acting in a matter such as this, I say that they are behaving as Pharisees, as whitened sepulchres. The Member for Pembina, whose thinking is twisted and simplistic, and who has throughout the evening, and just recently again when rising to speak, sought to ascribe all sorts of motives and words to those of us who have spoken or participated in this gesture of solidarity, I say, let him listen, if he is capable of understanding, while I repeat, that my action of last night was a gesture of solidarity.

If a flag was burned, and I stress - if this was the case, which thing I did not see last night, either during, before or after the demonstration; I did not see any of my colleagues carrying a placard or participate in any way in the burning of a flag, if indeed this did happen. And who knows, in the event that it did happen, whether it was actually a participant in the demonstration who set fire to a flag, or whether some crackpot slipped in or was even planted there to carry

this out, so as to attach motives to the demonstration which would not have otherwise been ascribed to it; what I said this afternoon, I now repeat; I do not support this action. I never have. I do not condone the burning of any flag. Neither myself nor any of my colleagues, I'm sure, were aware that a flag would be burned at this demonstration. Had we been aware of it, I am sure that none of us would have participated.

I am against oppression wherever it exists, regardless of the totalitarian regime or the country of the world that tolerates it. The numerous speeches this evening have covered almost the entire gamut of countries in which oppression exists. Whether it is a communist country or a totalitarian state in Latin America, it is, in either case, equally bad. I believe it is our duty as Canadian citizens who have our freedoms - freedom to speak and to assemble together in a gesture of solidarity - to stand up and be counted, to stand up and say no to injustice and to oppression. If we do not, we are in some degree giving our approval to these evils.

When members of the opposition say that oppression in communist countries is more serious, or, as the Member for Lakeside says, fourteen times as serious, I reply that oppression wherever it exists, when it impinges on our freedom in any of its aspects, and when it causes the death of our fellow men, this oppression is every bit as evil in one case as in another. — (Inaudible) — the oppressed, and when the opportunity arises in the future, I shall again exercise this right of freedom, which is mine, to stand up, out of duty, and express my opposition to all oppression, and should my colleagues of the opposition desire some day to initiate any gesture against oppression, I will be most happy to join with them in this gesture.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(End of Translation)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to compliment the Member for Radisson for taking the opportunity to speak in the other official language. We used to hear quite frequently from the Member for St. Boniface that he wouldn't feel completely at home in the Chamber until he knew that he could not only could in the language, but that he could be understood in it as well. I can understand why he would want to do that. He's going to participate in a debate, it's reasonable to expect that one should be understood by those to which he's addressing his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, in the comments that the Member for Springfield was making earlier, he seemed to want to make the question an issue of human rights. Somehow, what has been the cause for concern this afternoon and this evening and this morning, was based on the fight which he and some of his colleagues are supposedly carrying out for human rights. That's not the issue at stake, Mr. Chairman.

The issue at stake is the behaviour of Ministers of our government. I don't especially care what the Member for River East does, or the Member for Inkster, or Radisson, or Springfield. They are backbenchers on the government side, albeit, but they have their consciences to answer to and they have their

constituents to answer to. They don't have any wider responsibility than that, other than to stand up and and vote with their colleagues on the front benches when they need their support.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the fact that two Ministers of the Crown were involved in this demonstration. They cannot divorce themselves from their position as members of the treasury bench; members of the Cabinet of the Government of Manitoba. One must ask themselves whether or not this is the way that they would expect a government to conduct its business in a democratic system such as we have here, or our neighbours to the south have. My concern is, Mr. Chairman, that most people - certainly not the members on this side - will not see that as the proper way for a government to conduct itself. The people of Manitoba will express that to their government here. Of course, they will have to answer for that. Perhaps even the broader concern is how the people of the United States and how the Government of the United States are going to interpret this kind of behaviour on the part of the Minister of Natural Resources and the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Economic Development.

It strikes me as being especially bad judgment on the part of the Minister of Natural Resources. This is the Minister whom I accompanied, and my colleague, the Member for Lakeside, accompanied to Washington last June to ask for the opportunity to meet with congressmen and senators in the United States, and try and tell them that as good neighbours, they shouldn't be proceeding with the Garrison Project. They shouldn't be voting money for it. We were lobbying there, not relying on international cheese, but lobbying, relying on good will because the Minister of Natural Resources and I don't vote in the United States. We don't have any political clout down there, Mr. Chairman. The only way that those people would listen to us is because we were members of governments and legislatures in their neighbour, Canada.

They listened to us very politely. I think that the mission that we had, had some impact, even though the Member for Inkster expressed a view that he didn't really trust the senators and congressmen who were proponents of the Garrison Project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the same Minister of Natural Resources is going to be proposing to lead a delegation back to Washington again to once again impose — (Interjection) — The Member for Inkster has, I don't think, ever had a point of order in his life.

MR. D. SCOTT: The Member for Turtle Mountain has once again tossed a slur my way. I would just like to know on what instance, or could he please clarify it for the benefit of the members of the House, that I, while I was in Washington inferred to U.S. congressmen who not supporting the Garrison Diversion Project, that they could not be trusted. I never expressed any such things, and that's another innuendo that we've come to expect from the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the view was expressed by the Member for Inkster at the luncheon that was tendered on the last day which the delegation was in Washington, and the proceedings had been going

very well. The Minister of Natural Resources had done, I thought was a credible job. The Minister of Employment and Immigration had done what I thought was a credible job and we seemed to be making progress and just when everything was about ready to shut down, that's when the Member for Inkster chose to stand and inject his comment, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we have the same Minister of Natural Resources who now wants to go back to Washington and impose upon the decency of the congressmen and of the senators to have he and his delegation back in their offices taking up their time to lobby against something which most of them are in favour of. Otherwise, they wouldn't be lobbying those people. They're not going to go and lobby those that favour our position on Garrison.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister of Natural Resources has irreparably damaged his ability certainly, to deal effectively with this issue. I believe he has also damaged the credibility of the Manitoba Government in dealing with this issue. That perhaps can be overcome. The Minister of Natural Resources, his personal involvement, the Member for Inkster in my view, could no longer be a member of a delegation to conduct that kind of mission again.

I think that is very regrettable that these Ministers . . . — (Interjection) — Well, you see, Mr. Chairman, we finally hear the real views of the Member for Inkster when he says that I'm a disgrace. Well, that's his view, I rather expected he's probably held that view for some period of time although he hasn't seen fit to express it. Normally, I appreciate direct dealings with people to know exactly where they stand. What we saw last night with the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development and others there strikes me as being very much a continuation of an anti-American attitude which has been demonstrated by the members opposite time and time again.

We saw it during the last Session, Mr. Chairman, when the Member for Thompson introduced a Private Members' Resolution dealing with Reaganomics and what the debate consisted of by the members opposite was a simple, pure diatribe against the Americans. These people somehow love to kick this big giant, friendly neighbour we have, Mr. Chairman. It's easy to kick someone who doesn't kick back, I guess, and is big enough to be able to accept that kind of thing. But how can the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Economic Development be so quick to condemn our friends, the Americans, over this issue when the organizers of the event say that they have no evidence, they don't know that the Americans were involved? But when something happens that is contrary to what they would like to see happen, they immediately assume that the United States is involved and they hustle off with their little placards down to the Consulate and start parading.

They don't know, by their own admission, that the United States was even involved. Perhaps they were, perhaps they weren't, I don't know. I'd like to know how the Minister of Natural Resources knows, how the Minister of Economic Development knows, because what they've done is condemn our friends without knowing that they're even guilty. If an individual person wants to do that, wants to go out on the street and demonstrate, fine, 100 percent. That is their right in

our democratic society, Mr. Chairman, to be able to do that, but a Minister of the Crown has to demonstrate a little finer sense of judgment. In fact, a lot finer sense of judgment, because whether we like it or not, a member of the Crown really has no personal life once they become members of the Crown.

To take it to the extreme, one could never expect that the President of the United States could undertake an action or make a statement as a private citizen and turn around and say, oh, I'm really not the President of the United States tonight, I'm just here as good old Ronald Reagan, just wanting to make a statement, just wanting to carry this little placard. Mr. Chairman, it wouldn't wash and you know it wouldn't wash.

The ministry of Natural Resources isn't on a par with the presidency of the United States, but nevertheless he can no more disassociate himself from that responsibility than the President of the United States can. He has compromised himself, just as the Minister of Economic Development has compromised herself, by that action that they took. When they combine their anti-Americanism with this constant feeling that we get that they seem to look with considerable favour upon the Marxist philosophy, you combine those two things and it becomes cause for concern to me. I know it's cause for concern for a good number of my constituents and I expect for others, because I hear expressions of concern that the government is prepared to finance a conference such as that but not to finance things like the 4-H Program or other large conventions that are coming to Winnipeg.

I would think that the people of Manitoba very shortly are going to begin to say to this government, tear yourself away from the intellectual pursuit of participating in a Marxist Conference or tear yourself away from marching down in front of the Consulate and deal with some of the problems that we have in Manitoba, deal with the question that we've got 55,000 unemployed people in Manitoba. That's what the Minister of Natural Resources should be doing, he should be dealing with his responsibilities here. Send the backbenchers out if he wants to do that kind of extra curricular activity, but his responsibility is to look after the government. His responsibility is also to order the Business of the House, because he's the back-up House Leader, in order to see that the business is conducted in an efficient fashion.

It's only, Mr. Chairman, because of the ineptness of the Government House Leader and of the Minister of Finance that this forum was available yesterday afternoon and last night and this morning to be able for us to debate this issue. Mr. Chairman, the members opposite will learn, I'm sure, in time that the Rules of the House always work to protect the rights of the opposition, and that opposition there is almost always a way for the opposition to be able to express its displeasure with the actions of the government.

This happened to be an especially good opportunity because of the ineptness of the Government House Leader and of the Minister of Finance not having their business ordered. You see, the Member for Springfield doesn't agree with that. He didn't seem to understand earlier, Mr. Chairman, what the problem was, that this bill — (Interjection) — well, I'll repeat myself to the Member for Radisson, I'll repeat myself as often as I have to until there seems to be some level of

understanding by the members opposite. Eventually I expect the members opposite will learn how the Rules of the House work. I'm going to explain to the Member for Springfield how this opportunity need not have come about.

This bill should have accompanied the Interim Supply Bill, and they could have been dealt with and both passed at the same time with virtually no debate. The Interim Supply Bill went to second reading last Friday in about 15 minutes, and we gave leave to have it go through, Mr. Chairman. — (Interjection) — No, Mr. Chairman, I'm somewhat hopeful that perhaps we will be able to pass this resolution. I have been attempting to stay away from any sort of comment that might cause the members opposite to feel aggrieved and have to rise and speak. No, what I stated was fact, Mr. Chairman, that the opportunity has been presented because the bill was not brought forward before when it should have been. Had it been brought forward before, then the House would have adjourned at 10:00 o'clock. To the the Minister of Government Services, had we been dealing with the second reading of the bill, with the Speaker in the Chair, the House would adjourn at 10:00 o'clock.

MR. A. ANSTETT: What if we had been in Committee of the Whole?

MR. B. RANSOM: We were on second reading to the Member for Springfield. We took the bill — (Interjection) — does the Member for Springfield wish to get into debate again because we are quite prepared to continue on, Mr. Chairman, if that's the wish. — (Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, I happen to know the rules. I happen to know what we were prepared to do to facilitate the business of government. — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Natural Resources says, obstruction. The Minister of Natural Resources wasn't here this afternoon when I explained to him some of the things that had gone on in the past. Since he wasn't here this afternoon, and since he has seen fit to charge me with obstruction, Mr. Chairman, I will explain to him once again that we have been facilitating the business of government. If the Minister of Natural Resource would like to listen, two years ago when the Interim Supply Bill was introduced, I believe on the 11th of March, in order to give sufficient time for the opposition to be able to debate because they had said earlier they didn't have enough time to debate Interim Supply, so we brought it in. Mr. Chairman, to the Minister of Natural Resources, on the 11th of March. The members opposite debated it at this stage in Interim Supply for seven days. Seven days, and there was no issue.

MR. H. ENNS: Nobody was burning flags.

MR. D. ORCHARD: No flags were being burned.

MR. B. RANSOM: It was simply a situation where they had a desire to speak and they spoke for seven days on that stage of the bill. We moved Interim Supply through with about ten minutes and that Minister accuses us of obstructing? That's why, Mr. Chairman, the First Minister made a mistake when he didn't appoint a member from his government who had been here before.

If he had appointed someone like the Member for Lac du Bonnet, he would have remembered that they took seven days to debate this issue. We would not have had a problem. We would have been co-operating as we are now and he would have realized that he was getting co-operation from the opposition.

Well, we still have six days to go, Mr. Chairman. This can go on for six more days if the members opposite think this is obstruction. If this is obstruction, you know, it can go on for quite a period of time. I recommend to the members that they go back and review the record. The Member for Springfield is having a look. I can go and get my notes and when I rise again this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I will give him the dates and I'll give him the names of the people who spoke.

So the Minister of Natural Resources should not say that we are obstructing debate. Mr. Chairman, we're moving it along. I would hope that this item would be able to pass, so that we will be able to move on to another stage in moving towards the passage of the bill by tomorrow. — (Interjection) — Well, today, later this morning, the next sitting of the Legislature, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Turtle Mountain didn't want to allow me the option of asking a question, and I really had two points that I wanted to make to him.

The first one is found in the assumption that I would not suggest for one minute that the opposition is obstructing the passage of Interim Supply. If someone on this side is suggesting that, than I disagree with that member. If the Deputy House Leader has said that then I disagree with him. But, for the Member for Turtle Mountain to self-righteously and indignantly get up in this House and complain about what happened two years ago, then he falls into a bit of a trap because he has four colleagues sitting with him in the House tonight who can tell him what his previous government or opposition group did in 1974. In the debate in 1974, we had a filibuster that went on for much more than seven days. So, if the Member for Turtle Mountain wants to talk about precedence and he wants to go back two years, he should go back nine years and he will find exactly the same thing happening.

When he wants to talk about incompetence, — (Interjection) — that's not a good reason. What was done in 1974 was not justified and I would be willing to admit what happened a couple of years ago was not justified. There are no grounds for holding up Interim Supply. The Member for Turtle Mountain is right. The opposition has all kinds of opportunity to engage in debate. I don't quarrel with him on that, but to suggest that in some way the Government House Leader was incompetent by allowing this debate today, demonstrates his lack of knowledge of the rules of this House. The Member for Turtle Mountain, as the Opposition House Leader could easily have engineered the opportunity for this debate to take place today. If he doesn't know how and he says he couldn't, I am going to tell him now because I think he needs some help.

He could have allowed, had the Capital Supply gone through last week as he said it should have, when

Interim Supply went through, he could have allowed either of those bills to go through second reading and into Committee of the Whole. As soon as they were called for Committee of the Whole, the whole free-wheeling debate that's taken place for the last eight or so hours could have occurred then.

The member either forgets or doesn't know that the same opportunities exist. I concede the point; there's no obstruction; the opposition has every right to engage in this debate. I also concede the point that it could have happened under a variety of other mechanisms that maybe the Opposition House Leader isn't aware of and I suggest that before he accuses our House Leader of incompetence or engages in that kind of warfare in this House, that does nothing to generate the kind of goodwill that is necessary to provide for good House working relationships that will get the business of the people of the province accomplished, that he should become familiar with those kinds of issues and those kinds of provisions in our rules. Until he is, none of these things are going to be accomplished and the business of the people of Manitoba is going to be neglected while these kinds of games are being played. If the Member for Turtle Mountain thinks it's a game, he deludes himself. The rights that are given to the opposition are not the rights to engage in games, they're the rights to provide opposition to government, and when those are abused then the people of Manitoba are not well-served.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MR. PEYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, it seems that we have all been invited to comment on our particular reasons for participating in the event yesterday and, being the only person there I believe who was actually born in the United States, that probably puts me in a special category in terms of the perceptions of the members of the opposition. There seems to be a common assumption that Americans are some monolithic universal group of people all the same, that they all think alike. You say what will the Americans think of this, what will the Americans think of that. There are many different kinds of Americans, many different groups and the whole culture is riddled with conflict, with differing directions, not just between right and left, but between war and peace, as well.

The Member for Pembina earlier tonight suggested that I should be grateful to America for going to school there and that's true. How do you go to school in the States, what do you learn when you go to school in the United States? They are very keen on teaching a sense of history, and I appreciate history, that's why I'm an historian, a Canadian historian. But when you learn American history in an American school, the first big event is the American Revolution and from then on it's a series of wars. You have the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, those are all the benchmarks. Those are the key dates that you hang all of your framework of history on. They even had a war in 1800 with the Barbary Pirates of Algeria. These are things you don't learn, but we do. It's war, it's a series of wars. The town where I came from, where I grew up, Hagerstown, Maryland, you've probably never heard

of it. It's about 60 miles northwest of Washington, D.C. It's 10 miles from the Antietam Battlefield, maybe you've never heard of that either.

A MEMBER: We certainly have - Antietam.

MR. P. EYLER: When I was a boy, I and my friends used to ride our bikes down to Antietam Battlefield, and you could go through Pipers Cornfield or along Bloody Lane and we would pick up the bullets that were a 100 years old that had been fired on that battlefield. I wasn't the lucky one, but a friend of mine found a bone with a bullet in it. That is one aspect of the tradition that I grew up in - war.

The other tradition is my home, and what kind of a home did I grow up in? I believe it was a good hard-working Christian home, it was a Brethren home. Have you ever heard of the Church of the Brethren? That's my background. I'm sure that if you've heard of that, then perhaps you know that in World War I, there were three churches which were given conscientious objector status. The members of those churches did not have to fight in the army: the Quakers, the Mennonite groups, and the Brethren.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. P. EYLER: That's part of the background that my home - my father did not go to war. When I was a child, that always embarrassed me. I was ashamed because the culture was one where you go to war, and if your father didn't go to war then you were strange. Those are two totally different opposing forces in my life, and I think that it is something that you have to recognize that these values are always fighting one against the other and you have to have a religious base, a fundamental belief, and that belief has to be that war is bad and that's why I don't want to see the United States exporting war. Maybe it's because I came from the States that I care so much about what the States does; the States is the country that I know. I don't know the USSR.

MR. H. ENNS: They caused most of the war in this world.

MR. P. EYLER: War is caused by people who fight and the basic assumption behind war is that somebody is going to win. You don't go to war if you're going to lose, and they thought they could win. As long as they could make a profit they could stay out.

That is why I was down at the Consulate, not the American Embassy as has been said. It's because I don't want to see an export of war from the United States. I don't want to see arms exported anywhere and I don't care if they're American arms or Russian arms or Cuban arms or anyone's arms. Just because I can't go down to the Cuban Embassy or the Russian Embassy in Winnipeg and demonstrate against them, it doesn't mean I can't go down to the U.S. Consulate.

I don't know who it was here tonight that said we had our consciences to answer to, but I have nothing to answer to. I have no regrets for what I did; I have

no apologies to make to anyone, to the Members of this House, to my constituents, to anyone. What I did was based on belief and faith and a moral conviction that war is not right, that you do what you can and you don't sit in this House and talk about things, but you try and get something done out in the streets.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, we wish to continue debate and I welcome the debate. The Member for River East has introduced a very personal note in the debate which begs me to - although as a legislator have tried to shy away from that kind of personal debate. Firstly, I'm here as the Member for Lakeside to represent my constituents, and I've always had that trouble, of course, even over the 16 years that I've been a legislator, as to what is my proper role. When do I properly represent the constituency that elected me, or when do I represent my personal beliefs?

But at this late hour, the member twigs my conscience to remind him that as a member of the Mennonite faith, a pacifist long before it became vogue with the present movement, dates back to Menno Simons at about the year 1534, but more recently, in the last Second World War, my two brothers who were of military age, faced the same situation that obviously he faced with respect to the draft in the United States. What did my two brothers do? They worked for 50 cents a day tending to mental patients in Brandon facility; tending to forestry projects in Alberta. They were ostracized, just as the honourable member. I recognize - the member touched me because I know exactly what he says; you were out of step with what was happening.

Because while Hitler's legions were sweeping Europe and incarcerating people into concentration camps at Auschwitz, my two brothers, who I looked up to, were not part of stopping him because of religious and pacifist beliefs. But my two brothers didn't leave the country that nurtured them. They served the country that they believed in and they paid their penalty in terms of social ostracization, if you like, in that sense.

I'm proud to say that didn't prevent one of them from becoming a Member of Parliament in years later; my brother Sig, who my colleague from Fort Garry served with, another brother became an alderman in the City of Winnipeg and demonstrated their effort and their capability in being able to, in our mixed society, have an be able to hold onto the beliefs that one strongly feels without being a traitor to one's country; without running away from the obligations of one's country; without them throwing salt in the wounds and participating in the burning of one's former homeland's country's flag. That, my brothers never did and will never do. They served their country in their full and true conscientious belief, as their religious faith dictated to them. I've never had to apologize for the actions of my two pacifist brothers in the last World War.

I'm very proud to say that they didn't feel compelled to have to leave Canada to find some other haven to expound and to extrude the kind of hatred that I find so repulsive that the Honourable Member for River East now finds compelled to extrude upon his former citizens; his former countrypeople; born 60 miles from the Capitol, Washington in Maryland that he now feels compelled to do in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman.

Furthermore, on the other issue, I understand well when the honourable member says that America, and indeed as Canada, and indeed as our most freedom loving countries, are made up of a host of different people. That is, of course, one of the greatest advantages that we have in a free country. That doesn't happen in Russia. That doesn't happen in Cuba. That doesn't happen in any Marxist system of government. But, it happens in a free, thinking western free democracies, where we can stand up and have these kind of debates.

What we are talking about here today is not the peoples of Canada versus the peoples of America. We are talking about official action of government to government, of government Ministers demonstrating in front another government's doorstep. That's what we're talking about. There are other channels open to them.

What would have been wrong? I happen to know, as most of us members know, that the American representative in this city here by the name of Lillian Mullin is a very approachable person. We've all enjoyed her hospitality on July 4th at meetings, not July 1st, as the Member for Radisson likes to get things confused in his innocence. I happen to know that there would have been no difficulty for honourable members opposite as a Cabinet, as a Premier, or indeed, as a caucus, to have summoned the American representative into their caucus room and said, hey, we don't like it, we are concerned, we are worried about possible American involvement in Nicaragua.

If you wanted to pass on an official message, government to government, then that's the way it should have been done. If the Premier of this province wanted or felt compelled because of the pressures of the Honourable Member for Inkster, who I understand is the biggest instigator in this whole business. If the Member for Inkster who can persuade his caucus members and lead his Ministers astray, to the point where they burn American flags, if he felt . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State your point of order please.

MR. A. ANSTETT: The Member for Lakeside has just alleged, after hearing contrary statements, under Citation 322, from many members on this side, that members on this side were involved in the burning of an American flag. That assertion has been denied. It's been denied unequivocally by members on this side, and I'd ask him to withdraw that assertion.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw that remark, but only for about 24 hours. It was just a little while ago under questioning period, when the Member for Springfield made his apology - I have trouble with these big words - apologia the other day, I forget the hours are drifting. He said he saw no flag being burned, he saw nothing happening like that. Tonight, I understand he acknowledged in this Chamber, and it'll be recorded in Hansard, yes the American flag was burned. I'm just putting that on the record that I accept, I will withdraw the remarks, but I want to say how the positions have shifted within this little debate in the last eight hours.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that government Ministers and government caucus members were present on an occasion where an American flag was burned.

MR. D. SCOTT: We were part of a demonstration.

MR. H. ENNS: That's all I'm saying. I don't mind at all withdrawing that remark.

Mr. Chairman, the obvious feelings and sentiments that are being aroused by this debate have been extremely worthwhile, because they have really enabled us to bring into the open many subject matters that have been kind of under the sheets up to now. I welcome the contribution from the Member for River East. I have a great deal of respect. I do not doubt his sincerity when he talks about the Brethren and his convictions of what brought him into this country. I'm simply telling him my personal experiences, as he felt compelled to tell me his, of the experiences that I had in my immediate family as a pacifist. I must tell him, Mr. Chairman, it was much more difficult in 1939 to be a pacifist when German armies were butchering people, when German armies were running over France, and putting people into concentration camps, and being of German background myself, to be a pacifist, that took a hell of a lot of guts.

It was a hell of a lot easier, Mr. Chairman, for Americans to be pacifists in a distant war in Asia. You will understand what I mean, Mr. Chairman, because we've got problems with Asians, you all look alike and it's a long way off and there's an element of racism that creeps into it.

Where were the pacifists in the First World War? The point that I'm making, Mr. Chairman, I make it very sincerely. It was very difficult for a person of German ancestry to be a conscientious objector in the last world war when German people were doing what they were doing to people in this world. That's the point that I was registering. It was a self-criticism that I was making. I am suggesting, Sir, that it was a heck of a lot more difficult to be a pacifist in the Second World War, of German ancestry, than to be a pacifist in a war that involved Americans in Asia.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: I didn't want to interrupt the Member for Lakeside in his speech, but he does seem to have been left with an erroneous assumption which is, that I came to Canada to avoid the Vietnam War. That's not true. I already had conscientious objector status. I didn't need to come to Canada to avoid the war. I came to Canada merely at the age of 19, as a matter of wanderlust, and I liked what I found and I stayed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to enter again into the debate and I don't intend to be as long and perhaps as declamatory as I was the first time I was in this debate.

I have great sympathy for what the Member for River East has said. I think everybody in this House

understands the sensitivity that each of us as a member of this House holds, with respect to the sacred nature of mankind, of men and women, and our right to pursue the kinds of happiness, the kinds of ambitions that represent our aspirations and the right to pursue them in freedom. We all bring a serious, conscientious appreciation of freedom to that argument and we have some different views as to what represents the best offensive freedom.

As a consequence I must say that I respect what the Member for River East has contributed to this debate and what he has had to say, but I have to interject at this juncture that many members on the government benches who have entered this debate have missed the basic point that some of my colleagues and I have been trying to make and that is, that the participation of the Member for River East, the Member for Rupertsland, the Member for Springfield, the Member for Radisson and many other ridings in last night's demonstration, or Wednesday night's demonstration is not the central issue here. What we are concerned about is that as Manitobans, Sir, we are represented by a sworn government, the spokesman of which, the representatives of which are Cabinet Ministers sworn in as Ministers of the Crown.

In this case there were two of them, the Minister of Economic Development, the Minister of Natural Resources who felt free to represent the people of Manitoba, namely me and you, Sir, and everyone else in this Chamber and beyond this Chamber, in an episode which does not reflect the views, the position, the posture of the people of Manitoba. That is our difficulty. I have no great difficulty with the position taken by the Member for River East. He's perfectly entitled to take the position he's taken, to go out and demonstrate if he wishes against what he feels to be perhaps the unacceptable performances and postures of different governments, whether it be the government of this country, Canada, the government of the United States, the Soviet Union, whatever or wherever. That is not the point.

In my argument this is the issue that I think has been obscured and has been distorted and misrepresented by speaker after speaker in this debate and particularly by the Minister of Natural Resources. The point is that we as Manitobans, and I am one of one million Manitobans, are represented by a government, by sworn Ministers of the Crown who are our Ministers in the government. They do not have the right to go out and operate simply as individuals unless they want to operate, Sir, simply as individuals. They embarrass me. They humiliate me. They create great difficulty for me when they stand up and represent essentially, de facto, not with my support but in terms of what they've done in public, the position of the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba on a central issue which does not jibe and does not coincide with my essential feelings and I think that it does not jibe, in this case, or coincide with the essential feelings of the majority of Manitobans and that is my difficulty.

It's not the fact that the Member for River East, or the Member for Radisson, or the Member for The Pas or Rupertsland, or the Member for Inkster participated within the last 48 hours in a demonstration in front of the U.S. Consulate here in Winnipeg. It's that Ministers

of the Crown who represent me and apparently reflect the position of the people of Manitoba, and I say "apparently" underlined, the fact that they apparently represent the people of Manitoba, two other Manitobans, two other Canadians, two other North Americans including citizens of the United States, two other citizens of the world have taken this posture and this position, that makes it so difficult for me.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose there are a number of people in this Chamber who have suffered from the effects and results of war, World War II or Vietnam or Korea or perhaps even World War I, and other international disputes, other international military confrontations around the world. But to try to suggest that there are people on this side of the House or any side of the House who in any way subscribe to or endorse the concept of war, is a total distortion, misrepresentation and prostitution of the debate at hand here. Those on this side of the House who were talking about the position that the United States of America is taking vis-a-vis the defence in the free world are not, Sir, defending a military posture, or a military initiative, or a warlike attitude, or an endorsement of war.

I frankly feel that I personally have suffered as much from war as anybody in this Chamber. In a personal sense I believe I have. I think there are many many others in this Chamber, perhaps everybody who to some extent has suffered some degree of loss, pain, difficulty and agony as a result of war, whether it was World War I or World War II, or Korea, or Vietnam or whatever battle or confrontation of a military nature that may have taken place during our lifetimes.

All I am doing, in the position I take with respect to the involvement of members of the Treasury Bench, of the government of the this province in the affairs and the events of Wednesday evening here in Winnipeg, is saying to them and appealing to them as a Manitoban, to remember that they have a responsibility, a pledge, an oath that means that they represent me. We are not members of the same party, but they represent me, Sir, because they are officers and executives and Ministers of the Government of Manitoba and therefore, they are representatives and instruments of the people of Manitoba. That is the thing that is so difficult for some of my colleagues and some of my supporters and me to accept, with respect to the events of the other evening.

It's not the fact that people don't have the right to go out and speak or take a position, or object to a posture, or even adopt an attitude of anti-Americanism or antipathy to any regime or jurisdiction in the world today, it's not that at all. It's simply that when people are elected to represent me and my colleagues and those members opposite were, Sir, whether we agree with it or not, we accept the fact that the people of Manitoba did elect them to represent us, to represent the Province of Manitoba, to speak to the Province of Manitoba. When people are put in that kind of a position, they've got to acknowledge their responsibility to all of us. I believe that the Ministers responsible, who participated in the events of the past 48 hours, which has been the subject of this debate, have been very very irresponsible in terms of their recognition of that responsibility. That is what bothers me. It's not that six or five or seven or whatever number may be the relevant one, other members of the government caucus have

been out participating in some kind of a demonstration. That's not the point at all. I think that there's been a very contrived, if not a devious effort to obscure that argument, to obfuscate that issue on the part of members opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have some sympathy with the position advanced by the Member for River East. He obviously comes from an environment and a milieu, in which he was given cause and reason to ponder the values of life, the values of his country, the values of western society in general, and to measure against those values of western society the kinds of things that he understood to be the activities and ambitions of his own nation and his own society. I appreciate the kind of agony and introspection that a person goes through in that kind of exercise.

But I would ask him to simply bear in mind the fact, that regardless of what difficulties and differences he had with that particular jurisdiction and country from which he comes, to bear in mind the fact that he comes from a jurisdiction which has been one of the great catalysts, one of the great generators, one of the great engines of democratic thought emanating down to us from the days of Jefferson and from the days of Washington, but in particular Jefferson and down through Lincoln's period and down through some of the great contemporary American leaders and Presidents of our time and that he not be too harsh in his judgment of that society and that country and that people from which he comes.

We are glad to have people from other countries, be it the United States or wherever, who come to our country, join our country and our society to serve as good and loyal Canadians in the battles that we have to fight. But at the same time I think we all, on this continent - many of us having emanated from roots that are just as much American as Canadian - all of us on this continent would want those who make that kind of shift, or make that kind of transition to be fair, and to be loving, and to be responsive in their acknowledgement that the great values of North America are in substantial part, values that have been hammered out at Valley Forge and have been hammered out in Philadelphia, have been hammered out in Washington and that come to us from the Great Republic to the south and that bear some support, some endorsement and some kind of commitment from friends and allies such as Canadians, such as we constitute here in this country.

So I would simply say to my friend from River East, that though he comes here and endorses and embraces what we were trying to do, I would hope that he would also in that commitment recognize those whom we recognize as allies, as friends and at the top of that list, of course, for me and I think for most of my colleagues, repose the citizens of the Republic to the south, the United States of America.

I don't think you can come to Canada from the United States of America and immediately adopt a posture of anti-Americanism. That is not acceptable, it is not Canadian. If you are coming here and you wish to become a Canadian, you accept and adopt Canadian standards and most Canadians look upon Americans as very close friends. Most of us are very integrally and fundamentally related to Americans. I believe that most of us in this House are fundamentally related to

American families, American roots and American traditions as we are related to English and French-Canadian roots and traditions.

So, if one is to be a good Canadian, in my view, one recognizes, accepts, adopts and supports one's commitments to the heritage of Canadians. That heritage goes beyond a relationship to Anglophone and Francophone roots. It extends to a relationship that is as old as the beginnings of North America itself and is integrally and fundamentally related to the republic to the south of us, the United States.

That's the difficulty that many of us have with the kind of posture and position that two Ministers of this government took the other evening. We simply find it extremely embarrassing, extremely uncomfortable, that Ministers who represent us, who speak for the people of Manitoba or purportedly speak for the people of Manitoba, should go out publicly and take a position and a posture that is hostile to that great republic and to that great tradition of friendship.

I find that, as a Manitoban, as a Canadian, as a Western Canadian, extremely embarrassing and extremely uncomfortable, and I call again upon my friend, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources, the Member for St. James, and his colleague, the Minister of Economic Development, and the First Minister of this province to apologize to the President of the United States for having taken that kind of action.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Mr. Chairman, I am overrun by the sentiments expressed in this Chamber about the undesirability of war and struggle, because war has never been good to mankind as history has shown. It is no better illustrated than the story of a soldier who was wounded - in a revolutionary war - with a bandage on his head. He's almost mumbling to himself and is speaking to himself and he said, I love this country. I am willing to go hungry for this country; I am willing to go thirsty for this country. I am willing to die for this country, and I hope I don't fall in love with another country again when this war is over.

There is no doubt that war has been one of the curses of mankind, and it has caused untold sufferings to millions and millions of human beings. In my youth, I have faced war and stared it in the face. I have seen, as a matter of personal experience, dog fights, and when the Japanese came and they started rounding people, for the mistake of one, the whole community has to be executed and suffer. The things that you see in the movies are things that have come to pass in life, and there is nothing good at all about war or struggle among nations.

Why do we have war? That is the question. We cannot really explain it in any single reason or explanation, but perhaps one explanation is human pride. There are some who consider themselves higher in status or in position or in privileges to other people in life, but I am glad that I have found a country where there is human dignity enthroned as one of the brightest jewels in its traditions. Here is a country where there is peaceful electoral processes, changes in the ruling power of government, without any bloodshed.

In other countries - you have read in the paper - no election will pass unless there will be some kind of

violence and killing. It is because they no longer trust their ballot system. It is because the sanctity of the ballot has been violated and, when the ballot does not work, the only thing that will work will be the bullets. We do not want to live under such kind of a system.

I have travelled personally in all the seven Latin American countries: Nicaragua, Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama. These little banana republics, I have seen them all, because I once worked for the Canadian International Development Agency doing some interviews in those little countries. The kind of system that they have is a typical system in a developing nation where a small minority of the population, the elite of the society, let's say about 5 percent to 10 percent, will control the resources of the country about 80 percent to 90 percent. They enjoy all the privileges that power brings. They entrench themselves in the power and they begin to think that they are entitled to it as a matter of right, so they begin to oppress the lower classes. It doesn't matter what ideology they are motivated with.

I believe that the only way to peace is moderation. Extreme left and extreme right will bring nothing good to humankind. Take whatever good you may find in life; food is good, but try to eat to excess and see how you feel. Drink is good; a little wine is good, but try to drink to excess and see how you feel. The next morning you wake up and say, oh boy, that was a good night but why did I drink myself to death? I have a headache all day now, so you begin to regret it. — (Interjection) — Sex is good in moderation, but try to do it every day and see that you will find yourself in trouble.

A MEMBER: What kind of trouble?

MR. C. SANTOS: What I am saying is that the golden rule, the middle ground, the moderate approach to life is the best approach in life.

I am fortunate to find a political system of government where there is all these basic guaranteed rights, the guaranteed freedom of speech, the right to peaceably assemble and petition their government for the redress of grievances. They are all now entrenched in our Charter of Rights. The fact that we can debate and throw diatribes in this Chamber across and all over as much as we like is, to me, a boon because we can express all our sentiments, our feelings and yet preserve the traditions and institutions that we have inherited from the country which is the mother of all parliament.

What I am saying, unless we try to preserve our parliamentary institution, we will deserve what we will get. We owe it to those who have sacrificed their lives, their fortunes, to preserve this institution even at that cost of putting their lives and fortunes in the battlefield in order to preserve our way of life. We owe it to the future generations to preserve our peaceful way of life, our democratic processes, our parliamentary traditions, our debates in Chambers, and behave ourselves, I hope, that we will be an honour and a credit to the institution that we all represent.

Whether we like it or not, when we were young we do whatever pleases us, but when we grow older as St. Peter had said, you will have to do things that you don't want to do because the burden of obligation begins. — (Interjection) — All right, St. Paul.

What I'm saying is that we should be able to preserve our democratic processes, and hold it dear, and sacred because it is part and parcel of our way of life. If we try to abuse, or do excesses in the exercise of our rights and privileges we will begin to lose those privileges and those rights. Anything that we abuse we begin to lose.

Therefore, I implore the member of this August body even in our debates, even in our exchanges of opinion, it is better to accord due respect to your fellow member of Parliament rather than cast aspersions because what you give is what you get.

If we respect one another, listen to one another's thoughts and ideas then we begin to feel that there is a bond of humanity that binds us all as one family under God. Only when we begin to satisfy, and recognize, and not forsake the fact that self restraint on our part can do a tremendous role in preserving our rights and liberties.

A MEMBER: It'll never happen in Cuba.

MR. C. SANTOS: Who created Cuba?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

A MEMBER: Keep going, Conrad.

MR. C. SANTOS: Liberty is a precious thing. People lay down their lives in order to be free. What life is to the eyes, what love is to the heart, liberty is to the soul of man. Without liberty the mind is a dungeon where chained thoughts and ideas die with their pinions pressed against the wooden door.

Only when we fill our hearts with love, so filled with love that there is no more space for hatred to be in the heart of man, only then we will be able to find the secret of human understanding among all peoples of all nations of all the world. Only when the power of love has replaced completely the love of power in the hearts of men, will there be a fulfillment of the prophecy that they shall build their souls into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nations shall not lift up swords against nations, neither shall they make war anymore.

I thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I have just heard from the Member for Burrows one of the best speeches that has been presented in this Legislature in this debate. I would say to the Honourable Member for Burrows that I respect his statements. As a matter of fact I have respected his statements anytime he speaks in this House because they are down-to-earth, straight-forward, and I might say that I wish he was probably the Leader of the NDP Party with the down-to-earth forward statements that he makes in this Legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Member for Burrows, who comes from another country, he comes to this country and has been elected as a member of this Legislature, he sincerely believes that he can, in his capacity as an elected member, to do everything that

he can to make Manitoba a better place to live in. I sincerely give my compliments and my sincere appreciation to that member's presentation tonight and the presentations that he has made in this House.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Okay, Frank you can get on with your speech.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I want to go back and briefly touch on what we started on tonight and which I started on earlier tonight.

MR. H. ENNS: Get back to your friend from St. James.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Get on with your speech, Frank.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, I'll get on with my speech fellows. I would ask my colleagues to just let me get on and I'll do it very briefly.

I made the statements and I started earlier tonight to say that there is a responsibility to Cabinet members. I did not understand the Member for Radisson. I am going to read his words tomorrow but I think in my impression that he was giving us probably a little bit of hell for the position that we are taking.

I would say to the Member for Radisson as caucus Chairman, and he's a Manitoban down to his toes and believes in Manitoba, that he, when the invitations came for demonstration, as caucus Chairman he should have maybe, and I think he should have, put his authority much more forward than he did. If he had done that, if he had done that we would not have members of Treasury Bench - and maybe if he'd done that he could have taken his authority, and maybe that's not the right word, his influence over the backbenchers to say that this is not the right thing to do.

As caucus Chairman, and I - you know I met his brother-in-law the other night and he's a fine fellow and he said you're a fine fellow, but as caucus Chairman, and as a Manitoban, maybe you should have shown more authority. I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that it's very hard for the caucus Chairman to show any authority over the Member for St. John because he just lives in another world, jumping around and doesn't really know what he's talking about — (Interjection) — Inkster, I'm sorry. — (Interjection) — No, he doesn't.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say very briefly, and when I spoke earlier, I was condemning the Minister of Resources, as a Minister of the Crown doing what he did and he was wrong. The Minister of Economic Development, who is the Deputy Premier of this province, was wrong, but they have been here a long time and I'll respect their opinions and what they want to do, but they were wrong as sworn Ministers of the Crown, to do what they did.

When the Member for River East stands up and says that he was rather disappointed about what his country had done through history, I say to the members here today, including the Member for St. James, that he didn't go somewhere else and snipe at Canada or Manitoba. The Member for River East was concerned about what happened in his country. A democratic country, where anybody can run for election. Why didn't he, like the Member for St. James, and even the Member for Inkster, who I say doesn't have that much, even the

Member for Springfield and the Member for Fort Garry - the member for anywhere. Why didn't he decide that if he didn't like what was going on in his democratic country, that he would stay there and run for election and try to change the situation within his own country.

I don't agree with the Member for Inkster. I think he's a fly-by-night guy, but he's here and he is trying to say, as an elected member in the country he was born in, what he thinks should be right, and what have you.

The Member for Burrows, who comes from another country, has never sniped at the constituencies or the country he has come from. He has talked about helping people. If the Member for River East has decided that he didn't come from a democratic country - and he did - and he comes to Canada, he becomes an elected member. I welcome him. He has every right to come here, the same as the member sitting over there has the right, anyone of us, to become members of this Legislature and that's our democracy.

But to stand here and go into a demonstration against United States, when he had every opportunity to become an elected member there and change the course of the history, if he wants to, of that country. But to come here and become an elected member in the Province of Manitoba, in the country of Canada, and then snipe at United States, is absolutely disgusting. If he doesn't like the system in the country he came from, it isn't Russia, it isn't anything else, the country he came from has democratic elections and if he wanted to change it, if he didn't like the history of his country, if he didn't like the Civil Wars, if he didn't like what was going on there, why didn't he stay there, become elected there, and stand in the Parliament there and try to change it? Why does he come here and be elected and snipe?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I say to you, the Member for St. James, who I have criticized all night, and I really don't like his attitude for what he did, he didn't run away from Canada and snipe at us from somewhere else and I say that sincerely. But I also say sincerely, the Member for River East lives now, as he did before, in a democratic society and has the right to do what he wants to do, but he better remember that he came from a democratic society and he is in a democratic society and he should have respect for both of those societies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I may be rather harsh on the Member for River East, but he has to have that consideration and I say sincerely to the Chairman of caucus, he should have been tougher. I say sincerely that it's unfortunate that the Premier hasn't been here tonight because I believe the Premier to allow his Treasury Bench to do what they have done, is weak-kneed, lily-livered. He obviously has no control over his Cabinet and if he doesn't, I sincerely say to the Chairman and the caucus Chairman of the NDP Party, who I like - he doesn't know that - but I think he's a rather good guy, but he hasn't been as tough as he should have been.

I would say to the caucus Chairman, you should walk out tomorrow and just take that laughing little guy over

there, the two of them, and you should rake them over the coals like they've never been raked over before. Because they have done more to hurt your party than the Member for Radisson would ever do.

I respect the Member for Radisson because he believes in his party, he believes in what is going on, but he is not taking control over his caucus, his caucus Chairman, and the Premier of this province has not taken control over his Ministers.

I repeat myself, when I end my statement, the Member for Burrows, was credible in this House tonight, very credible. I don't think the Member for Burrows, as I believe, as the Member for Springfield said today, that I could believe in the burning of any flag. I don't think that those things should have been done on this side of the House or the other. I don't think, but I'll repeat again, I don't think that any — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Chairman, my statements that I've made earlier have been proven out. We've got Twit and Tweedle-dee over there, who really don't care what happens. I would ask the Chairman of caucus to maybe put them in their place.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that anybody in this Legislature and certainly on this side would like to see

what happened last night. The Member for Burrows is a Member of this Legislature who believes in helping the benefit of the people of Manitoba. The Member for River East may have the same opinion for the benefit of the people of Manitoba, but to come here and say I'm for the benefit of people of Manitoba and say I don't like what's going on in the United States where he came from, I say sincerely that he should have stayed in the democratic system that they have there. We have a democratic system here, but he could have stayed there and maybe made his voice known to change the situation in his country, rather than come here and be elected and snipe at the other country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

1983 Capital authority requirements for nonbudgetary programs.

RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$30 million for Capital Supply.

Schedule A; Jobs Fund, \$20 million; Manitoba Beef Stabilization Fund, \$10 million; Total, \$30 million, for the fiscal year ending the 31st Day of March, 1984.

Agreed? (Agreed)

Committee rise.