

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 30 May, 1985.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR Cont'd

#### RESOLUTION RE MANITOBA - NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Order please. On the proposed resolution of the Honourable First Minister, and the motion thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and amendment thereto and the motion of the Honourable First Minister and subamendment thereto, the Honourable Member for Lakeside has 22 minutes remaining.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Prior to the supper hour adjournment I was expressing the opposition's concern, a very deep concern that we have, that the subamendment before us has in deleting all and any recognition to the commitments that this country has with our friends, neighbours and allies, very specific commitments that we have as Canadians to the organization known as NATO. Mr. Speaker, we wonder why it is that this New Democratic Party Government has difficulty with that.

I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, why it is that words like freedom and individual liberty are not really part of the lexicon of those who wish to influence and determine that we should take a particular course of action in the kind of global conflicts that this resolution addresses. Those words aren't just empty cliches. People gave their lives for those values.

It wasn't just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, that we had introduced in this Chamber a resolution calling on the nations of the world to forego torture as a means of persuasion by the State. The Member for Thompson introduced that resolution. I recall telling the Honourable Member for Thompson, Mr. Speaker, unless there is some genuine will on the part of all to adhere to conventions and accords that give some meaning to these fine sounding ideas and phrases, that they accomplish little, Mr. Speaker.

Not so many years ago a similar convention of nations passed what is known as and referred to as Helsinki Accords. Mr. Speaker, what has that done in terms of opening up the movement of ideas, never mind the movement of people, never mind the uniting of families, to do precisely what that great convention was purported to be all about.

Mr. Speaker, treaties and declarations can be signed. Adolf Hitler signed a friendship and non-aggression pact with Russia in 1939 at the same time that he was preparing his armies to inflict one of the most devastating wars any single nation has ever suffered on the face of this earth. That is a matter of recorded history.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find it really difficult why honourable members opposite would find it difficult to accept the amendment that was put forward by my Leader, some

recognition, you know, of what that cenotaph is all about just down Memorial Boulevard here, some recognition of what the cost of freedom and liberty is all about.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I just find it difficult to explain. I know that people in Lakeside will find it difficult to explain that the New Democratic Party finds it repugnant or finds it impossible to acknowledge and support our commitments that we have with those freedom loving brothers and sisters of this world that have preserved those freedoms for us, that makes it possible for us to do precisely what we are doing right now. — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for River East says, "Bring it in." We brought it in, Mr. Speaker. My leader brought it in and they removed it. They said, no, don't stand beside Britain, don't stand beside France, don't stand beside those Allies that fought shoulder-to-shoulder with you to keep tyranny off the face of this earth, to wipe out the concentration camps of Nazi Germany - no, no, no, that's terrible, don't do that. No reference, no reference at all, to those very same people that preserved our freedoms in this country. Somehow that is repugnant to the New Democratic Party, and they found it necessary, Mr. Speaker, to spend days figuring out a way of introducing a subamendment to delete that reference from my leader's amendment, which incorporated the principles of the main motion, which underlines the obvious, that we're all opposed to nuclear war, that we're all in favour of nuclear disarmament, or that we all pray that a nuclear holocaust will never be visited on this planet Earth.

But there's been a peculiar, and I would say strange, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I say an unacceptable response by the members opposite in their calculated and deliberate surgery of excising from that amendment the reference to NATO.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, that is the Conservative Party of Manitoba's principal concern with respect to the motion now before us, the fact that honourable members opposite are not prepared to acknowledge at what price and at what cost liberty and individual freedom has been retained for us. That will disturb many Manitobans. It will disturb many Manitobans in my constituency. It will disturb many of the families who lost immediate members in the preservation of that liberty and freedom whereof I speak. It will certainly disturb members of the Legion who remember that sacrifice.

They will not understand why it is that this government refuses to acknowledge a Canadian commitment. They will wonder what motivates them. What were the political forces upon you, upon the First Minister, upon the Premier of this government, that makes it impossible for him to acknowledge the fact that the alliance that we have with the NATO countries is something worthwhile. Maybe people will question in a far deeper way than honourable members now who think they're passing a particular resolution that maybe there are some immediate and short-term Brownie points for them. I tell you, there are none for you.

Nobody is going to convince anybody in my constituency that the Member for Lakeside doesn't deeply and earnestly desire peace, doesn't deeply and earnestly want to see a disarmament process take place, fears and is concerned for my two children as much as your children about the consequences of nuclear war. You know, how foolish do you think the people of Manitoba are?

What you are being held subject to is some very serious questioning as to the political motivations that brought in a resolution of this kind - pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I'll retract that - that motivated them to insist on the surgery that they felt was necessary, even as the opposition was agreeing with their main motion, but they felt it was necessary. It was not possible for us to stand up with our brothers and sisters in the United States of America, in England, in France, in Italy, in Germany, in Norway, in Denmark, those of us of the western democracies that happen to believe in the personal individuality, individual freedom and liberties that we enjoy. That is why they are going to have difficulty understanding why it is that you found it necessary to take the action that you have. Well, Mr. Speaker, they will have to answer to it.

I just wanted to put on the record very firmly and very clearly that I am very comfortable and very satisfied with the position that our party will take on this matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside seems to read into the efforts that we on this side have taken to make of the resolution and the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, the subamendment that we placed, to see in that some Machiavellian manoeuvre to disassociate ourselves with international obligations.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned as a government and I trust the opposition is concerned as responsible opposition, that the resolution that emanates from this House should be a clarion call for peace, an urging that all people reconsider the stock phrases that have been used for generations about might being right and we have to have tremendous defences in order to be free. We hope that we will set an example in really talking about peace, really talking about, as the amendment that the Leader of the Opposition moved, a de-escalation of the arms race.

Let's not talk about defensive alignments in a resolution. Let's not talk about treaty obligations; the Warsaw Pact or NATO or NORAD. Let's talk about ploughshares. Let's talk about the differences now that exist in this world where millions of people throughout the world are looking for peace. They've heard enough about defensive arrangements. They've heard enough about the massive nuclear weaponry that's there. They're looking for leadership to peace and the subamendment was to take the virtuous recommendations that were contained in the amendment and fashion them in a way that makes it possible for us to appear to the world to be not looking at defensive arrangements, military arrangements, but calling upon the superpowers to show leadership in de-escalating the arms race that seems to be on such a completely hopeless destructive path.

We took the merit that was in the Leader of the Opposition's amendment and strengthened it in this subamendment. Our commitment as a country to NATO is there. The fact that we improved this resolution without referring to defensive alignments, doesn't take away from the commitments we have to that organization.

So I urge the Member for Lakeside and the members of the opposition to see that what our subamendment has done is take the strength, the merit that was contained in the amendment and fashion it away now that it's an even better resolution than when first introduced by the Premier. A combined message of concern about the nuclear arms race and a concern that we show in this province some leadership in declaring our province a nuclear-free area.

It is now, Mr. Speaker, a question of looking for peaceful methods to solve disputes, not using military might. That's the message in this amended resolution: peace and not war, love and not hate. We've seen enough intolerance in society. We see it in various parts of the world. What we hope in this combined, this improved resolution is to draw to the attention of people everywhere that the people of Manitoba think that it is time to call a halt to the arms race and time to set an example of standing for sanity.

Mr. Speaker, when you look around the world and you see the strife in Ireland, family fighting family; when you read of the devastation in a beautiful city like Beirut in Lebanon, people fighting one another - for what cause? Do they really know? Kampuchea, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Africa - intolerance and hate that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. What this resolution and this subamendment look forward to is a de-escalation of hatred and the threat of violent destruction of Planet Earth.

We have in the Middle East a continuance of the state of war. And why? Why is that enmity? Why is that bitterness? Do people really know? Isn't it time that we in Manitoba said, look, can't we start afresh, can't we say no to nuclear weaponry in Manitoba? Can't we call upon the superpowers to really sit down and de-escalate what is madness, when we see the tremendous cost to society of this arms race? It's absolutely beyond reason, Mr. Speaker. In excess of \$700 billion a year that is going into arms.

That's why we welcome and endorse that portion of the Leader of the Opposition's amendment that talks about de-escalating that monstrosity that's out there, that madness. The statistics, Mr. Speaker, are horrendous, absolutely horrendous. Military spending of the NATO powers, \$312 billion; military spending of the Warsaw Pact, \$300 billion; of China, \$49 billion. Those are the major partners in this international escalation of arms spending. A fantastic waste, Mr. Speaker.

Our concern about the escalation of arms is not new. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from the writings of one who is considered a militarist, someone who was the Supreme Allied Commander in World War II, and before he left the White House, before he left the presidency, he had some words to say about this inordinate spending on arms, Dwight Eisenhower, and I would like to quote from his message. This article was entitled, "The Cross of Iron" and it's reported in his speeches in this journal published by the American Heritage

Magazine United Press International, and I'd like you to hear the words in respect to arms, the arms race, by the late former president. I quote from mid-article because it's a fairly lengthy article, but I would like to put these words on the record, Mr. Speaker.

"And so it came to pass that the Soviet Union itself had shared and suffered the very fears it had fostered in the rest of the world. This has been the way of life forged by eight years of fear and force. What can the world or any nation in it hope for if no turning is found on this dread road? The worst to be feared and the best to be expected can be simply stated: the worst is atomic war; the best would be this, a life of perpetual fear and tension, a burden of arms draining the wealth and the labour of all peoples, a wasting of strength that defies the American system or this Soviet system or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the peoples of this earth.

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this - a modern brick school in more than 30 cities.

"We pay for a single fighter plane with half a million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people. This, I repeat, is the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron.

"This government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of production, freedom.

"If we strive but fail, and the world remains armed against itself, it at least need be divided no longer in its clear knowledge of who has condemned humankind to this fate. These proposals spring without ulterior purpose or political passion from our calm conviction that the hunger for peace is in the hearts of all peoples, those of Russia and of China, no less than our own country. They aspire to this, the lifting from the backs and from the hearts of man of their burden of arms and of fears so that they may find before them a golden age of freedom and peace."

Mr. Speaker, those were the words of a great military leader, the late Dwight Eisenhower, given April 16th, 1953. Mr. Speaker, that same mission, that same dedication to a commitment for peace should be with us today. I think that is the spirit of the resolution moved by my Premier and the amendment made by the Leader of the Opposition that though it may seem that it's merely the message of a Provincial Legislature, it sets an example in Canada and throughout the world, because individual efforts do count, Mr. Speaker.

Members in this Chamber know about the individual efforts of one known as Jesus of Nazareth. They know of the individual efforts of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin

Luther King. Mr. Speaker, individuals count, and bodies of opinion like this Legislature count, and let us send a message throughout the world that we are concerned about peace.

In our day we saw Anwar Sadat take the chance, take the risk, have some trust and faith that what he could do as an individual would be meaningful, and we know what happened when he was able to sit down beside Golda Meier and talk as friends, former enemies talking as friends.

Mr. Speaker, we should not belittle the individual efforts that have been made recently, efforts of the Pope going throughout the world talking about peace; asking, pleading people to pray for peace, to stand for peace and to revoke violence. Mr. Speaker, that message is as important for us in Manitoba as anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the late Dwight Eisenhower spoke about was his great concern for the kind of developments we have seen in his great country. Mr. Speaker, a seeming interest and a dedication to an industrial military complex, one that he warned about. The brief message I read again from that text, and this is a paraphrasing of what he said. Perhaps I should take the longer text as it was published in the New York Times on Wednesday, January 18th, 1961. This is when he was leaving the presidency, Mr. Speaker, and he says, "Until the latest of our world conflicts the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of ploughshares could, with time as required, make swords as well, but we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defence. We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this 3.5 million men and women are directly engaged in the defence establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations.

"Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence, economic, political, even spiritual is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development; yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved, so is the very structure of our society. In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex.

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the wake of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted, only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defence with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Mr. Speaker, the late Dwight Eisenhower was concerned about that growing influence, that growing dependence of the arms industry in the United States. Sad to say, Mr. Speaker, industrial merchants of military hardware and devices to kill people have come to this country from the United States and urged that companies in Manitoba, companies in Canada get on

board in respect to building arms in the arms race because it's a great business. We know some of the stories that have come out of Washington in respect to the tremendous abuse that has occurred in respect to military provisioning.

Mr. Speaker, what this subamendment does is focus on that waste of resources, not just money, not just material, but as has been indicated by Dwight Eisenhower, the genius, the toil, the productivity of the human race that is going into a wasteful use when all of that energy - imagine, Mr. Speaker, over \$700 billion. When Dwight Eisenhower made that speech, I'm sure that the total military spending was half of what it is today. Think of the enormous depravity of a society in which we live where millions of people go without food and clothing and shelter and adequate medical and hospital treatment, but we have billions of dollars to spend on madness.

Mr. Speaker, whether we look anywhere in history, we find that the military solutions have never lasted, and those in our history who told us that love was the way, tolerance was the way, that we should find ways to reconcile ourselves with others, that is the way. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we in this country can see the example of that.

We saw in our lifetime the differences that exist between our neighbour and that great country of China. For a period of history, the people of the United States, thank goodness, under even some Conservative Governments, the late John Diefenbaker, we recognized China. But in the United States for a time - it was then the population of China 600-700 million people - it's a billion today - just did not exist, they could have no relationship with those people. We know that's changed. Maybe it was just an insignificant thing, the pingpong match. Little things can break down the barriers, barriers that need not have existed. Because the theories that existed at that time in the United States, prevalent also in Canada, that all the people in the world if they adopt some sort of a philosophy think alike. That's not correct. The old domino theory that existed, found that doesn't exist, it doesn't happen. People are different, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I could give the honourable members a bit of a history lesson in respect to the development of Communist China but it wouldn't be relevant and germane to the amendment we have before us. The subamendment, as I've indicated, seeks to address in a responsible, productive way the concerns we must jointly have for enmeshing a call for nuclear sanity with a call upon the superpowers to really sincerely address the continuous madness that seems to pervade the planners in both those countries.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution, the amendment, and the combination as revised and approved by the subamendment seeks to deliver a message of peace and understanding and concern. We are saying no, we are saying no to further arms relationships. You see, at the present time there is concern, a valid concern, as to whether or not we as a country could be drawn in through our linkages, through our treaties, with a further escalation of militarization of space, and at what great cost.

So in this subamendment, we cut away any reference to militarism on the part of Canada or Manitoba. We talk about peace and understanding that is involved

in a declaration of a nuclear free zone and a clarion call upon the superpowers to stop this madness.

Mr. Speaker, with that kind of joint message, let the opposition and the government, together, with that resolution as it's now been amended, set an example in Canada and North America and the world, that peoples everywhere are seeking an example, a thrust and a dedication to peace.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

I want to begin by placing on the record my appreciation for the words of many who have spoken on this resolution, and in debate on the amendments. I think there have been many fine speeches included among those the one of the Minister of Labour, who has just preceded me, speeches from people who, I believe, are very sincerely and hold their feelings very strongly about the issue before us, the issue of making a statement, sending a signal, a symbolic gesture such as has been said by the First Minister in the direction of world peace and nuclear disarmament, things which I believe are important to all Manitobans.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the various references that were made by the Minister of Labour to speeches by Dwight Eisenhower, references to John Diefenbaker, Anwar Sadat, world leaders, all of whom have indicated positions that are laudable and stand as a goal and an objective for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour and many others have, of course, taken the position that we must stand united for world peace. We must stand united in stating our abhorrence for the possibility of nuclear war. We must stand united against nuclear weaponry, the build-up of nuclear weaponry, the escalation of the arms race and all of those things and indeed, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of that. Who in his right mind, Mr. Speaker, could want war? Who, in their right minds, could advocate nuclear holocaust, nuclear madness that all of us can't countenance in our future in the world?

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I regret sincerely that on a resolution in the name of peace, such a laudable objective, that there could be the development of such acrimony as was existing earlier today and was developing earlier today on the matter of dealing with this, on a matter of pressure by the Government House Leader on behalf of his colleagues to deal instantly and quickly on the resolution. I remind members opposite that they took eight days to arrive at a subamendment to the amendment which I had proposed, that the Government House Leader, I believe, said in conversation with one of our members, that he had worked ten days to get something that was approved by his caucus and also was workable under our rules in terms of a subamendment.

You, Sir, took considerable time to arrive at a determination as to the acceptability and the admissibility of this under our rules, and yet having given us only six days, the government chose to impose, in effect, closure on the debate to insist that the matter be dealt with expeditiously today because of some timetable which they have placed before themselves, Mr. Speaker.

There was the outbreak of shouting, of baiting back and forth about who was agreeing with whom and who was having difficulty making up their minds and all of those things. Mr. Speaker, it was an almost unbelievable sequence of events on an issue to do with world peace, to do with an accord and an agreement of declaration on a topic that, as I say, is of such importance and significance to all in Manitoba. I find this, indeed, regrettable.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments with which we are dealing, the specific amendment and the overall debate of course, centres around the topic of the establishment of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. We desire, of course, by that, to send a signal, a message, that we wish to put an end, forever, to the threat of nuclear annihilation, nuclear warfare in our world; to send an even stronger message perhaps than has been in the past sent, of the desire of Manitobans for world peace.

Mr. Speaker, a number of the things which have been said earlier bear repeating, things to do with the desire on the part of all of us on both sides of the Chamber to support the role of everlasting world peace, to declare strongly and forcefully our abhorrence for the nuclear arms build-up in the world because, as I said earlier, each of us knows that there are no winners in a nuclear war. Everyone stands to lose and as long as there is a commitment to the build-up of nuclear weaponry, then of course, Mr. Speaker, there can be no feeling or sense of real security on the part of anybody that at some point, either by accident or on purpose, nuclear weaponry won't be used.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, because I think it's important, that the resolution is a symbolic gesture and as such we must not be so naive or delude ourselves or others into thinking that this is going to have an instant action or result. Rather, it is, as has been said, a signal, a direction pointing us along the path that many have chosen. We, as elected representatives, perhaps can lend the weight and the voice and the strength of our commitment and enhance that desire on the part of so many to be in that direction and to signal that intent.

Mr. Speaker, I hold out no illusion that this would, as the First Minister said, remove the cloud of doubt and gloom over the heads of all young people in Manitoba. I would not go so far as to try and persuade young people that this resolution would do that. It isn't going to prevent the possibility that we would be under nuclear attack; there's no question about that. It will still all around us. What we will have done is sent a message saying that we don't want to see nuclear war, that we don't want to be a part of the nuclear arms build-up, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that that message has been sent before and it has been sent before by many who were referred to in earlier speeches. We are not leaders in this. We are simply following a prudent path that has been struck for us by many others.

Mr. Speaker, I say though, in specifically referring to what is the net effect of the subamendment to the amendment which I moved, that I find it, too, regrettable in the sense that it specifically moves to combine two legitimately presented, sincerely held points of view, and desires with two exceptions. Those exceptions have been alluded to by the two earlier speeches tonight. Those exceptions are that one of the clauses of preamble has been exorcized and that is the one that

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

For some reason, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is indeed regrettable that the government, this New Democratic Administration, cannot support that statement of fact. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that rejection of the reality of what has gone before.

The Minister of Labour said earlier that they, in choosing to exorcize those two clauses of the preamble, wanted to erase any mention of war. They wanted to not refer to any of the treaties that are, in effect, defence agreements amongst the countries of an alliance. But, Mr. Speaker, they exist; those treaties exist, the alliance exists and the freedoms that are enjoyed by the people of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were indeed secured at immense cost in human suffering and property destruction during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, in the Second World War, it is estimated that 50 million people died; died as the result of the use of all sorts of weapons including primarily conventional weapons; 100,000 alone died in an air raid on the City of Dresden, more than died in Hiroshima. Think about those sacrifices, think about that aspect of history and what it contributed towards the peace and democracy which we enjoy in our country here in Canada. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that it's important to recognize that.

When I made my remarks earlier on the resolution, Mr. Speaker, they were made on the day of the 40th Anniversary of V-E Day. Later that day, there was what appeared to be a hastily called reception. I say "hastily called" because in speaking with many of the veterans who were there, they were notified about it on the previous Friday and this was Wednesday, May 8. So, almost as an afterthought it appeared as though the government decided that there should be some recognition of the 40th Anniversary of V-E Day.

Mr. Speaker, at that particular reception, I saw a number of members of the government mingling amongst the veterans, mingling amongst the Legion members, the various people who had served in the armed forces who had made many of the sacrifices that I've been talking about; sacrificed their youth, sacrificed their health in some cases and, of course, there were those we were remembering who weren't there who had sacrificed their lives. Mr. Speaker, during that reception, many of the government members were there smiling, chatting, shaking hands - the Member for Inkster.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what those people would think if they knew after that kind of public exercise that the members of the government got together and decided that they should exorcize from this proposed amendment any mention of that service, any mention of those sacrifices, any mention of the immense cost of human suffering that resulted in bringing us to the point that we are today in history.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour says that they merely wanted to remove any juxtaposition of war or treaties or any of those things with a peace resolution, but in order to know where you're going you have to acknowledge where you've been and how you've arrived

at where you are. This subamendment seeks to erase all that, not acknowledge that's what brought us to where we are today. I find that, indeed, regrettable.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour said that the subamendment just focuses on the waste, but it doesn't. It chooses to ignore history and not to face reality. I don't think that there was any problem or should be any difficulty on the part of any Canadian in recognizing what we went through in order to get where we are.

Mr. Speaker, I said on V-E Day and I'll repeat it today, that anyone who served, anyone who lost during the Second World War, the greatest tribute we can pay to them is to work for everlasting peace so that it can never happen again, and that was a message that was said by many that day and I believe that it's strongly held. Yet, it seems as though the members on the government side want to erase that memory and want not to acknowledge the sacrifices, the service and the existence of those people who fought for and ensured our peace and democracy through those sacrifices in the Second World War by exorcizing that entirely from this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there's a second part of the preamble that is removed as a result of this subamendment and it is the statement that says "WHEREAS Canada has a continuing commitment to the defence of freedom through NATO," and that's been exorcized.

Mr. Speaker, some members on the government side have said that the effect of that is a message of support for NATO. As a matter of fact, members of the media picked that up and said that what the Conservatives were doing was to try and bring in, as part of the resolution, a message of support for NATO. Mr. Speaker, that is a statement of what exists. Canada has a continuing commitment to the defence of freedom through NATO and until that's changed, that's what exists today. That's a statement of fact, of reality.

It's no attempt to editorialize. It's not an attempt to say, yes or no, good or bad. It's a statement of fact and I find it absolutely incredible that the government, that this NDP administration chooses not to accept the statement of fact. It's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why they choose not to acknowledge the existence of NATO or of the commitment that our country, Canada, has undertaken as a member of NATO. Mr. Speaker, is it that they somehow feel that NATO represents something that is inconsistent with this desire for world peace? NATO is an alliance designed to deter war, not to fight one. I'll quote from a book on NATO.

It says, "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO, basic purpose was and still is to deter aggression against any of its members by presenting a common front in the belief that it's better to prevent a war than to fight one." And infinitely less costly, and nobody wants war. That's a statement that all of us keep repeating over and over again and yet, for some reason, this NDP administration has to exorcize that from any resolution with which it's connected, and I find that shameful and regrettable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think that those are things that the veterans, that the members of the legion, that all of those who were here for that reception will want to know. The families of those who were lost in the Second World War, who made the sacrifices, who gave the service, will want to know that their service, their

commitment, their sacrifice for world peace has been totally rejected, ignored and in fact wanted to be erased from the record by this NDP administration.

I find it regrettable as well, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the effect of this subamendment to really look at the politicization of this issue in the manner in which this administration is handling it because I said earlier, and I'll repeat again, Canada is a nuclear weapons free country because our government has chosen to make it that way and will indeed keep it that way, Mr. Speaker.

No nuclear weapons are now stationed on Canadian soil and that is done by the jurisdiction in this country, the government which has jurisdiction over that, not by a Manitoba Government passing a symbolic gesture. That is done because that is what exists and that is the choice and the policy of this country of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and that is what is important in this whole thing and that too is being obfuscated by the manner in which the NDP administration is attempting to deal with this; because somehow they are trying to take some credit, by passing this symbolic gesture, that will somehow overcome the effect of what already exists and that is that the Government of Canada has made this a nuclear weapons free country.

Mr. Speaker, peace has existed in our country since the Second World War because of the sacrifices of the many who gave up their lives, yet this administration will not allow any public recognition in the form of a clause in this resolution to acknowledge that.

The Minister of Labour chastised the American Government for, as he said, ignoring the existence of 600 million to 700 million Chinese, Communist Chinese, by not recognizing the People's Republic of China. He said they were ignoring the existence of those people. Well, Mr. Speaker, he and his administration want to ignore the sacrifices, the service, the commitments that were made by those who were in the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, it's regrettable that, in the effect of their subamendment they want to ignore and erase all of this, all of our history and, in fact, the statement of reality as to what exists. Contrary to their opinion and the assessment and interpretation of the media, we believe that it's important to state this and to have it on the record.

By their politicization of this issue, I think that they have demeaned the intent, that they have severely reduced the potential effect of this because I think it's become apparent in the course of this whole matter and the course of the manner in which it's been forced through the Legislature under pressure in recent times, contrary to what people, I think, would expect, in terms of something that is seeking to bring people together, to get a common front on an issue of such importance, they have demeaned the intent of this and the thrust of this by their politicization of the issue.

Mr. Speaker, they have talked about educating our youth and helping to give strength and a sense of purpose in the future to our youth. Yet how are we supporting or educating our youth when we begin by denying the facts, when we begin by ignoring history? Mr. Speaker, those losses and those sacrifices, that sense of where we were and how we got to where we are is the best knowledge and education that we can leave with our children and our grandchildren.

I can't believe the kind of manipulation that has come on to this and the smirking and the giggling that went



on this afternoon over who was agreeing or disagreeing and who wasn't ready to speak and why and all of these things, Mr. Speaker. I can't believe that that kind of attitude does anything to enhance this resolution and its intent. I can't believe that imposing closure this afternoon does anything to enhance the intent of this resolution. It only shows the intent of the government was one of somehow claiming political credit and getting some political exposure, as opposed to any real sense of commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to make mention of the fact that the sense of urgency that was put on this issue by the Government House Leader, no doubt at the behest of his caucus colleagues, to say it must be dealt with, call it forward, deal with it, have the great debate, call this, spend an entire day, keep the pressure on, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that all the normal business of the House is wiped aside, is set aside for the purpose of getting some immediate political response as they shouted across they passed this declaration of Peace Week and there's a peace mark and that's the timetable that they have chosen. They have chosen to show where their real priorities lie.

Earlier on, even within the last number of days, we talked about what the priorities of this administration were. In his pious way, the First Minister talked about the fact that it's the economy, that it's job creation, that nothing else is more important in Manitoba today, that nothing takes precedence - that's what the government chooses as its No. 1 priority. They then chose to erase all of that, to wipe it all aside and, in fact, say if you don't deal with this, if you don't debate it and get on with it, this will take precedence and we'll keep putting it forward and forward and forward until nothing else matters. Mr. Speaker, I think that this shows how the government flip flops in its priorities; it shows how the government wants to put symbolic gestures ahead of the real priorities of its administration.

Mr. Speaker, its image, its perception, is everthing with this administration. That's what they're reduced to. They are so insecure, they are so lacking in leadership, so bereft of ideas for the economic development and enhancement of this province that they have to be reduced to putting as No. 1 on their priority list, wiping out everything aside dealing with this symbolic gesture. That's what this administration has been reduced to, Mr. Speaker; force aside all government business and place it ahead of all priorities because that, in their view, is what they need in order to be re-elected in this province of ours.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, they give out so many different mixed signals. There's a lack of clarity, there's an instability developing because people are calling us from Pinawa, the Whiteshell nuclear research establishment there and they're saying, we are engaged in peaceful nuclear use, we are engaged in research that leads towards that, we employ hundreds of people here in Manitoba, there are many of us who work in the development of this peaceful research and nuclear establishment there. There are others who are working in other forms and they say, what is the government trying to say by this? What do they mean? Are our jobs next? Is our existence in danger? All of these things.

Mr. Speaker, it's because the government puts this as a priority over everything else on the Order Paper,

over everything else in its responsibility as a government, that people are now feeling insecure about the government and its future intents. I think that after this resolution has been dealt with, the government is going to have to make some other statements to people to let them know what their priorities really are and whether or not they will have jobs to go to, and whether or not they do have a place in Manitoba's society in future.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I just want to say that we on this side of the House proposed our amendment to the government resolution in all sincerity, in a sense of commitment of purpose to try and get together with this administration and to try and tell them that we believe very strongly that there were things lacking in the resolution that they had put forward.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the amendment which we put forward, the government has chosen to remove two very important clauses, one which acknowledges history, the fact that the freedoms that are enjoyed by people in our country were secured at immense cost in human suffering and property damage in a World War II, a fact that we acknowledge and people whom we honoured on the 40th Anniversary of V-E Day are wiped out by that amendment, and we object to that. The second one is the fact that they want to remove an acknowledgement of the fact of the existence of NATO and Canada's commitment to the defence of freedom through our membership in NATO.

Mr. Speaker, in both cases we believe that those are significant removals, that those are removals that are wrong. They're wrong for the youth of our country to try and erase history, to try and give them further insecurity by not telling them how we've gotten to the point where we are and by simply not acknowledging that we are members living in a country that has chosen to be nuclear weapons free and that has commitments and has taken on those commitments in good faith, Mr. Speaker, and that exists as well. They can't, for some reason, bring themselves to give any acknowledgement that NATO exists or that, in fact, the Second World War took place and that people made sacrifices and led us to this point of peace and freedom in our country.

Mr. Speaker, as a consequence, we cannot support the amendment to the amendment that the Premier has proposed because the net effect of that is to remove those two clauses and we believe strongly that those two clauses ought to be left in place.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, and knowing that this government with its force of numbers and the kind of urgency and pressure it was putting on this afternoon, we'll override our concerns about that removal and we'll force this matter through. I'd say, Mr. Speaker, that we will be supporting the eventual amended resolution because we believe that the cause of world peace and nuclear disarmament are the goals and objectives that all of us have and we want no mistake about that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** Are you ready for the question?

On the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister, a subamendment to the amendment, all those

in favour, please say Aye. All those opposed, please say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it.

On the proposed amendment to the resolution . . .

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

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yeas and Nays on the proposed subamendment. Call in the members.

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

### YEAS

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

### NAYS

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

**MR. CLERK, W. Remnant:** Yeas, 25; Nays 19.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** The motion is accordingly passed.

The question before the House is the amendment as amended. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have followed the debate with considerable interest and I suppose for some members of the Assembly it's been a difficult time trying to figure out the exact implications of the various amendments that have been made, but I think the intentions on both sides of the Chamber, in terms of trying to frame a resolution that would have some broad appeal and be meaningful and also useful, which is perhaps the most difficult part of the exercise, I think all of those attempts have been taken in the right spirit and frame of mind. Although in some cases there may be some overlapping and there may be some segments which don't exactly fit, I have not seen any insurmountable problem with either the original resolution or some of the amendments that followed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been an interesting debate. There have been some very good contributions and there have been some flawed arguments, I think, put forward as well. One that I found interesting was put by the Attorney-General who, when he debated this, I think, thought it was a significant point that dozens of resolutions had been passed by municipalities on the nuclear question, that there had been a nuclear question put in the election of 1983 and he was impressed with the fact that these resolutions had opposed the distribution of nuclear weapons. At the same time, as he spoke, I thought of how he himself wasn't impressed at that time with the language resolutions which were equally well intentioned, which equally well expressed the feelings of people in

Manitoba on a crucial and direct question and were also an exercise in democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is important but it also seems to me quite obvious that it is really in fact a private member's resolution. It has been raised to the highest level by the House Leader and the Premier and is, of course, a crucial issue, but I think would have been better served as a private member's resolution and unfortunately the government seems to be having a mental block. When it comes to that side of our agenda, they are prepared to discuss government business, they are uninterested in private members' resolutions and proposals, but when they come up with one measure themselves, then aside from their so-called priority of jobs, jobs, jobs, this suddenly takes a back seat and I think for the possibility of scoring some points, has decided to push all other business aside as they did on this particular day.

Mr. Speaker, when the Second World War ended, I was nine years old and I recall very clearly first hearing, as a nine- to ten-year-old boy attending Strathcona School, some of the horrors of nuclear weapons. I recall some stories that were disseminated on the schoolgrounds, quite exaggerated and quite inaccurate about what happened with nuclear weapons and I really did not grasp what happened at Nagasaki and Hiroshima until the late Fifties, when I was a university student attending what was then called United College, along with the Premier and perhaps other members of this Chamber. It was there that I started to dig in and delve into the whole nuclear question and was horrified at the prospects of a nuclear war.

I also, at that particular time, joined with other people in the anti-nuclear protests of the 1960s. Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to shirk from standing for what I believe in, but I have also never been very keen about carrying a placard. That was, I think, the only time in my life that I can recall where I picked up a placard and walked down Main Street and down Portage Avenue in an anti-nuclear demonstration, somewhere in 1960 or '61. I didn't like the idea of doing it but I did it because of what I believed in.

So now, Mr. Speaker, for some strange reason, fortunately we are in a revival period of anti-nuclear feeling. Maybe it has now taken a generation, maybe the generation that I belonged to, which really was from the '50s and was still active in the early '60s, somehow or other the interest faded and somehow or other it rekindled, and that, Mr. Speaker, is a good thing, including all of those demonstrations and all of that revived interest that has come about.

Mr. Speaker, I heard somebody this morning, I think on the Peter Gzowski Show make a crucial point. It was a brief point and it was a point only made in passing, but it was a discussion on the nuclear arms talks that are now being held between the Soviet Union and the United States. This fellow in effect said that what was ultimately required was understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when you think of all the mistrust, all the hatred, all the concern and all the military build up that has been going on, I guess maybe since the dawn of history, but particularly since the end of the Second World War, one can see that this is in fact the key. We all know about the billions and trillions of dollars being spent on armaments and the two superpowers, the



USSR and the USA arming themselves to the teeth with the potential of blowing each other up many, many times over, now talking about nuclear weapons in outer space; and we can see that, if somehow or other, some understanding could be brought into the debate, it would be a wonderful thing.

Mr. Speaker, what is peculiar in history - and I taught history in high school for a number of years - is how enemies can become friends and friends can become enemies; and if you had gone around in 1944 and '45 and said to people living in North America or in Europe that some day Germany and Japan might become allies of the United States, and as Churchill used to say, quote, "Our gallant allies, the Russians," might become our enemies, people would have thought you were insane. They wouldn't have believed for a split second that the hated Axis powers of Germany and Japan and Italy would then become our friends, and that our wartime allies, the Soviet Union, would then become our major foe.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to add one particular point here and that is that it's regrettable I think and it's unfortunate - maybe it's only human and maybe it's understandable - that the Second World War which raged in Europe over 40 years ago is still being debated, still being discussed, still alive and well every night on television and in the movies.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the Second World War. There has been a great rage that went on recently as a result of President Reagan's visit to Bitburg, Germany. This was rather surprising, in the sense that for many years at this cemetery where there are many American troops stationed in that particular city, that where there were wreath laying ceremonies for at least 25 years, all of a sudden there was a tremendous reaction in the United States. A lot of people then revived and relived and rekindled some of the old hatreds, the old concerns, the fears, and some of the foibles that have gone on in wartime and ever since.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that some writers in the media have made some highly intelligent comments about this and I would like to refer to a couple of them. Eric Wells, I think is one of the more intelligent and more sensitive and best educated and has a general good grasp of history and I want to read what he said about the wartime legacy in a broadcast on CJOB on February 15th, a couple of paragraphs.

Mr. Wells said, "Except in cases involving specific murder charges, surely by now, after the passage of 40 years, the time has come to halt the accusations being made about persons who served in the armed forces or in the political organizations of those on the opposing side in World War II. At the present time in Canada, unknown numbers of our citizens who arrived in this country to start a new life, now find themselves chained to the wartime baggage which they thought they had left behind them.

"One of the prospects so often extolled during the war was that after it was over, people of the world would have a chance to start over again. This promise had particular application to people once enmeshed in the toils of war, seeking a new life where human values would be paramount right here in Canada; but a survey of our Canadian news today reveals that our country is being increasingly entangled in a cross-examination

of wartime experiences which many Canadians would prefer to forget and with good reasons enough. They were entitled to start a new life; we welcomed them and there is no fair way in which we can now expect them to account for the terrors and mistakes of a world at war." That's what Mr. Wells said.

I quote just briefly from an article by Doug Collins. I don't know if members of the Chamber are familiar with Doug Collins but he's a tough, gruff, rough announcer from the West Coast, sort of a Jack Webster on radio. His nickname is "Bulldog" Collins and Collins, I believe, was also a famous escapee from prison camps in Germany in the Second World War.

We had a member like that in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. Gordon Johnson, from Portage la Prairie apparently was a legendary prisoner of war who on more than one occasion escaped from a German prison camp in Europe, and Collins was the same type. He could not be and would not be held down.

Well, the Member for Morris says, how would Gordon Johnson feel about this? I would assume - I can't speak for him - but I would assume he'd be very strong on NATO and other aspects of the resolution in line with my honourable friends.

I just quote the beginning and the end of what Collins said in his comment about the attitude of people 40 years after the end of the war and his article was called "Forty Years Is Too Long To Hate."

He said at the beginning, "If anyone had told me in 1945 that I would on this Remembrance Day be writing the column you are reading now, I would have referred him to the doctor. I was a good hater you see but time is not only a healer, it's a teacher." At the end of his article he said, "Forty years is long enough to talk about hate literature."

So, there's Collins who during the wartime was a man who went to war, hated the enemy, fought the enemy, killed the enemy, shot the enemy, and now says what's done is done.

It's also interesting, Mr. Speaker, to note that when you come to war and you come to sides of war, one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist. Isn't it interesting that you always get people talking about terrorists when somebody else is calling them freedom fighters. It depends of course on whether they're backing your cause or opposing your cause.

I thought there was a good cartoon about this in the paper a number of months ago, maybe a year ago, when there was a series of cartoons by Doonesbury, G.B. Trudeau, the American cartoonist, who I think is one of the best of all time. He had a war scene making fun of the media and making fun at government press agents and the foibles and failings of people and the blindness that I suppose all of us have. The media types said to the sergeant "What is it now, sergeant?" He said, "We just got the final count on the terrorist evacuees, sir." He says, "Well does this include the terrorists wounded from the terrorist hospitals?" The soldier said, "Yes, sir, along with the terrorist doctors and the terrorist nurses." They obviously knew the jargon. So, the other reporter says, "Well wait a minute, what is all this terrorist business? Wasn't Begin once a terrorist too?" This is obviously a reference to the Middle East. This other reporter corrects him and says, "Mr. Begin was not a terrorist, he was a freedom fighter." The other reporter says, "Oh." So, the other

reporter says, "Well how many terrorists' relatives?" The soldier finally ends saying, "There are 3,000 terrorist wives and 2,000 baby terrorists."

Mr. Speaker, the point trying to be made by the cartoonist is that again from one aspect, from one point of view we're talking about terrorism. From the other side, the same people are viewed as freedom fighters.

Mr. Speaker, I will move towards a conclusion and simply say in general that when it came to the recent controversy that went on in Bitburg that it was unfortunate and that rather than perhaps beginning a healing process or a process of reconciliation which will come in time, it seemed to exacerbate the situation.

Jeffrey Simpson wrote an excellent article on this called The Bitburg Controversy and I just quote briefly from his remarks in the Globe and Mail where he said as follows, "West Germans are not trying to hide or forget what happened from 1933-1945. They have indulged in this introspective not only for their own reasons but to show as West Germans always try to do, that they are good Allies, friends and neighbours."

He said in the end of his article, "The Bitburg Cemetery after all has been the scene of replaying ceremonies for years by senior Western military people."

He ended by saying that "Surely even critics must concede that Mr. Reagan's intention to offer a gesture to West German-American rapprochement rather than sanctify anything that went on between 1933 and 1945."

So, it is hard to forget, Mr. Speaker. It is hard to forgive, but I think it is time that an attempt was made. Otherwise, people will spend their energies fixing on a particular point in history and trying to root out and stamp out and crush every other opinion on the other side. People will try to peddle their own particular point of view and that, of course, is something that we must all be on guard about. It has to be even on both sides. It has to be fair to both sides.

So, Mr. Speaker, if people are talking about hunting down war criminals, I think all of us think, as was said recently, that a war criminal is a war criminal. That was a statement that was made. It's an analytical statement, it cannot be denied, but if criminals are going to be tried from one side in one theatre, it isn't fair or isn't balanced. Unless we go after all the criminals in all the theatres of war, then I think there is an inconsistency here. If that procedure is followed, if that approach is tried, then we have to re-examine Vietnam, we have to re-examine Korea, we have to look at Latin America, we have to look at South America, we have to go to Africa and the Middle East and Iran and Iraq and look at all the wars of the 20th Century, and there evidence will be a problem. Whose evidence will count? Will it be the two enemies? Will it be the governments or the rebels? Will it be the left and the right? Will it include the collaborators and the agents? Will there be trials here? Will there be evidence from there or from here? Will we seek justice or revenge?

Mr. Speaker, I would end on this particular note and say that it was heartening to see that in certain places and in certain cities there were attempts made on the 40th Anniversary of the Second World War to get together. This was done among many other places, in Paris where there was a show of Franco-German reconciliation. I'm now looking at a headline in the Free Press.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that the time has come to move beyond some of the old hatreds and some of

the old rivalries that have existed in the 1930s and the 1940s. Mr. Speaker, we're in several generations beyond that, but there are still people who are fixed forever, frozen forever in 1939-1945. I think that this resolution that has been proposed by the government and the amendments that were included by the Conservative Party are worthy of debate. There's an obvious portion, a large portion of idealism in what has come from the New Democratic Party. There is a lot of idealism in that. When I heard the Minister of Labour speak, I thought that was clearly the road that he was travelling down.

There is also, I think, a healthy injection of realism that came from the Conservative side and the Conservatives, who pride themselves on being realists did make and have made some worthy suggested amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your attention and feel that the amended resolution is one that can be supported by everyone in this Chamber.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed and so ordered.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

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

### YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Birt, Blake, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyles, Filmon, Fox, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Mackling, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Ransom, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Steen, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas, 45; Nays, 0.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The amendment is accordingly carried.

The question before the House is the amendment as amended to the proposed resolution. Are you ready for the question?

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Premier proposes to speak next. I would ask before he begins, if there would be leave, in view of the hour, for him to go beyond 10 o'clock?

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

The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, let me commence my remarks by thanking honourable members for gran

me leave to go beyond 10 o'clock, upon what I believe is one of the most important issues and resolutions that we can deal with during this Session of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend all members that participated in this debate for the constructive points of view that were raised, the concerns that were expressed by individual members of the Legislature. I believe that those concerns and points that were raised were done with the utmost of sincerity and commitment to the particular point of view as expressed by the member in question.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe it is important on my part to respond to some of the points that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this evening in regard to his complaints insofar as the handling of the resolution that is before us. First, I regret, and it's with a great deal of sadness to have heard the Leader of the Opposition suggesting there was any manipulation insofar as the presentation of this resolution.

As I indicated, I do not question the sincerity of any individual in this House during the debate and therefore it was with deep sadness to hear the Leader of the Opposition suggest there was manipulation, because I recall the Leader of the Opposition the day that this resolution was introduced into this Chamber, leaving this Chamber and being interviewed by the TV cameras and indicating to the public at large that he thought that his party, his members would be in a position to give support to the resolution that was presented that day.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was the finest of expression on that particular day - I believe it was a Tuesday - on the part of the Leader of the Opposition that this resolution ought not to cause problems. The Leader of the Opposition also indicated - and this was a point that surprised me no end, Mr. Speaker - that in some way or other, we were so bereft that we were prepared to wipe aside all other business of this Legislature in order to deal with this matter and I believe the Leader of the Opposition's words were something to the effect as though this was a priority.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology. This is a priority. It is a priority of every Manitoban and I am astonished by a suggestion in this House that this is an item that can be dealt with just as any other particular item that might be concerning us in this Chamber. This is an item which I indicated in my first address to this Chamber supersedes all other issues. For example, we took strong action today in respect to the pork producers; but there's no point taking creative and innovative and firm steps on behalf of the pork producers or the women of this province or the trade union movement of this province or the business people of this province if we are not going to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we have worldwide control of the nuclear buildup that is taking place throughout the Planet Earth.

This is an issue that I acknowledge is priority No. 1 and I would be surprised if it is not priority No. 1 with each and every member across the Chamber, as well as members on this side. Mr. Speaker, there was also a great deal of comment by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to NATO and NORAD and I don't really understand NATO, I don't really understand the concern in respect to the reference to NATO. I don't understand the reference because we are duly dealing with the

question of a nuclear arms free zone. Mr. Speaker, no one in this Chamber has denied the existence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I know of no member that has denied the existence of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to proceed to ensure the acceptance of the message which I commended earlier the Leader of the Opposition for proposing a message to the USSR, a message to the United States of America, do we proceed to speak to those two superpowers on the basis of a sense of trust or do we on the way to present those messages, rattle our sabres. That is the question.

I do not believe that in bringing any message to Washington that we rattle the sabre of the Warsaw Alliance. I do not believe insofar as bringing the message from this Chamber that we need to rattle any sabre in respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Those organizations exist. What is important, Mr. Speaker, is that we deliver that message and the environment in which we present that message to both the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

I regret to say that the process that was proposed by the honourable members would doom the message to failure before the message would, in fact, leave this Chamber. The message would be poisoned by the atmosphere of acrimony that would be attached to that message and the sabre rattling that would be accompanying that. That does not deal with the question of NATO whether we're for NATO or against NATO, whether we're for Warsaw Pact or against the Warsaw Pact.

The second area dealing with the honourable member's concern about what was taken out of the resolution that was moved by honourable members is a suggestion that I find really a sense of twisted logic on the part of honourable members, the suggestion that since there was a deletion of the clause WHEREAS the freedoms enjoyed by people of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization were secured at immense cost in human suffering. Mr. Speaker, they were; millions killed and injured. Mr. Speaker, that suffering was not restricted to people living within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. Speaker, within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization there are countries in fact that were not on our side during the Second World War; Germany and Italy and Spain. The honourable members are paying tribute to the suffering and the deaths that occurred insofar as those countries, that's fine. I have no problem with that. Why isolate those countries from those countries that are not members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that also suffered by way of millions that were killed, millions that suffered as a result of the Second World War? Mr. Speaker, there was suffering, the holocaust, there was suffering and killing and deaths by Allied nations and by nations that fought us during the Second World War. Mr. Speaker, suffering is suffering and death is death, and to disjoint this resolution by suggesting that we respond to the particular suffering of some countries of the world, including some countries that fought with Nazi Germany during the Second World War but excluding a reference to those countries that were our allies during the Second World War doesn't make sense.

When, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution that is enshrined with the noblest of intent to present a

message - and again I commend the Honourable Leader of the Opposition - to the superpowers, why would we poison the message in that way. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's Leader, the Prime Minister, is one of the best diplomats and best negotiators and one of the most tactful individuals that I have seen in respect to attempting to bring together differences. Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the Prime Minister of this country with his great skills and tact and diplomacy would suggest that there be such a letter sent that would ensure the destruction of that which was intended before the letter would, in fact, leave this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, what is interesting — (Interjection) — is that the honourable members want to delete a clause which was in the earlier resolution and I want to read that resolution to you, the WHEREAS.

"WHEREAS Manitobans continue to object to the world powers spending more than \$2 billion per day on armaments while millions of men and women live in poverty and starvation confronts much of the Third World."

Mr. Speaker, why would we want to delete that clause? Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been restored, it is restored, but the earlier amendment on the part of the Leader of the Opposition would have removed that clause. Mr. Speaker, why would we want to remove that important message? Why would we deny the fact that within the global context, Mr. Speaker, why would we not acknowledge the fact — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the existing resolution that is before us, the existing resolution which includes that clause.

I am delighted that this existing resolution includes that clause that recognizes the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in this gigantic political bureaucratic military complex, billions of dollars are being spent to build up future means of mass destruction, countries of the world that just cannot afford to be involved in that type of arms race, that we spend these kinds of monies while at the same time there is famine throughout the world. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to deal with values and the value of the fact that we do in the present order of things not even wink at the fact that billions of dollars are being spent on military expenditure while, at the same time, there are millions that starve from famine and starvation.

Mr. Speaker, rather than honourable members being shy or reluctant to see this as part of the resolution, I think that we can feel proud that we have declared the direction that we would want to proceed with by way of ensuring that money that is so expended would be better expended on dealing with the real economic and social root causes of war and the frictions that lead to war.

Mr. Speaker, this is as we have indicated again and again the important message, a true symbolic message. Manitoba will be the first province to have been officially declared a nuclear arms free zone insofar as Canada is concerned. In fact, Manitoba will be the only jurisdiction in the whole of North America that will be declared a nuclear arms free zone area. Mr. Speaker, we can argue whether or not and we can take a cynical view that it really doesn't count for much, that it's not really very practical, etc., but I think within our hearts and within our souls we know there are times when everything can't be measured in straight, practical

weighing of one side or another. What is important, is that we do give clear signals, definitive messages, Mr. Speaker, and I am pleased with the fact, and I think history will reflect favourably on the fact that Manitoba signalled clearly our commitment as a provincial community to Manitoba being a nuclear free zone.

I would hope, talking about going beyond, I would hope honourable members would also take a position that the Mulroney Government and the Liberal Opposition and the New Democrats in Ottawa do likewise at the federal level, ensure a nuclear arms free zone for Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it's not enough that the Leader of the Opposition says, but we have nuclear free now. We've just gone through the Cruise and the Cruise is a carrier that tests methods by which we test the carrying of nuclear weapons. I find it rather ironic that we could stand in our place and say, well, we can breathe easy; we are a nuclear free country, when on the other hand we permit the testing of the Cruise over Canada in the air space of this country. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunately that kind of indifferent attitude, if it becomes rooted, which leads from one rationalization to another.

This resolution has to do with a desire to give a message of peace, a message of the importance of decent relationships, individual to individual, family to family, country to country. It's an effort, just for once, to remove the stigma of the cold war atmosphere from the message that is being delivered, so that it is a message that's truly based upon a sense of trust and confidence and desire to draw together those nations that would prefer to carry on the mad nuclear arms race that the Honourable Minister of Labour made reference to.

I would hope that the Leader of the Opposition, when fears are expressed to him, as he indicated they were but a few minutes ago, fears he said that he got some calls from Pinawa - all the Leader of the Opposition had to do was to point out that the resolution said, nuclear arms free zone. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition pointed out to the caller from Pinawa what we're dealing with is not a nuclear free zone, but a nuclear arms free zone. I wonder in fact if the Leader of the Opposition said, I am proud to support that resolution because we're dealing with nuclear arms; we're not dealing with research into the nuclear industry, peaceful use. We have no opposition to peaceful use. I wonder, because the Leader of the Opposition didn't add to his comments, he left it dangling that he had received this call from somebody in Pinawa that was very worried and frightened and concerned about losing his job. The Leader of the Opposition left it at that, as though the caller from Pinawa would have had good reason to be frightened and to be concerned.

I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition proceeded to remove the doubts and fears of the caller from Pinawa because one can use an issue of this nature, if one wants, to awaken fears, to encourage fears. On the other hand, you can proceed to remove fears, to ensure that the facts are clearly presented. I hope that honourable members across the way, when that next caller phones in from Pinawa, will say we're dealing with nuclear arms, not the peaceful research into nuclear power.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been an historic debate. I think this is a debate that has continued for quite a

period of time. I think it's a debate that has brought out many brave, worthy contributions and I'm pleased that despite some of the allegations that have been raised back and forth that the end product of this resolution is a positive one. It is a positive one that follows the line of the Deputy Premier who, the very first day, when the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment said, why don't we wed these two thoughts together? Why don't we have a recognition of nuclear arms free zone and, at the same time, why don't we deliver a message to the two responsible superpowers? That's what we've done, Mr. Speaker.

I think this resolution is all the better because of the contribution by honourable members across the way, because we did wed those two fundamentally important thoughts together in one resolution so that we're able to speak with one voice in this Chamber as to the most crying issue confronting Manitobans today. Let there be no doubt, as I indicated earlier, one only need to speak to classrooms in our high schools and universities to know what is praying on the minds of our young people.

I spoke to a group about a year ago, a year and a half ago. A couple of high school girls had indicated they had written letters to both the head of the Soviet Union, the head of the USSR. I believe at that time it was Andropov that was the leader in the Soviet Union, Reagan in the United States and the message was very simple: "We are only 16 or 17 years of age. This is a beautiful world and we have most of our lifetime still to live. You, Mr. Andropov and you, Mr. Reagan, you've lived most of your lifetime. You're now in your seventies with just a few years left. Why don't you give us a chance?"

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I believe does give, by example, if that example is picked up by the Soviet Union and by the United States and by other nations in the world, it does provide an example, an example of a direction, a path to ensure human fellowship, respect, trust, the elimination of massive expenditures on military nuclear weaponry so that we can proceed to attack those horrible problems scarring the face of

the earth: unemployment, inflation, the debt-ridden situation in Third World countries because of the build-up of their own armaments, the reduction of famine throughout the world.

We said that this was a symbolic message that is also a powerful message. It is a message of truth, of love and of direction, a message of historic importance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The question before the House is the proposed resolution as amended. Those in favour please say Aye. Those opposed please say Nay.

In my opinion the ayes have it and I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Call in the members.

Order please. The question before the House is the proposed resolution by the Honourable First Minister as amended.

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

### YEAS

Adam, Anstett, Birt, Blake, Corrin, Cowan, Dodick, Doern, Downey, Driedger, Enns, Evans, Eyer, Filmon, Fox, Gourlay, Graham, Hammond, Harapiak, Harper, Hemphill, Johnston, Kostyra, Kovnats, Mackling, Manness, McKenzie, Mercier, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Parasiuk, Pawley, Penner, Phillips, Plohman, Ransom, Santos, Schroeder, Scott, Smith, Steen, Storie, Uruski, Uskiw.

**MR. CLERK:** Yeas, 45; Nays, 0.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The resolution is accordingly carried.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).