

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN**  
**April 28, 1981**

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**  
**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

**Regulations**

**THE CLERK:** — Mr. Lane, from the special committee on regulations presents the first report of the said committee, which is as follows:

Your committee met for organization and appointed Mr. Lane as its chairman, and Mr. White as the vice-chairman, and Mr. T.C. Wakeling, Q.C., of the law firm of McDougall, Ready, and Wakeling as counsel to the committee.

Your committee has examined Saskatchewan regulations 1-80 to 296-80, a total of 296 regulations, thus completing its scrutiny up to December 31, 1980. Of this total, your committee considered 30 regulations drawn specifically to its attention by counsel, and has sent to the authorities who made the regulations comments on 18 of these regulations, inviting them to submit explanatory memoranda should they see fit. Eighteen replies have been received and considered by the committee. Your committee does not wish at this time to draw special attention of the Assembly to any of the regulations on the grounds set out in its terms of reference.

Your committee has also had under consideration the order of reference dated May 22, 1980, namely, the by-laws, rules and regulations, and amendments thereto of various professional societies tabled as addenda to session paper 7 of 1979-80, after March 18, 1980, and session paper 5 of 1980-81 up to December 9, 1980. Your committee reviewed the said by-laws, rules, regulations and amendments to ensure that each had proper legislative authority, was in the public interest, with further information being sought with respect to two of the by-laws. Your committee met with Dr. R.A. Waechter, a member of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association, Dr. Bryan M. Wurtz, president of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association, and Mr. E.E. Carlson, registrar of the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association, concerning amendments to by-law 28. Your committee has considered this amendment, and in the light of the testimony heard recommends that the amendment be ratified and confirmed. Your committee recommends that the by-laws, regulations and amendments of the following professional societies be ratified and confirmed for 1979-80: the Law Society of Saskatchewan; the Psychiatric Nurses of Saskatchewan; the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation; the Saskatchewan Surveyors' Association; the Saskatchewan Society of Osteopathic Physicians; the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists; and the Saskatchewan Registered Nurses' Association.

For '80-81: the Certified Public Accountants Association of Saskatchewan; the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Saskatchewan; the Saskatchewan Funeral Service Association; the Law Society of Saskatchewan; the Saskatchewan Ophthalmic Dispensers Association; the Saskatchewan Pharmaceutical Association; the Saskatchewan Society of Occupational Therapists; and the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association.

Your committee recommends that during the present session of the Assembly a committee on regulations comprised of 9 members should be appointed to continue the work of the scrutiny, and to consider outstanding memoranda submitted by the authorities who have made regulations and by-laws.

**MR. LANE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Regina Wascana:

That the first report of the special committee on regulations be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

### **WELCOME TO STUDENTS**

**HON. MR. BROCKELBANK:** — I would like to take this opportunity to introduce a group of visitors from Saskatoon who are in the Speaker's gallery today. As I understand it, there are 62 grade 8 students from Caroline Robbins School. Their school is situated in the constituency of Saskatoon Westmount. They are accompanied today by Mr. Gordon, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Panashiuk. I hope the students, while they are visiting Regina, find this to be an educational and interesting event, I know all members will join me in that wish for them and in wishing them a safe journey back to Saskatoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a group of students also from Saskatoon. I think the two groups must be responsible for having brought some moisture from the beautiful city of Saskatoon to the Queen City of Regina; I know we'll take credit for that. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce the group of students from Churchill School, 29 in number, grades 4 and 5 students. It is my understanding that they are accompanied by teachers and chaperones, Karen Shmon, Mr. Bill Davonport and Miss Bogdanoff. I hope they have had an interesting and an educational trip to Regina. It will be my pleasure to meet with them at 3 o'clock and I ask all members to join with me in extending a hearty welcome to the Churchill group from Saskatoon.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

### **QUESTIONS**

#### **Overtime Dispute in Correctional Camps**

**MR. HARDY:** — My question is to the minister responsible for the public service commission. As you are aware, over the last month or so, there have been six correctional camps off the job due to a contract problem. These employees number between 30 and 40; in fact I am given to understand that with the overall staff that has

left – the transferred staff, the training staff and the casual labor staff – the number would probably be about 100. Has the public service commission been advised as to the results of the audit carried out by the Department of Labor with regard to overtime work by these SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association) workers in the six correctional camps? And what has your department done with regard to getting the situation settled?

**HON. MR. TCHORZEWSKI:** — Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the latter question first. Negotiations have been taking place between the employer and SGEA to determine the arrangements that would be applied in the provision of services through these camps in the future. Those negotiations, as the member knows, have broken off and Mr. Walter, from the Department of Labor, has been attempting to bring about some movement in those negotiations.

As far as I am aware, there has not yet been a report from the Department of Labor on the investigation it was doing because of a complaint brought forward by an employee. Therefore I cannot comment further on what may be the disposition of that report.

**MR. HARDY:** — I have a question to the Minister of Labor. Mr. Minister, it has been brought to my attention that in the last day or so your department has unofficially agreed that these public service employees do have about six hours per day overtime coming to them for each day they worked at the camp. Could you inform this Assembly if this is true and, if it is true, what your department is going to do about it?

**HON. MR. SNYDER:** — In answer to the hon. member's question, I would have to tell him that, no, I am not doing an assessment. The apprenticeship and standards officers have done an assessment of what was alleged to be moneys owing as a result of overtime performed. My information is that the audit was virtually completed except for some non-permanent employees and will be completed, I believe, as early as tomorrow. My understanding is that Mr. Walter, the industrial relations officer who has been working on this case, stands by to offer to the parties any assistance which may be required.

I am not in a position where I am making any judgments nor have I see the audited statement with respect to actual number of hours that are presumed by the member for Kelsey-Tisdale to be owing. I have no knowledge of it except to say that I believe the audit is virtually completed.

**MR. HARDY:** — I have a question to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Minister, you told me in the House about two weeks ago that due to these negotiations, no matter what happened, none of these camps would be closed. I have been led to believe now that three of these camps will be closed on May 4. They then will be taken to the community correctional centres. I would like to know if this is true. Is your department prepared to shut down three of these camps just to eliminate the labor problems?

**HON. MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the member that the department has no plans to shut down any of the camps. At the present time Echo Valley is not operating as a result of the federal legislation, which was struck down concerning people driving while suspended. That operations has been shut down for the past two months as a result of that. As well, Challenge Camp is shut down at the present time, due to the fact that there is no one there to man it. It will be started up as soon as the negotiations, which we anticipate will start in the near future, bring about a settlement to the problem.

**MR. HARDY:** — Supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services. Is it true that there would be approximately 100 to 120 employees involved in this dispute over wages, and the total wages, if paid out as claimed, would be about \$1.5 million?

**HON. MR. LINGENFELTER:** — Mr. Speaker, my information is that there are 21 permanent and 9 temporary staff involved. I am not sure where the member gets the number of something over 100 employees. That is the information from my department. As to the amount of money which will be, or could be owing. I don't think that is my place to decide. As a result of the negotiations, if it is decided that overtime is to be paid, the overtime will be paid by the department. I think it would be premature now to get involved in the negotiations to say how much money might be involved.

### **Hospitals Serviced by Greyhound Routes**

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — My question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, the present Greyhound bus strike is posing some problems for hospitals serviced by Greyhound routes. Delivery of blood supplies and emergency drugs have been interrupted, and in some cases, hospitals have been forced to use private couriers rather than mail service, because of the unpredictable nature of the mail service in the province. Would the minister give his assurance today that should the strike be prolonged, his department will give financial assistance to those hospitals which have been forced to use these private courier services?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly we will give consideration to that. Any exceptional circumstances would have to be reviewed during the year. It is unfortunate that the situation has arisen. Certainly, we have done nothing to cause this particular situation. I agree with the member that there are specific hospitals which have incurred some difficulties. My understanding, however, is that all situations have been taken care of. There may be some financial burdens to various hospitals. We certainly will have a look at that once the strike has been terminated. The hospitals can then check with my department to see just how much cost is involved. I don't think it will affect all that many hospitals. I don't think the cost is that substantial. We will certainly review the situation throughout the year.

**MRS. DUNCAN:** — Would you not agree, Mr. Minister, that this is an unexpected and unbudgeted expense? Given the budgetary constraints placed on hospitals today, would you not agree that should this strike go on, that your department will have to step in and give financial aid?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly, if the member says that there are budget constraints in the province of Saskatchewan, then other hospitals in other provinces must really be suffering, because we did give them about a 16 per cent increase. Although I will admit that this is an extra expense, I have indicated to the member that we will have a look at it. I am not making any commitment at this time that we will pick up those costs. But if it is a special burden to some hospitals, we will be prepared to have a look at them, and I'm sure that we can resolve the situation.

**MR. LANE:** — Would the minister give the assurance as well that because of the strike there are no problems in ensuring delivery of drugs, blood or whatever other medical supplies are needed in the hospitals?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, certainly, by the way the member for Maple Creek asked her questions, she indicated that she understands the hospital system much

better than her seatmate. Her seatmate ought to know that it's not the Minister of Health or the Department of Health that runs local hospitals. Those are run by local boards. They make the decisions, and I'm sure they will make every effort to assure the people in those areas that their needs will be met and that the necessary equipment and the necessary drugs are made available to those hospitals.

I simply want to indicate to the member that we will do whatever we can to co-operate with local boards, and see to it that the people of Saskatchewan are well-served.

**MR. LANE:** — Is the minister saying that the supply of blood, drugs and other medical necessities to the hospitals is not a health problem, and that he is not going to take action? Is he prepared to look at the matter as a potential health problem and ensure that the supplies are delivered?

**HON. MR. ROLFES:** — Mr. Speaker, I have every confidence in the people who are appointed to the local hospital boards. I know the member for Qu'Appelle doesn't but his seatmate, the member for Maple Creek, has the same confidence in the local boards as I have. I know they will use every effort they can to make sure that the services are delivered to local hospitals, and I and the Department of Health will co-operate.

I think the member for Maple Creek should take exception to the member for Qu'Appelle for interjecting when she . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order!

#### **Taxes on Property Added to Town of Kamsack**

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. In a letter to the minister from Mr. Sasyniuk, dated September 10, 1979, he wrote (and with Mr. Speaker's permission, I quote a pertinent part of the letter):

A piece of private property last year was added to the city limits. This property runs from the Duck Mountain Motel parallel with the highway running east. The property has been rezoned from agricultural to industrial. The town council has allowed owners of the mentioned property to be assessed taxes at an agricultural rate until there is a development on the property.

This whole handling of the property by the town council is contrary to section 323 of the municipal act, and in the new act it is 314. I brought this matter up before at a public meeting of the mayor and the council in October but, again, nothing was done.

My question to the Minister of Urban Affairs is this: did you ever reply to Mr. Sasyniuk's letter, dealing specifically with the item I have just quoted?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. When did you reply?

You must remember now, I said “specifically.” What did you say? Would you table the letter?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I specifically acknowledge the letter within a few days following the receipt of it. To be exact, it was on October 19. We also advised Mr. Sasyniuk that our staff was investigating the matter.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Mr. Speaker, a new question to the minister. You have just evaded my question, Mr. Minister. I know that you just answered the letter; I know that you didn't answer specifically. My new question to you is: will the minister acknowledge that because of his negligence, over \$9,000 in tax revenue was lost by the town of Kamsack, the hospital board, and the school board, because the minister did not follow section 10 of The Department of Municipal Affairs Act as it applied at that time? Can the minister assure this House, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that this was not an intentional act on his part to aid and abet councillors Koturbash and Zabinsky in property tax evasion?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no and no.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — Do you agree that my interpretation of these transactions could be a case of collusion, conspiracy, fraudulent acts, and in short form, what is commonly known as a type of Watergate corruption? Also, when you are answering that, tell us why you dropped the Department of Urban Affairs estimates which were slated for today. What were you frightened of, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not acknowledge the hon. member's allegations. The reason we are not able to deal with our estimates is that the officials of the Department of Urban Affairs, both the deputy and the associate deputy ministers are in Toronto today at a conference of deputy minister. We will be prepared to consider our estimates tomorrow. They are returning tonight.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — You indicated, in response to a question from the member for Arm River just a moment ago that you did reply to this letter of September 10 from Mr. Sasyniuk. You indicated that you told him an investigation was under way by your department. You also know that under the act you are obliged to file any report of such an investigation with the mayor as well as your department. Now, will you tell us where the report is, to whom it was sent, who has a file, when was it filed, and will you table it in this House?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I did not say there was an investigation. I advised the hon. member that I acknowledge the letter and that we also directed our staff to make inquiries. Might I tell the hon. member that I had a series of letters and exchange of correspondence with Mr. Sasyniuk. First of all there was his letter of September 10, my reply or acknowledgement on October 19, 1979; a further letter from Mr. Sasyniuk on January 4, 1980, and my reply on January 14, 1980; a further letter from Mr. Sasyniuk to me on January 21 and a reply to that letter on February 27, and it goes on and on.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — By way of supplementary, if these allegations were made, you are obliged, as minister, to conduct an investigation. Either you acted as minister to have an investigation done (which you said earlier – the record will show that), or you didn't. Now, was it an investigation or inquiries? Which was it? Those are your words. Was it an investigation or did your officials make some inquiries? In either event, where is the

report?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, I suppose one can say both. If you are trying to find information, you make an inquiry. Also, there will be investigations. It is a combination of both. They were both informal — both the inquiries and investigations. We did not establish a third party to investigate or inquire. We now do have a request, as I indicated to the hon. member for Arm River yesterday. The mayor of Kamsack did send a Telex to the Premier dated March 27. I'll read his telegram:

As the mayor of Kamsack I believe that an immediate investigation into the affairs of Kamsack for the past five years is necessary, for there are too many instances where The Urban Municipality Act was broken. Your immediate attention is requested and gratefully appreciated.

This was addressed to the Premier and not to me as minister. It was dated March 27, 1981. I acknowledge the Telex on April 1, 1981. Part of the letter was quoted yesterday, but not in full. Perhaps it might be worth while for me to re-read into the record the letter which I wrote. This is to Mayor Mydonick. It says:

This is in response to your Telex to Premier Allan Blakeney dated March 27, 1981. I have asked my officials in the Department of Urban Affairs to review your request for an investigation into your concerns regarding the affairs of the town of Kamsack and to provide me with a recommendation.

Several matters pertaining to the activities of the town council have been brought to my attention over the past year and one-half. I understand that the officials of the department have resolved these with council. I will make a decision with respect to your request in the near future. But, to assist me in make the decision, I would like you to outline your specific concerns in some detail.

Mr. Speaker, I am still waiting to hear from the mayor. I must acknowledge that the mayor has written to the Premier, but he has not written to me.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — I think he gave up. He's still waiting for an answer to the letter of September 10, 1979. I'm going to take you back to the letter of September 10, 1979, where he set forth the allegations in some detail. Is it fair to say that your department did conduct an investigation or an inquiry into the activities of certain members of the town council of Kamsack as a result of the September 10 letter from Walter Sasyniuk of Kamsack?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — It appears to me that the hon. member has the names of Mr. Sasyniuk and Mr. Mydonick mixed up. Mr. Sasyniuk, to the best of my knowledge, has not been the mayor since I've been the minister . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Well, I think the record will speak for itself. I certainly acknowledged Mr. Sasyniuk's letter. In the case of Mr. Mydonick, he has never communicated with me directly. He has communicated with the Premier and I have responded to and acknowledged his Telex, as well as a letter which he sent to the Premier dated April 8, 1981. I replied to that letter in some detail setting out the events, meetings, discussions and correspondence that there has been between the Department of Urban Affairs, the individual citizens from the town of Kamsack, as well as council members and the past mayor.

I think that the officials of the Department of Urban Affairs have done their work in terms of assisting the council. The hon. members opposite obviously believe that the role of

April 28, 1981

the Department of Urban Affairs is to interfere in the administration of towns and villages. We believe that elected council members and mayors should have the right to determine their own affairs as much as possible . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order! Final supplementary.

**MR. BERNTSON:** — Mr. Speaker, our only concern is to see that the law is followed. It's your act, not ours. Will you, or will you not, table the investigation which resulted from the letter sent to you from Walter Sasyniuk on September 10, 1979? If you do not have that report, if it is not tabled, that tells us that you are in breach of the act because you didn't conduct an investigation.

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that we, as a department, do not conduct investigations because somebody makes an allegation. We do inquire. In fact, I have a lengthy file of the correspondence, as well as the meetings which have taken place between the director of management services and the deputy minister of urban affairs, as well as the municipal advisers. Whenever the town council asked for assistance, the Department of Urban Affairs was available to give it assistance and advice and to conduct any inquiries which they have asked us to do.

**MR. MUIRHEAD:** — A new question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Going back to this letter of April 1, 1981, I will just quote very carefully what you said:

Several matters pertaining to the activities of the town council have been brought to my attention over the past year and one-half. I understand officials of the department have resolved these with council.

Mr. Minister, the council stated that you have not done any inquiry; you only discussed it with the council. Do you not agree that just discussing this with the council is like asking the fox who ate the chickens?

**HON. MR. SMISHEK:** — No, I do not agree, Mr. Speaker.

### **Reduction of Royalties to Assist Oil Industry**

**MR. ANDREW:** — A question to the Minister of Mineral Resources. On Friday, you indicated that the reason the government did not reduce the royalties as an assistance vehicle to the oil industry and went in with its band-aid solution was because to do so would be viewed as capitulation on your part. In 1975, I believe it was, your government proposed to give one-half the royalty revenue to the federal government under an energy bank proposal. You modified that proposal in 1977. My question is this: how can you view a short reduction of royalties back to the Alberta standard as capitulation today, when in 1975 and 1977 you didn't believe your proposal to give half that royalty wealth to Ottawa was capitulation?

**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — By applying some logic to the circumstances.

**MR. ANDREW:** — A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If you were to reduce your royalty take, the take by the federal government under the national energy program would also be reduced. If you rolled your royalties back closer to those of Alberta, how could the federal government step in and take extra revenue, when they would be taking a minus figure away from the oil industry?



**HON. MR. COWLEY:** — Mr. Speaker, the member talks about a temporary or short-term reduction in royalties. Those were the member's words. The problem with any temporary or short-term reduction in royalties, in terms of spurring on some forms of development, is that obviously people who are drilling or investing that kind of money are going to be looking at the long term rather than the short term.

In terms of production, a short-term reduction in royalties would have a short-term impact, presumably in the same way that this program does. I think what the member is suggesting (if I understand his suggestions correctly) would have the same impact. I believe that a reduction in royalties is not in order. We have the same royalties structure in place as we had prior to the national energy program. During that period of time prior to the NEP in 1980, we had a record year in the oil industry in this province and there was no indication that there was anything wrong with our royalties. I believe there is no indication to date that there is anything wrong with our royalties, but the fault lies with the national energy program.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

## **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

### **Bill No. 87 – An Act to amend The Unified Family Court Act**

**MR. KOSKIE:** — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member, I would like to move first reading of a bill to amend The Unified Family Court Act.

Motion agreed to and ordered to be read a second time at the next sitting.

## **ANNOUNCEMENT**

### **Congratulations**

### **Birth Announcement**

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Before orders of the day, I would like to draw to all members' attention the absence of our Clerk, Mr. Mitchell, from the Table today. I understand that he and his wife have become the parents of a new daughter, born at 7:00 o'clock this morning.

**HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. SPEAKER:** — I don't know whether that has anything to do with Saskatchewan air or not

The daughter will be named Jane Elizabeth. I understand the mother and daughter are doing well, and the father will recover.

## **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

### **Committee on Regulations**

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — I move, seconded by my seatmate, the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista:

Ordered that members Lane, Andrew, Duncan, Prebble, Romanow, Skoberg, Solomon, Swan and White constitute a special committee to consider every regulation filed with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly pursuant to the provisions of The Regulations Act, with a view to determining whether the special attention of the Assembly should be drawn to any of the said regulations on any of the following grounds:

- (a) That it imposes a charge on the public revenues or prescribes a payment to be made to any public authority not specifically provided for by statute;
- (b) That it is excluded from the challenge in the courts;
- (c) That it makes unusual or unexpected use of powers conferred by statute;
- (d) That it purports to have retrospective effect where the parent statute confers no express authority so to provide.
- (e) That it has been insufficiently promulgated;
- (f) That it is not clear in meaning.

If they so determine to report to that effect, that the committee having the assistance of legal counsel in the reviewing of said regulations, that it be given the power to sit after prorogation of the Assembly, and that if it be required prior to reporting that the special attention of the Assembly be drawn to any regulation, it will inform the government department or authority concerned of its intentions so to report, and that the committee be empowered to invite any regulation-making authority to submit them memorandum explaining any regulation which may be under consideration by the committee, or to invite any regulation-making authority to appear before the committee as a witness for the purpose of explaining any such regulation, and that the committee be empowered to review the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto, as referred to the committee to determine whether or not they, or any of them, are in any way prejudicial to the public interest.

Motion agreed to.

### **Referral of By-Laws to Committee**

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by my seatmate, the member for Saskatoon Buena Vista:

That the by-laws of the professional societies and amendments thereto, tabled after December 9, 1980 as addenda to sessional paper no. 5 of 1980-81, be referred to the special committee on regulations.

Motion agreed to.

### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

#### **PRIVATE BILLS**

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

### **Bill No. 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Congregation Agudas Israel**

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 03 — An Act respecting St. Peter's Hospital, Melville, being An Act to amend and consolidate An Act to incorporate St. Peter's Hospital, Melville**

Sections 1 to 14 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 04 — An act respecting Montreal Trust Company and Montreal Trust Company of Canada**

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

### **Bill No. 06 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Notre Dame College**

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed.

The committee agreed to report the bill.

**HON. MR. MacMURCHY:** — Mr. Vice-Chairman, we will stand item 6.

## THIRD READINGS

### **Bill No. 02 — An Act to amend An Act to incorporate the Congregation Agudas Israel**

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **Bill No. 04 — An Act respecting Montreal Trust Company and Montreal Trust Company of Canada**

**MR. WHITE:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

### **Bill No. 06 – An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Notre Dame College**

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Speaker, I move the bill be now read a third time and passed under its title.

Motion agreed to and bill read a third time.

## MOTIONS

### Resolution No. 22 — Freedom of Information and Privacy Legislation

**MR. ANDREW:** — Mr. Speaker, I wish to be very brief on this motion. Last year I brought a motion before the Assembly with regard to the concept of freedom of information. This year the motion is calling for an extension of that concept to cover the whole question of privacy as well.

Since last year when the motion was introduced, I think two material things have come down. First, the federal government, the Trudeau government, has introduced Bill 43, which is presently being debated before the federal parliament. It is at the committee stage. All signs indicate that the legislation will be passed at this session of parliament, and that freedom of information and privacy legislation will become a reality in the federal House. Clearly, there are some concerns with the package. However, from our point of view in this legislature, the material thing to look at and to recognize is that one government in this country has now made a move which is very encompassing with Bill 43.

As well, the Ontario commission on freedom of information and privacy has come down with its three-volume report, which is a very good report. Hopefully, that will lead to some legislation in the province of Ontario. The only concern I would have is that now a majority government stands in place in Ontario. We will have to see whether the Davis government moves with that freedom of information legislation or, because it is a majority government, tends to want to shelve it.

I want to read what I think is a very significant quotation from the report of the Ontario commission on freedom of information and individual privacy. It is from *Privacy and Freedom*, by Allan Weston:

The modern totalitarian state relies on secrecy for the regime, but high surveillance and disclosure for all other groups. The democratic society relies on publicity as a control over government and on privacy as a shelter for groups and individual life.

I think that is really the stage we are at in our western democratic system of government. Canada stands far behind other countries in the world with regard to freedom of information legislation. The United States and Sweden, particularly, were leaders in the field. It is now moving into many of the democratic systems in western Europe. Both Australia and New Zealand now have freedom of information legislation. It is high time that Canadians who in the past have tried to argue . . . The argument of the Attorney General three years ago, when a freedom of information motion was brought in by the Liberal member, Mr. Cameron, was that you cannot have freedom of information legislation in a parliamentary system of government because to do so, you eliminate the concept and the idea of ministerial responsibility

I think we have gone past that argument. Last year, the Attorney General's counter to the proposal for freedom of information and privacy legislation in Saskatchewan was that the Government of Saskatchewan was in favor of this type of legislation, but because it was so complex and difficult, the government was proposing, in due course, to present a white paper, or a green paper presented by the Government of

Saskatchewan on the whole concept of freedom of information, and whether that would then be delegated to a committee of this legislature, or a special investigation by a commission in the province of Saskatchewan, to come up with a proposal.

I have not yet seen that white paper or that green paper forthcoming from this government. I think it is high time that this government addressed (or started to address) the whole question of freedom of information.

I think the legislation in both Bill C-43 and the proposal put forward by the report of the commission on freedom of information and individual privacy in the province of Ontario, basically addressed the questions that have been the root of that legislation since the days of Jed Baldwin. The debate on that went on for some 10 years in the Parliament of Canada. Those basic requirements are such that, firstly, there will be a presumption that all government information is free and open to the public. That is the basic presumption of any piece of legislation. Right now, it is simply that the information that emanates from the government is what the government wants to see emanate from this government.

The second prerequisite for freedom of information legislation calls for certain exemptions. Obviously, any legislation is going to go through those. I think the ones that I set out last year, which are many of the ones advanced by Jed Baldwin, are the same ones to be found now in the Ontario report, and the same ones that are in Bill C-43 now before parliament. Those are very realistic.

My suggestion is that if the government wishes, or has concerns with some of those, at least it should bring in the legislation with broad exceptions now, and that those exceptions be whittled down as we proceed year after year amending freedom of information and privacy legislation.

The third one, as it relates to ministerial responsibility, is the fact that you must ultimately have a review agent or an appeal. All people in Canada now, I think, dealing with access or with freedom of information legislation, agree that the senior court level of any province, or of the federal government, is the proper final review. In this case, in the province of Saskatchewan, of course, it would be the court of appeal.

I think it is amply clear that the government in the province of Saskatchewan is against this type of legislation. I would like to bring to the Assembly two or three situations where I think it would become relevant and material. The debate that has been generated in this legislature, over the past month or so, as it relates to SGI's problem, and the whole question of the contracts in Europe, and of how much money was lost, etc., is a clear example of information. When you have a Crown agency that is 100 per cent owned by the government, and therefore, 100 per cent owned by the people, the people have a right to know what that information is. It is only through that type of disclosure (open disclosure) that we can move in this field.

I'm sorry that the Attorney General is not here today because under Bill C-43 in the federal House, there is a concern advanced by the provincial attorneys general, led by Mr. Romanow of Saskatchewan, against Bill 43 as it relates to disclosure of federal-provincial negotiations. I would like to make it clear that it seems to me that it's time that we recognized what is taking place in the parliamentary system of government and the federal-provincial relations in this country.

What is happening is that we are moving more and more to what is called executive

April 28, 1981

federalism. The debate is now not taking place between the government in Ottawa and the two opposition parties. The debate and the decisions are, in fact, taking place between the government in Ottawa and the governments in the various provinces. There is nothing that is more secretive than those types of negotiations.

I don't think all of that has to be out in the open, but I think we must move in a direction that much of it is. After a problem has been resolved, that information surely should be available to the people to see what position was taken by this government, or what position was taken by the Alberta government. We add some credibility and democracy to executive federalism, which, I think, is an important factor in Canadian political life. I don't wish to dwell on the subject any further. I would like to move, seconded by the member for Wilkie:

That this Assembly recommend that the Government of Saskatchewan follow the lead of the federal government and other provinces in introducing freedom of information and privacy legislation.

**MR. SKOBERG:** — I listened with a good deal of interest to the comments of the hon. member for Kindersley. I am sure that each of us in this Assembly agrees that freedom of information (in so far as privacy is concerned) — as it reads here “introduction of freedom of information and privacy legislation” — is something we can all agree to. It is the mechanics of putting it together that is a concern.

I would also like to believe that if in fact the select committee (which we have recommended before this House in the rules report) was structured and found acceptable to those opposite, this may well be a good topic for a select committee to investigate — to travel about the country, to try to find out exactly how it could be applicable in Saskatchewan.

I also believe, and I'm sure most people in Saskatchewan would agree with me, that we do have one of the most open governments that you could possibly find anywhere in North America. There is no doubt that the people of this province are able to find information they want, when they want it. They do not necessarily have to go through the charade that we have seen here the last couple of days in finding out what has happened within the departments of government. They can approach the ministers and departments; there is open government; there is no privacy involved whatsoever.

This government has consistently followed the course recommended by the hon. member for Kindersley at this time. That is freedom of information — freedom in so far as anything that some people might consider private is concerned. There is no doubt in my mind (and I think the hon. member for Kindersley has made this very clear) that if legislation is introduced, there has to be certain areas of concern that would have to be considered private.

We found that out on a trip to London, where we talked to many people about how those things considered private are dealt with as private.

I believe that the member opposite is well aware of the fact that the Attorney General is very concerned about this type of legislation, and I'm sure he also realizes that the Attorney General, and this side of the House, believe that, because we do have the open government, we are fulfilling the needs of a good part of this resolution.

At the same time I would expect that the Attorney General would like to respond to the

hon. member, and with that I beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

### **Resolution No. 33 — Self-Determination for El Salvador**

**MR. ALLEN:** — Mr. Deputy Speaker, almost every day we hear news reports emanating from El Salvador of important people who have been killed: Monsignor Romero, the Archbishop of San Salvador, shot through the heart as he celebrated mass; four American Women Religious brutally murdered, seven Catholic priests brutally murdered, six leaders of popular organizations forcibly taken from a meeting at a Jesuit high school by 200 members of the armed forces, brutally murdered.

I could name a host of others, and almost daily new cases of important people murdered are reported on the news. There are literally, Mr. Deputy Speaker, thousands of others whom we don't hear much about in the news reports. A grandmother tells a Catholic relief worker of the death of her daughter at the hands of the security forces. Her daughter is in an advanced stage of pregnancy, and the soldiers cut her open, pull out the perfectly formed infant and murder the baby before the eyes of the mother, and then murder the mother before the eyes of her other children. This woman was an uneducated peasant. She had no political ambition. She would have led no insurrection. But her children who saw her die might. The reports don't mention her name. She has no name because she was not an important person.

She is like the 20 people who were dragged from their homes in a suburb of San Salvador and summarily shot in the street. The ones who would not come out of their homes were shot in their homes in front of their families. They were not important people. The reports don't mention their names. They are like the 600 women, children, and old people who were massacred at one time at Rio Sumpul. They, too, were not important people and the reports don't mention their names.

There are other people we don't hear much about on the news who have simply disappeared, and whom groups like Amnesty International are trying to find. People like: Hugo Antonio Bonilla, age 15 years, arrested by the army. He is believed to be in prison at Soneante and being tortured. People like: Regina Elisa Lara Monanda Henriquez, a student aged 20, arrested in San Salvador; she was last seen in national police headquarters on January 5, 1981. She has never been seen again. The authorities deny she is being held in detention.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few years countless thousands have been murdered; other thousands have disappeared and are presumed dead; thousands upon thousands of people have become refugees both in El Salvador itself, and escaping to other countries from the absolute terror and horror that is El Salvador today.

Some people argue that this situation is a result of civil war between extreme right- and extreme left-wing groups, and that the government is attempting to protect people from both of these extremes. I have to ask the question as Archbishop Romero did in a public letter before his death. If these claims are true, then why (to use the archbishop's words), "are there no victims among the large landowners? Why do most victims come from the peasantry?"

For the answer to that question, I think, we have to look at the history of El Salvador. El

Salvador is a very small country with a total land area of only 8,259 square miles. To give members an idea of the size of the country, imagine a country which runs from here to the Manitoba border down the Trans Canada and extends 25 miles on either side of the highway. Packed into that small area are 4.35 million people or 515 people per square mile; 89 per cent of these people are Mestizos, 10 per cent are Indians and 1 per cent are Caucasians; 60 per cent of them live in rural areas. The people speak Spanish and 83 per cent of them are Roman Catholic.

The gross national product is a mere \$618 per year, but even this figure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is misleading because there are great extremes between the rich and the poor. The rich are very, very rich and few in number. The vast majority of people are very, very poor.

The area of El Salvador gained its independence from Spain in 1821 and was part of various Central American federations until 1841 when its present boundaries were set and it proclaimed itself to be an independent sovereign state. The history of the country since that time has been marked by varying degrees of violence, instability and frequent coups d'etat.

By 1860 half of all the land was in private hands, displacing thousands of Indians and small landholders. Today it is estimated that 2 per cent of the population owns 60 per cent of the land. Consequently, a wealthy oligarchy holds political and economic power. In 1932 there was a peasant revolt and it is estimated that 4,000 Salvadorans died in the uprising and 30,000 died as a result of reprisals after the rebellion had been put down. Since the 1932 rebellion, the military has had a firm hold on the country.

During the 1940s the country began to industrialize under the control of a small entrepreneurial elite. Migrants came to the cities seeking employment and were forced to live in slums with no basic services and little hope of work. In 1975, the average family of six in El Salvador needed \$704 to just subsist and 80 per cent of the population earned less than that amount.

From 1932 to the present, the country has been ruled primarily by military governments. The first fully contested election was in 1972 and it is alleged that the results were doctored by the governing elite to ensure victory for their candidate. Following that election in 1972, unions, peasant groups and students began to band together to demand land reform, increased wages, improved health care and housing. This began a widespread campaign of repression throughout the country.

The population was terrorized by the armed forces and so-called right-wing death squads. As a result, the 1977-79 right-wing regime of Carlos Humberto Romero was widely condemned worldwide including by the United States state department, for flagrant violation of human rights. Since 1970, armed guerrilla groups have been active. Over time they grew in size and became increasingly militant.

In October 1979 Romero was ousted by a group of younger army officers who established a five-man military-civilian junta. Their goal had been to bring in social, land and political reforms. This has not happened and it's becoming increasingly clear that repression has not abated and the population is becoming increasingly polarized.

The opposition parties have banded together in a coalition to form the Revolutionary Democratic Front, the FDR. Armed guerrilla groups have also banded together in the Farabundo Marit Front for National Liberation (FMLN). The political and guerrilla



groups have joined under a unified political and military command. At the present time, the FMLN controls areas in the north and northwest parts of the country. This is also the area of major armed conflicts.

It is obvious that the current conflict is a state of civil war between right-wing and left-wing forces. What is equally deplorable is the flagrant violation of human rights by the existing right-wing regime. The 1977-79 regime was widely condemned for human rights violations around the world.

Under the current junta, the situation has not changed in this respect. In the spring of 1980, Archbishop Romero of San Salvador was assassinated by right-wing groups, Archbishop Romero was an outspoken opponent of the junta. During his life, Romero appealed to the U.S. to:

. . . not provide military aid to our government, because, in spite of statements as to its use, the military and facilitates repression against the people and facilitates persecution against the church.

In October 1980, the *United Church Observer* exposed the massacre of up to 600 women, children and elderly which occurred in May of that year. This massacre was a joint operation of Salvadoran and Honduran military forces.

Church sources in El Salvador indicate that up to 4,000 people were murdered by the military in Morazan province in October 1980.

Referring to the November 1980 assassinations of two priests and the murders of four American missionaries, Bishop Rivera Damas, successor to Archbishop Romero, stated on December 5, 1980:

These criminal acts of persecution against the church are the culmination of four years of persecution which has grown in frequency and cruelty during 1980, a time period that coincided with the new political leadership of the country. Only an immediate and effective end to the repression and persecution . . . would give credibility to the repeated offers of dialogue for bringing peace to the country . . .

On January 15, 1980 the legal aid office of the Archdiocese of San Salvador issued a document analysing the facts regarding thousands of victims of repression. The introduction of the document states:

The time has come to call things by their real name – and we termed the situation genocide.

On March 8, scarcely more than a month ago, Dr. Roberto Cuellor, director of the legal aid office, presented to the 37th session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva evidence of 8,600 people assassinated by government armed forces and security forces. To this figure, he added 4,400 civilians – mostly women and children – who died in operations of total extermination carried out in the past three months by Salvadoran armed forces. Dr. Cuellor spoke on behalf of the Commission on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches.

On March 2, 1981 three United States Catholic agencies – Conference of Major

April 28, 1981

Superiors of Men, the Leadership Conference of Women Religious and U.S. Catholic Conference – issued a joint statement calling for the end of all military aid to El Salvador. They have been joined in the last 10 days by 77 bishops of the American Episcopalian church. Today the International Committee of the Red Cross estimates that it is handling up to 100,000 people within El Salvador emergency camps. It is estimated that 80 per cent of these are women and children displaced by the conflict. It is estimated as well by the Red Cross, the United Nations Commission on Refugees, and UNICEF that approximately 300,000 people have fled the country as refugees. Combined, this is almost 10 per cent of the population of El Salvador. If the same situation took place in Canada, it would mean 2.5 million refugees.

In December 1980, the Canadian government supported the United Nations General Assembly resolution stating opposition to military aid and intervention in El Salvador. In December 1980, and January 1981, the U.S. resumed increased massive military aid to the junta. American assistance has been justified in terms of East-West conflicts. This justification has not been supported by many European countries and other Latin American countries such as Mexico, as well as North American religious and humanitarian agencies.

In justifying this position, the United States Secretary of State charged that El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras are targets on a Soviet “hit list” that has already consumed Nicaragua. The U.S. has further halted all aid to Nicaragua on the pretext that rebel forces are receiving arms through that country.

On March 5, 1981, the Canadian Council of Churches wrote to Prime Minister Trudeau. The letter in part urged Canada to take a firm and independent stand on El Salvador and in particular to stand firm on the position that Canada took in supporting the U.N. resolution in December 1980.

On March 24, 1981, the United Church of Canada, acting on resolutions representing 70 per cent of the church membership, sent an open letter to Prime Minister Trudeau urging Canada to withdraw its support for the Duarte government.

This letter goes on to state, and I quote:

That tolerating the intervention of the Americans simply puts us (Canada) on the side of those who have supported governments that have kept the people of El Salvador in their desperate condition for so many years.

On the anniversary of the assassination of Archbishop Romero, the social affairs commission of the Canadian Catholic Conference of Bishops, stated their support for:

The people of El Salvador in affirming their right to self-determination and to participate effectively in keeping their own destiny free of all foreign interference . . .

Members will note that the resolution we are considering today is very close to the position taken by the Canadian bishops.

On March 20, 1981, Hon. Mark MacGuigan, appearing before the standing committee on external affairs and national defence, stated that the junta was:

The best hope for peace and democracy for the protection of rights in El

Salvador . . . A government which despite its faults and despite its weakness, is caught between vicious right-wing and left-wing elements.

However, in the analysis of others, such as the legal aid office which I mentioned before, they state that this “caught in the middle syndrome” simply does not exist. The legal aid office report states:

In El Salvador, extreme right-wing groups do not exist. It is the national army and the security forces which, whether in uniform or not, are actively engaged in innumerable repressive operations against the people of El Salvador. It is the high command of the armed forces which bears the responsibility for these horrible deeds, just as it does for the murder of Archbishop Romero.

The U.S. in the past few months has increased military aid to El Salvador in addition to sending in military advisers, Mr. MacGuigan and Prime Minister Trudeau have spoken on Canadian opposition to United States military aid, and in support of the UN (United Nations) Declaration. Mr. MacGuigan has also spent a lot of time lately, and unfortunately, qualifying the Canadian position – “pronouncing” but not “denouncing”, “criticizing” but not “condemning” military aid from the United States. Mexico, Mr. Speaker, has taken a strong position of opposing all military aid to the junta. This should be the position of the Government of Canada as well.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing has been a kind of barebones chronology or description of the situation in El Salvador. But to really understand the situation, we must look deeper and the first place we must look is to the church. El Salvador is a Catholic country and the church has always been an extremely important force in that country. The church in all of Latin America has been in a state of change for a number of years. Nowhere is this more evident than in El Salvador and among church people in El Salvador. The *Sunday London Times* of January 18, 1981 describes Archbishop Romero in these words:

More than anything, Romero was a martyr to the cause of Catholicism’s new political role.

Continued in the same article, and I quote some more:

Romero is an excellent example of a Catholic prelate originally without political pretensions who was inevitably drawn into the centre of the political struggle in his country to become the one point of resistance to the republic’s rulers.

Mr. Speaker, when he was appointed in 1974 as the Archbishop of San Salvador, the government was delighted. The former archbishop, a man by the name of Gonzales, was far too liberal for the regime and they actively supported Romero because he was a member of the conservative Opus Dei movement in that country, and, they thought, a person that would be unlike Gonzales. Within a month of his appointment, government forces massacred a still unknown number of demonstrators in the square right next to the cathedral in San Salvador. The new archbishop could scarcely do anything else but condemn the murders, and the honeymoon with the junta was over.

Shortly after this, one of his closest friends, Father Rutiliu Grande, was murdered. He began more and more to come to see what the system was doing to the poor, and more and more he came to speak out against and work against injustice. He looked at the

question of violence, and he saw that in El Salvador it was more than personal cruelty. Violence in El Salvador, in his eyes, was a natural product of the system. He saw it as institutional violence, and he spoke out against it. To his critics who said he was fomenting more violence by speaking out, he replied:

The church has not incited brother against brother but has recalled two fundamental considerations. The first regards institutionalised violence. When there is a situation of permanent and organized injustice then the situation itself is violent. The second is that the church knows that in such a situation any word, even if really inspired by love, will sound as if it is violent – but it cannot fail to say this word.

Archbishop Romero was not content merely to speak out against injustice. He took concrete steps to help the victims of the injustice.

One of the pressing needs of the poor in El Salvador was legal advice. There were 2,000 lawyers in San Salvador but few of them were willing to help the poor for free, particularly if their problems had any political connotations. So the archbishop organized a group of young lawyers in the diocese to give free legal aid to the poor. Their main efforts have been centred on applying habeas corpus which is enshrined in the constitution but is not respected by the police.

A young lawyer explains his work in this way:

A few days ago, workers in a branch of public transport set a strike and informed the authorities. The government, by law, had four days to decide whether the strike was acceptable. On the next day, police arrested 40 people – one of them died in prison and most of them were tortured. There were many witnesses to this. We estimate that 85 per cent of people arrested under the public security legislation were tortured.

There is, however, no organized system of torture. It is just left to the guards to do what they feel like. Once a person is arrested he is supposed to appear before a tribunal within three days. We happen to now be handling a case of a person who has been held without trial for 25 days and many people have witnessed the tortures he has suffered. We assume that he is in so bad a physical state that the authorities have to hold him longer before showing him to his family.

Mr. Speaker, within the church in Latin America, there is a growing movement called liberation theology. The traditional view of the order of things in Latin America has been that God created some people rich and some people poor, that he created some people to rule and others to be ruled, and this would all be straightened out after you died. There would be the old “pie in the sky when you die,” if you like.

The theology of liberation teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It teaches that men are created equal because they are equally loved by God. It teaches that God created the world and provided its resources, and that he meant for these resources to be shared among his children. Liberation theology teaches the fundamental dignity of the human person and that any system that violates that fundamental dignity must be opposed by people who hold to the gospel of Jesus Christ.

This opposition to oppression has been met by more repression and more terror, not

only in El Salvador, Mr. Speaker, but in country after country in this region of the world.

Archbishop Romero and others like him say that in Latin America the church must identify with the poor because the vast majority of the people are poor.

Mr. Speaker, even the archbishop's funeral was marred by violence, gunshots and bombs going off outside the church. I read an article in which Father James L. Connor, a Jesuit from Washington, D.C. who was there, described some of the events and how he felt about them on that day. I want to read them to the House.

As one of the concelebrating priests, I had been inside the cathedral from the start. Now I watched the terrified mob push through the doors until every inch of space was filled. Looking about me, I suddenly realized that, aside from the nuns, priests and bishops, the mourners were the poor and the powerless of El Salvador.

Absent were the government representatives of the nation or of other countries. As I huddled in the El Salvador cathedral with thousands of terrified peasants, I found myself viewing the Salvadoran social situation with the poor and from their perspective of weakness, terror and oppression. I was given a vivid experience of the evil that can permeate the institutions and behavior of those who fight to uphold an unjust system.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the final solution to the problems of El Salvador will be. I do not know where or how these people will be able to solve the problems that beset them today. I do know that for years the Government of the United States has propped up military dictatorships all over the world in direct contravention of their creed, as set out in the Declaration of Independence, which all of us are familiar with:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I have to ask the question, Mr. Speaker: does American policy toward El Salvador contribute to or hinder these rights for the poor? I can only conclude that it hinders the rights of the ordinary people of El Salvador.

It is evident to me that before anything else is done, the supply of arms must stop to all sides. President Carter did stop supplying arms for a while at the request of Archbishop Romero, who wrote to him, and at the request of the United States bishops. President Reagan has begun to supply them again, supposedly to fight communism.

The fact of the matter is there are few Communists involved in the struggle, although there are certainly some. The vast majority of people, Mr. Speaker, are very strong Roman Catholics who are opposed to Marxism. Archbishop Romero was not a Marxist. The priests who are involved with the people there are not Marxist; the people they serve are not Marxist.

My fear is that by supplying arms to the people who oppress them. The people will be driven into the communist camp.

I believe that there is a wide degree of support for this proposition in Canada. In this respect I would like to quote from a letter written to Dennis Gruending (who was kind

April 28, 1981

enough to give me a copy of it). Dennis is the social action department chairman of the Archdiocese of Regina. This letter was from the member of parliament for Kingston and The Islands and I would like to quote from that letter:

Thank you very much for your recent telegram regarding the situation in El Salvador. The continuing atrocities against individuals and groups in el Salvador, and the continuing violation of human rights, have caused me anguish and anger.

I, and my colleagues, have no hesitation in condemning the abuse of human liberties that are taking place in El Salvador. Indeed, we strongly back the United Nations resolution to that effect and on two occasions my colleagues have tried, unsuccessfully, to introduce motions into the House of Commons.

In recent days I have, in an attempt to be fully informed of the most recent happenings in that tragic country, met with officers of the Department of External Affairs who have just returned from Latin American, with Dr. John Foster and his colleagues on the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights and with representatives from the executive committee of the Democratic Front in El Salvador. In each case I have expressed our abhorrence of the use of arms by the increasingly destructive civil war. I have stated, as well, our party's view of non-intervention in the El Salvador problem by any outside power or government, and I will continue to do so.

The question faces us: what can Canada provide in such a situation without interfering in the internal conflicts of that beset country? My own hope is that countries such as Canada and Mexico, and others with non-imperialistic designs, would be able to suggest means of political action rather than military action to resolve the struggle.

We shall be asking the Secretary of State for External Affairs to speak out on Canada's behalf in offering whatever diplomatic and economic initiatives it can to bring some resolution to an increasingly desperate situation, so that the human rights and human dignity become paramount in that land. Sincerely, Flora MacDonald, P.C., MP, Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other question that I would like to address that is not mentioned specifically in the resolution, and that is the question of the refugees.

I mentioned in my remarks earlier, that there are over 300,000 refugees outside El Salvador. For many of them, to return to El Salvador means almost certain torture and death. Recent reports indicate that the Government of the United States is considering deporting refugees, in direct contravention of the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which it is a signatory. Article 14(1) states: "Everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution."

I call on the Government of the United States not to deport these refugees, and I call on the Government of Canada to welcome these refugees with the same warmth, concern and compassion, that we welcomed the boat people from Vietnam.

In respect to refugees, I refer all hon. members to the words of Pope John XXIII, in his papal encyclical *Pacem in Terris*.

The sentiment of universal fatherhood which the Lord has placed in our hearts makes us feel profound sadness in considering the phenomenon of political refugees, a phenomenon which has assumed large proportions and which always hides numberless and acute sufferings.

Such expatiations show that there are some political regimes which do not guarantee for individual citizens a sufficient sphere of freedom within which their souls are allowed to breathe humanly. In fact, under those regimes, even the lawful existence of such a sphere of freedom is either called into question or denied. This, undoubtedly, is a radical inversion of the order of human society, because the reason for the existence of public authority is to promote the common good, a fundamental element of which is the recognition of that sphere of freedom and the safeguarding of it.

At this point, it will not be superfluous to recall that such exiles are persons, and that all their rights as persons must be recognized, since they do not lose those rights on losing the citizenship of the states of which they are former members.

Now, among the rights of a human person, there must be included that by which a man may enter a political community where he hopes he can more fittingly provide a future for himself and his dependents. Wherefore, as far as the common good, rightly understood, permits, it is the duty of that state to accept such immigrants and to help to integrate them into itself as new members.

Wherefore, on this occasion, we publicly approve and commend every undertaking, founded on the principles of human solidarity and Christian charity, which aims at making migration of persons from one country to another, less painful.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should follow the words of Pope John XXIII, and “welcome as many refugees into this country, as want to come here.”

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say why I think this topic is an important one for our legislature to be discussing. I know there are some who think that international affairs have no bearing on what happens here. In my view, there are no islands left in the world. The boundaries which separate us from our brothers and sisters, the world over, are artificial boundaries – they are set by men, by people like us. We are called, as representatives of a Christian community, with a Judaeo-Christian tradition, and a heritage of freedom, to bear witness to justice.

The 1976 Labor Day message of the Canadian Catholic Conference states:

We are called to participate in actions to change the policies of governments, corporations and other institutions that cause human suffering. This is our political responsibility as Christians, and as citizens in a democratic society. In a world being torn apart by an injustice in conflict, this kind of active Christian witness will be sign of hope.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the knowledge that there are people in a place thousands of miles away in Saskatchewan who are concerned will bring some small degree of hope

April 28, 1981

to the poor of El Salvador, and will in some small way temper the actions of those who oppress them.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with the words of His Eminence George Cardinal Flahiff:

Jesus was hardly a professor, but he taught much about the perception of injustice and oppression. Unlike them, he chose not the comfortable life of quiet retirement, but the demanding life of a witness to justice.

I call on this Assembly to witness to justice in El Salvador. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Regina Wascana:

That this Assembly acknowledges and commends the actions taken by the Government of Canada in December 1980, joining 73 other member nations of the United Nations, opposing foreign intervention in El Salvador; and now calls upon the Government of Canada to clearly reiterate Canadian opposition to all forms of foreign intervention and coercion in El Salvador, including any supply of arms and ammunition or the training or use of military advisors.

And further, this Assembly believes that the people of El Salvador should determine their own economic, social and political future without interference from the outside.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WHITE:** —Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to second this motion so ably spoken on by the member for Regina Rosemont.

Over the past weeks, I have been reading as much as possible about El Salvador. Last week I had the opportunity to converse privately for an hour with an individual from the Salvadoran trade union movement when he stopped in Regina. I'll keep my remarks brief, but certain things that I've become interested in are the leadership of the Salvadoran liberation movement headquartered in Mexico City. The individuals in Mexico City were sent there by the Democratic Revolutionary Front, partly because their lives were seriously threatened in their native land. And they appeared to be quite a distinguished group, not what you might class as typically Marxist, or the stereotype of Marxist.

I want to mention four particular individuals at this time, Mr. Speaker, since some knowledge of them will convey some idea of the type of support the Front has, as well as its composition. The leader of the group in Mexico City is Dr. Guillermo Ungo. Politically he is a Social Democrat. He was a member of the government of El Salvador in the late 1970s and was a candidate for the vice-presidency of El Salvador in the 1972 election, an election decided basically by fraudulent means. His profession was a lawyer; his place of practice, the capital, San Salvador. He comes from a middle class family, relatively small businessmen involved in the printing industry. A second prominent individual in the group is Dr. Jose Napoleon Rodriguez. He, too, is a lawyer by profession and among other things, he lectured at the national university. He has an upper, or upper middle-class background. His family were wealthy merchants.

The third such individual, Dr. Favio Castillio, ran for the presidency of his country in



1967. He is a medical doctor and like Dr. Rodriguez was connected with the national university of which he was rector. His family while not poor was far from being rich. The fourth person, Dr. Salvador Samayoa, is of middle-class background. Among other things he was an educator, a professor in the secondary school system. He was a member of the national government serving as minister of education in 1979. In 1980 he resigned from his post to demonstrate his opposition to the government's increasingly repressive policies.

Mr. Speaker, just looking at these four individuals shows that the liberation movement, or at least part of it, centred in Mexico city was led by lawyers, teachers, doctors, not to mention part-time politicians. They come from a variety of backgrounds: rich, poor, urban, rural. At least two of the four I've mentioned are definitely of the possessing class in El Salvador, and would have something to lose by a change in government.

The type of leadership, I think, attests to the truth of the claim by the Democratic Front that it is a broadly based organization.

It includes the progressive element of the church as the member for Regina Rosemont indicated, together with people in workers' organizations, members of the university community (both faculty and students), a good deal of the peasantry, professional and technical people, teachers, small- and middle-sized businessmen, prominent people from different political parties, and even some ex-military officers and soldiers who have ceased to support the self-appointed government.

The objectives of the Front are democratic government, peace and education for the nation's children, and a better standard of living for the mass of Salvadoran people. That of course implies the end of the 50-year-old military dictatorship which has oppressed and held in virtual serfdom, for at least a half century, the mass of the Salvadoran people.

As I said earlier, I spoke with an official of the trade union movement in El Salvador last week when he was in Regina. He wasn't in Canada to seek military aid or anything like that. His prime purpose was to inform Canadians of events in El Salvador, something the international press has not been doing adequately. When I say that, I don't want to sound overly critical of the press. Members of the press have suffered casualties there and you can't blame them for being somewhat hesitant to spend their time examining events in El Salvador.

The Salvadoran representative's main concerns were the refugees, human rights violations by the military junta, and national self-determination. As the hon. member for Regina Rosemont pointed out, the refugees are largely women, children and the elderly. They have gone to the camps as that is the safest place they can find. Though they are aided by, among others, the Catholic church, they are suffering a great deal from food shortages, medical shortages, inadequate shelter and so forth. Outbreaks of epidemics among the refugees are highly probable. Their lives are made doubly unpleasant by forays into the camps by military troops which serve to terrorize the children in particular.

One of the most recent methods adopted by the military junta in El Salvador in violation of human rights is a scheme called "Plan Herodus," named after King Herod. It is not particularly well-known outside the country. It came into use in February after the general strike and consists of taking hostage whole families of people being sought by government forces. Word is then spread that the family will be held until the person

April 28, 1981

named reports to the police.

If the person does not report, the hostages may be tortured, especially the young people who are generally assumed to be anti-junta. If the person reports, he or she is immediately detained. The family may or may not be released. According to reports, whole families have simply disappeared. We should, Mr. Speaker, make it clear that this Assembly does not condone such activities by any government.

In the past few weeks (as I said) I have read fairly widely on El Salvador, and I was particularly careful to read extensively in American publications. Such readings assure me that many citizens of the United States are every bit as concerned as any one of us about foreign intervention and the violation of human rights in El Salvador. They would, I believe, want us to pass this resolution. They would also want us to go on to press the Canadian government to make its stand on the el Salvador situation much clearer and to live up to its commitments to the United Nations respecting foreign intervention in that nation, and the gross violation of human rights there.

Mr. Speaker, I think all member of this House can do no less. Members of both our parties in the House of Commons have already done as much. If I had any reservations about this motion, it would be that it doesn't go far enough. I would personally like to add something about requesting Canadian action on Honduras as well. Large scale foreign intervention in El Salvador, if it should come, may well come from there. I want to read short extracts from an article from an American journal *The Nation* which appeared last month. It indicates opinions in certain quarters in the United States, and I think fairly widespread opinions. It also indicates El Salvador is not the only area we should be concerned about, I will just quote briefly from it:

Recent reports from Central American indicate that Washington is concentrating much of its military hardware and personnel in Honduras.

The poorest country in Central America, Honduras, has everything Reagan could dream of in a banana republic. It has little opposition to a long-standing military dictatorship; a backward economy quickly boosted by modern infusions of U.S. aid; primitive political structures easily swayed by U.S. influence; and most importantly, a sprawling, rugged frontier which touches on El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua.

The three countries, along with Honduras, have been played off against each other ever since the first glimpse of gunboat diplomacy at the beginning of the century.

Since July 1979, the United States has been quietly stepping up the armaments and sprucing up the public image of Honduras. Last March the Carter administration sent 10 helicopters to that country on a special lend-lease program that had not been implemented since Vietnam. In last April military dictator Garcia yielded to U.S. State Department pressure and held national elections which were then heralded in the United States as "a blow for democracy."

The elections were more show than substance, selecting a constituent assembly whose prime duty was to set a date and lay the groundwork for a presidential election. To date, almost a year later, that date has not been set. General Garcia took advantage of the April election to announce the extension of his provisional presidency for at least another 18 months. In the meantime, U.S. military support of this bastion of democracy is on the increase. Armed shipments have been arriving regularly, some of the rerouted to El Salvador.

The official number of U.S. military advisers in Honduras has been estimated at at least 200. the luxury hotels in the capital have large new contingents of non-uniformed U.S. personnel.

Church workers have brought back reports of an air base under construction in the northwestern zone of the country contiguous to El Salvador. There have been numerous reports of Honduran military personnel and U.S. helicopters taking part in joint actions with Salvadoran government forces.

There has also been a high level of tension on the Nicaraguan border. The Nicaraguans fear that if the United States wanted to wage war on their country by proxy, Honduras would be the ideal base. That is an expression from an American paper and I think, as I said, it reflects a good deal of American opinion. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that as in El Salvador, there are numerous violations of human rights in Honduras.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I fully support the motion.

**MR. PREBBLE:** —Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to take part in this debate and to support this motion.

I want to open my remarks with a comment about why I think Canadians should be concerned about what is happening in El Salvador. It is indeed discouraging, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Minister of External Affairs recently expressed the opinion that Canada has no immediate interest in activities in Central America and particularly in El Salvador.

That is in sharp contrast, Mr. Speaker, to the history of Canada over the past 50 years. Canada was the only foreign country that actually landed troops in El Salvador to support the military government of General Hernandez in his efforts to put down the peasant rebellion of 1932. it may be, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. MacGuigan's memory is short or it may simply be that he prefers not to recall Canadian intervention at that time. The New York newspapers reminded us of it last month. At that time, of course, Canadian intervention took place at the request of the British.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a responsibility to be concerned about event sin El Salvador because, as has been said by previous speaker, the El Salvadorans are our neighbors. They are closer to us than many parts of Canada are to each other. Not only that, El Salvador is also the scene right now of the worst human rights violations which we have seen in any country in the world.

Practically all of Central America and Latin America has become a scene of institutionalised repression. Perhaps one of the reasons that the number of human rights violations in countries such as Argentina and Chile has dropped over the last couple of years is because so many of the opponents of the governments there have already been eliminated. As referred to earlier, in the past 15 months, 17,000 people have died in El Salvador and many more are missing, wounded, injured or have disappeared in some way.

We see clearly that the primary focus for this repression has come from the government itself and from the right-wing death squads which the government officially sanctions. We've seen (as it has been well-documented by many sources including conservative sources such as the *Globe and Mail* in Toronto in a January 30 article), that the

April 28, 1981

repression has extended itself to large numbers of people who are not in any way directly involved in the fighting which is taking place in El Salvador today. So, we see a vicious repression placed upon refugees who are fleeing from the fighting. We see attacks on villages and on all civilians in those villages because the Salvadoran army suspects that a few people on the left, who are fighting the military, may be hiding out in those villages. We see complete massacres of the people who reside there.

We see a situation where no one can doubt that the innocent – those who have nothing to do with the fighting—have become the primary target of repression; doctors, health workers, teachers, and members of the church. Members who have not necessarily committed themselves to the FDR at all have been targeted by the military and by the death squads.

Mr. Speaker, if one had any doubt about what was the primary cause of the killings in El Salvador over the past two or three years, one has only to take the word of the former U.S. ambassador to El Salvador, who can hardly be considered a liberal force in United States society. Robert White said, when he appeared before the United States congressional hearings last month, that the chief killer of Salvadorans is the government security forces. Members of this legislature, I think, should have no doubt about that.

Amnesty International has pointed out that the victims of torture and death at the hands of the security forces:

. . . were not generally shown to have any direct involvement in armed guerrilla activity.

That's from an April 9 Amnesty International bulletin. Anyone who had any doubts at all surely had his doubts removed when it became public this month that the government has now officially sanctioned its death squads to eliminate 138 persons whose names have been published on a death list because they opposed the government in the past or denounced violations of human rights by the security forces. On that death list is included the head of the legal aid office for the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have made reference to the attacks that the government in El Salvador has made upon the church. In all, up until November 19, 1980, there had been 270 documented incidents of such attacks.

I want to make reference to some of the other groups in El Salvadoran society that have come under attack by the government. I particularly want to make reference to health workers and patients and also to teachers. Health workers and patients, Mr. Speaker, give one a good historical account of the real nature of the government that the United States has chosen to support in El Salvador. As all members of this legislature will know, the 1864 Geneva Convention, which most nations in the world including El Salvador were signatory to, provides for doctors, health workers and patients to have automatic neutrality in the event of war. Therefore, any attack by an government or by any members of the armed forces upon such persons is clearly in violation of the Geneva Convention.

Because of concern about repression among this group in society, the American Public Health Association, the Physicians' Forum and the American Friends Service

Committee were invited to organize a public commission of inquiry to investigate the violations of the rights of health workers and the killings of doctors and patients in El Salvador. That commission was made up of three doctors, a professor of public health and a teacher of community health and social medicine. I just want to read the conclusions of that commission, Mr. Chairman:

1. Military and paramilitary personnel have flagrantly entered hospitals and shot down patients in cold blood.
2. There is no instance in which the Salvadoran government has punished, prosecuted or even identified those responsible for these killings.
3. The military in El Salvador was found to have flagrantly violated the Geneva Convention of 1864.

From October 1979 to July 1980, Mr. Speaker, the commission found that at least nine physicians, seven medical students and one nurse were killed by death squads, sanctioned by the government. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the intention of these killings is clear. The intention is to ensure that health workers in El Salvador will not come to the aid of injured or sick opponents of the government. The only way that the military was able to ensure that that would not happen was to begin killing any doctor or any nurse who was suspected of offering aid to the opposition.

I think that gives us a sense of the kind of government that the people of El Salvador are having to deal with.

Representatives, Mr. Speaker, from the teachers' federation in El Salvador were recently invited by the British Columbia Teachers' Federation to Canada. They visited Saskatoon last week and they also spoke, of course, to the BCTF. I just want to make reference to the kind of repression that the government and the death squads that it sanctions have imposed upon the teachers of El Salvador.

In the past 10 years the government has killed 235 teachers and 200 relatives of teachers; 3,000 teachers have been imprisoned; 2,500 teachers have been wounded or assaulted; the homes of 40 teachers have been bombed; 4,000 instructors have been forced to flee the country and 6,000 have had to relocate within El Salvador. Mr. Speaker, in the past 10 years the military has raided the teachers' national office on 10 occasions and I think there can be no doubt that that repression is institutionalised and intentional.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on one of the weaknesses that I see in this resolution. This resolution makes no reference to the United States' intervention. This is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that any type of intervention should be sanctioned. But I think the resolution misses the point in that the primary source of intervention has clearly been the United States.

Members of this legislature will know that the Carter administration had sanctioned some \$5 million worth of military aid to the Government of El Salvador. It somehow described it, Mr. Speaker, as non-lethal aid, but in fact it was very lethal and involved the provision of military training for El Salvadoran troops in Panama and a shipment of helicopters and other military goods to the government. Since then, Mr. Speaker, another \$35 million of military aid has been approved by the Reagan administration for the year 1981. In all, since October 1979, the United States government has provided

April 28, 1981

\$41.2 million in military assistance to the Government of El Salvador, a figure which is 250 per cent greater than the amount of military aid that it provided from 1950 to 1979. Reagan has announced that he is planning to provide an additional \$66 million worth of supplies and training, starting in September.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about what this aid supplied by the United States has meant for the war in El Salvador. In January 1981, the *Washington Post* reported that the fighting in El Salvador was slowing down, and that the government forces were running low on ammunition. They only had two helicopters that were still operable. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the money that was injected by the United States has made a tremendous difference in the ability of the military dictatorship in El Salvador to continue the war and its policies of repression.

Members opposite may say, "Well what about military aid that is supposed to have come from sources, for instance, in the Soviet bloc?" That has been the excuse that the United States has used to justify its injections of military aid into El Salvador. Let's just suppose for one moment (and, of course, I don't suppose it at all) and take the figures that the United States has used about so-called aid from the Soviet bloc to El Salvador. Its own reports, Mr. Speaker, document a maximum of 200 tons of military aid being supplied by the Soviet bloc. In fact, only the first \$4 million of \$25 million that will be coming in the next three months to the Government of El Salvador in military aid from the United States has already supplied 340 tons of military aid to El Salvador, a figure which does almost twice as much as the United States claims is being supplied by the Soviet bloc. In fact, I think one of the unfortunate things is that the press, internationally, has failed to establish the details of the documents that President Reagan has released. Those documents show that any efforts that members of certain parties in El Salvador have made to attempt to get aid from the Soviet block have been practically unsuccessful. The documents, Mr. Speaker, clearly show that any members have been, practically, completely unsuccessful in doing that. The obvious reason is that the Soviet Union has little interest in activities in Central America. It's not part of its domain at this point in time. That should be obvious to all members of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I don't support the idea of the Soviet Union giving aid to El Salvador. I reject the Government of the Soviet Union. I reject the human rights violations undertaken by the Government of the Soviet Union. But I want to say that the issue is clearly not one of Soviet intervention in El Salvador. The issue is the desire of the United States to crush a popularly-based movement in El Salvador that is fighting for the rights of the people in El Salvador which is not particularly interested in forming any alliance with the Soviet Union, but is just trying to get the United States government off its back.

Mr. Speaker, I think, if one looks at the record of tampered documents, the "Pentagon Papers," clearly demonstrate with respect to Vietnam the attempts of the United States government to show communist infiltration into Vietnam in far greater proportions than was ever the case, and the clear lies which were publicly put forward by the United States government with respect to Soviet intervention there. I believe we have every reason to suspect that the same thing applies in the case of El Salvador.

I want to make reference to the question of who has opposed United States military aid . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** — Order, order! The debate has been fairly orderly up to this point. I think all members should be given an opportunity to be heard. If we can restore order in the Chamber, perhaps all members can be heard; then I will be in a position to protect members on either side of the House, should there be interruptions. However, if members put me in the position of not having my rulings observed for one side of the House, then, obviously, they can't expect to have my rulings observed on the other side of the House. The debate has been fairly orderly up this point, I will ask the members to restore order so that members can be heard.

**MR. PREBBLE:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want briefly to make reference to other governments and other organizations which have supported the position that there should be no military intervention or assistance to the Government of El Salvador. Foremost, of course, among those who requested this was Archbishop Romero, himself. My colleague for Regina Rosemont has already made reference to that. But in addition, I want to point out to the members of the House that the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States has called on all its member churches to oppose any form of military intervention in El Salvador. It has called on the government of the United States to guarantee that it would not intervene directly or covertly to determine the fate of the Salvadoran people. Amnesty International has made a similar request, as have a number of members of the United States Congress. In fact, last month there were 46 members of the Congress who introduced a resolution into the United States Congress calling for an end to U.S. military assistance to El Salvador.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a number of other countries in western Europe express concerns about U.S. policy in this regard; foremost among them has been West Germany. Willie Brandt has offered his assistance as a mediator in attempting to settle the dispute in El Salvador. President Reagan has rejected assistance from western European governments, from the government of Costa Rica, and a number of other governments from which the FDR has been willing to accept assistance and mediation services. That the United States government has rejected the prospect of political discussions and mediation to resolve this issue, as has the El Salvador government, whereas the FDR has repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, announced its willingness to begin negotiations for a political settlement rather than a military one. I think that is a point which is worth reflecting on.

Venezuela, Mr. Speaker, has criticized the United States for turning Latin America into terrain for "its confrontation with the Soviet Union." Mr. Speaker, Mexico's President Portillo has also criticized U.S. efforts to resolve El Salvador's internal crises by military means and again has argued for a political settlement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in contrast to these governments and the positions which they have taken, what has been the position of the Canadian government? I think, Mr. Speaker, the position of the Canadian government has been a complete flip-flop. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat unfortunate that in our resolution we choose to give congratulations to the government for the position it took in December. While that was a good position, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian government has since abandoned that position completely. I think we should also in this resolution condemn the Canadian government for having done that.

April 28, 1981

Mr. Speaker, it was interesting that on January 30, the Minister of External Affairs, following a brief meeting in Washington with the United States Secretary of State, said:

I would certainly not condemn any decision the United States takes to send defensive arms to El Salvador . . . The United States can at least count on our quiet acquiescence.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that the Minister of External Affairs could make a statement in December opposing U.S. intervention in El Salvador, and the next month could demonstrate such a complete turnabout.

I think the Reverend Thomas Anthony of the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights in Latin America is very correct when he says:

Mr. MacGuigan's contradictory statements, on the one hand condemning the introduction of lethal offensive weapons, and on the other hand refusing to condemn the U.S. government for doing just that, represents an embarrassing emasculation of Canadian foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of External Affairs has continued to emasculate Canadian foreign policy. On March 11, 1980, he again gave in to the United States Secretary of State Mr. Haig, by saying:

The present government of El Salvador is probably the most feasible channel through which the people of El Salvador can realize democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is just another example of the Canadian government propping up United States imperialism. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a disgrace. The Minister of External Affairs has let all Canadians down by the disgraceful position which he has taken on the El Salvador issue.

I want to close my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by making reference to some action which I think the Canadian government should be pursuing with respect to El Salvador. In making reference to these actions, Mr. Speaker, I will remind all members of the House that at this point in time the Canadian government continues to provide \$9.7 million in indirect aid to the El Salvador military government. That aid is being provided through a number of sources, both directly and through loan guarantees offered by the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-America Development Bank, and the World Bank. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian government should use all efforts which it can possibly put forward to have these loans either cancelled or delayed until the human rights record of the El Salvador government is reversed.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Canada should terminate all trading relationships with the Government of El Salvador, because it is the funds from Canada's trade which are injected into El Salvador which are artificially propping up the government there, just as funds from the United States and other countries are propping up the Government of El Salvador. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in addition to this, the Canadian government's parliamentary committee on external affairs and national defence should undertake an inquiry into the situation in El Salvador to document for all Canadians the atrocities that members of the House have been making reference to today.



And finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think the Government of Canada and the Government of Saskatchewan should extend generous financial assistance to the refugee camps that have been established in Honduras, Guatemala and El Salvador itself. Clearly, the suffering that is taking place and the shortage of supplies in these camps are things that all members of this House, and all Canadians, should be concerned about. My colleagues have made reference to the 300,000 refugees who are currently in these camps. I think it is the responsibility of the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to provide generous assistance through the various international funds, particularly through the Catholic church, to ensure that money goes where it is most needed and can be best spent. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be happy to support the motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — I think the last speaker had the courage to call it what it is from that side of the house. When we look at this debate we can lump it into two categories, and then choose which one we want to talk about. Are we against totalitarian government throughout this world? Most of the people in this world live under a totalitarian government – not simply the people of El Salvador – particularly the people of the communist bloc. That's the number one question: whether we are against totalitarian government. I think everybody in this Chamber should be or is against that system of government, as a utopian view that we would like to get to. That's argument number one.

Argument number two (and the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland made it very clear) is that their policy is not against totalitarian government. Their policy is anti-American. That's what you would be talking about, if you had the decency to get up there and call it the way it is.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — That's exactly what we are talking about here. Are we anti-American? If we can attack the Americans because . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You talk about stupid. When did we ever hear from your voices, Mr. Minister of Urban Affairs, any concern about civil rights in the Soviet Union? When did we hear the Minister of Urban Affairs ever talk about the problem in Angola or in Afghanistan? But oh, you are great when it comes to the question of El Salvador, because that's where you get off – on the anti-American attack. It wasn't so many days ago that Ronald Reagan appeared in Canada and the members of your party sat in the House of Commons with black armbands on, as members of the NDP. I take it you people endorse that type of thing. It was at that same time that the delegations out there burned the American flag, and I take it you people endorse that, because that is exactly what you are talking about.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — The member for Saskatoon-Sutherland would have us believe that the Soviet bloc is not interested in South America. How naive can you be? The Soviet Union is aggressive; it is imperialist. And anybody in this Chamber who doesn't believe that clearly must rate at the height of naivete, because they are moving on all fronts. Would anybody deny that they are moving in Afghanistan? Would anyone deny that their next move is into the Middle East? Would anyone deny that they were moving into Africa and have moved into Africa? Would anyone deny that they are interested in

having a presence in the western hemisphere, in South America?

Did we hear one word from you people as to the position of your friends in Cuba? Did we hear you say one word about Cuba? No, not one word. But, you jump on the Americans. You jump on the people who are probably the best friends that we have as a nation. That is a topic that you people can ram at; but don't touch the Cubans, don't touch the Russians, don't touch anybody else. That's why I say, Mr. Speaker, this debate is not about totalitarian government; this debate is anti-American. That's exactly what it is.

You talk about freedoms. I think the member referred to El Salvador as the worst human rights violator on Earth.

I say to the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland that there are many other countries where human rights are being stepped on – in particular in the Soviet bloc. What about Czechoslovakia? What about Poland? What about those countries? The members opposite are the same people who jumped up and down with regard to Vietnam, the problem in Vietnam, the anti-American stuff. That was the last decade. They were talking about the atrocities of the war in Vietnam and no one liked to see the war in Vietnam. But what happened after the war in Vietnam when the Americans pulled out? Did we hear a cry from the people over there? Did we hear a cry from the member for Saskatoon-Sutherland as 30 million people died in Cambodia and Thailand? Was he concerned about that? No. That's under the control of the Soviet bloc. That's exactly where it is.

I'll tell you where you people stand – you stand for the left-wing terrorists. I'll tell you boys that's where you and I get off the train. That's the problem we are concerned about in this world – the left-wing terrorists and communists. If you don't think the communist threat is there and is relevant, then I suggest you have something else coming.

You are using the same logic here that somehow in this legislature we should pass a resolution, and somehow we will bring an end to the problems in El Salvador, or we will send our good little Premier down there to straighten everything out. That is not, my friends, how international politics work.

I have here a speech from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. I'm sure you people won't like what Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has to say. This was addressed to the Harvard graduation class in 1978. Everyone will know of the types of problems he faced in Soviet Union concentration camps. What Solzhenitsyn is telling us is that we in our pretty western world want to look at the world of international politics with the American standard. These people should have the same freedoms we should have. They should run their country the way we do. But that's not the way it is. That's not the way it works in the East. That's not the way it works in the Soviet Union. It's not the way it works in the Middle East. Those people have their own standards. Somehow we think we are the guys who can deliver the sole message to them, and that somehow we should superimpose our system on the rest of the world. It doesn't work that way.

I think Solzhenitsyn, as a refugee from Russia who has spent much of his time in prison, is crying to the western world to wake up to exactly what the Soviet Union is doing. They are imperialists; they are aggressive; and they intend to move not only their power but their system and philosophy.

Do you know what Solzhenitsyn calls the members opposite? He said the reason the Nazis didn't win was because we were able to rally the allies and beat them. But what the Soviets have (and the Nazis didn't) is their fifth column within the countries which they are opposed to. That's where you people sit — you're the potential fifth column of the movement.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. ANDREW:** — Those are the remarks I wished to make. There are a couple other members of our caucus who would also like to say something, so I will take my seat and let them speak.

**MR. MATSALLA:** — Mr. Speaker, the motion before this House is one which is dealing with a subject that ought to be of the gravest concern to all of us. I ask the indulgence of the members of the House, should I be somewhat repetitive in what I am saying of that which has already been said by some of my colleagues. I personally feel that some of these points ought to be repeated.

Now, the hon. member who has just sat down indicated that our policy is anti-American. It just doesn't seem right for him to even say that. The fact that we criticize the American policy certainly doesn't mean that we are anti-American, and it certainly doesn't mean that what the Americans do is always right. After all, the Americans do criticize the Canadian policy and they criticize Russian policies and other countries' policies. So I think it is our right that, if what we see is not right, we should criticize that policy.

Furthermore, the hon. member indicated in his remarks that we stand for left-wing terrorism. That would mean that he disagrees with the position which the church and many other religious organizations are taking on this complete issue. The sheer magnitude of the tragedy in Latin American today demands that we raise our voices in protest. For what will we tell our children when, years hence, they ask us what we did about the wholesale slaughter of peasants, workers, students, teachers and priests, nuns and other clergy, now under way in El Salvador?

We cannot hide our heads and pretend that the brutal campaigns of repression by military dictatorships in small countries thousands of miles away are none of our business. We cannot pretend that the killings are merely the result of clashes between opposing political factions. There is no longer any doubt, if indeed there ever was any doubt, that the governments of El Salvador and Guatemala are waging campaigns of genocide and terrorism against the people, against the church, and against any group or organization which dares to speak out against the institutionalised terrorism of those dictatorships.

Mr. Speaker, almost daily, horror stories flow out of those countries. On the night of Tuesday, April 7, an American Broadcasting Corporation news team reported that a squad of police and army regulars descended on a poor district of San Salvador, the capital of El Salvador. With the government death squad was a hooded man and going door to door, the hooded man pointed to the men, women and children who were to be shot and, in some cases, mutilated. The next day 30 bodies were counted in the streets; most shot at point-blank range. Almost daily the killing increases with the increased arms shipments to these repressive regimes and the arrival of mercenaries from the United States.

April 28, 1981

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to make three points about the monstrous situation in Latin America. The first is that the publicly stated reasons behind American military aid to El Salvador and other military dictatorships in the region bears no relationship to the reality of the events there.

The second point is that the struggle against these governments is being carried on and supported by the vast majority of the people there, including the clergy and their Christian followers.

The third point, following from the first two, is that unless we clearly stand opposed to the propping up of such regimes, nations of the world will judge us hypocrites who preach freedom, brotherhood and tolerance at home while turning a blind eye to war crimes abroad. For there can be no doubt that the government in El Salvador is waging a war on a defenceless population.

We know that in the United States, the Reagan administration is pouring billions of dollars worth of arms and military supplies into the region. A small contingent of Green Berets is now in El Salvador. Secretary of State Alexander Haig says the issue is simply one of repelling communist forces in the area. Those who have allied themselves with the forces of darkness now ruling El Salvador would have the world believe they are engaged in a political struggle with an ideological opponent seeking to undermine the western hemisphere. General Haig, himself, says that the matter is a simple one. He claims the Soviet Union has taken control of Nicaragua and now seeks to spread its domination through El Salvador to Guatemala and Honduras. Anyone who questions this view is a Soviet-style Communist and not worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a moment examining Nicaragua to see just what it is that the United States military fears will take hold in El Salvador. We know that the United States shipped arms to Nicaragua in an attempt to prevent the popular Sandinista forces from taking power there. I think we can gain a clearer understanding of Latin America by considering what the Sandinistas were fighting, and what they are doing now, after their victory.

In Nicaragua the United States installed the Somoza family in power some 50 years ago through a direct intervention by United States marines. When Somoza fell, the family owned 60 per cent of the country's arable land. They owned the national air line and shipping company, the largest newspaper and a TV network. Government terrorism in the country was rampant. Pedro Chamorro, editor of the opposition newspaper in Managua, was murdered.

Opposition to the Somoza regime resulted in the Sandinista force – a coalition of dissenting businessmen, priests, students, intellectuals and private enterprisers. In the struggle for basic human rights that followed, 50,000 people were killed. Somoza fled, leaving the country bankrupt.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what have the feared Sandinistas done with their victory? In San Isidro, a community of 3,500 people, a new water and electric program has been launched. Families, according to a report by Father Vincent Giese in the Catholic publication *The Sunday Visitor*, no longer have to pay up to 80 per cent of their total cash income to buy water. Father Giese's report spoke of a mass he attended which he said was:

A symbol of new life in the community, only now no more killings, massacres, and mutilations of the body by government troops . . . They were gathered together to celebrate the sacredness of the body, even in death.

In Chinandega province, an area of about 40,000 farmers, the Spanish Sisters of Mercy have, for eight years, been running health outreach programs. Now the Sandinistas are building a new hospital and five outreach clinics. Other religious orders now operate co-operatives and schools in Nicaragua, and the government pays teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, across Nicaragua, the Sandinistas are working closely with relief agencies like the Catholic relief services, Olga Ramierey De Gomez is a 45-year-old supervisor in a clothing co-operative. Samozan forces brutally tortured and killed members of her family. Her slogan is "Socialism, yes; Communism, no." She says there is a big difference. So does her pastor, Padre Rafael, a young Dominican, who has an interesting point of view. Padre Rafael says, and I quote:

Living in Latin America today is a privileged moment. It is an opportunity to break with capitalism, which is a structure of the deadly sins, and to look for a new form of socialism.

Mr. Speaker, hospitals, employment co-operatives, land reform, an end to indiscriminate terrorism and killing – that is General Haig's label of Soviet domination. A moderate people seeking only the freedom to select their own government – that is what the arm shipments from the U.S. into Latin America are supposed to prevent. Basic human rights and freedoms – that is what General Haig fears will spread from Nicaragua to El Salvador and through El Salvador to Guatemala.

The struggle of the poor against their wealthy oppressors in Nicaragua has been won. Now the same struggle has erupted in El Salvador. There are those who believe the United States is really more interested in Guatemala, where American business interests are heavy and where there are more natural resources than in El Salvador. But, if the rightist government of El Salvador is toppled, Guatemala will be next and American business interests want to hold the line of progressive revolutions in El Salvador. Mr. Speaker, it was not Soviet domination that threatened Nicaragua. It is not dogmatic Marxism being attacked in El Salvador. What General Haig fears is simply democracy – a system in which the people of these countries can freely choose who will govern and how their economies will develop. To suggest El Salvador is a battle against Soviet imperialism is a monstrous falsehood. It is a shameless lie for which the people of El Salvador daily suffer and die. It is a lie used to hide a campaign of genocide against a people.

Mr. Speaker, the situation in El Salvador is so overwhelming one does almost now know where to begin. But an event just over a year ago brings the conflict into sharp focus. On March 24, 1980, Archbishop Oscar Romero of San Salvador was murdered in his church by the rightist death squad. This has been mentioned by my colleague earlier. Shortly before his death, Archbishop Romero sent a letter to then United States president, Jimmy Carter, asking that the United States not intervene with "military, economic, diplomatic or other pressures to determine the destiny of the Salvadoran people."

A joint statement by the United States Catholic Conference, the Conference of Major Superiors of Men and the Conference of Women Religious was issued on the first

anniversary of the killing of Archbishop Romero. It stated that “the principal responsibility for violence rests with the junta.” Fact-finding missions of British members of parliament, the Organization of American States, an American ecumenical delegation, the Salvadoran Human Rights Commissions, and the legal office of the Archdiocese of San Salvador have all blamed the violence and torture on the integration of the military and paramilitary, financed by the wealthy landowners. Father Giese, editor of the *Sunday Visitor*, says El Salvador is one of the most criminal states in the world, and that American policy in the area is an open invitation to government-sponsored terrorism around the world. By placing human rights violations on the back burner, as the members opposite would like to do, Reagan has signalled military dictatorships everywhere to go full steam ahead with their repressive policies, assured of no United States criticism.

Just this February, a panel of respected lawyers, judges and clergymen met in Mexico City to conduct a public inquiry open to the press to hear evidence from both sides. They too condemned the junta for genocide, torture and violation of fundamental human rights. Yet many western news sources continue to relay orchestrated news, designed by Washington to support its own paranoiac view of the situation. It is a curious fact that, within weeks of assuming office, the Reagan administration was able to pronounce with certainty that the popular liberation fronts in El Salvador were just Soviet Communist dupes. Yet the December murders of three American nuns and a lay missionary by the junta troops remain a mystery. Almost nightly, we hear statements from the White House and General Haig justifying their genocidal policy. Yet the murders of the nuns slip quietly from the news and the Mexico City inquiry was hardly reported at all.

No one will claim the opposition to the Salvadoran junta has not tried peaceful means. Two years ago, government troops attacked a peaceful demonstration and killed 600 people. The *Sunday Visitor* reports the church, in its broadest sense, is in solidarity with the Revolutionary Democratic Front of El Salvador. The response from the government has been to murder, imprison and exile priests, nuns and Christians along with the ordinary workers, students, teachers and farmers.

Mr. Speaker, we are today called upon to take a stand – a stand before God and a stand beside our fellow man. I want to quote from an April monthly letter of *The Knight*. It’s a publication which is issued by the Canora Council, Knights of Columbus. It points out the position of the church and the Knights of Columbus on this issue before us. A section of it deals with El Salvador.

Archbishop Halpin and Father Jim Weisgerber recently toured five Latin American countries where the struggle for justice is pronounced. A statement from Archbishop Romero to President Carter on February 12, 1980 said, “I urge you, if you really want to defend human rights: (1) to prohibit the giving of military assistance to the Salvadoran government, (2) to guarantee that your government will not intervene directly or indirectly with military, economic, diplomatic or other pressure to determine the fate of the Salvadoran people.”

Romero was assassinated March 24, 1980. Some 12,000 people were killed in El Salvador last year. American commitment to El Salvador appears to be growing at an alarming rate. Four advisers become 54. A military aid program of \$10 million reaches \$100 million. Helicopters, arms, etc. keep

flowing into El Salvador.

The next section of the publication says:

Canada's guilt? To what extent are we bedfellows with American imperialism such as we witnessed in Nicaragua? In Nicaragua, the Samosa family controlled the wealth from 1933 to 1969 and then took from the country \$1.6 billion, leaving behind some \$6 million and much anti-American sentiment. (Sounds like Iran.)

We cannot try to duck the issue by pretending that the issue is one of resistance to Soviet imperialism. There is simply far too much evidence for that argument to have any credibility at all. That is simply an excuse for those who, unwittingly or otherwise, want to see the forces of tyranny prevail – those who would, perhaps inadvertently, stand with today's tyrants, dictators and oppressors.

The junta in El Salvador is really no different from other repressive regimes we have known – Idi Amin in Uganda, Stalin in Russia, Hitler in Nazi Germany, Pol Pot in Cambodia.

The debate on the motion before us will show who understands the gravity of the situation. It may also show whether anyone here would rather pretend that the issue is one of partisan politics than admit that it is one of basic human and democratic rights. The motion is worthy of support. We can no longer turn a deaf ear to the cries of the oppressed. I urge all members to give their full support to this motion.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join in on speaking to this resolution, but first of all, I wanted to point out to the members opposite (it's just a little point, but I think it might be of interest to you) that members of this side certainly speak for themselves, and are not told when and how to speak. Consequently, when they do speak, they are speaking for themselves, and not for the others on this particular side, necessarily – although that may be the case (I'm not saying it is or is not) in this particular resolution.

I want to also point out that to condemn the United States for certain actions, at some particular time, doesn't necessarily mean that that particular person favors a Soviet Union – anymore than if someone condemns the Soviet Union you wouldn't arrive at the conclusion (at least, rightly) that that person is pro-American. There are people in this world who are, in some cases, not pro-American, nor are they pro-Soviet Union, and that's a consideration to be made . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the hon. gentlemen says, "What about you?" Yes, I'll tell you about me. I'll tell you one thing: I get a little riled up when there are insinuations that certain members on this side of the House are more or less second-class citizens. I'll tell you why I become riled up. It is because my ancestors happen to come from eastern Europe, and there are many in Saskatchewan whose ancestors come from eastern Europe.

Those insinuations that sometimes have, in the past, come from members opposite, inferring that somehow those people of eastern European origin are second-class citizens, just don't wash down well with me. In fact, I dislike it thoroughly and I consider it to be an insult to me and my family, and I consider it to be an insult to all people of Slav origin in Saskatchewan and consequently a slap in the face to all the people of this

province.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all members of this Assembly abhor the repressiveness of the regime in El Salvador. I'm sure that all members abhor the murder that has gone on in that country over the past number of years. I am sure that, as an Assembly, we would wish to see peace and harmony in that nation. But, Mr. Speaker, how can there be peace and harmony there if a repressive regime is allowed under the guise of legality to murder, torture, starve and intimidate its citizens, 95 per cent of whom live in abject poverty?

Why is there a repressive regime there, allowed to operate Al Capone style? Is it not because it is being propped up by foreign and domestic intervention, so that these foreign and domestic corporations and individuals can be saved at the expense of the El Salvadorans? It is not because these corporations and individuals like the El Salvadoran regime to be a middleman in subjugating El Salvadorans and maintaining the status quo there, which is really 14th century feudalism in the 20th century?

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have always spoken out against repression, whether it was practised by a communistic, capitalistic or socialistic regime, as I'm sure some members on that side of the House have done in the past also. Many in this Chamber spoke out against the repression directed at the Ukrainians in the Soviet Union. Many spoke out against the repression directed at Valentine Morosz, and just because we on this side of the House didn't tell the whole world that we spoke out against the repression directed against Morosz doesn't mean to say that we didn't. I can well remember one night – in fact it was New Year's Eve – in front of City Hall in Saskatoon. It must have been 60 below and there must have been a 60 mph wind. I might tell you, for your information on both sides of the House, that the Attorney General was one (I was another one) who stood there in a vigil directed against the oppression of Valentine Morosz. But we didn't tell anyone. That doesn't mean to say that we haven't done that in the past with other people, other incidents and other issues.

Many spoke out against the repression that was directed against Valentine Morosz. Many spoke out against the repression in El Salvador which culminated in the assassination of the Archbishop while he was serving his people and his church in El Salvador. So you see, our attention to repression has not been selective on philosophical grounds. Rather it has been based upon humanitarian grounds and, I grant you, we probably do not hold a monopoly on that (just to calm down the members opposite).

The regime of El Salvador is held up as a shining example by certain world leaders who claim that terrorists are behind the extreme discontent in El Salvador. Now, I ask you, was Archbishop Romero a terrorist because he wanted to help his people? Is the *Prairie Messenger* terrorist because it, too, directs its ire and its wrath against the repressive regime in El Salvador, and those who would intervene to prop up that regime? Well, I'll tell you one thing: there were many articles in the *Prairie Messenger* and you either have to say that those articles are not true or, as I do, believe that they are true. Well, let's just assume that they are true because I hear nobody in this Chamber denying that they are. Is the *United Church Observer* terrorist? Now, to say that all these papers and these individuals are terrorist is simply not true.

I commend the Government of Canada for what it has done in opposing foreign intervention in El Salvador. I urge it to go even farther, to use stronger language and possibly even action to promote it even more. In fact, I would want the Canadian



government to do the same thing in regard to terrorism or repressive regimes wherever they are in the world regardless of philosophical.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** — Wrap it up.

**MR. MOSTOWAY:** — I have just a few minutes to go, kind sir, and I will wrap it up very quickly. The people of El Salvador, just as the people of the United States and Canada did and are doing, should be allowed to determine their own future because, as Ernest Hemingway stated in his book, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, when even one individual in the world suffers an indignity without a protest from others, we all lose dignity, and we are all the worse off for it in the world. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this resolution.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.