



**Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**

---

**31-32 Elizabeth II**

---

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



MG-8048

**VOL. XXXI No. 148 - 10:00 a.m., FRIDAY, 12 AUGUST, 1983.**

**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Second Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, 12 August, 1983.

Time — 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Ninth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. ASSISTANT CLERK, G. Mackintosh:** Your committee met on Thursday, August 11, 1983, and heard representations with respect to the bills before the committee as follows:

Bill No. 102 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act,

Dr. Linda Asper, Manitoba Teachers' Society.

Bill No. 112 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1983),

Mr. Bill Gardner, Manitoba Chamber of Commerce,

Mr. David Newman, Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce.

Bill No. 110 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act,

Mr. Wayne Ritcher, Private Citizen,

Ms. S. Juravsky, Manitoba Monument Association,

Mr. Garth Steek, Steek's Interiors,

Mr. Victor Steek, Steek's Fine Furniture,

Mr. Jim Band, House of Teak Furniture.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 99 - The Court of Queen's Bench Small Claims Practices Act; Loi sur le recouvrement des petites créances à la Cour du banc de la Reine,

Bill No. 100 - The Court of Queen's Bench Surrogate Practice Act; Loi sur la pratique relative aux successions devant la Cour du Banc de la Reine,

Bill No. 102 - An Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act,

Bill No. 104 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate The Sinking Fund Trustees of The Winnipeg School Division No. 1.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill No. 98 - An Act to amend The Queen's Bench Act and to repeal The County Courts Act, The

Surrogate Courts Act and The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act and to amend The Municipal Boundaries Act; Loi modifiant la loi sur la Cour du Banc de la Reine, abrogeant la loi sur les Cours de comté, la loi sur les Tribunaux des successions et la loi sur les Cours criminelles de comté, et modifiant la loi sur les limites municipales,

Bill No. 101 - An Act to amend Various Act of the Legislature to facilitate the Reorganization and Expansion of the Court of Queen's Bench.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

Your committee has also considered:

Bill No. 62 - The Provincial Court Act; Loi sur la cour provinciale,

Bill No. 72 - The Wild Rice Act; Loi sur le riz sauvage,

Bill No. 110 - An Act to amend The Consumer Protection Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments, on division.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce to members of the House that, effective September 1, 1983, there will be a price increase on most alcoholic beverages in Manitoba. These increases result from an increase in the indexed federal excise tax of over 13 percent, accompanied by a number of price increases from suppliers. Suppliers' increases were brought about through increased production costs.

I would like to point out at this time that due to the strength of the Canadian dollar in certain foreign markets, a large number of imported wines will decrease in price effective September 1, 1983. Some domestic wineries have also decreased their prices. Canadian spirits - whiskey, gin, vodka, rum - will have increases of between 7 and 12 percent, ranging from 95 cents to \$1.45 for a 710 ml. bottle. Imported spirits will generally increase by about 90 cents per bottle. The increase in Canadian wines will be modest, averaging about 3 percent or 10 cents for a 750 ml. bottle. Some European wines will decrease in price by as much as 10 percent. Manitoba beer will increase by 20 cents per dozen.

Let me just, Mr. Speaker, add that - and this responds to a point raised by the Member for St. Norbert - in order to maintain the budgeted profit of the Commission, the Commission's markup will be applied in this proposal to the excise and supplier increases.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney-General for bringing this information to the House, but we must recognize that it is this government that, in the 1982 Budget, requested and instructed the Liquor Control Commission to increase their prices in order to raise an additional \$20 million in revenue in the spring of 1982, after just having imposed a price increase.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening here, as the Attorney-General has indicated in response to my question, the Provincial Government and the Liquor Control Commission are imposing their markup which, for example, on imported spirits is 138 percent of the increase in the excise tax. The Attorney-General, in response to my questions a few days ago, indicated that he thought the increase in the excise tax of 13.3 or 13.5 percent was excessive, and he was asking the Minister of Finance to make representations to Ottawa criticizing that excessive increase in prices.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government is imposing a markup of 138 percent on that 13 percent increase in the excise tax. So the provincial percentage increase, compared to the increase in the federal excise tax, is about 20 percent over and above the 13 percent increase in the excise tax. This government has pushed the prices of the Liquor Control Commission in various areas, particularly in the area of spirits, to where Manitoba prices are second-highest in the country, which is a very significant change in the relative prices in Manitoba compared to those in effect under the previous government, Mr. Speaker.

So I find it somewhat astonishing that the Attorney-General and the government can on the one hand say that the excise tax increase of 13.3 or 13.5 percent is excessive, and at the same time impose upon the consumers of Manitoba a percentage increase of some 20 percent through their markup of 138 percent on, for example, imported spirit.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to report on the status of the health emergency Aerial Spraying Program.

Data received late yesterday has shown a significant drop in viral activity. This is encouraging news.

Based upon recommendations received last night from the Manitoba Arbovirus Surveillance Committee, I am announcing that no further aerial spraying is planned at this time; however, the DC-6 aircraft used in the aerial spraying program has been asked to remain in the province on a stand-by basis. This will allow additional data to be collected and will act as a safeguard against another resurgence in viral activity.

Although mosquito numbers are high, and the hot and humid weather has accelerated mosquito growth

and activity, it has always been made very clear that the province was not conducting the aerial application to control nuisance mosquitoes.

Let me emphasize that even though viral activity is now minimal, there still remains an element of risk and I again urge everyone to take personal precautions to avoid contracting Western Equine Encephalitis.

Since I last reported to you, aerial spraying was conducted over the communities of Killarney and Boissevain.

There are now six confirmed horse cases of Western Equine Encephalitis. These are from the areas of Marquette, Souris, Benard, Beausejour, Glenboro and Marchand. Onset of the disease in all cases is believed to have been prior to mid-July.

Over 300 people are now being examined for possible symptoms of the disease, however, there have been no confirmed human cases to date.

Monitoring of viral activity throughout the province is continuing and I will report the results to the House at the earliest opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for this information. The news appears to be good and we hope it continues to be encouraging and that the health threat is soon eliminated completely.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Pension reform legislation

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I provided the Acting First Minister with a copy of a letter from the Co-operative Superannuation Society indicating its concerns about the government's act to amend The Pension Benefits Act. I have supplied the Acting First Minister with a copy of the letter which I have just received. A letter was sent to the First Minister by Mr. Green, Senior Vice-President of Great-West Life. The original was sent to the First Minister and I've received a copy of it.

I would ask the Acting First Minister whether or not the comment on Page 5 of this letter, "Sponsors of large pension plans will be faced with increased costs which, on average, might be in the order of the Manitoba payroll tax. In order to remain competitive with employers who are not subject to these increased costs, employee contributions might be increased or plan benefits might be reduced," is she not concerned enough now with the letter from the Co-operative Superannuation Society and this letter from Great-West Life that the government would consider referring the act to amend The Pension Benefits Act to an intersessional committee to consider all of the ramifications of the proposed amendments?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the concerns raised in the two letters are indeed worthy of consideration. In a quick perusal of the Great-West letter that I just received before coming in today and on reading of the one that was presented to me two days ago, there are concerns raised that I feel confident the Minister sponsoring the bill will take into account during the committee hearings.

Just reading through quickly, there are some issues where there may clearly end up just being a difference of opinion. The rationale in the letters is not - there are other interpretations of those concerns. There are one or two items, I do acknowledge, will require study on our part, but we are prepared to bring the resources to bear and see that those are dealt with in the normal procedure.

I think basically the government's concern that more workers in Manitoba get coverage; that they get it as soon as possible; extend the contributions over as long a period of time as possible to reduce the actual burden on them as they move along; and that overall, pension savings be considered deferred wages. I think if those principles are looked at, then many of the criticisms taken in that perspective can be dealt with.

However, there are one or two items that I give my commitment to serious study in an accelerated way by the people in the government.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the concerns by the government, which are shared by members on this side of the House, that employees in Manitoba obtain broader and expanded coverage, and in view of the fact that Mr. Green goes on to state that, "Small employers who have voluntarily established pension plans in the past will react in one of two ways to these amendments. Some, possibly even a majority given the current economic climate, will simply terminate the pension plan. Many will adopt alternative pension funding arrangements," Mr. Speaker, in view of those concerns and the government's concerns that there be expanded pension coverage, does the Minister not consider it inappropriate to consider this, as she says, in an accelerated way which really means to push this legislation through in the closing days of this Session?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, there has been wide opportunity for public input and discussion as the proposals have been developing. As I say, some differences of opinion will persist. It is our belief that most private employers that run pension plans are genuinely interested in having fair and full coverage for their employees but, as we say, it is a form of deferred wages and, therefore quite rightfully, is taken into consideration in the total either formal or informal negotiation on wages.

We want people to have coverage. I think what we are saying is that the private plans have an opportunity now to demonstrate good faith. They want reasonable coverage for their workers, and they are prepared to work on developing those plans. If they choose to withdraw their plans or terminate them in some way, then that is a signal to us of their unwillingness to

develop on the pension front, and we must then look at other avenues. But it is our belief at the present time that most employers do see pension plans as a reasonable benefit to be worked out with their workers, and that they will co-operate with the changes.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Mr. Green goes on to state that, "I am very confident that few small pension plans will survive in Manitoba unless significant changes are made to Bill 95. It is certain that few, if any new plans, would be implemented in the future."

What is the Acting First Minister saying when she says that the government will consider other action, when she says that this is a matter of opinion? Does she not respect the opinion expressed by officials of the Co-operative Superannuation Society and of the Senior Vice-President of Great-West Life who have been involved and are very knowledgeable in this particular area? Is that not of sufficient weight to suggest to this government that they are proceeding too fast?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the pension debate is not a new debate. One of the key items raised in the Co-operative Superannuation letter has to do with interprovincial questions. I think that is one that does have to be looked at.

The other issues, however, have to be weighed; on the one side, where people offering pension plans want them fully funded and at minimal cost.

On the other hand, we have the concern that workers in Manitoba are assisted in an orderly way with gradual contributions throughout their work life and in improved portability, that they are assisted in having adequate savings through pension to cover their retirement years. It is our interest, and I think the interest of the members opposite if they really think of what it is we're trying to accomplish through pensions, that as many workers as possible in the province be covered in an orderly way. As I say, I have confidence that most of the employers in the province will want to see that their workers are given fair coverage and that the most reasonable possible plans are in place.

If the members opposite don't have that faith, they are entitled to that opinion, but it is our considered judgment that what we are doing is safeguarding the workers of Manitoba and assisting them with their retirement savings in a reasonable and carefully thought-out manner.

### Premiers' Conference

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Acting First Minister. Two days ago, we brought to the attention of the government statements being made by the First Minister in Toronto which bore little relationship to the facts about the Jobs Fund. Yesterday, the First Minister was heard in Toronto to be making statements about Manitoba's alleged restraint program, which are at complete divergence with the record here in Manitoba.

Today in the newspapers, the First Minister is reported to be criticizing his fellow Premiers, describing them

as a bland bunch, doing all of the things that are not necessarily conducive to the public interest of the province or better relations between the government and the people of Manitoba and the other provinces of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Acting First Minister would consider sending a message to the First Minister, similar to one that a senior British politician received from his club back around the turn of the century when he was also making foolish statements. The message went something like this: Best friends here trust that you will stop making further ass of yourself.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, it seems to me what the Leader of the Opposition opposite fails to recognize is that there is a political debate going on in Manitoba and in this country as to what is the best way to plan for the economic security of the future and to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of both the burdens and the benefits of that economy.

There is room for difference of opinion, and I commend my Premier and the comments he has made at those meetings, where he has done a very estimable job of putting together an alternative proposal to building and maintaining the economy of the country, so that there is not a group of workers or of unemployed people in society that must carry the full burden of very difficult economic times. What he is proposing is a fair approach to economic development and an initiating approach by all the governments of Canada and I, for one, wish that the other Premiers and the Government in Ottawa would take heed of what he is proposing, because I think it is a set of proposals that offers hope and offers real alternatives to what we are currently seeing.

**HON. S. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we all have sympathy for the socialist Premier of Manitoba being out of step with everybody else in Canada; if not sympathy, we at least have understanding. Mr. Speaker, considering the considerable wrecking job that this socialist government has done to the Manitoba economy in the last 20 months or so, would the Acting First Minister not agree that even when an NDP Premier goes to a Premiers' Conference that truth should not be a stranger to his statements?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to rephrase his question to seek information, rather than an opinion from the Honourable Minister?

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**HON. S. LYON:** I am seeking information, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking why the Premier of Manitoba doesn't speak the truth at Premiers' Conferences?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, what we are hearing from the opposition is a view of democracy that I absolutely reject. It is that one group or one individual, perhaps in this case, has a monopoly on truth.

What we are encountering in the current world and what we are trying to deal with in the democratic process is the exploration of different alternatives, their different ideas as to how we can best achieve an

equitable and a secure society. Mr. Speaker, to suggest that there is no room for difference of opinion, different alternatives, seems to me to deny the validity of the entire political process in which we are all engaged. There is a room for difference of opinion and for the contribution of thought-out proposals based on our values, which are the very heart and soul of our political party.

It would be remiss of the Premier of this province not to contribute from his perspective when he attends these meetings. He takes them most seriously and does this preparation well and makes a constructive contribution. He does not, however, go and say: I am the truth, the only way, and you must all agree immediately. He is contributing to an open debate on how best to solve the very real problems that face Canada and Manitoba.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a final question to the Acting First Minister - and I feel apologetic really of putting her in the position because of awkward statements being made by her leader - but realizing, as we all do, that Manitoba now is sort of a "Typhoid Mary" at these conferences, does the Acting First Minister not agree that giving false statements about the Jobs Fund and giving false statements about the guidance rules that apply to this year's Budget, saying that they were 0 to 5 when in fact expenditures increased 19 percent, is doing no service either to the present Government of Manitoba or to the people or this province?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I fear what's happening in the opposition is that the leader is recalling his experience at the First Ministers' Conference, where he was not following any coherent political philosophy in the positions he took, and he experienced being a "Typhoid Mary or Marten" - whatever he wishes to be called - therefore he can't imagine an honest contribution to debate an acceptance of difference of opinion as realistic and acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, on the Jobs Fund and on his sense of timing about 0 to 5 guideline and this year's increase in the Budget, does he not recall that there is a budgetary process, that guidelines submitted now for the formation of next year's Budget and next year's Estimates can differ because of the changed circumstance and our changed assessment of the situation to what we had the previous year? Does he think that one pulls the simple formula out of the sky and applies it, unthinkingly, year after year when one is in government? That may have been the way he approached his budgeting process, but it is not the way the government on this side of the House is approaching it.

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see the Acting First Minister get into the same problems with the truth that her leader is in. I suggest that she read the speech that was distributed yesterday by Information Services to see where her leader stated that this year's Estimates were drawn on the basis of 0 to 5 when, in effect, 18 to 19 percent is the factual increase. I don't want my honourable friend to get in trouble with the truth.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't believe I perceived the question there, but the Honourable Minister of Economic Development may answer if she did.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, you can set guidelines for a Budget for the initial presentation - 0 to 9 were the guidelines we were operating for the 1983-84 Budget. Within that, we examined the proposals. We also looked at the needs of the time and selected some areas for priority spending. The Jobs Fund, as we have been explaining to the members opposite, was a will to go beyond the 0 to 9 spending in a targeted way, as a special effort to deal with the unacceptably high unemployment. It was an initiative, Mr. Speaker, based on our assessment of the unemployment situation out there and of the appropriate role of a government, when the economy is at the bottom of the trough.

What we are now gradually moving into - and we hope and pray and we'll be doing our bit on this side to preserve - is a gradual moving out of that trough and we therefore think it appropriate, as well as dealing with the fact inflation rates have come down, with a narrower guideline for the preparation of Budget and we will still be making priority choices as we go through that and not mechanically applying that simple formula. It is merely a guideline to assist all the spending groups to be realistic in the preparation of their Estimates.

### Headingley Jail - interview of inmate

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Deputy Premier in the absence of the Minister of Corrections and the Attorney-General. Does the government approve of a practice whereby an inmate from Headingley Jail was allowed to, first of all, be interviewed on television with the sounds of breaking glass and disturbance in the background some two or three nights ago, and also appear yesterday morning on a radio hot-line show in Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question seeks an opinion, whereas it should seek information from the front bench. Would the honourable member wish to rephrase his question?

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is whether it is a government practice to allow inmates from Headingley Jail to appear on radio and television?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister, I don't have the answer to that question, but I will undertake to obtain it.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister when she's speaking to the Attorney-General and the Minister of Corrections whether they would review what can only be described as an unacceptable practice to allow prison inmates to make news, be interviewed, become media stars or personalities? I would ask her whether she would also recommend to them that this practice be eliminated at once?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure there really was a new question there. I am wondering why the sensitivity of media stardom, if there's some sense of competition perhaps. But seriously, I do take the question as a serious question, and I have already undertaken to see that there will be a reply.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not recognize that there is a difference between a person who has been sent to jail for a crime and possibly a murder and a member of the Legislature?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**HON. S. LYON:** Which gulag do you want to go to?

### Jobs Fund - advertising

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting First Minister. I note that there are still ads appearing on television with respect to the Jobs Fund, and that those ads do not contain any specific information with respect to asking people to inquire as to the Jobs Fund, soliciting any applications for projects under the Jobs Fund. Since these ads in total are costing the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, is it possible that these ads are simply being run to try and improve a badly tarnished image of the government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I would have thought they were intended to demonstrate to the people that they have a government that are willing to take action on unemployment where they can to build their momentum of confidence so that we can all, workers, business and government, get down to the very difficult business of building the economy here in Manitoba and having brighter days ahead.

There are many people out there who feel, rightly or wrongly, that the system as it currently operates is leaving them out. We are not of that persuasion. We are determined to keep working and to build employment opportunities within our capacity. The Jobs Fund Program, as we have explained time and time again, still has programs to which people can apply to get actual employment. The phase that has been all but completed is the allocation of major blocks of funds to specific areas, but there are opportunities emerging through the programming that follows from that allocation of funds.

### Jobs Fund - allocation of funds

**MR. B. RANSOM:** A further question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. The government had included \$72 million in its budgetary Estimates for the Jobs Fund. We have been trying to find out from the Minister exactly how those funds have been allocated. Can she tell the House

at this time whether or not the government has allocated more than \$72 million of budgetary funds?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day, there was full opportunity when the Jobs Fund was being debated in this House during the Estimates procedure to ask the questions that are now being raised. The detail on the fund, I think, is better left until the Minister of Labour and Employment Services, and the First Minister are in the House.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister. These questions were asked during the review of the Estimates of the Jobs Fund. Indeed the Minister of Labour refused to provide the information. It was only after the Minister of Natural Resources stood to answer a question that we discovered that indeed the information was available.

Some time has passed since then, Mr. Speaker, and all we are asking of the Minister, will she provide updated information? The information was provided some weeks ago. Will she provide an update of how the money has been allocated? How many jobs have been created?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I know I was sitting here during the Jobs Fund debate with the full information in front of me of the programs that came under my jurisdiction, ready to give the rationale for the allocation, the expected job creation and any details that could have been put about that particular program.

In terms of an updating, that will come forward, and I have already really answered that question.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Acting First Minister: When will we have the information? The government has that information on an up-to-date basis, or else they could not manage this fund. When will we get the information?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I gather that the people opposite are suggesting because the absolute detail or update is not available, just when they snap their fingers, that somehow 200 million allocated to job creation is not having an effect out there. The precise numbers of jobs that come from it will come in an update, and I have already given my commitment to that, but to suggest that 200 million is not having an impact is somehow an inference that I cannot understand.

The message, I think, that we wish to convey is that we are willing to do what is within our capacity to deal with the unemployment situation. We wish we were in a situation to guarantee that we could create full employment but, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of issue that the First Minister was addressing at the Premiers' Conference, because the initiatives required to accomplish that really do require not only the other provinces to co-operate but the Federal Government.

### Water quality problems - Pilot Mound

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several days ago, the Honourable Member for Pembina raised

questions concerning the Pilot Mound water system. He, no doubt, is aware that the problems of taste and odour in Pilot Mound are longstanding and the quality of water has become objectionable primarily during winter months. The source of the water is a reservoir, and the treatment plant is owned by the Water Services Board. As I understand the situation, the plant design capacity is too small. It was originally designed to treat well water, rather than surface water.

For the honourable member's information, we have hired a consultant, A.J. Poetker and Associates to look at the water treatment plant and recommend improvements. We hope that the report will be in by September of this year. As asked me, whether or not there were test drills for ground-water alternatives, we have completed this work, and we've given the information to the consultant to incorporate into his recommendation. The reservoir has been flushed to reduce the organic matter in the reservoir.

Another problem that was encountered there was the whey from the cheese plant was spread on fields within the watershed of the reservoir, and there has been some run-off into it, increasing the BOD load, adding to the taste and odour problem. This practice has been stopped, and recent problems in June and July of taste and odour were caused when a relief operator was operating the plant and apparently was not given adequate instruction. This problem has been corrected.

We are of the information as of this morning that our staff were at Pilot Mound, and the taste of the water is good, with no odour. Members of council were recently - this matter was discussed with them, and they are very pleased with the results that they are getting, but we hope that by September the problem, or at least the long-term solutions, can be put into perspective and a solution found to the water problems of Pilot Mound.

### Manitoba Association of School Trustees - meeting

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Education.

Last Friday morning, in response to my questions about the Minister's refusal to attend a general meeting of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Minister responded to me - and I believe it's accurately reported in the newspaper of Monday - that Association President George Marshall never indicated to her before Thursday's mass meeting that Deputy Minister Ron Duhamel wouldn't be a satisfactory replacement. In view of the fact that I have a letter that was addressed to her on July 26th by George Marshall, President of MAST-elect, the last line of which reads, "It is most important that you be there personally as it would not serve the same purpose to have your position explained by a civil servant."

My question to the Minister is: does she read her mail?

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

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I suppose that I could give a smart aleck answer, Mr. Speaker, and say, yes, and sit down, but I won't.



I get about 75 pieces of mail a day, between 1,500, and 2,000 a month. That's a lot of mail to keep track of . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Well, we have a few smart alecks on the other side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of things I would like to say is that I am really surprised that the Member for Tuxedo continues to raise something that is a non-issue, that is a red herring. My guess is that, since he has raised this in the Legislature, he has not been in contact with trustees and superintendents across the province, because the information we have is that they were highly embarrassed by the whole matter; that they found the whole thing embarrassing. They have never ever in any other organization had any concern at any time with the Deputy Minister being sent as the designate of the Minister.

I also said, there was a reason for it. He was the most knowledgeable person on a complex piece of legislation next to myself and would be in the best position to explain or clarify or answer any questions. It was clear from the misunderstanding and misinterpretation that did take place at the meeting that caused trustees a lot of concern that, had he been able to be there, he would have been able to clear them up right away.

As it is, we're going to have to try and get the information out to boards, so they do not continue to believe that a new teacher who is let go at the end of the first year by May 31st is going to have a due process or the right to a hearing if they go and get job in another division. That's not true.

When the Member for Tuxedo talks about how important the issue is, due process, to the quality of education, I continue to be amazed that they have spent three-quarters of their time concerning themselves with the appropriateness of who I decided to send as a designate to a meeting, as if that's a major issue. It's a non-issue, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in my view, truth is always an issue in this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is the fact that the Minister chose to ignore a letter that was sent to her on a major legislative issue, major piece of legislation, and she chose to ignore a letter from one of the two most important groupings with respect to education in this province.

My question to her, because she says that the Deputy Minister was the best person to represent her, is: do the Deputy Minister or any of her civil servants make policy decisions, or does she and her government make policy decisions with respect to legislation and proposed changes to that legislation?

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, decisions like that are made . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** Mr. Speaker, it is myself, as the Minister of Education, and my government that makes policy and program decisions, and they are carried out by the civil servants. That does not mean for a minute that civil servants are not often put in the position of explaining and communicating what that policy and what those programs are. In fact, they are. That's a big part of their job, is to take the policies and the programs that are determined by government, and to do their part in communicating and explaining them. It is something they do all the time. It doesn't mean they make the decisions, but they do help explain and communicate them.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the misunderstanding is not on the part of the trustees, but on the part of the Minister. She has indicated that the trustees don't understand. They indicated at that meeting that they understand it only too well. They weren't looking for someone to explain it to them. They were looking for someone . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** My question to the Minister is: did her Deputy Minister have the authority to change the legislation?

**A MEMBER:** No, it's a public meeting.

**HON. M. HEMPHILL:** I think that's exactly the case. There wouldn't be changes in the public meeting. He does not have authority to make legislation. He does not have authority to change legislation, nor would he have been expected in any public meeting nor would I have expected to go to a public meeting and stand there by myself, as one Minister of a government, and change or commit a change to legislation. That's ludicrous. That's absolutely ludicrous.

I do want to make one other point. When he raised the point of, do I read my mail, and I said yes, I should have followed through with an additional piece of information. I did read the mail, and I did see in the letter the points that they made. I did have a personal discussion with the President of the Trustees Association the night before the meeting, and indicated that I would be sending somebody to represent me. He agreed that person would be welcome, whoever it was, gave no indication that there were restrictions or some people that would not be acceptable. I said I will be sending a representative. He said your representative will be welcome.

### Child abuse investigation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister of Corrections and Community Services, I wanted to report to the House that with regard to the CAS of Eastern Manitoba case, I have asked the Ombudsman to check into the proceedings there, to guarantee that we will have an unbiased and accurate report of the case in question.

With regard to the Sun article this morning where there was alleged rape and incest cases ignored by CAS of Winnipeg, the Deputy Minister of Community Services and Corrections met this morning with the Attorney-General's Department. We have asked the city police to look into what was to-date unreported criminal behaviour. I expect that the members opposite will honour the usual practice of no further public statements until we have a report of that investigation.

### Headingley Jail - study re conditions

**HON. M. SMITH:** I also wish to give the dates for the report on the remand and corrections system of when the Garson Report will be available. The information I have now is that a preliminary report on Headingley will be available by the end of this month, and the Garson Report by the end of September.

### Child abuse investigation

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, with regard to the initial comments by the Acting Minister having to do with investigation by the Ombudsman and allegations and charges at the present time with respect to various incidents in the child welfare field, I want an opportunity to look at a transcript of the Minister's remarks on the first occasion possible. I must say, Sir, that I didn't have the opportunity to fully hear everything she said, and I want to ask the Hansard Office for a transcript of those remarks as soon as possible.

### Headingley Jail - riot

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** With respect to the second part of her response, having to do with the Headingley Jail situation, I appreciate that information. But I would take this opportunity to ask her whether she has had made known to her or the government has had made known to it the dismay and anxiety being felt on the part of security officers, line custodial officers at Headingley, that no action is going to be taken against the ringleaders or the instigators of last Sunday night's insurrection?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I have not a report on that specific question. I did, however, send the Executive Assistant of the Minister of this department to Headingley yesterday to tour the facilities and confirm the damage report. We have also checked into some concerns that we were hearing that the guards felt that, because the police were sent away in some people's opinion summarily, they were afraid they might not be available should another such incident occur. I have asked the Deputy to check that through with the relevant police grouping. If there is any concern that arrangement is not in good working order, we would address it immediately.

Regarding the discipline of the individuals in the case, I do not have a specific report on that, but I will undertake to get it or to see that the Minister, when he returns, deals with it.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we move to the first item, may I advise members that there will be Royal Assent on five bills momentarily.

### ROYAL ASSENT

**DEPUTY-SERGEANT-AT-ARMS, Mr. M. Mason:** Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

Her Honour, PEARL McGONIGAL, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, having entered the House and being seated on the Throne:

Mr. Speaker addressed Her Honour in the following words:

**MR. SPEAKER:** May it please Your Honour:

The Legislative Assembly, at its present Session, passed several bills, which in the name of the Assembly, I present to Your Honour and to which bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent:

Bill No. 16 - An Act to amend The Oil and Natural Gas Tax Act;

Bill No. 33 - An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act; Bill No. 88 - An Act to amend The Workers Compensation Act;

Bill No. 92 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act;

Bill No. 109 - An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2).

**MR. ASSISTANT CLERK:** In Her Majesty's name, Her Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

Her Honour was then pleased to retire.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, would you now call Bill 48, please?

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

#### BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, Bill No. 48, the Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the amended Bill 48, amended by my colleague for Kirkfield Park.

Based on the figures from the last election, if this bill had been in effect at that time, I understand it would have cost the taxpayers of Manitoba some \$1

million. Certainly this is the kind of amount that the Province of Manitoba cannot afford, not at this time or probably at any time as far as I'm concerned, but members opposite are great for feeding at the public trough. We have seen a number of bills that have been introduced this year that would like to see the taxpayers of this province finance a lot of their day-to-day operations.

I would say that members of my constituency certainly are not in favour of this kind of bill and would strongly urge that I vote against it. Certainly there are many other areas that a million dollars could be put to good use in not only the constituency of Swan River, but I'm sure all of the other 56 constituencies throughout the province.

The present legislation provides for donations to assist political parties in functioning. Certainly I don't have any objections to that kind of an arrangement, and I think it works out very well. If the individuals would like to donate money to their favourite candidate, well, that's fine. The people are not pressured to donate if they don't want to, but certainly the provision is there for individuals to donate money to the cause. I know that previous speakers, speaking yesterday, indicated many names, listed names and the donations that they had contributed.

The Member for Ste. Rose, when he was speaking, indicated that by donating sums of money to a political party that somehow obligates that political party to provide some kind of payola to that individual. I think that the member - although I can't say for sure that he indicated that they would refuse donations from certain corporations if, in fact, the certain corporations wanted to donate money to the ND Party.

He did indicate numbers of dollars that individuals had paid to the PC coffers during the last election, and that's fine. I don't see anything wrong with that particular kind of legislation. Where individuals or corporations want to donate money to political parties, that's fine. Certainly we don't have any problem with that.

My colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, had indicated and listed the number of donations made by commercial corporations, trucking firms and other types of companies that made fairly substantial payments to the ND Party during the last couple of years. Certainly that was also pointed out where many of those individuals had received some kind of recognition by the government members opposite. Certainly they seem to have a hang-up and feel that this is the way that the game operates; that when they receive money from individuals that they have to respond and either appoint them to some board or award them some particular kind of contract which would be based on provincial job opportunities.

The \$1 million certainly could be well used in the province at the present time. As we know, there aren't many things happening as far as economic development and any thrust to the province at the present time. Just recently, I had asked questions about the closing of roadside parks in my constituency and other parts of Northern Manitoba. The Minister of Resources had to subsequently indicate to the House that, in fact, there was the closing of a number of wayside parks. I think he referred to it as the re-priorization of the Department of Resources. He couldn't justify some of the costs that were related to the maintaining of the roadside

park at Mafeking, for instance. I believe there were one or two other roadside parks in that area.

Yet at the same time, the members of government would donate some \$7,200 to a conference of Marxists here at the University of Manitoba in 1983. They weren't concerned about the spending of \$7,200 to the likes of that kind of organization, which I'm sure the majority of Manitobans would not support that kind of expenditure, so it depends on the priorities of the members opposite. They certainly don't hesitate to place extravagant expenditures on the taxpayers of Manitoba as a result of this kind of bill that we see before us at the present time.

I think it's fair to indicate too that the kind of expenditures this million dollars would be spent on is the type of brochure that was sent out during the 1981 election campaign, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans." The first page is signed and written by the now Premier of Manitoba, where he says, "We can build a dynamic future for Manitoba. We can turn around the harsh economic circumstances of the past four years. We can tap our sources of energy wisely. With ManOil and Manitoba Hydro, we can develop programs to guarantee that no Manitobans lose their homes or farms due to high interest rates. We can provide interest-rate relief and an economic climate to ensure that small business stays in business. We can ensure that Manitoba's farms remain in the hands of Manitoba farmers through the development of an effective Farm Lands Protection Act. We can improve the quality of life in small towns and rural communities. Manitobans are great people. Together, we can build a great future. That's a promise we can guarantee."

Well, this is the kind of literature that was sent out prior to the 1981 election campaign. This is what Bill 48 would be asking the taxpayers of Manitoba to contribute to, and I'm sure that the majority of taxpayers or residents in this province do not want to have any part of Bill 48. They like the freedom whereby, if they want to donate money to the election campaign, they are free to do that.

This, "A Clear Choice for Manitobans" goes on, and it says, "An NDP Government would take action to get Manitoba's troubled economy moving again. Tough economic action in the areas of energy, resources, housing and agriculture would restore vitality to the provincial economy.

"Resource development, a New Democratic Government would establish ManOil with a \$20 million, four-year drilling program. This Oil and Gas Corporation would explore for oil and gas in Manitoba with the help of joint ventures with SaskOil, Petro-Canada, co-operatives and Canadian-owned companies.

"The Manitoba Mineral Resource Corporation would be revived to work as a joint venture partner with private companies, or act alone to guarantee our mineral resources are developed."

Well, we all know what happened during the eight years of the Schreyer administration when the royalties were at such a level that the mineral resource development was at an all-time low. Energy development, immediate orderly development of our hydro-electric resources coupled with ManOil would provide the basis for a sound, sensible energy strategy for Manitoba. The New Democratic Government would act to develop needed energy resources."

This is the kind of material that was sent out to all of Manitobans during the 1981 election campaign and this is what Bill 48 is asking the people of Manitoba to help pay for. It goes on to say: "A Fair Share for Manitobans. Manitobans are the owners of this province's resources and we should be getting our fair share from mineral development. Mineral taxes and royalties will ensure Manitobans receive a proper share of benefits." Well, I don't think that the present government have changed the adjustments that we in government had introduced. I believe that the royalties have not been changed by the members opposite, because we all know that during their eight years in government the levels of royalties that they had set discouraged development from taking place in Manitoba, particularly Northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer to another couple of sections of this: "Orderly development of Hydro power. Orderly development of Northern generating stations would commence immediately." Well, we all know that that hasn't happened and thank goodness it hasn't because there's no market for the power. "Adequate planning and training would be undertaken to ensure maximum benefits for Manitoba from Hydro development. The NDP will not allow Alcan ownership of a hydro-electric plant. Energy development, not energy giveaways, are the policy with greatest benefit to future generations of Manitobans."

I can recall during the 1981 election campaign where there was a great effort by the members opposite to tell the people of Manitoba, and they sent out this kind of a document that they're asking people to help pay for, that we were involved in resource giveaways. An article, after they formed the government, headlined in the Free Press of April 5, '82 says: "Smith unsure Alcan deal is worthwhile." Yet this would have provided thousands of jobs and economic spinoff like we haven't seen in this province before, but the Minister of Economic Development says that she's not sure that Alcan is all worthwhile.

The article written by Fred Cleverley says: "Anyone looking for the Manitoba Government's real dry bones position on business in the province should read Page 473 of the current Session's Hansard." I think that this article just points out one of the reasons why we don't have Alcan in the province today. Certainly, this is the sort of thing that has prevented the Limestone development from proceeding, and as well as providing jobs in Alcan. The development of Limestone itself would be a great economic stimulus to this province. But no, today's government was not interested in getting involved in having Alcan proceed with their development in this province, which would have allowed the start-up of the Limestone development.

Of course, we all know that the Western Power Grid would have also provided the stimulus and the market for power to proceed with the Limestone development. This is all part of the election campaign of 1981 where the present government said that they were going to start up the Hydro development, it was right in their propaganda, which they're asking now that this would be the stuff that would be paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba under Bill 48.

It goes on to say in this, "Clear Choice for Manitobans. Manitoba New Democrats would provide security from layoffs, up to 12 months notice or compensation to

employees would be required in the event of shutdowns or layoffs involving more than 50 people. Priority would be given to wages and pension benefits if a company closes, with provision for seizure of assets in the event of non-compliance." Well, this kind of material certainly was interesting, I'm sure, to a lot of employees, particularly in Northern Manitoba as well as other parts of Manitoba.

But another article shortly after the government formed, if I can just find it here - this was shortly after the election, amazing just a month, December 18, 1981, and it's in the Winnipeg Free Press. It says, "Talks fail to produce plan to avoid layoffs at Northern mines. Three provincial Cabinet Ministers and officials of Sherritt Gordon Mines Limited emerged from a meeting yesterday with no firm plans on how to avoid the impending layoff of about 400 workers from the company's Lynn Lake and Leaf Rapids mines. 'I can't foresee a situation where there won't be layoffs,' said Mines Minister Wilson Parasiuk, following what he called frank talks which lasted for three hours yesterday, 'it's a very serious time.'" Yet in this "Clear Choice for Manitobans," the NDP said that they would provide security from layoffs up to 12 months notice or compensation to employees. That's what the NDP said, and that's what they're asking for the people to as least pay part of the cost.

But the article goes on "Company officials, along with Finance Minister Vic Schroeder and Northern Affairs Minister Jay Cowan, discussed options which would maintain as much employment in the two communities as possible, said Parasiuk. The bottom line is that the situation is going to cost jobs, he said. The company is trying to avoid a total shutdown of the mines and save the other 800 jobs of the firm's 1,200 workers in the two communities, said a company spokesman. The final decision will be made Tuesday by company directors at a board meeting in Toronto. The directors rejected Manitoba managements 1982 operating budget almost two weeks ago. The director has recommended major cuts, forcing local officials to propose the layoffs."

Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm making reference to these articles is that it just shows you the comments made by the members opposite in putting together election campaign material. Obviously, they did not expect to get elected when they made the kind of statements that they were making. The situation is that we're now discussing Bill 48, which would help to pay for this kind of election expense. Certainly, I can't support it and I suggest to the Minister that this bill should be pulled.

Another article, which was not sent out at the election time, but it's the kind of material that the members opposite would use during an election, they do not research the material they put out. They indicated that the Glenella Creamery was closed up and would no longer be in business; the Brandon Co-op store closed; and we all know what's happened to many co-op stores since the members opposite have taken over government, as well as the record number of other bankruptcies and record number of farm bankruptcies in the Province of Manitoba during their short term in office of some 20 months or thereabouts.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 48 makes provision where various political parties, whether they be of the Communist philosophy, or the Marxist philosophy, or many other

kinds of political dogma that generally the people of Manitoba do not support; and yet it's quite possible that these kinds of political parties could be financed partly by the taxpayers of Manitoba. Certainly, this is something that Manitobans are not prepared to do. Particularly in the Swan River Constituency, they'd be aghast at this kind of bill if it was to be passed.

A million dollars may not seem very much to members opposite, but \$1 million is a lot of money and it would contribute another \$1 million to our ever-growing deficit. The Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce had sent in a financial report that all members of the Legislature received earlier this year; they attached the highlights here and it says, "Because Manitoba Government spending is so out of control, the province faces an imminent crisis regarding the deficit." It goes on to say a number of points here regarding the expenditures of this government.

In spite of these appalling circumstances, the government indicates further increases in spending and deficits, and yet this government is prepared to bring in a bill like Bill 48, where it would inflict another \$1 million on the people of Manitoba. Ever since the Careerstart, the Jobs Fund was introduced back in early April, and it was closed, I believe, after a very short period, I believe, April 23rd or April 22nd, and after that time and up until as recently as this morning I was still getting calls from people that would like to indicate how they can participate in Careerstart.

Well, we all know that the money has been expended and no more applications being accepted and haven't been since April 22nd. A number of people that took advantage of this program last year failed to qualify this year, because they didn't get their applications in time. The government had changed the name of the program where businesses that made very good use of this program and provided job opportunities to many young people were cut off because they didn't get their applications in and mainly because the program took on a different name. It was the same old program with a different name attached to it, and so by the time individuals were able to find out what had happened, it was too late, the money was all allocated and so they missed out on this.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm indicating that if we were going to spend \$1 million through the efforts of Bill 48, I would say, let's scrap Bill 48 right now, and if there is \$1 million extra money to be used, I think there are many areas in all of the departments in all of the constituencies of Manitoba that certainly could make excellent use of the \$1 million and put it to much better use.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I want to put on record that I'm absolutely not going to be supporting Bill 48, but will be supporting the amendment that has been introduced by my colleague, the Member for Kirkfield Park.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. EYLER:** The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Mr. Speaker, I, as you have probably noticed, haven't been in the House for the last few days. I've been out bringing in the harvest, whatever there is to bring in. Our crop is similar to

others, where the quality is down and the yield is down. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in sitting in that combine and harvesting, I've had a rare opportunity over the last three days not only to contemplate but to listen every half hour to the news and that's interesting.

It's hard to believe at times when you sit here day in and day out that you make a lot of news, but you very rarely have an opportunity to digest it. I've had that opportunity over the last four days, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to listen to my favorite stations, particularly the one from Portage, and listen to the news on the half hour and every hour. It allows one to sort of remove themselves for a short period of time and develop a new attitude towards the government, because of course half the news broadcasts are devoted toward the important issues of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that having had that opportunity over the last few days, I realize now what dreadful shape this government is in. Mr. Speaker, without exception, every news item that comes forward today is one that leaves probably no doubt at all, in the minds of every rural listener at least, that this government is out of control, really that there's no leadership and that they know not what they're doing. Mr. Deputy Speaker, almost on every issue it's become apparent that this NDP Government really is out of touch completely with society.

That's the main essence of what I want to say today on Bill 48, The Elections Finances Act, which has been covered in varying degrees by my colleagues previously. Mr. Deputy Speaker, without doubt, this Bill 48 is best described by my leader as one that imposes grand larceny upon the citizens of this province. It is without doubt highway robbery.

I would like to cover some specific areas of the bill, mainly as related to principle. I would, I suppose, begin by posing the question: what does this government find so obnoxious about the present form of financing of elections that is used by parties in this province? What do they find so distasteful about the procedure that has been in existence now for some two or three years? The procedure that allows people, if they so wish, voluntarily, to give to the party of their choice and depending upon their income circumstances, to make a deduction from net taxation payable. Mr. Deputy Speaker, what does the government find so obnoxious and so disconcerting about that present form? — (Interjection) — Well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs whispers across to me, "payola." He seems to make the remark that it's a situation where those that have, give, and therefore expect to receive something in return.

Well, Sir, all I can say to that is my colleague, the Member for Tuxedo, just spent, I understand, a full hour an hour of his speech the other day going through item by item, person by person, company by company, name by name, of individuals of NDP persuasion, who have made their contributions to their particular party out of free choice. I guess it would beg the question, particularly in view of the remarks made by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, as to whether he was including that section of people in his comment, when he was talking about "payola."

**HON. A. ADAM:** Read my comments.

**MR. C. MANNESS:** Well, I will read the Minister's comments and possibly at that time he expands on specifically what he means.

But, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing wrong with the voluntary system. You know there are many many ways and manners, in which individuals wishing to reduce taxable income, that they have at their disposal with which to reduce their amount payable if they so wish. One just has to spend some 15 minutes in reviewing a tax form and he can see, if he so wishes, the various means which can be used; all of them, of course, legal in a taxation sense.

I suppose I would like to ask the members opposite, how they can draw a line of difference between the various credit systems that are used, after it's determined on the tax form how much should be paid to the government? Because you have the child credit, I believe, you also have an investment tax credit and you have a political tax credit, some three or four or five credits that can be subtracted from the amount that is payable to the governments. Yet, of all the four or five that are listed there, this government takes exception to the one dealing with political donations. I suppose they feel that it's only the rich, so-called rich, that can take advantage of that type of system.

I totally reject that, Sir, because I, last year on behalf of my own executive, made an appeal to the Conservative membership in my constituency asking them to take advantage of that particular system before year end. I watched closely, Sir, as donations came forward and I knew a great number, basically each and every one of the people that felt voluntarily free to make contributions, and I can tell you without any hesitation that 90 percent of those donations came from people who I would classify as middle-income people; basically most of the farmers, basically most of them, I would say, earning somewhere in the area between \$15,000 and \$25,000 net income.

The reason that they gave contributions to my party and to my riding association wasn't for "payola," Mr. Deputy Speaker. As individuals, they were all free, they are all farmers, they saw no direct benefit to them by way of giving to the party. There was no benefit to them whatsoever. They saw an indirect benefit, of course, because they felt that their future and their children's future was safeguarded more so if a Conservative Government was in place.

So I reject totally the theory of those who say, first of all, people contribute and take advantage of it because of "payola," and secondly because they are the very wealthy, because I believe under the present system, after contributions of \$1,000, that there are no further deductions from tax payable. So, hopefully, Sir, the members opposite will set to rest that funny notion that people only give because there is, first of all, a tax benefit to do so, and more importantly, there is a payoff at the end of the rainbow if they contribute heavily now.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, other reasons given by the Attorney-General, when he introduced this horrendous bill in late May, he said that the principle underlying this particular statute, Bill 48, is to prevent politics from becoming the preserve of the wealthy. Well, I suppose you could interpret that in different ways. I guess you could interpret it as being that only those who have wealth will have an input into selecting

people and choosing people who will guide parties. I suppose you could mean it that way. Also, he may have meant that Bill 48 would not stop those who are very wealthy from coming into power. One of the interpretations is that that only those that are wealthy should aspire and become politicians. Well, I don't think he drew out his point to a logical conclusion, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I would say right here and now, that I think it's incumbent upon any member from the government who's speaking on this bill to come forward and say specifically what preserve of the wealthy of which they are speaking.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, other aspects of Bill 48 have been covered in great detail by my Leader and I won't dwell upon them. Certainly three-quarters of the bill seems to be directed towards that whole area of registering and then de-registering, and I take it that's all brought in so as to be used as a definite monitoring procedure of proper registering of parties, and to determine exactly all the donations to that party, and how that money is spent.

One of the main concerns was that individuals cannot advertise without endorsement by the candidate. Well, I guess it begs the question, Sir, whether there is some restriction of freedom of speech. I really can see what the government wants to do, and I can tell you I have members in my constituency executive who would like to see some type of restrictions being placed on advertising. I think they believe as people who are on the front line soliciting campaign support on my behalf and on behalf of the party that some of the major direction of the large party funds at times may be misspent when they look at the huge amounts that go into media advertising. Nevertheless, I think what is being indicated here is that a third individual cannot go out and advertise on my behalf, or indeed on your behalf, because of this new regulation. I think it begs the question as to when I can do something for somebody I believe in, and when I can't, and under what rules I have to continue to conduct my affairs and determine whether what I'm doing is in conflict not only with the law, but with the basic freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said also about the Advisory Committee. Those people that'll come forward and make recommendations to the government as to how elections in the future should be conducted, I won't have an awful lot to say on that specific area, other than to use it as a launching pad into that whole area of discussion of fringe groups. I know my leader and other members of my party have spent considerable time in this whole area because it is a very real concern. I would suppose that other than the removal of one's right to decide how his funds, his tax dollars, should be directed and into what political party, that this area of which parties will be granted government support is the biggest concern to almost everybody.

Much has been said about the fringe groups, and we'll call it the fringe group theory, I endorse in almost everything that's been said in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, it's not too difficult in this day and age, as we see around us, where five people in five different ridings could be found to share a common ideal, and therefore would decide to run as a political party. The government tells us not to worry about that because unless this group of people achieve firstly 10 percent of the vote that they will not be eligible for any government support.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to take some exception to that retort by the government. I know we've used, on this side specifically, parties and associations that are both left and right on the political spectrum. We've used the Maoism, and we've used the Pro-Peace, and we've used the Rhinoceros. Very few people on this side have used a party that, in my view, has a greater chance of coming into existence than any of these because it has a greater foundation to it, and that I believe is the Western Concept Party.

I'm wondering if the members opposite, in drafting this bill, the Attorney-General, and also in listening to our criticism of the fringe groups, which the people of this province could find themselves supporting by way of this legislation, if any thought whatsoever was given to a Separatist Party. I haven't heard it discussed on any of the debate on Bill 48, although I haven't been here for the last three of four days, but I think it begs a question. Could you conceivably see ourselves as taxpayers in this province supporting a major Separatist group? Obviously, I don't know if this legislation is enforced in Quebec. It probably is. But conceivably, and obviously if it was in place some five or six years ago, what you had was you had the taxpayers of the province funding a group — (Interjection) — well, a movement, certainly it's been a movement for many years, but by then a political group, funding them long before any referendum had been put to the people. I question the government as to whether they would see that as proper.

Imagine what you're doing, you're taking the concept of supporting political groups, associations and movements; you're taking it so far and you're giving it such a wide interpretation that you're saying if a group wants to come along and work towards the destruction of the very political entity under which you govern, then it should be funded.

I wonder if in closing debate, if debate in this bill is ever closed, whether the Attorney-General can see fit to specifically make comment as to that potential situation, because to me it's very real, and all of the members opposite throw the comments across the House - I know jokingly - as to what's happening, particularly having viewed the results of the Saskatchewan election and seeing the total demise of that particular movement. But I can tell you, coming from rural southern Manitoba, that there's a very latent feeling towards a Western Canada goal and concept. It's certainly far below the surface, and it's not spoken openly about - and so it shouldn't be - but I can tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, should the next federal election again bring about a Liberal Government, one which is elected before our TV sets go on at 8 o'clock, then you've got some very definite potential. That should come as no surprise, because I believe the area in which you come from also harbors some thoughts. I'm not saying a vast majority, I'm not even saying a large minority, but I'm saying over 10 percent of the people. That's the criteria used - 10 percent of the people.

Well, I hope I've made my point on that, because I think it's incumbent upon this government to remove that criteria and re-think that whole area as to when government support is gifted to those who deem themselves to be, first of all, a political party; and secondly, those who, I think in some cases, could legitimately and quickly arrive at the 10 percent

threshold. Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess it brings us back to the point, what is wrong with supporting ourselves? What is wrong with individuals who aspire to political life, who want to represent people, who want to be public figures, what is wrong with supporting themselves financially and seeking support?

Excuse me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, my mind been taken off my train of thought here. — (Interjection) — It's one of Abe's specials. In all sincerity, again I question what is wrong with the theory of supporting yourself? Why does this government believe that the state of democracy - and they've never explained to me, Sir, where they've said that democracy has reached a new threshold, is moving up in its development, or whether it's dropping back. I'd like to hear the members opposite. They just seem to be indicating that now is the time to bring in this new area of support by the people, regardless of where the people want to be aligned and with whom the people want to be aligned. They've never indicated whether democracy is evolving, or whether it's dropping back, and therefore it requires this type of new legislation, because I think it's a very important conclusion, and it's a very important foundation on which to bring forward a bill such as this. I think that it's very important that the members opposite again try to come to grips with their own thoughts as it relates to democracy, as they bring forward not only this bill, but all bills that deal with the process of financing elections to this House.

Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how much time there is left?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The honourable member has 16 minutes remaining.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Cut it short . . .

**MR. C. MANNES:** Thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster asked me to cut it short. Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, when one sits and reflects on the combine and looks at a bad crop coming in, and you think about the good times and the bad times in the House, I was actually able to put out of my mind for three days the Member for Inkster. It was with great difficulty, I might add. I had to think about a lot of different things, some of them very unfavourable and some of them very unseemly, but finally I was able to put out of my mind the Member for Inkster and all those funny resolutions that have come forward under his name. But, Mr. Speaker, he rises again. He comes forward and he likes to hurl his comments, which I hear he does in great frequency in caucus, Sir.

Nevertheless, back to Bill 48. The important — (Interjection) — well, the Minister of Municipal Affairs asks me who tells me that?

**A MEMBER:** There's a leak in that caucus over there, Peter.

**MR. C. MANNES:** Well, I dare not point out the individual, Sir. I wouldn't want to have that person removed from caucus. It's not the Member for Elmwood, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, we come to that part of the legislation that deals with registering a party. Again I alluded to

it earlier when I talked about just running five candidates allows you to use a label. I wonder how many groups conceivably you could have that would be part of an advisory committee. What are the chances in the next election that's held in Manitoba that there is a Green Party? What are the chances that there will be a Rhinoceros Party, one that's organized this time? What are the opportunities or chances that there will be a Western Concept Party? How many groups, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will there be registered as political parties? Conceivably you could see eight, nine, or ten because there seems to be . . .

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Penner will start the Communist Party again.

**MR. C. MANNES:** That's right, which would lead to a member on the Advisory Committee.

But the state of a society today, as I read it, is that there are a large minority of people who are starting to make fun of the political system. They believe, in their own mind, that it's at best a joke. I say that this legislation is going to set forward, in front of them, the challenge to prove in some senses, at least to their thinking, that it is a joke, because I can tell you right today there are groups on campus who would just love to bring forward organizations or so-called political parties, and tie right into the history of the system as we know it. That will happen, and this will allow it to happen. It will allow people to come forward to these committee hearings under legal entity, to come forward and to make representation with no concern whatsoever for the well-being of the population at large.

Mr. Speaker, there are some specific areas that I think should be noted, if I can find them quickly. There's a section, Sir, that concerns itself with contributions, indicating that all contributions, I believe it's \$5 or \$10 must be recorded. I know that colleagues of mine had made reference, passing reference at least, to what one would do when a large rally is held. Let's say that I'm at a meeting and I'm discussing Bill 3, and I advertise it, 1,000 people show up to lend support to my arguments, and specifically to the arguments of this party to Bill 3. I happen to have in attendance, Sir, a member from my executive, who sees this as an opportunity to bolster the treasury of the constituency executive. He asks that donations be made to that cause. What does one do if an individual walks in with \$100, not with a \$100 bill, but let's say 20-\$5 bills, and keeps floating them into the hat that's being passed around? How is that recorded? Well of course, it isn't. The question is then: how can the regulations be brought into being so that it can be recorded? Well, of course, they can't be — (Interjection) — the member opposite says, well they would want a receipt. No, not necessarily. Not everybody wants a receipt.

I hate to admit it, Sir, but some farmers sell eggs on the side; some farmers sell turkeys on the side; and some sell beef on the side. It's not recorded, so there are no receipts. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happens in that case? — (Interjection) — well, the Minister for Municipal Affairs says, "Never. Something like that has never happened." Well, I believe the Minister if he says he has never done that, I believe it.

**A MEMBER:** Some of us doubt him.

**MR. C. MANNES:** I have some colleagues though that say they might not.

The point I'm trying to make, Sir, is: how does the Chief Financial Officer, particularly if this is during campaign time, how is that person supposed to come to grips with those types of situations? Well they can't, conceivably.

Sir, you have another section that deals with, and I believe if I could just make reference to it, anonymous contributions. It says, specifically, "If the contributor's identity cannot be established, the contribution shall be turned over to the Minister of Finance to be paid into the Consolidated Fund." Well isn't that something? Here we have the government saying that an individual's right to give to a party of his choice is superseded by only one other right, and that is the right of the province to garner that money, and take it in for its own purpose.

Well I find that totally, totally unacceptable; a situation where a person who wants to give something and remain anonymous, and yet is prevented from doing so because somebody on the opposite side has deemed it the right of the government and the public to know everything about everybody.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area that concerned me a little bit, and that was the arbitrary approach used to differentiate between those larger ridings which would be eligible for a higher degree of provincial support or spending, and the large number of ridings that would not.

Sir, I have 1,700 square miles roughly in my constituency. There's a road every one of those square miles. Everything is divided, of course, into the square, and there's a road every one of them, and people live along it. I question what the rationale was used to differentiate between those who seem to spend more because the ridings are large geographically, and those which are smaller, but which have people dispersed throughout.

Again I would ask the government to come forward and set forth the logic and the rationale used to create those differences. I don't argue with the principle. I just argue with the rationale that may have been used. I don't even argue with that. I would just like to see it, because it seems to me that some magical formula which seems to be the case with this government - this government, Sir, seems to work towards the conclusion by knowing first of all what they want, and then setting forward the formula.

We've seen it in education. I don't know enough about health to say if it exists there, but we have certainly seen it in education. Here is another clear-cut case, in my view, where we've known what the answer is. We know what constituencies, for whatever reason, we want to lend this additional support to. Then we bring forward the magical formula which allows us, under the guise of objectivity, to do — (Interjection) — well I'm sorry. The Minister had something to say?

Mr. Speaker, reading through the bill, one is concerned about the tremendous responsibility that the Chief Electoral Officer will have during the campaign. I really question, who would want that responsibility during the next election? I know that it always has been rather onerous. Of course, each and every one of us like to select somebody who is competent in reading regulations and rules, but I, in reviewing Bill 48 and going through particularly all the registering and



deregistering regulations, find it almost incredible that any individual who was sound in thought would want to act as a Chief Financial Officer for any one of us who may want to come back another time. Because, without doubt, that individual is responsible almost for every aspect of this massively expanded act. I wonder - I really do - why somebody would want to undertake that responsibility, and particularly as it relates to the donations of people coming forward, either anonymously or otherwise.

Well to sum up, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the main argument used by the government is that the "so-called" rich today benefit by today's system, and therefore obviously a new one is required. I take exception to that. In my own experience, like I related to you earlier, I find that 90 percent of the funds contributed to my campaign, or to the party, have always been from people that are middle-class individuals on the financial spectrum. Are they do it voluntarily, and they do it freely. I see nothing wrong - yes, some of them do it because there's a tax benefit for doing it, some of them do it - I again ask, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with society when it says that if I want help of any type, I can go directly to my neighbor, and ask him to help me? What is wrong with that type of approach, rather than I, myself, going to the government, who have to take it by force from my neighbor? What is wrong with the simple system?

Because in almost every aspect of society today, that is what has happened; individuals not feeling free to go towards people next door, people in their community, people within their family, asking for support for whatever cause. But no, they set forward this vested interest group which allows them to go to government, who then by way of taxation rip it away and then to go the long route to sort of separate, to so-called make it clean.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm violently opposed to Bill 48. I think that it has to be prevented. I would support my Leader who has said on many times, "Our party, once it resumes power, will put forward retroactive legislation to make sure that not one cent is sent by way of return to parties through the government." I would therefore conclude my remarks by hoping that members opposite would see the light and withdraw this particular legislation.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there any reason that the light is blinking, Mr. Speaker? There we go. Okay. I thought I was down on my last minute already.

Mr. Speaker, last night I said to the members opposite I would forego my speaking if none of them were going to speak any further, and that we would have a vote on this. They've had two speakers since then. They just holler: "They have lots more." I'm going to take this opportunity to get a few more comments on the record and try to make some reference to the hoist resolution, as well as the main resolution. Since we are debating the hoist, I think it's worthwhile to have a few words towards that as well.

In that point I would say, Mr. Speaker, in that area, I can't quite understand why they always pick on the

Member for Kirkfield Park to do their hoisting. It seems that she's become the hoist member, and I can't quite understand why they don't share it around to a few other people and a few other members over there. Why does all the weight have to rest on her shoulders?

The point of a hoist can have some validity, and that's why it is in our rules as a provision for a party to be able to move a hoist and show a party's dislike of particular legislation.

Why are they against this legislation with such strong opinions? And as the Member for Morris just finished saying, he is violently opposed to it. I don't very often hear people who have a great faith in democracy being violently opposed to very many items, especially when something is being done in a democratic process, in a free country where people - and the Member for Sturgeon Creek questions whether this is a democracy or not. Well if he doesn't live in a democracy, maybe his own little mind isn't in a democracy, but let me assure him that the rest of us in this country do live in a democracy. We shall maintain that democracy and the integrity of that democracy until our very last hours on this earth.

Democracy is very precious, Mr. Speaker. It is also very costly. Looking at the history that we've had in the past of where there has been undue influence of large contributors to political parties that we have an issue where there is a role for the public at large. There is a role, I'll repeat that, a very strong role for the public at large for the maintenance of the democratic institutions. In our democratic institution, it is based on one thing and that is election, free general elections, universal suffrage.

At one time, people with the mentality of some members opposite and their predecessors in the electoral process in Canada, wanted only people who owned property to be able to vote. If you did not own property, you could not vote. If you were a woman, you could not vote. With universal suffrage, with merely citizenship requirements at age 18, we have done away with that. We're now moving into another step for the public to accept a stronger responsibility in the maintenance of the democratic process, and that is public funding of elections.

I wonder if these members really believe, or just how strong their belief in democracy is. How strong is their belief in democracy? When they say that if an electoral party gets a certain percentage of the vote, and under the law that party with a percentage of vote, and we're proposing here a 10 percent, if 10 percent of the populous agrees with that political party, that they should be denied that kind of funding because the members opposite don't like the mentality of that party.

Well, I would suggest that if that was the case you would have an awful lot of parties where people - in Saskatchewan, the Progressive Conservative Party, was nowhere at all for several decades and all of a sudden they bounce back and into a position.

The limit of 10 percent in a 10 percent role is put on there specifically not to try and close out new political parties, because we do not believe, as the Member for Sturgeon Creek does, that only the establishment parties, if there's going to be any kind of public funding, that they should be the only ones that qualify for public funding, because we believe in democracy as opposed to some of the members opposite in their so-called belief of democracy.

Let us look at their elitist position; let us look at the role that they have played and the role that certain corporations have played in the development of some of their policies, and whether or not they are leaving themselves open, Mr. Speaker, for challenges to their integrity.

When the Crow debate started, the opposition was very very slow to take up the battle to maintain and to keep the Crow rates. They had crank calls of it being obsolete, then let's move into the 20th century. Was that their honest belief on the issue? Because they've turned around once public pressure has been shown to them, especially in their own rural communities, that the CPR and the CNR should maintain their present services and expand its services, I might add, under a prevailing rate system where the farmers pay a portion of the cost of shipping grain. They started off with the position that the farmer should subsidize the building of expanded rail access for the west coast; not for grain, but for the shipment of coal, because that is what the Crow really does. You wonder why their position was like that. You see in their contributions provincially that they received \$25,000 from Power Corporation, a very major shareholder of the CPR. Now could there be any link there? Could there be any link between that and their position?

One sees again a \$10,000 contribution from Abitibi. Abitibi got a very good deal under the previous administration regarding forestry, stumpage fees. Now did they give \$10,000 in the previous election, in 1977, or would the public maybe think this \$10,000 was not given out of just grace and out of commitment to the political party, but of some form of reward? That's a question the public can still have out there. When they see a company that has gained so substantially from a law and regulations that have been passed by a government, they then turn around and reward that government.

We had the previous government totally opposed to rent controls, just like Billy Bennett out in Mini WAC, out in B.C.; he's wiped them out virtually all together. In Ontario, they have fairly ineffective rent controls. We were going to strengthen them after they had been basically destroyed under the previous administration. They were still there in name, but name not really informed, and we see major contributions from Metropolitan Properties or Metro Properties of almost \$9,000 and Shelter Corporation, who has two apartments in my constituency, of almost \$6,000.00.

We had another one and this one could be even more specific and this is with an insurance company, that under the previous administration was made and given a contract to reinsure Autopac insurance policies. The company was called Northern Union. Its parent is the Park Lane Group and one of its principals is a chap by the name of David J. Miller, I do believe. Between Northern Union, the Park Lane Group and David Miller, they gave to the Conservative Party some \$10,000.00. They had a very lucrative contract with our Crown corporation, established I believe in the previous administration, so that opens up questions as to the efficacy and to the cleanliness of a political party, when you have things like this that come into the fray.

Now, I'm not going to put motives on the opposition or motives of these particular companies. I know that Mr. David Miller, who is a principal in Park Lane and

Northern Union, from what I understand, also gave \$5,000 to the New Democratic Party. I'm also aware that the New Democratic Party cancelled Northern Union's reinsurance contract very shortly after we got into office. I don't know if he was giving equally or to two parties - \$10,000 to one, \$5,000 to the other one - if they were trying to gain some form of influence along with their steady lobbying, but the point is when you have elections as costly as they are today, political parties are basically forced to go out and try to raise money from wherever they can get it.

I'm very proud of the party that I'm a part of, the New Democratic Party, because it gets the vast majority of its contributions from individuals, the vast majority; and I'll get to that in a couple of minutes time here, of just how much - what share of our total revenues we get from individual donations.

In looking at other jurisdictions as well and the influence that corporations in particular can have on their policies and can have on the governments themselves and the troubles that government can get into, when it's so reliant on large donations from a few corporations.

In Nova Scotia, my home province, we've just gone through a couple of years of court battles involving the former Premier, involving a number of people or head honchos of the Liberal Party in Nova Scotia, because the liquor companies were paying to the political party a percentage or so many cents per bottle, or cents per ounce or whatever, of liquor that was sold to the Nova Scotia Liquor Commission.

In New Brunswick, similar problems, Mr. Speaker. Back in - and I'm not sure when the election was - but it was the election that Bennett was elected and the Conservatives were elected, I think it was in 1931, just a couple of years after the start of the Depression. The Liberal Party then was just in a miserable mess, the same as it is now, same sort of scenario, just terrible conditions. They were two years into a depression, just as we're a couple of years into a recession now, they are at an all-time low on their polls now, they were at an all-time low up to that time in history, back when this election was called.

The Liberal Party had virtually their whole campaign financed by one company. It's a company that's a bit west of Montreal; I believe it's a power company, it was called Beauharnois. There was a tremendous scandal around that, after the election of the Beauharnois Company's influence in the Liberal Party; and Heavens to Betsy, the party suffered for it then, as it should, because it relied so much on its funding from one donor, and what is to be traded off. Why does a corporation give .5 million at the peak of the worst recession that this continent has ever witnessed in 1930 or 1931, that they could dip into their pockets - when companies were going bankrupt left, right and centre across the country - and pull out .5 million to give to the Liberal Party? — (Interjection) — Yes, there's been CPR scandals and scandals of a number of different sorts. It is because of this potential for undue influence, and it's not us who's going to benefit from this. If anybody, it is going to be the opposition party, the parties opposite to us, not only in this Chamber but in the general political atmosphere of Manitoba.

In bringing this public financing, you reduce the pressures of the parties to go out and raise funds to

pay for their elections, which is by far our largest expenditure, that we, as a public, in recognition of the costliness and the essence to our whole democratic process of elections, that we, as a public, have a responsibility to assist in the paying of those elections.

I can see in some ways, and I don't think it's only the public finance of things - sure, that is what the opposition has picked to harp on, but I do not think that is a basic and the basis of their arguments. One of the reasons I feel this way is because in looking at the 1982 Annual Report, Elections Commission, which when I spoke on the bill proper some months ago, I pointed out the amount of spending which the opposition was involved in. I can certainly understand why they are so much after the Member for Dauphin, after the Minister of Government Services, and trying to do everything they possibly can to try and rub some dirt or do one thing or another towards that member and do him harm in his constituency.

The Conservative Party spent over \$24,000 trying to try and re-elect Jim Galbraith. No wonder they're sore. In Brandon West, they spent some \$28,000; in Kildonan, \$24,000; Fort Rouge, \$43,000; Riel, trying to save Donald Craik - their great economic wizard and their man of Alcan's buddy and what not - they spent \$27,000 trying to keep the present Member for Riel from being elected. — (Interjection) — Our expenditures? Just let me check and see what we spent in Riel. According to the Elections Report here, Riel - here we are, Doreen Dodick, NDP, \$9,857 versus \$27,000, almost one-third the amount.

Now, one of the things that we recognize when you move toward public financing is that you have to control the level of expenditures. That is what, I think, the members opposite do not want more than anything. They don't want to be able to control the level of expenditures in the election campaign, because that is so much of their role and the way that they conduct their campaigns. The Member for Tuxedo shakes his head. Well, in a fairly safe seat - at least, I usually think of Tuxedo as being a fairly safe Conservative seat - I see in the report here, in the elections report, that they spent \$25,000.00. That's six times as much as the NDP candidate spent — (Interjection) — and you got six times the vote, precisely. Okay, thank you very much to the Member for Tuxedo for that bit of information. That falls in line with what in the United States - and I use the U.S. example because, in the 1980 elections, I heard a report at one stage that in only one constituency in the whole of the United States in the senatorial races and also the gubernatorial and the House of Representatives - all those races - only in one instance did a person who spent less money than his opponent win, only in one instance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can see the importance, especially to the Conservative Party, of high-spending campaigns. They get into high-spending campaigns. They need high bucks. When they get into high bucks, they start going to corporations and getting huge sums of money or substantially large sums of money from them. We see that party provincially - I'll just limit the first comments here to provincial. Provincially, they received from individuals \$340,000 in 1981; from corporations, another 10 percent more than that, \$413,000.00. Of the corporations total, \$163,000 - I think that's somewhere in the 30 percent range or 40

percent range, I guess - came from outside corporations, offices outside of Manitoba, from Toronto, from Calgary, from all over the country. I trust there are none from out of the country because that, I believe, is supposed to be illegal under Canadian political process.

The NDP on the other hand, as opposed to the Conservative Party, which only got 45 percent of its total revenues that year from individuals, we got 90.2 percent from individuals; corporations, 6 percent; unions, 3.6 percent. We got more money from corporations than we did from unions, but we're supposed to be in the hands of the unions according to the members opposite. We have a great deal of support from union members, and I would hope and I would feel much happier knowing that a good amount of our individual donations came from individuals who happen to be members of various syndicated unions. I would hope that is the case.

Federally, the situation is not much different, Mr. Speaker. You have individual contributions for the Federal New Democratic Party, 83 percent. That's up 2 percent over 1981 and the latest 1982 statistics: 83 percent in '82; 81 percent in '81 came from individuals. For the Conservatives, I give them credit. They're moving up. Sixty-three percent came from individuals, versus 62 percent. They moved up a percent. The Liberals moved up the most. A dismal 41 percent of their revenues came from individuals. They are up to 52 percent now.

Corporations, 3 percent for the Federal NDP's total revenues. That's the same as the previous year in 1981. For the Conservatives, they dropped 2 percent, from 37 percent to 35 percent. For the Liberals, they dropped 11 percent or 12 percent, from 53 percent down to 41 percent coming from corporations.

Union contributions for the NDP federally have decreased from 10 percent down to 7 percent. I might add that those dues that are union contributions, the bulk of them, come from not just the union writing cheques to the NDP. It is their affiliation fees. If you want, unions can join the NDP. It costs them about 12 or 13 times as much as it costs me to join the party. For an individual, it costs \$7; for a union, I believe, it is \$120.00. That is where the bulk of the funds from unions come to the NDP, from locals affiliating with the party. So it's not as if one is going to them and asking them for huge sums of money. The bulk of the money, over half of the money is coming from locals who democratically decide to contribute or to belong, and thus contribute to the New Democratic Party. That is a process, Mr. Speaker, which I am both proud of, and that I hope lasts forever.

We have the basis, therefore, of our party on individual contributions, and that individual votes, an individual person. Although in legal definitions a person can include an organization or a corporation, an individual as a human being is the only one that can vote. My own preference, quite frankly, would be that as far as just straight contributions and donations outside of membership fees that go towards a political party, I would feel happiest if it all came from individuals, for it is the individual that votes. Corporations don't vote. Unions don't vote as a total organization. Their members vote. The Boards of Directors, as long as they are Canadian, vote. At least, I hope they vote. The employees of the companies vote.

The corporate body itself does not vote, and yet you have such large amounts of money coming from a select few corporations, although I fully grant that the bulk of it is in donations of a much more nominal amount. I believe the figures of the average corporate donation from public corporations to the Liberals was almost \$5,000 and from private corporations, \$324.00. For the Conservatives, the average public corporate donation was \$4,000, and private corporation, \$252; and from corporations without share capital in unincorporated or corporated organizations, \$266 and \$656, respectively.

So you have the possibility of a political party putting some of its reputation and its integrity on the line by going to particular organizations. In this case, the vast majority, I would say, are corporations where they pull out just huge sums of money. The political process, I would maintain, is much more secure and will have much greater longevity when that process is dependent on donations from individuals and not from large corporate donations or large union donations, if they happen to be. Unfortunately, they aren't very high.

In union contributions - just for the members' opposite information, I ran through the 1981 election year contributions for the NDP. The union contributions amounted to, as I mentioned earlier, 3.6 percent of our total revenues, or \$37,000 - again that's largely affiliation fees, I would imagine - corporation donations to us of \$64,000, as compared to the PCs of \$400,000.00. Now individual contributions almost three times, they're going towards three times what the Conservatives received. We received \$931,000 from individuals in 1981. I'm very proud of that, Mr. Speaker, that we have individuals digging into their pockets, such as myself, such as the members of our party. The Conservatives could only manage to get \$340,000 out of individuals in this province, and that does not bore very well in my estimation of the kind of support that there is for a party when they can only get that amount of money from those, so-called, dedicated to contribute to their campaign.

Individuals again, and look at us as elected representatives; last year personally on taxable I put in, I guess, about \$2,200 into the party federally and provincially. Most of the members on this side gave somewhat similar amounts. I gave another \$1,000 to my constituency organization, which didn't have any tax associated with it at all. I believe in our democratic process, and our party, I think, is by far the most democratic of all the parties. I believe that our party must have financial integrity and that integrity comes from individual donations, and we as members on this side give very freely and happily to our party. It is a decision by our caucus, as a matter of fact, that we give substantially to the party. So we have collectively made a decision that the party is of such importance

that we, as representatives of that party who have gained electoral office under that party's banner, should contribute to what we believe in.

I compare that from running through some of the federal lists and some of the provincial lists primarily with members opposite. I don't see hardly any of them giving provincially. I see one, whom I'm particularly happy with, and it is the Member for Tuxedo who gives handsomely to his party. When you look at the amount of money that's collected from our side, it reduces substantially the amount of money that we then have to go out and pound on doors for. Although, the pounding of doors, of individual home doors, in particular, is the guarantee when they are willing to finance the party, that is the security of the party.

The members opposite, some of them talked about ethics and principles. I questioned the Member for Fort Garry the other day - one hears rumours all the time that he's thinking of running federally - that if he runs federally, will he accept federal contributions back to the cost of his campaign, that's 60 percent of the funding? He said, "Yes, he would." That he would abide by the federal law. Well, how can a political party claim that it will abide by a federal law and gain revenues from the public, from the taxpayers at large which they hate to take from, and yet provincially they will say that they're ethically against it, their principles are against it, that they're violently opposed to it? How can you be violently opposed on fundamental principles, opposed to any kind of public sharing of the election finances expenditures and yet stand on your feet and say that, yes, Mr. Speaker, I will accept funding from the Federal Government if I am a candidate in a federal election? — (Interjection) — The federal deficit, as the member here says, is far worse. The deficit does not matter one iota in this instance as far as I am concerned, because it is the principle of the integrity of the democratic system, and when you have to provide funding for that democratic system, Mr. Speaker, one provides for it up front, as individuals and as a government, as a society. For society, as I said at the start, does have a responsibility to maintain the integrity of our democratic system.

We have some members opposite - I've gone through the provincial list and I can't find any donations by the Leader of the Opposition. I went through the federal list, it's somewhat larger. I see the Leader of the Opposition, a man who stands in his desk constantly professing his faith in their view and their vision of the democratic process, and I see he gave \$141.14.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. When this motion is next before the House the honourable member will have 10 minutes remaining.

The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. (Friday).