

**THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA**  
**Wednesday, June 8, 1977**

---

**TIME: 2:30 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan):** Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 21 students, Grade 4 standing, of the Windsor School. These students are under the direction of Miss Klass. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today. Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

**PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee has considered the following Bills:

No. 29 — An Act to amend The Snowmobile Act,

No. 32 — An Act to amend The Hospitals Act,

No. 54 — An Act to amend The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act,

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

No. 6 — An Act to amend The Jury Act,

No. 30 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2),

No. 35 — An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (3),

No. 48 — An Act to amend The Insurance Act,

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

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

**MR. JENKINS:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HONOURABLE J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to table **The Annual Report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other tabling of reports or statements? The Honourable House Leader.

**HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to schedule Law Amendments Committee for Thursday evening for hearings on legislation which has not been previously subject to public hearings. Then if we are concluded with that work, then the consideration of bills clause by clause. That's tomorrow, Thursday evening.

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

**MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I note that the House Leader has called the Agricultural Committee for a meeting on Thursday, tomorrow morning, but I am a little bit confused as to why Bill 56 is not included in the list of bills that are to be considered at that particular time. The only one that is indicated in the list is Bill No. 3, and I thought that the understanding that we had reached yesterday in private conversations was that we would have the hearings on Bill 56 at that particular time, and a number of people have phoned me and I have indicated that that is the time that bill would be heard.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, that is correct; that was the intention and Bill 56 will be considered tomorrow before Agricultural Committee at 10 o'clock. There has apparently been a confusion of instructions but it will be considered tomorrow at 10 o'clock, as indicated yesterday in the House. And I would advise the Clerk to so advise any people who are wishing to make representations concerning the bill.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that there is no further crossing of lines, is it also the intention of the House Leader to call private bills at the same time? The understanding was that those two committees would meet simultaneously, and I agreed with that suggestion. That would mean that all private bills then would be referred to Private Bills Committee at the same time, and hearings would be held at that time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** That's correct, Mr. Speaker. That's the announcement I made yesterday. The only

announcement that I wished to make today was that . . . And I'm glad the honourable member has cleared up the fact that that bill wasn't indicated. It is to be heard at Agricultural Committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. There is Law Amendments tomorrow night at 8 o'clock.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Any other Ministerial Statements; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister as the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. I wonder if the First Minister could give us a status report with respect to the generating capacity and the utilization of that capacity of each of the hydro—electric stations in Manitoba over the last six months.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can attempt to get that in tabular form.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would also like to suggest that all bills previously referred to other committees, including the bill relating to the Telephone System and the bills sent to Municipal Affairs Committee, be sent to Law Amendments Committee to be dealt with by Law Amendments Committee as well as the other bills now referred to Law Amendments Committee so that the only committees we would be dealing with are Law Amendments, Agricultural and Private Bills Committees.

### ORAL QUESTIONS Cont.

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

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. With respect to the status situation of the hydro-electric generating stations, is the First Minister in a position to advise the House today as to what capacity is being utilized at the Grand Rapids station at the present time? Is it operating at full capacity, 50 percent, 70 percent capacity or what is the status of Grand Rapids at the present moment?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I think that because it would not be possible to generalize in response to that question, that it would be also in that case necessary to provide it in tabular form in relation to certain months because the utilization factor in Grand Rapids will show variation from week to week, let alone from month to month, in recent months. I will try and get that in tabular form.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for that and a further supplementary to the previous two questions. Could he also give us a status position with respect to the two fossil fuel plants at Brandon and at Selkirk as to when they have been operated in the last six months to make up for deficiencies for the non-operation of the hydro generating plants?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Yes, I could, Mr. Speaker, although it is relatively easy to respond with respect to the two coal burning thermo plants since they have been operating practically on base load but I can include that in the tables.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the House Leader. Could the House Leader advise us when he expects to be calling the next meeting of the Committee on Economic Development?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I was awaiting the progress of events but I think probably some time on Friday, either in the morning or the afternoon, probably Friday morning but I am not sure at this point.

**MR. LYON:** A further question, Mr. Speaker. Could the House Leader advise us when he expects to be calling the next meeting of the Committee on Public Accounts?

**MR. GREEN:** I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LYON:** A question to the House Leader, Mr. Speaker. Could he advise us when he will be calling the next meeting of the Committee on Public Utilities?

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know, and I tell the honourable member that committees will be called in the same way as they have been called in previous years.

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

**MR. STEVE PATRICK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct my question to the First Minister responsible for Hydro. The First Minister indicated that on certain days the province will be importing up to \$100,000 worth of power per day. Can the Minister indicate to the House for how long this contractual arrangement will exist? Is it for one month or two months? I know he can't predict water levels but is there any arrangement to safeguard that we will have sufficient energy?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, it is not a contractual arrangement in the same sense as the

purchase of power. The purchase really is pursuant to a standing arrangement that exists between the utilities that are interconnected for the purchase of off-peak power and there is no way . . . If my honourable friend is assuming that there is a termination date on that, there is no termination date. It is something which is taken advantage of from time to time depending upon water flows, depending upon weather, etc.

**MR. PATRICK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. On exchange of power, can the Minister indicate to the House what price we are paying or what is the rate for purchasing. Is it the same as we are receiving for export of power in the wintertime? Would it be the same or is there a differential in the rate that we are paying?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that question assumes that there is one price for exported energy and in fact there are several prices, depending upon whether or not it is distressed power, whether it is off-peak, etc. I think that the best way to answer that question by the honourable member would be to prepare him a written reply which would indicate the amounts, at various prices, that have been purchased by way of import and the amount that has been sold by way of export. The amount under at least several different price levels.

**MR. PATRICK:** A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. In view of the low water levels for almost a year now, can the Minister indicate if there is any consideration given by Manitoba Hydro to upgrade the present coal thermal units that we have — or perhaps add to them?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any serious plans for the upgrading — presumably by that the honourable member means expansion — of coal burning thermal capacity, for the reason that it is felt that both because of increased capacity going on line later this year and this winter, coupled with the availability of Sunday and night-time power at lower rates which permits ponding, that for those reasons, plus increased interconnection, that there is no combination of strong reasons for any increase in thermal capacity.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Assiniboia, a final question.

**MR. PATRICK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House where do we get our interconnection now? I mean the purchase of power — where. And the Minister indicated that we will have increases in the near future. Can he indicate from what generating station those increases will come from?

**MR. SCHREYER:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the interconnections with Saskatchewan, Ontario and Minnesota. Of course, in northwestern Ontario the water levels are the same as they are in Manitoba — there is a problem — so that northwestern Ontario doesn't really have significant supply of power available for our purposes. So, practically speaking, when talking of increased interconnection, in practical terms I am referring to the thermal capacity south of us in Minnesota.

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

**MR. DAVID BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. I wonder, in view of the fact that the fishermen in Manitoba are being paid 62 cents a pound in the round for pickerel and they are marketing today at Eaton's at \$4.35 a pound, I wonder if he would undertake to provide an answer to the House on why such a large discrepancy in the price of this particular natural product exists.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield):** Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I had a bit of difficulty understanding the whole question there was so much noise from both sides of the House. No, I don't intend to launch an investigation on the subject matter. We haven't in the past and we don't control those types of prices today as we haven't in the past. That is something that is left, as the honourable member knows, to the marketplace.

**MR. BLAKE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wasn't particularly asking the Minister to launch an investigation. I was asking him if he would provide an answer to the House in view of the fact that this is marketed through a marketing board, if he might provide an answer to the House on why there is such a discrepancy between the price paid to the fishermen and that required of the consumer in the marketplace.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is wanting me to confirm or deny the figures that he has presented to this House, I will. NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT RE R. A. PAULLEY

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

**MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could have leave of the House to make a non-political statement.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Sir, perhaps it will be slightly political but it will be shaped in favour of a long-standing member of this Chamber, Sir, who deserves some recognition on

this particular date. Monday of this week marked a significant date in history being the memorial of the date when Allied troops landed in Europe in World War II. Today marks the date only slightly less significant in terms of an invasion because today begins the 25th year since the invasion of the Legislative arena in this province by the distinguished Minister of Labour and Honourable Member for Transcona.

Cornelius Ryan may have got it wrong, Sir. He described June 6th, 1944 as the longest day. We feel that in submitting some of the questions that we have submitted to the Minister in this Chamber in the last few years and yielding to his answers, that on some of those occasions we have gone through what indeed has been almost the longest day. But we want to mark and acknowledge the long and distinguished service of the Minister of Labour to the Province of Manitoba and to all citizens of the province.

I have had the privilege in the last few years of representing my party in the area of labour debate in this House. It has been a dubious privilege in one sense because I have been catapulted up against what I think all of us would recognize is a figure who was one of the most formidable in terms of debate and in terms of participation and knowledge in this Legislative arena. So it has been a learning process for me, Sir, and like all learning processes, it has been painful at times. It has also been gratifying and satisfying and I feel I have had the privilege of learning a great deal in being put in that position opposite the Minister of Labour.

I note that the Minister describes himself elsewhere as an old traditionalist. All I can say, Sir, is if he is an old traditionalist, I would hate to be up against an old radical. Nonetheless, I won't challenge the description that he places upon himself for I am sure that he knows better than I and most of us how he would describe his sincere approach to the public affairs of this province. I want him to know that despite the differences that we have had in this Chamber, that I count him — and I think my colleagues count him — as among our friends outside the House. I hope he feels the same way; certainly he understands democracy and the system and the jobs that people have to do. I know that I have suggested, perhaps rhetorically in the past, that he should meet a particular fate that would not be desirable from his point of view. I know that I have suggested he should perhaps someday wind up in the Museum of Man and Nature and perhaps he should, but perhaps, Sir, for a different reason than the ones that I have implied. Perhaps he should be there because in fulfilling 25 years of public service through this Legislative arena to the people of Manitoba, he has set an enviable and in very large degree, an unmatchable record. I think the former Premier, the Honourable Douglas Campbell, was in this House for 47 years, if I am not mistaken, or close to that in any event. But the Minister of Labour has set a distinguished and an enviable record that I am sure few of us in this Chamber, or in the future, will be able to match in terms of longevity.

So I just wanted to acknowledge on behalf of myself and my party the contribution that we believe the Minister has made. This is not a surrender, I intend to continue challenging him in debate and I would expect that he would expect that of me, Sir. But we acknowledge his service, we pay tribute to him on this day, we wish him a happy retirement when that time comes. We are not sure what the First Minister has in mind in terms of the length of this particular Legislature, but when it comes we wish him a happy and constructive retirement and we hope that he will be taking his place in the loges on this side, perhaps sniping away at us in intent and in informal argument in the years to come, because that kind of participation would inject continuing colour and continuing excitement into the debate in this Chamber that all of us, I am sure, appreciate.

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

**MR. JAMES H. BILTON:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may claim a few moments too on this particular occasion. And I do this because of the fact that the Honourable Member for Transcona and I will be going out hand in hand out of this House which we both dearly love. Having said that — (Interjections) — You can take it for granted, Mr. Speaker, that I'll hear more about this in caucus.

It's a privilege to me, Mr. Speaker, to continue the eloquent remarks made by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. I am not going to imitate him or attempt to imitate him but rather to just say a word in appreciation for the courtesies that have been extended to me over the years by the Honourable Member for Transcona in many many ways. Politically we are poles apart but, as my honourable friend said a few moments ago, that outside of this House we are still good solid Anglican friends and always will be.

Mr. Minister, I want to thank you for the courtesies that you extended to me over the years and I want to wish you well in retirement. I know very much how fond you are of gardening and I know from now on you will be able to tend those roses. But there is some person we should not overlook at this particular time and I want it to go into the record, and that is to his good and faithful wife Mary, who has stood beside him over the years and, as a consequence, he has served the people of Manitoba and served them very very well indeed.

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

**MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, if I may have leave to offer a similar thought and congratulation to our friend and colleague, the Member for Transcona.

It will be interesting to see after the election is called and results are in, to see if my honourable friend, the Member for Transcona, has relaxed his political grip on that area. It will be interesting to see. I think it is somewhat of a change in procedure for members to congratulate members of other parties, not because of the particular occasion, but I think that even the youngest member of this House will recognize that some day some members will rise and speak to his condolence motion. So it is a pleasure that that tradition has been changed somewhat, where we can speak face to face to the person that we know — at least we think is leaving our group. We're not sure of that. I know my friend, the Member for Transcona means what he says when he's going to retirement. We in the Liberal Party wish him and his good wife, Mary, a long and happy retirement from the political scene but not from active life.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is only appropriate that I should join in the outpouring of spontaneous and unrehearsed expression of feelings. It is, however, with some fear of being misunderstood that I do so because if I were to wish the Minister of Labour a speedy and happy retirement that might be interpreted as being indicative of a certain attitude on my part. But, I think, Sir, that it is fitting to acknowledge the fact, I believe it is a fact, that 25 years in this or any other parliamentary body is a significant period of time and one that fittingly receives some acknowledgement and tribute. Of the 25 years, it has been my, in many ways, privilege and pleasure to have been associated with the Minister of Labour for, on rough calculation, 16 of those 25 years and many of those 16 years very productive ones.

When the Member for Fort Garry referred to the longest day in the context of the Minister of Labour, I couldn't help but feel, and I hope that my colleague forgives me this bit of banter, although it has elements of truth to it, that on those Cabinet days in which the Minister of Labour has had multiple items on the agenda, has sometimes seemed to me to be the longest day.

Notwithstanding that, Sir, every parliamentary body has to have a Dean and if there weren't such acknowledgement, it will be necessary to invent it. Our Dean for the past several years has been the Minister of Labour and when he retires it will be interesting to see what the electorate does in terms of determining who his successor Dean of this House will be. I could venture some guesses but that would be at the risk of seeming immodest, Sir, so I shall desist from saying more on that.

I want to conclude by wishing, on behalf of all of us, to the Minister of Labour, appreciation for a quarter century of service in this Assembly, appreciation for the productive undertakings with which he has been involved, on both sides of this House. That need it be said, I suppose it should be said, that the productivity of this Assembly, although it is difficult to measure, really requires the two sides of the Assembly. And also in concluding, to wish my colleague a happy retirement but it is one, I feel, that will be also productive. I do not expect that his retirement will be complete.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, since the Chair is not representative of either side, I too would like to add my own felicitations to the honourable member. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to the words of felicitation that have been given today by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, the Member for Portage la Prairie, and the First Minister. It occurred to me, however, that the First Minister and the Member for Transcona, now translated as the Minister of Labour, and I were probably the only three contemporaries of this House who were in the House in 1958 together. I am usually not wont to correct the First Minister's arithmetic except on things such as gross per capita debt, the wastage in Manitoba Hydro and a few other minor matters, but I am forced to do so here because he did mention that he had known as a colleague, the Minister of Labour, for some 16 years. I think if he will recount — and I am now sounding like the Honourable Douglas Campbell used to — if he will recount, he will find that that period is something more like 19 years that he has been a colleague in this House as I have been . . . with a suitable sabbatical which the First Minister had and I had as well.

At that time, when we were first elected, the Minister of Labour was a young sprite who had been serving in this House for only six years. My heavens, you know, there are people sitting around us on both sides of the House who can dwarf that kind of longevity as we stand here today in 1977. He was full of fire and brimstone; he wasn't the leader of the party in those days, he was one of the chief advocates of his particular group. He was a man who hated to sit long hours in the House, particularly when he was in Opposition. I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, at that great mutation in his attitude that has taken place since he has now taken a position of responsibility on the far side of the House. No longer do we see the bed cap, no longer do we see the bed cap with the tassie hanging half-way down his back that he used to adorn himself with when the House Leader of those days would decide that the House should sit until maybe such a terrible hour as 12 or even 1 in the morning. The Honourable, the Member for Transcona, as he then was — later as Leader of the New Democratic Party — would don the bed cap and give forth a tirade against the anti-democratic methods of the then government, and so on. o

Much as we have fought, the two of us, over the years — and believe me, we have fought. We have

had some knock-down, drag-out, battles some of which that have taken place in recent months are only pale imitation, pale imitations of what used to take place — much as we have fought, I re-echo the words of the Member for Fort Garry, that no matter how vitriolic the exchanges in the House, no matter how condemnatory the abuse that was thrown from one side of the House to the other, you could always count on the Member for Transcona emerging from the House with that true parliamentary spirit and either kicking you in the pants or throwing his arm around your shoulder and inviting you to join him for a respite in his office. Usually he was asking for a respite in somebody else's office but the point is nonetheless clear that what went on in the House was one thing in the passion of debate but what went on outside of the House in terms of personal relations was always manifested by him in

So, terms of true friendliness to all members of the Legislature. I rise with the other members to join in congratulations to the Honourable Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour, to a man more particularly who most of us prefer to call a good friend, to wish him well in his retirement, to wish him good health in his retirement, and to wish him the constant support that he has had over the years from his charming wife, Mary. There are many many other occasions when we can recount some of the incidents that took place on various trips that we've had together, occasions when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was in his particular trade at a time when he used to carry a measuring tape around, Mr. Speaker, and when the Member for Transcona was not feeling particularly well, the Member for St. Boniface went out with the tape. I am happy to know that he hasn't got that business yet and we all are, because the Member for Transcona has always added a spark and a lustre and a kind of seasoning to this House that is going to be greatly missed when he departs from the Chamber.

So we genuinely arise and acknowledge his contribution to public affairs, today. We congratulate him on his anniversary and we wish him Godspeed on his retirement.

**HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY, Minister of Labour (Transcona):** Mr. Speaker, and friends, it is tough, it is really tough for an old emotionalist like I am to reply and close the debate on the subject matter this afternoon.

I truly appreciate the comments made by honourable members and sometimes when I, like the present time, am reflecting on some of the remarks made, wonder whether or not they were like some of the remarks that I have heard over the years during debates, attributed to honourable members and directed toward me.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition made reference to the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health and his tape. I don't know whether the offer that was made to me by the honourable gentleman still holds true that in some of the periods when I wasn't feeling too well he said he would get me a complete funeral service at half price. I don't know whether that still holds true; I'll have to speak to my friend.

Then there was another occasion that I well recall, around about three or four o'clock in the morning, when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and I were engaged in a pretty vigorous debate. The question of legal representation arose and my friend, the redhead, said across to me on the other side of the Chamber, "Russ, I'll defend you in any court in the Province of Manitoba without charge." And I said, "Then, I would be assured of being convicted of any charge that was laid against me."

The remarks of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, I know, were sincere because it is true that as opposites in debates on labour matters that we have had some pretty strenuous and vigorous debates. Sometimes we haven't really treated each other as gentlemen inside of the House. But outside of the House, those differences were diminished and we were truly friends.

The Honourable Member for Swan River has said we are going out together hand-in-hand. I think it might be appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that when the next election is called that I be invited to Swan River so that we can go hand-in-hand throughout the constituency of Swan River to just indicate it is time for change of representation politically in that particular area.

And to my Premier and friend, I thank you, Sir, for your remarks. The date of my actual termination in the field of politics, as has been indicated, rests in your hands and not mine.

The Attorney-General, I do not know whether or not he will get the Human Rights Commission to set up an investigation or an inquiry as to the firing because a fellow happens to be over 65, or reach that age. We'll have to see what happens there.

But there has been one thing, Mr. Speaker, that has been said today — and I want to thank you for your comments — that is true. That as I enter into my quarter of a century service as a member of this House, I would not need the fingers of one hand to count those individuals who have served Manitoba as other than friends.

I made a brief tabulation the other day from June 8th, 1953, until now of the changes that have taken place in this House, Mr. Speaker. Approximately 163 persons are gone, for one reason or other: some by the will of the electorate, some have passed to their just rewards beyond, and others have taken their retirement. So we have seen, over those years, a change in the Legislature, or the

membership. We have seen many changes that have taken place in the responsibilities and the undertakings of government.

When I became a member of the Assembly there were just five CCFers at that time, so there has been a tremendous change. But the change that I am really talking of, Mr. Speaker, is the change in the responsibility of this Assembly. Back in 1953, our sessions lasted maybe a month and a half or two months and the work was terminated, and now sometimes we almost go six months in order to conduct the business of the House.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute paid to my wife. She has been an inspiration to me all these years, and if I have any real regrets of having been involved in the field of politics, it is because I was not beside her during the youth and the raising of our two lovely daughters. That was my only real regret and I thank you gentlemen who paid a tribute to my Mary. She deserves it even more than I. Thank you.

### ORAL QUESTIONS CONT'D

**MR. SPEAKER:** Questions. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

**MR. BILTON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Has the Minister received a copy of the recent federal committee's findings on prison reform throughout Canada?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

**MR. BOYCE:** Not as yet, Mr. Speaker, but I am advised that copies are on the way to the provincial authorities.

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

**MR. BILTON:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, has the Minister been progressively informed as to the progress of this committee's investigation across Canada.

**MR. BOYCE:** We have been advised of the information being provided to the committee. It came as a shock to many people in the provincial jurisdiction that they were being ignored by this committee, because they form the greater part of the criminal judicial system.

**MR. BILTON:** A final supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister would undertake to insist that he gets a copy of this report from the Federal Government, and provide one for the opposition.

**MR. BOYCE:** I'll be glad to provide them with a copy as soon as I receive it, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just would like to follow-up on the same questions to the Minister of Corrections. In view of the findings of the federal committee concerning conditions in the prisons and the methods used, and considering that many of them are parallel to our own, is he going to consider undertaking a similar kind of investigation within the provincial penitentiary service and jail system?

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we are somewhat premature. All I am familiar with, at the moment, is what is reported in the press. But predicating my answer on what is in the press, I have expressed the view that it is somewhat as if they have become an authority in the obvious, because many people across the country who were involved in the administrative capacity in the correctional systems have been saying the same thing for years.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister's statement is correct that people have been saying the same thing for years, and I assume people in the provincial system, would that not then be sufficient reason for us to undertake a similar assessment in our own provincial jail system to determine how severe the conditions are and whether the same kinds of reforms and improvements recommended by the Commons Committee should now be implemented in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, taking the one point that is attributed to the Commission, the fact that the people who are employed in the system have not had programs available to them to keep up with the changing trends of society. We have adopted a position in Manitoba that rather than re-analyze and analyze and — well as Trudeau says himself, paralysis by analysis — we have done something about it. As I announced several months ago, in co-operation with the Federal Government, we have taken steps to alleviate the problem of training staff by a contract between the Federal Government and the province.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the range of reforms recommended by the Commons Committee cover a much wider area than staff training and in fact point to the kinds of symptoms of problems here such as the number of suicides taking place in the City lockup, the lack of psychiatric services, the over-crowding in the Youth Centre . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question, please.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** . . . concerning all these questions, would the Minister not consider it appropriate that a similar committee be formed in this province to examine the same questions and come up with specific recommendations for reform?

**MR. BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Government for Manitoba has expressed their willingness to do something about it rather than re-analyze it all the way along the line because the reason that they set up this particular ministry was to upgrade the total system. Because it isn't just training of staff, it's a very complex problem and society, by and large, had ignored this field since the turn of the century. As they have said several times in this House, in Estimates and at other times, that we have embarked on a physical upgrading. I understand from the Minister of Public Works that the new institution at Brandon is going to tender and as we upgrade these facilities over the next ten years — because we can't do it overnight — that the Government of Manitoba has made a commitment to upgrade the physical facilities, upgrade the staff and try and put in programs to keep people out of correctional institutions in the first instance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Final question. The Honourable Meer for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Just one final question, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the Minister's answer then, would he take account of the recommendation that work programs be introduced into the prison system considering that we abolished the work programs in the provincial system two or three years ago.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I did not abolish work programs in the correctional system. We phased out the Headingley farm because the capital cost of upgrading the farm was prohibitive because the people who were being sentenced to Headingley Jail had such a short length of time to spend in that particular institution that it was of no benefit as far as a therapeutic program was concerned but there are other programs which involve work activities in the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

**MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General what measures are being taken to increase the surveillance at the lockup in the Public Safety Building?

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

**HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I would take that question as notice.

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

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. It is with respect to the Alberta judicial inquiry into the affairs of the Royal American Shows. Some Edmonton police were in Winnipeg gathering evidence. Was this done with the co-operation from the Attorney-General's Department or the Winnipeg City Police Department? In other words, were the Edmonton police here on their investigation with the knowledge and the co-operation of either the City of Winnipeg police or the Attorney-General's Department?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think I should, for purpose of accuracy, take the question as notice. I believe that there was less than proper consultation between the Edmonton City Police and the City of Winnipeg Police but I feel, for purposes of accuracy, I had best take the question as notice.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** I thank the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps he could take this question as notice also. Was the proper application made to his department for the wire tapping which was alleged?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, that question was asked yesterday. I had proposed that it might be wise for members to await the final outcome of the inquiry. I am not satisfied that it has yet been proved that a wiretap did in fact take place and I think that we would be unwise at this point to speculate until we have received the balance of the testimony at that inquiry and the decision by the judicial officer conducting the inquiry.

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Well, one final question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Attorney-General be receiving, or will he be asking for a copy of the final report of the Laycraft Inquiry in Alberta.

**MR. PAWLEY:** I am sorry, I couldn't get the . . .

**MR. G. JOHNSTON:** Into the alleged bribery by Royal American Shows, will the Attorney-General be requesting a copy of the final report of that Inquiry from Alberta?

**MR. PAWLEY:** I will, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAR:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MR. ROBERT G. WILSON:** A question to the Attorney-General. Can the Minister confirm that his department ordered the seizing of the film and the arrest of the theatre manager last night at the Venus Theatre?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that a film has been seized and that charges are being laid in connection therewith.

**MR. WILSON:** Well, in light of some of the questionable movies being shown around town, is the Minister planning to stamp out pornography or set new guidelines for films?

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think as witnessed the fact that this is now the third film to be seized and charges to be laid within the last month, six weeks, that it indicates that charges are being brought to bear where there is a contravention of the Criminal Code pertaining to obscenity and that, I think, speaks for itself.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Communications. In respect to the proposed, or the policy paper issued by the government and the comments of the Chairman of the CRTC that he has not recognized the legality of the Manitoba-Federal Agreement on Communications, can the Minister indicate if the Provincial Government plans to withdraw its policy paper or revise it in light of those remarks by the Chairman?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN:** No, Mr. Speaker, certainly not. We are not wanting to withdraw or amend based on comments presented to the people of Manitoba by an appointee of the Federal Department of Communications. We have arrived at an agreement with the Federal Government and not with the CRTC.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to questions last week, the Minister indicated that the CRTC would be the body that would be licensing, or approving licensing, for any application to Manitoba Telephone System for use of hardware facilities. Can the Minister now indicate whether CRTC is still prepared to act as that licencing body or is the Minister going to set up a new licencing body in the Province of Manitoba to take such applications?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, any applicant wanting to be licensed to offer services in Manitoba, will apply to either the CRTC or the Federal Department of Communications and will have to be licensed. If the CRTC decides, in contravention of the agreement that we have arrived at with the Federal Government last November, there are two alternatives. The Federal Department of Communications can deal with the CRTC or we can deal with them like we have in the past.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister explain to the House which body will take requests or applications for use of Manitoba Telephone System hardware outlets? Who is going to provide the regulation or accountability for those particular applications?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well again, Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to determine with a wide brush, in the sense that the Manitoba Telephone System offers all types of communication hardware material. So it depends what type of advocacy or what type of service is desired by a group of citizens. If it is pertaining to provincial jurisdiction, authorization will be given by provincial authorities. If it's of a federal jurisdiction, licensing, I take it, will be had through the CRTC.

Unless the honourable member has a specific, I can't be more specific myself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. A final question.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, in being specific, in the proposed policy paper the Provincial Government claims jurisdiction over questions of offering services such as broad-band news broadcasts. Can I ask him, in the case where a company such as Home Cinema, or others, wishes to offer those services, to whom do they apply? Who provides the regulation within the Province of Manitoba?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd better take this question as notice, to be more specific in my answer. The information that I have at surface would be that the group in question would apply to the provincial Department of Communications. And in regards to complaints or adjudication of same, they would go to the Public Utilities Board.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, could I just direct a question to the same Minister, a follow-up to the questions being asked by the Member for Fort Rouge. Is that not the whole issue that's in front of the CRTC hearings at this very moment?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well again, Mr. Speaker, it depends — if the honourable member is referring his comments now to the questions posed of me by the Member for Fort Rouge — quite possibly. And this is equally one of the reasons why the Federal Minister of Communications has written a letter attempting to clarify the agreement that was signed between Manitoba and Canada, last November. That is equally one of the reasons why we decided, at this time, to lay before the House and the people of Manitoba, the document that I had tabled last week in regard to the agreement and related matters.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister not agree that it would neither be practical, possible nor politics for him to answer at the moment, until the CRTC reaches some decisions this week?

**MR. TOUPIN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the CRTC will not be deciding on jurisdictional matters. That is something to be arrived at between the provinces and between the Federal Government and ourselves.

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

**MR. PATRICK:** Mr. Speaker, I see the Minister of Highways in his seat. Perhaps I can direct a question to him. Has the Minister or his officials examined the condition of Trans-Canada Highway Number One East in the area of Richer, Manitoba, and can the Minister indicate is the serious deterioration a result of reduction in standards, or what has been the cause? Because there are some 15 miles that we're having gravel now on Number One highway.

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

**HONOURABLE PETER BURTONIAK (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, I've heard about that problem a day or two ago. I understand there have been signs posted — No Passing, and the likes of that — and the police have been patrolling it, and I have asked for a report on the matter, which I have not received as yet.

**MR. PATRICK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps if I may indicate, one side of the highway, or one way, is somewhat older; one section is quite new. Can the Minister indicate, after his investigation, is this the cause of lessening the standards, or is it the cause of faulty construction, and who is going to pay the cost for repairing?

**MR. BURTONIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I'm quite certain that when I get a report from the department I would imagine that all these things that the honourable member is asking for would probably be included.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. SCHREYER:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a member of each party opposite, plus the Minister of Finance, the Member for Seven Oaks, to take note that on Friday next it would be proposed to deal with a condolence motion relating to the late Art Wright, MLA, and in the event that for procedural reasons it would not be appropriate Friday, then as early as possible next week.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before we proceed, I see I have two members wanting to make some exchanges. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** I'd like to make some changes on the two committees, Mr. Speaker. On Industrial Relations, the name of Jenkins to be replaced with Shafransky, and the name of Osland to take the place of Bostrom. In Private Bills, the name Johannson for Toupin, and the name of Barrow for that of Cherniack. Thank you. (Agreed)

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

**MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON:** Only one substitution, Mr. Speaker. That will be on Private Bills; the Member for Brandon West for the Member for Gladstone.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### ADJOURNED DEBATES — SECOND READING

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you. Orders for Return. The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, maybe we could deal with the Orders for Return after the government business.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Very well.

**MR. GREEN:** Proceed with Bill No. 40, Mr. Speaker.

#### BILL (NO. 40) - AN ACT FOR GRANTING TO HER MAJESTY CERTAIN SUMS OF MONEY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE PROVINCE FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING THE 31ST DAY OF MARCH, 1978

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 40. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** I adjourned this bill for my colleague, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. I believe he will finish debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance shall be closing debate.

**HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want it known that I will be closing debate. I believe members opposite are aware of this.

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

**MR. MILLER:** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care to the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke on two occasions on this particular bill. It was sort of a two-stage effort; last Friday and then again on Monday. But you know the contribution to the debate on Bill 40 was long — it ran over two days — and it was convoluted but really it dealt with nothing new.

Now last Friday the Leader of the Opposition's comments ranged from the discussion of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire — if you can think back that far — and the dire things that were going to happen to this province if this government remains in office. They ranged on the complete spectrum. But as usual, Mr. Speaker, outside of the rhetoric, he failed once again to give the House, or the people of Manitoba, for that matter, any clear indication at all of what sort of positive policies, if any, his party stands for.

I'm still waiting to hear about positive policies, either positive or negative. I hear nothing except vague innuendoes, vague suggestions, implied criticisms, but not really firmed up and not substantiated. So we hear the same tired old — and they are becoming very old and tiring now — empty criticisms which, as I say, cannot be substantiated. But I think he is still playing the same old

game. I think he believes that if he keeps repeating time and time again the same thing that somehow this will influence people simply on the basis of repetition; and if he keeps saying it often enough, maybe people will believe it and will accept it. But, frankly I have more ' confidence in the people of Manitoba because I believe that this kind of approach is really an insult to the people's intelligence, and it shows, in my opinion, an arrogance on the other side of the House which I haven't witnessed in this province for a number of years.

I honestly, listening to them, am becoming very concerned about the kind of policies that Manitoba might be faced with if that group there ever took over the government of this province, particularly with that particular leader at their head.

Mr. Speaker, the Conservative strategy becomes very clear. In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition said — and I can't remember the exact words, I'll try to paraphrase it— in referring to the Social Credit Government of British Columbia, he said they found the Treasury deluded when they took office. He went on to say something like, "My heaven, what are we going to find in Manitoba; what are we going to find in the Treasury here? We anticipate finding many fiscal skeletons."

Now, I think that the people of Manitoba should look at statements like that very very carefully — very carefully. That's cute, a very cute comment. He doesn't say that there's anything wrong, but he implies.

**A MEMBER:** Especially after B.C.

**MR. MILLER:** Especially after B.C. It seems clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that whether there are skeletons there or not, they are going to find them if they get a chance or are they going to plant them if they get a chance, as was done in B.C.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition went to great lengths to express concern about the Annual Report of the Provincial Auditor and he went so far as to ask this government, he asked me and the government generally, for a statement of support for the Auditor because he was very critical when the Member for St. James questioned the Auditor who indeed works for the Legislature, not for the government. So he asked for a statement of support for the Auditor, Mr. Speaker. **ow, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, you can't have it both ways. If you anticipate finding fiscal skeletons, that's what you're saying, then obviously you have no confidence in the ability of the Provincial Auditor to now identify those. It's the height of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, to profess to support the Auditor and then in the next breath to implicitly challenge his ability and his integrity by suggesting that there are all sorts of hidden skeletons in the Treasury and in the province's financial position. But somehow it is implied that either the Auditor is hiding them, is somehow working with the government to hide them, and at the same time to suggest that we, the government, are not in support of the Auditor. Now, you know, really this is nonsense.**

**I say to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition that he has no right to take this position. Either he says — and if he wants to say so, then let him stand on it — that in fact there is something wrong; there are fiscal, to use his term, fiscal skeletons to be found, in which case, let him say so to the Auditor. The Auditor does not obviously agree with him but he can't have it both ways. He can't say we support the Auditor and at the same time he then proceeds to challenge the integrity and the ability of a professional, the Provincial Auditor of Manitoba.**

**Mr. Speaker, our government does support the Provincial Auditor and his staff. There is no question about it. But I can tell you frankly that if I were the Auditor, I would question whether the same degree of support exists within the Opposition because charges of hidden fiscal skeletons hardly suggests — to me anyway — that the Opposition have confidence ' that the Auditor is doing his job. He can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition tries to have it both ways on almost everything he says.**

**Mr. Speaker, in his comments on the Budget and again on Bill 40, the Leader of the Opposition kept referring to administrative costs which he said are higher within the Manitoba Government than all but two other provincial jurisdictions. He went on, I think it was Alberta and Prince Edward Island were the highest but after that, the third highest was Manitoba. And these are administrative costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, I found it hard to believe because I know that our total expenditures on a per capita basis are the third lowest in Canada. I know that. And I think that even friends opposite will have to admit that. So the statement he made made no sense to me and I asked staff to try to determine what the Leader of the Opposition was talking about when he made this statement. Well, I found out. The staff has done a good job; they finally tracked it down and I have some disturbing news for the Leader of the Opposition. He went to Statistics Canada, as I understand it, and got from them Canada's Provincial Governments Finance Publications and he looked at a category of expenditures which Statistics Canada calls "General Government Administration."**

**In their latest preliminary — I repeat, preliminary — Statistics Canada publication, for the years 1975-76 and 1976-77, this general government expenditure item was shown as being 7.5 percent of total expenditures in Manitoba for 1975-76 and 7.2 percent in 1976-77. Now, this appeared to be above the national average and, as my friend opposite said, was the third highest in Canada behind**

Alberta and Prince Edward Island. But the Leader of the Opposition didn't take the trouble to find out what he was really talking about and we did. My staff telephoned Statistics Canada to get an explanation because the staff too agreed that these percentages appeared too high. Well, Statistics Canada has acknowledged that they are too high. It turns out that for 1975-76 and 1976-77, Statistics Canada used a general government administration item as a sort of catch-all category and allocated for Manitoba a significant portion of our general purposes capital spending total which has nothing to do with administrative costs. Statistics Canada officials have acknowledged this and acknowledged that it unfairly distorts the provincial actual figures and overstates them substantially.

Part of the reason, they explained, is that 1975-76 and 1976-77 publications are only estimates and, of necessity, are put together without reference to the kind of actual specific detail which would appear in Public Accounts. They told us that to get a more accurate picture of provincial administrative costs as a proportion of total expenditures, it was necessary to go to their latest final publication based on actual information, that is, their publication for 1974-75. That is a verified statement. On that basis, Statistics Canada told us our administrative costs are relatively low compared to those in most other provinces and below the national average — not above.

Mr. Speaker, just to ensure that it should go on the record so that the Leader of the Opposition can't — you know, he'll have to maybe find some other kind of statistics to play around with — I am going to read these into the record. For the last year for which actual comparative information for ten provinces is available — the publication incidentally is Statistics Canada No. 68-207, Provincial Government Finance, that's the table — I want to point out that in the list of provinces showing percentages of expenditures, of administrative expenses as a percentage of total expenditure, the leader in Canada is Ontario, followed by Prince Edward Island, followed by British Columbia, followed by Saskatchewan, followed by Alberta, followed by New Brunswick, followed by Nova Scotia. Manitoba is ninth which means it's the second lowest within the ten jurisdictions; the second lowest in Canada, well below the national average of 6.3 because ours is 4.3. So Mr. Speaker, I hope that now that I've informed the Leader of the Opposition, that he will not have to seek out some other figures that he'll have to come up with because these certainly will not hold water.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked — (Interjection) — You did the manipulating, my friend. You did your own interpretation of raw figures. — (Interjection) — No, sir. These are Statistics Canada figures.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. MILLER:** You know that socialist junk that he is throwing around, you know that class war, they're are the people who are creating a class war, who are perpetuating a class war, and with their garbage talk, are trying to intimidate people into fearing something which doesn't exist. You know, the only thing you need fear is fear itself, and what he is trying to do is to create fear.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did ask me to advise him regarding the 1976-77 deficit. I indicated to him I would when the figures are available. Now, the numbers are not absolutely final and they are not audited, but the amount is \$18.9 million. This is slightly lower than the \$19 million figure that I gave as an approximation during the Budget Address, but it is very close, just slightly under. It is about \$6 million higher than the \$12.8 million originally estimated by the First Minister in the 1976 Budget, and of course we knew that it was going to exceed that figure. And a great many factors account for this difference. However, it is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, without going into all the possible factors, it is worth noting that the province received approximately \$9.8 million less from the Federal Government under the revenue guarantee arrangement in 1976-77 than we had budgeted for, and that was when the Federal Government retroactively changed the formula on the revenue guarantee. If we had received the full amount included in our Estimates for the 1976-77 fiscal year, the deficit would have only been \$9.1 million. And we were also able to hold down the deficit by restraining expenditures in mid-1976, as members will recall, when we realized that there would be a shortfall in federal moneys, when we realized there were some unanticipated expenditures, like the beef stabilization program and a very massive and extensive fire-theft in Manitoba, a fire-fighting cost. We went through a restraint exercise, and, as was noted in the Budget, the restraint reductions totalled approximately \$20 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, because of the restraint exercise we were able to maintain the deficit at the \$12.8 million level — less than what the Premier in 1976 indicated he was concerned about, that it might even reach as high as \$30 million; at that time he was sort of guessing what it might be — but it is nothing close to that figure, as I indicated, less than \$19 million.

Now that the information, Mr. Speaker, is available for 1976-77, I think it would be an idea because of the suggestion on the other side about the rapid rate of growth of our expenditures in Manitoba — I think it would be of some benefit now to compare the rate of growth between 1976-77 and 1977-78 on an updated basis, now that we have that figure. On that basis the rate of growth in our 1977-78 expenditure estimates, is approximately 8.3 percent above the preliminary unaudited figures for 1976-77. Now I might also point out that this percentage includes the additional \$16.5 million which were added to the current expenditures to cover part of the cost of the Special Employment Program.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition and others — but particularly the Leader of the Opposition — keep referring to government spending. I was interested to hear that the two people he now looks to for guidance are the two Simons, William Simons in the United States, former financial genius of that Nixon government, and Simon Reisman, Deputy Minister of Finance, Ottawa, until 1975. Now he has become a disciple of those two Simons. One of the main criticisms that the Leader of the Opposition, as I say, has come up with constantly, is that government activities account for too large a proportion of the gross national product. Now in all fairness to the Leader of the Opposition, he concedes that this isn't unique to the Government of Manitoba. He feels that this is a sin shared by all, but he does try to leave the impression that Manitoba's expenditures have grown unduly. He doesn't say so, but that's the impression he leaves. He is very, very good with words. He is very agile on his feet.

So let's look at the facts. What are the facts? Members may recall, Mr. Speaker, that there were tables circulated at the time of the Budget Speech. They were appendices to the Budget Speech, and they show that since 1969-70, the year we took office, expenditures in Manitoba have grown far below the national average. In fact we rank second lowest among the ten provinces in expenditure growth between 1969-70 and 1976-77. We are the second lowest among the ten provinces. This is after tax credits are accounted for.

But, Mr. Speaker, this aside, the numbers game aside, I want to say that I believe it is of questionable value in my opinion to focus too much attention on government's so-called share of the gross national product, or' in our case, of the gross provincial product. You know in recent months it has become fashionable to argue that government expenditures should not grow faster than a certain GNP or gross provincial product. Now this sounds attractive on the surface, but when it is looked at more carefully, I think people have to be very seriously concerned of what the implications are. Because if this philosophy had held true 20 years ago, Canada would have no hospital insurance program today. If that philosophy had pertained ten years ago, there would be no Medicare program today. Mr. Speaker, the same is true of old age pensions. We have always heard it: Can't afford it. Don't do it. If the government of that day had heeded the kind of arguments they are getting now, there would be no old age security pension, there would have been no Pharmacare program in Manitoba. There would have been no supplement for the elderly program. There would have been no personal care home program. There wouldn't be any of them. The list goes on and on.

Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba we would have had the same inflation we have across the country and across the western world, including countries which practice his economics. His economics, the United States, his economics. They are in the same position. —(Interjection)— Sincer Carter came in and he reversed the Nixon policies that you were pursuing the other day —(Interjection) — Oh, I'll stay in Manitoba if the honourable member were . . . . But the thing is, he has become a disciple of two geniuses from outside of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the so-called increase . . . . You know I don't hate anyone, it is the members opposite who hate. They are so filled with a burning need, a feeling to get on this side of the house, they will say anything and they will attribute anything to anybody, so long as they think it will pay them off. Mr. Speaker, I have never yet run across a group that has as aggressively, ambitiously used every means to justify their end, and I mean that — every means, every means.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that much of the so-called increase in government's share of GNP or GPP, the gross provincial product, has really been little more than the replacement of private spending with public spending. Before hospital insurance and Medicare, you know people were spending —(Interjection)— Stalin, is it? Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, it is being used by the President of the United States today — a good Stalinist, I am sure. Before hospital insurance and Medicare, people were spending a great deal of money on health care. At that time the government's share of gross national product or gross provincial product was smaller, but that doesn't mean that people were better off. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe the opposite to be true. I believe that when public health insurance became a reality, and it did increase government's share of GNP, this resulted in a substantial benefit to the people of Canada and Manitoba.

On this same point, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to them, you know —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. MILLER:** For all the facts that Medicare, hospital, health costs grew in Canada, I want to tell my honourable friend that the rate of increase in the United States has exceeded the rate of increase in Canada in the last five years — and that's the private, and that's the practice. So that money is still being paid, but it is being paid out through a person's own private sources.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look at the historical record. Let's look at the history. Let's have a history lesson, only in Manitoba. Let's not talk about anything else, okay? Only in Manitoba. Because they don't want to talk about anything else. Let's look at the historical record of government's share of gross provincial product in Manitoba.

You know in 1959-60 — it is a year those gentlemen there will remember, some will remember; there weren't that many here but some of them were — the provincial current expenditures

accounted for about 4.7 of gross provincial product. The year 1959-60, that's the fiscal year, provincial current expenditures accounted for about 4.7 of the gross provincial product. Eight years later, 1967-68, eight years later the percentage had grown to 11.5 percent, an increase of almost 150 percent under the former government. 150 percent. And incidentally, the 1967-68 figure I just gave you, which accounted for the 150 percent, doesn't include hospital insurance premiums which would have to be added in at another one percent they didn't include those because people paid their own premiums. It wasn't part of the provincial program.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the members opposite would say that this substantial increase of 150 percent in the share of the Manitoba gross provincial product back then in the Sixties, that was there, government-accounted for, reflected bad management. No, I don't believe that they would admit that or say that, and I wouldn't charge them with that. It is nothing more than an important program implementation. They felt there were certain things that had to be done, particularly in the field of education, and they did them. Sure, the percentage of the provincial expenditures and the percentage of the gross provincial product increased. But of course it increased, because programs were undertaken, work was done, needed things were being attended to. And so, I am not criticizing them, and I hope they are not criticizing themselves now with hindsight. Maybe they do, but I certainly wouldn't criticize them. But let them not try to come up with the idea that something happened when this government took office. I point out to them that in a period of eight years, there was an increase in the provincial current expenditures of 150 percent. Now under our government the share of GPP has also increased. Of course it has. But by a far smaller percentage than under the previous government.

**A MEMBER:** That's not possible.

**MR. MILLER:** Oh, it's not possible? In 1976-77 the current provincial expenditures represented about 13.8 percent of the gross provincial product. Now this is in fact lower by about a half percent than the share in the previous year. It just happened to work out that way. The figures are there. Go back to every Budget in the last 20 years, and you will find them. —(Interjections) —

No, the diddling is on your account because you don't deal with anything concrete. You make suggestions. You imply. Mr. Speaker, I will say this —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. MILLER:** I wish we could spend as much as the Ontario government is going to have — you know, I'll take their deficit, and I will take Alberta's surplus with their oil.

Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that there is maybe some comfort to those who are concerned with that kind of arithmetical juggling and equations, and tossing figures around, the fact is I don't believe that too much stock should be placed in attempting to hold government spending in an arbitrary relationship with GNP or gross provincial product. Any arbitrary relationship makes no sense to me, because costs don't always grow exactly in line with the gross national product, and neither, for that matter, do service needs. The needs are what count, and just to use an artificial arithmetical benchmark and say it cannot exceed that simply ignores the reality of supplying a service which is a needed service.

So the members opposite I find interesting. They now say that they now support premium-free Medicare. They now support Pharmacare. They now support personal care home programs, and they now support almost everything this government does. You know the conversion is fantastic.

Now if so, I want to ask them a question. I don't know how, at the same time that they are saying this, they can criticize the government when its expenditures grow as a percentage of gross provincial product. They apparently applaud what we have done, but then when the government's expenditures go up in order to pay for these programs, they are very critical. Well, either condemn the programs, or your criticism of the expenditures is phoney. Either one or the other.

Mr. Speaker, I have emphasized that much of the increase in recent years has resulted from the substitution from the public expenditure for private expenditure, so the distinction really is quite artificial, and not necessarily of any value except for those who want to find any excuse they can for discrediting governments and government programs — and to try to find a rationale for turning the clock back; maybe that is what they are trying to do. Maybe they want to turn the clock back to a time when many of these programs weren't available, because they keep insisting that program costs should not exceed an arbitrary, mathematical guideline or formula. Then, as I indicated, we wouldn't have Medicare, we wouldn't have hospital care, we wouldn't have supplements to the elderly, we wouldn't have a lot of things, because you never could have done them. And as I again said, Mr. Speaker, we were simply switching from private funding to public funding, and in the final analysis the dollars add up to the same thing.

**A MEMBER:** We have double-digit inflation then.

**MR. MILLER:** Yes, you've got double-digit inflation. That's right. You've got it all over the country, including the United States, which doesn't practice our system at all. And yet they have it. And you have it all through Europe.

Mr. Speaker, another area the Leader of the Opposition touched was on tax comparisons. And there he accused me of trying to kid the public about Manitoba having a lesser tax burden than the residents of B. C., Alberta and Ontario. He says, "Who do you think you're trying to kid?" — the Leader of the Opposition was quoted.

Mr. Speaker, those tables distributed to the House are correct. If any one was manipulating numbers, it was the Leader of the Opposition. And let me show you, let me show you. I would refer the honourable member to the tables appended to the 1977 Manitoba Budget Address. Those tables showed a lower tax prevailing in Manitoba, and were not based on carefully selected income levels as the Leader of the Opposition implied that I had done. They were not based on carefully selected income levels, but on a broad range.

Here is the range in those tables. Income levels considered at the following levels: \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000, \$9,000, \$10,000, \$11,000, \$12,000, \$15,000, \$20,000, \$25,000, and \$50,000.00. That is a carefully selected income level? Is that a culled number? Nonsense. That is across-the-board. The tables show significant advantages for Manitobans relative to Ontario residents and residents of other provinces, Mr. Speaker.

So then the honourable member attempted to show how a family of four with taxable income of, I think it was \$15,034 in 1976 — not in 1977 — would fare in Ontario relative to here. Now if there was ever a carefully selected income level, that's it, Mr. Speaker, because amongst modern income earners, that is the only point at which Ontario fares fairly well in the comparison and \$15,034 taxable income, and that is the income level of \$15,034.00. taxable income,

But even at this level, Mr. Speaker, and assuming 480 in property taxes, as the Leader of the Opposition assumed, the Ontario resident would receive a net refund or credit of \$275 in Ontario. Manitoba residents, using the same assumptions, would receive a tax credit or refund in Manitoba of \$375. In other words, a difference of \$100 in favour of the Manitoba resident. But here is the interesting thing. They talk about picking a carefully selected income level — at \$1 more, \$1 more of taxable income, the Ontario resident's tax credit decreases by \$31, his provincial income tax increases by \$61 and at that point, at \$1 more, the Manitoba advantage increases to about \$190 instead of \$100; that at every level, the Manitoba resident is ahead.

Now the Leader of the Opposition next — suggested and he really made a pitch for this — "Ignore Ontario health care premiums," he said — "Ignore them."

**A MEMBER:** Why?

**MR. MILLER:** I'll tell you why. He said, "After all, in Ontario they have a law, and the law is that any employer with 14 or more employees shall have to contribute towards the premiums of his employees." No doubt that's true. However, Mr. Speaker, surely the Leader of the Opposition knows this, he doesn't need me to tell him, and I know he knows it, and that's why I am so critical of him because he knows this and yet he proceeds to use this kind of argument to fool I don't know who. You know, such payments by an employer on behalf of an employee form part of the total compensation to the employee. They're included in his income for tax purposes. He knows that. They're included for Anti-Inflation Board purposes and every other purpose. The fact is that they're part of the employee's income, and regardless of the mechanics, mechanics are paid from his income and he knows it. The employee in Manitoba recognized this fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1973 because at that time when we eliminated premiums, there was a directive by legislation to every employer who is paying or contributing towards the premium, a directive that the amount the employer would be saving by virtue of the elimination of premiums, that amount would be paid directly to the employee, an equivalent amount equal to the amount of the premium which the employer had previously paid.

The convoluted attempts, Mr. Speaker, to defend the Ontario premiums make one wonder whether, if ever reelected — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, they are not phoney. The member opposite is attempting to show that somehow in Ontario, you can ignore the fact that the premiums are \$384 a year; that in fact because employers contribute — where they have enough employees, as they used to here — to the premiums that the employee has to pay. And of course, it's part of the employee's money. Instead of the employee paying it out of his own pocket, part of it is paid out by the employer. It's part of his wage package, it's what he negotiated. — (Interjection) — No, that's what he negotiated. And here when we brought it in, we said to those people, "Now if you've been paying premiums for this man or woman all these years, that you are being relieved of that from this day on. That will go into the employee's pay package." And that's what happened in Manitoba. And the money flowed to the employee instead of to the Health Services Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the member's convoluted attempts to defend the Ontario premiums make me wonder that if they were ever reelected to government, I wonder whether he would survive the temptation — because obviously he is tempted — to reimpose the health service premiums which he and his party imposed on all Manitobans the last time that they were in office. — (Interjections) — No, believe me the Minister of Health is not going to do it. Let me tell you he will not do it and he is not even going to suggest it. — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. MILLER:** The Leader of the Opposition did have a point, Mr. Speaker, when he argued that in all of these comparisons, that we're dealing only with personal taxes and that really it was not taking other factors into account. And I tend to agree with him, when everybody gets overly enthusiastic putting things in their perspective. He started to refer, I know, to a Free Press article to prove his point, but then he changed his mind when he realized that I told the same story that we were saying, so therefore, he sort of skipped that off and he left it. However, since then, you know, the honourable member has brought the matter up, and frankly I have no qualms about comparing Ontario and Manitoba situations with regard to the broad range of tax, what it means, not just the personal tax. Perhaps a few examples can cover it. Ontario has a 40 percent higher sales tax than Manitoba. How does that touch you? Like bingo, wham! You know, that's the kind of figure they use about the corporation tax being 44 percent higher in Manitoba, 40 percent higher salestax across-the-board in Ontario as compared to Manitoba. How does that grab you? Good, eh?

Ontario, incidentally, my friend, Ontario has got 50 percent higher corporation capital tax than Manitoba. Isn't that terrible? A 50 percent higher corporation capital tax than in Manitoba. Gee! — (Interjections)— That's right. Because we run a good, efficient ship. You're just proving my point; you're just proving my point, my friend. Our expenses have not got out of hand, we are prudent, we've managed well and therefore we don't need it, we didn't impose it. Because you see, we don't play the class game. We don't play the class game like they do. They would play the class game, they would eliminate corporate tax, all supposedly in the name of creating more jobs which isn't provable, and never has been proved.

So, Mr. Speaker, to repeat, Ontario has a 50 percent higher corporation capital tax than Manitoba. And Ontario's capital tax, Mr. Speaker, applies to all businesses. Do they make a distinction as the members would like to, between the large corporate sector and the small businessmen — they're always crying for the small businessmen. Not in Ontario, no way, corporate tax across-the-board. But Manitoba provides for an exemption, total exemption of the corporate capital tax to small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, let's leave that one; let's go to others. They don't want to be limited to just talking about personal taxes, let's broaden it. Ontario has a higher gasoline tax than Manitoba. The rates are 18 cents in Manitoba, 19 cents per gallon in Ontario. And their insurance rates are much much lower, much much lower, much much lower — Mr. Speaker, even with the amount paid towards automobile insurance, Ontario should be lower than ours, shouldn't it? But it isn't; it's higher, it's higher. So don't use that argument. You'll lose it. Ontario has a higher tobacco tax than Manitoba. I couldn't afford to live in Ontario the way I smoke. The rates are 20 cents per pack of 25 in Manitoba and 24 cents in Ontario. Now, it's true I have a vested interest in keeping that rate within a reasonable tolerance.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition also made repeated reference to another carefully selected — and I use that term because he uses it — another carefully selected comparison — had an income level and I couldn't identify it at first — of \$8,226 and he attributed — (Interjection) — Thank you — attributed this choice of income levels to the Province of Manitoba. Let me assure him, we had nothing to do with that figure. The comparison was developed by an independent Toronto . . . Here it is here! Hey, hey, come on. — (Interjection) — You don't have to, I'll save you time. The comparison was developed by an independent Toronto tax expert for the Toronto Globe and Mail, an Ontario newspaper, in April 1976 when the Ontario 1976 Budget was brought down. The comparison which included federal and provincial income tax credits and health premiums indicated that the burden on a family of four at \$8,226 income was higher in Tory Toronto than in any other province. And this was the Toronto Globe and Mail, done by someone on their behalf; I saw it the first time in the Toronto Globe and Mail. It has since been re-copied and printed in many many publications.

Now perhaps honourable members would really be interested in which province has the second highest. They were really veering in on Ontario. Ontario is the highest — which is the second highest, the third highest and so on? So, let's look at it.

First highest in Canada, Ontario, total tax in 1976, \$1,078; second highest, Quebec; third highest, New Brunswick; fourth highest, Nova Scotia; fifth highest, British Columbia; sixth highest, Prince Edward Island; seventh, Alberta; eighth highest, Saskatchewan; ninth, Newfoundland. Where is Manitoba? The tenth, the lowest in Canada. Toronto Globe and Mail, 1976. These figures are not mine; they were done for the Toronto Globe and Mail. We gladly took them and we gladly then reprinted them in various brochures.

I'd also like to remind the honourable Leader of the Opposition that the article and the comparisons that I refer to here presented by the Leader of the Opposition, deals with the 1976 and not the 1977 year at all. That's an old story. And really for someone who is always saying, "Let's talk about the future; let's not talk about the past," I am really surprised that he uses that kind of an old newspaper story. But I hope perhaps soon he'll start discovering and discussing that we're in 1977 and really should be talking about 1977. And for 1977, Mr. Speaker, the results of interprovincial tax comparisons for Manitoba are even more favourable than they were in 1976 to the point where — and I repeat this as I did the other day — over 97 percent of Manitoba tax filers pay less than they would

pay under the Ontario system, over 96 percent pay less than if they were under the B.C. system, 83 percent pay less in Manitoba than they would pay under the Alberta system. Mr. Speaker, I really hope that the opposition will begin to make it clear just what they have in mind when they talk about aligning Manitoba's tax system with those of other provinces. What taxes are they talking about? Are they suggesting increases for at least 96 percent of Manitobans, as would occur if the B.C. system was utilized? Or is this just empty rhetoric? I really wonder. Or would they increase personal income tax in order to decrease corporate tax? I am wondering again. I don't know. They have never laid it on the line and never said. They are just not saying too much of anything frankly.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of good speeches on Bill 40 and I welcome them. I must admit I also found the comments by the Leader of the Opposition very interesting, but I am sorry to say that in my opinion, his comments on Bill 40 did not give Manitobans any idea of where the Progressive Conservative Party is heading for or where to take Manitoba; it's a campaign secret, it's the best kept secret I have ever run across. It's such a good secret I suspect they don't know the answer. Maybe their leader will share some of his information with his caucus. Perhaps the time will come. But I do know this: That what we've heard today from the Conservative Party, not only should not give people a feeling of confidence in that party, but should make every Manitoban very concerned about what's going to happen to the high level of programming available in Manitoba to the management of affairs in Manitoba, which brings about a situation where we have the lowest tax in just about the country, where our per capita expenditures are the second lowest in the country, and we've maintained that position consistently over eight years in office. That, gentlemen, is management.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL (NO. 86) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE ELECTION ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable House Leader.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 86.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 86 proposed by the Honourable First Minister. It's in your name, sir.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, with leave, I know the bill is in the Minister's name and I am prepared to speak on it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to speak on it as well.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister adjourned the debate, therefore he is entitled to proceed.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I thought and still believe that this is a relatively non-controversial measure. I remember when I was asked whether there were controversial measures that were going to be introduced, I said that none of the ones that I hadn't referred to specifically were controversial in my opinion. And I still think this is a non-controversial measure. I think that there are some relatively minor amendments to The Elections Act, that there is a stipulation that the amount that would be permitted under the Act for election expenses would move from a gross of 40 cents I think it is, to a gross of 80 cents. And given the fact that this measure was first enacted many years ago, it would seem that that is a figure that would probably be acceptable to the political parties that compete for election in the province. The Honourable Member for Morris had some rather critical comments to make about this type of a legislative attempt to define election expenses and I think that there are problems with this type of legislation. I think that it is being attempted at various places throughout the country with more or less success. I would deny, Mr. Speaker, that the government party, the New Democratic Party, should be singled out as a group that, as my honourable friend referred to, as a violation of the legislation. I think that the question as to the spirit of the legislation and how it affects election expenses is rather problematic and I will be dealing with that particular item in due course. But I would certainly suggest that the manner of party expenditure has changed drastically in all three political parties. If one wants to look at the amounts that have been spent by the Conservative Party in the last month — and I am not being critical of this at all — but I do think that political parties have tried to make sure that much of their expenditures wouldn't be dealt with by the Act and had therefore spent them before the issuance of the writ. I remember when the former Member for Wolseley was the Leader of the Liberal Party. Many many dollars of expenditures were obtained in the purchasing of billboards several months before the election. I am not suggesting that that's a violation of the expenditure legislation, but that that shows some of the difficulties associated with trying to limit election expenditures. And there is much in what the Honourable Member for Morris says that I would sympathize with, but I would not subscribe to his view that suddenly this party becomes the culprit with regard to election expenditures.

I was much more concerned, Mr. Speaker, and have a sharper difference of opinion, with what was said by the Member for Morris with regard to the operation of the election machinery in 1973 as

distinct from other years. I think, Mr. Speaker, that many members here, and there are some who are here much longer than I — the Member for Transcona, the Minister of Labour is not here at the moment, but the Member for Souris-Killarney certainly precedes me and so does the Member for Swan River, the Member for Portage la Prairie and several other members, St. Boniface — have had experience in election campaigns and the election machinery, Mr. Speaker, and the manner in which it is handled is, in my opinion, one of the best features of our democratic process because the election machinery, Mr. Speaker, is one which is substantially handled by the ordinary people of this province. By and large, those people who comprise the returning officers, the deputy returning officers, the people who do the scrutineering and the compiling of the election lists are, Mr. Speaker, for the most part, shall I say in the male chauvinist way, housewives, or shall I use the new term “domestic engineers.” They are students, they are in many cases — (Interjection)— Is “domestic engineers” worse than “housewives?” Well, I’ve seen it used so many times. What will I call them? Those people, and I won’t say of one sex or the other, who contribute to society by working in the home and raising children, or doing work that is essential to the home, and it could be male or female.

In any event — (Interjection)— What is it? House spouse. Mr. Speaker, I am going to stick with “housewife” or “domestic engineer.”

In any event, the people who run that machinery, whatever political party is in office, are generally working mothers who have that time available to them. They are students. They are in some cases retired people. They are in some cases people who are not engaged in full-time employment outside of their normal activities for one reason or the other. They are also people who have the time available because their employment permits them to have the time available.

But, of whatever vocation, they are, Mr. Speaker, the average citizen in our society and of whatever political party — there is no hesitation in acknowledging that the political party that happens to be in office would appoint people who are known to them for the returning officers — and this would happen if there was a Conservative Party in power or a Liberal Party in power or a New Democratic Party in power.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is one of the most progressive, one of the best features of our electoral system, that there is not a built-in state agency controlling the election machinery. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that by and large it has worked very well and by and large, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, it has worked equally well in 1973 to what it worked in previous years.

Now, the Member for Morris, and I much regret this, Mr. Speaker, because one talks about dividing the population into classes and class warfare. One of the worst features that I have observed with a New Democratic Party government in power — and this relates not only to treatment by the media which I make no critical comment of because, Mr. Speaker, I consider most of the established media to be political friends and political advocates of the parties whom we oppose — I therefore fully expect that their institutions would be used to propose their own views and not the views which they oppose. I really can’t argue with that. I consider that a part of the system and the media to be part of the system.

But it’s not only the media, Mr. Speaker, it is the general tenor of those people who have from time to time held power in this province as part of the old status quo economic system parties, whether it be the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, who are offended when people whom they regard as upstarts, as being involved in positions which previously they have reserved to themselves. Mr. Speaker, it is the utmost snobbery on the part of those people to suggest that when the New Democrats are in power, suddenly those whom they consider the unwashed and the people from the wrong side of the street and people who are not ordinary, either amongst the beautiful people in our society or if not amongst them, people who pay obeisance to the beautiful people, are suddenly found to be in positions of some prominence or positions of importance.

And it’s that kind of snobbery, Mr. Speaker, which causes people to look at the 1973 election and to suggest that there was something unusual about the election machinery in that year that did not occur when the beautiful people in our society held power and appointed their friends to conduct the election machinery. — (Interjection)— That’s right, Mr. Speaker, I say that that’s the kind of class warfare we get when it is suggested, yes, when it is suggested — and I didn’t start it — (Interjection)— Yes, and I am going to read to you from the beautiful people not the housewives, the students and the people who were in control and handled the election machinery in 1973, insulted them in every way possible because it was suggested that they were New Democrats and not from amongst the beautiful people. That’s class warfare. And that’s the kind of snobbery, Mr. Speaker, that results in — (Interjection)— No, it didn’t come from us. We never said, Mr. Speaker, we never said, in the by-election in which was involved the Member for Killarney, Edward Dow, and Charles MacEachen and Arthur Bengé, petitioners, and Arthur Gordon McKnight, respondent — we didn’t say that it’s because of a Conservative appointee to be the returning officer that there was a foul-up of the election machinery and that the people didn’t know what they were doing and this is what comes from appointing people who are stupid and who don’t know what they are doing to run an election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, to give an indication to the Honourable Member for Morris, that election problems and problems with the election machinery did not start in 1973, I have brought with me, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Abridgement, Volume 14, which deals with elections and which has a recording of cases in which the election machinery and in which the returning officers — to use the honourable member's terminology — fouled up, or at least analogous to his terminology, fouled up the election machinery.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let's see whether this type of conduct started in 1973. "Rejection of ballots - result of election affected. At an election under the Rural Municipality, a deputy returning officer neglected to initial some of the ballots cast and in consequence the returning officer rejected them. Held the election was invalid. Pierce versus Fitzsimmons, 1944, One-Wester(?) Weekly Report, Saskatchewan."

That's before 1973, under a Liberal Government.

"Voters adopting. Wrongful act of deputy returning officer. Where, however, a deputy returning officer put upon the ballots numbers corresponding to the numbers opposite the names of the voters on the printed list and where the voters used these ballots and returned them to the deputy returning officer. Held the voters had adopted the improper act of the officer and their votes must be disallowed."

That's before 1973. It's 1878.

"Certain ballots were marked by a deputy returning officer with the poll number book. Others in a different subdivision were marked with numbers selected at random. Held these marked with the poll numbers could be identified. They were rejected." 1878.

If that's too early for my honourable friends, 1905: "Where a deputy returning officer placed on the back of each ballot the number opposite the voter's name in the polls. Held such ballots were not to be counted since the numbers provided a means of identification."

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I tell my honourable friend, there are pages and pages of reported cases — reported cases — before 1973 in which deputy returning officers and the election machinery were totally found wanting as a result of the way in which they were conducted by the officers. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that in any of those years it was suddenly brought out that the party in power and the people by whom they were appointed were people who deserved to be insulted and deserved to be condemned on the basis of their jobs as deputy returning officer.

In the election in Thompson in 1968, the by-election in Thompson, and I was there because I was there at the recount, the deputy returning officer in one of the polls, Mr. Speaker, had put the number of the voter on each ballot that the voter had cast, so that each ballot could be identified with the number of the voter. And that was appointed by a Conservative. I, Mr. Speaker, would say nothing wrong about that particular deputy returning officer because what happened in that election, Mr. Speaker, happens in every single election that you can go back to.

What was the difference in 1973? Was it the election machinery? It wasn't the election machinery. Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened in 1973 was that there were many many more close elections; that there were three elections — and this is almost a mathematical impossibility, but nevertheless it occurred — in 1973, I believe there were three elections where at one time or another, there was a tie vote as between the candidates: in the Constituency of Crescentwood, in the Constituency of Wolseley, and in the Constituency of St. Boniface. At one time or another, there was a tie vote that had to be broken as between the two candidates. It is unique in elections that there ever be a tie vote. In that particular election, there were three. Mr. Speaker, there were other elections where the margin was 50 votes or 75 votes.

What happens in 1973 is what happens whenever there is a close election. Whenever there is a close election, the organizations immediately go back and find out what happened in that election that can be brought to the attention of a judge in case it has to be controverted. That's why, Mr. Speaker, there was so much knowledge of difficulties that occurred within the election. But I tell the Honourable Member for Morris that in his constituency the same type of thing happened. In my constituency the same type of thing happened. In the Member for Transcona's constituency, the same type of thing happened. The only different was that the margins were so great that nobody would go back and try to find some irregularities so that the election could be dealt with in that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, I resent very much, because it has not happened before and I regard it as that kind of thing which creates the so-called class conflict which the Member for Souris-Killarney refers to. It's not us who did this thing but it was done in an insidious way by the newspapers, by Members of the Opposition, by other "beautiful" people in our society who resented the fact that the deputy returning officers, ordinary people, were being appointed by the New Democratic Party as against by the Liberals and Conservatives, and therefore they went on an attack against the returning officers.

Now, what is the usual case with regard to how returning officers are treated? I say, Mr. Speaker, that usually society congratulates and thanks the returning officers and forgives them for their mistakes and tries to do everything to indicate that they did a good job and that even if there was a mistake, it is not something which should be held against them because they were serving society in

a very useful function and in a very positive way.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is how returning officers were treated before 1973. And I'll show you the difference and it's going to be clear from the record the kind of attitude that I am talking about which I say is the worst feature of some of the criticism that we run up against and some of the strongest reasons why people will fight to continue this government in power. In 1966, there was an election and some months later there was a Controverted Elections Act filed by a Mr. MacEachen and a Mr. Benge against Edward Dow whom we sat with, and I believe was the member at that time for Turtle Mountain. There was a controverted election, Mr. Speaker, and this is what came before Messrs. Justices Nitikman and Wilson, and they dealt with what had happened and then they said, "The election is declared void. This disposes of the issues before us except that we desire again to emphasize our finding that while the respondent McKnight," and the respondent McKnight, for your information was the returning officer, "was guilty of 'corrupt practices' he did not intend to commit any breach of The Election Act although he was familiar with its provisions. We are convinced that he was motivated by an honest desire to correct what he believed to be an unfortunate oversight on the part of the election enumerators and did not intentionally violate the law."

Mr. Speaker, there was so much forgiveness of Mr. McKnight at that time, and his services to the community were so highly regarded even though he committed these "corrupt practices" and irregularities, his services to the community were so highly regarded by both the Liberal and Conservative Parties who were the activists in that election, that they both acknowledged that he was a great guy, he had done nothing wrong and that he was a real good working citizen of society. He was so great, Mr. Speaker, that when our party was considering who we should get as a candidate in the by-election which was to follow, I suggested that our candidate should be McKnight because he is so highly regarded by everybody as being . . . —(Interjection)— I don't remember exactly correctly, I don't remember whether we did have a candidate in the by-election. It's probable that we did.

But in any event, I said that McKnight would be the ideal candidate because he was so highly regarded despite the fact that he was engaged in "corrupt practices" according to the Controverted Elections Act, and had fouled up the election so badly that they had to controvert the election and have it all over again. Now, Mr. Speaker, that's not a crime of Mr. McKnight's and interestingly enough, here's what they also said: "We repeat what has already been said that there is no suggestion of any corrupt or irregular practice on the part of the respondent Dow," that's the member whom we sat with, "No stigma attaches to his name. With concurrence of all parties, there will be no costs." That means nobody was charged any costs of the proceedings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have another corrupt practices case in which the Member for St. Boniface was involved. This is Mr. Marion who sat with us for several sessions as a member of the Liberal group. "We repeat what has already been said, that no allegations were made and there is no suggestion of any corrupt or irregular practices or non-compliance with the Act on the part of the respondent Marion. No stigma attaches to his name." The identical words are used. "No stigma attaches to his name," and apparently in that particular case, Mr. Speaker, after the evidence came in, they agree that it was going to be controverted and they agreed that there would also be no costs. It is also indicated by the court, "This disposes of the issue before us, except to record our finding that there was no intent on the part of the respondent Desaulniers to commit any corrupt practices or mistake in the performance of his duties as returning officer, and no blame can attach to him in that sense." So that was also said, and particularly with regard to Mr. Marion who was to run in the next election, "No stigma attaches to his name."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a different petition here. This one is with regard to Patterson, a the member who sat in seat representing Crescentwood.

In this particular case, Mr. Speaker, I have read both the Queen's Bench judgment and the Court of Appeal judgment, in which, Mr. Speaker, it is agreed that all of the faults are with the returning officer, that is alleged to have made a mistake and the returning officer in that case did what numerous judges have held to be the right thing to do in certain ballot studies counted, but which the courts disagreed with in this case. Interesting enough, this is the way the judgment ends, and I have looked through it, "Petitioner will have his costs, subject to an agreement of all parties exempting respondent Richards from costs," so that the returning officer who is alleged to have done the bad thing has no cost and Patterson is ordered to pay the costs, apparently because he got elected, because in his respect, what was done was exactly what was done as against Pollard. It was done to both candidates, but Patterson is ordered to pay the costs, Mr. Speaker, and I have looked through this entire judgment and I cannot find the words, "No stigma attaches to his name." For some reason, Mr. Speaker, that is left out of the Patterson judgment, "No stigma attaches to his name." — (Interjection)— Pardon me?

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no allegation against Patterson. No allegation against Patterson, just the respondent. Nothing. Nobody suggests that Mr. Patterson did something wrong. The difference in the case is that, with regard to Patterson, they would not say, "No stigma attaches to his name."

That's the difference. That's the only difference. That's right. That's the only difference, whereas when the controvert was reported with regard . . . and costs are awarded against Patterson. The returning officer, who is an officer of the Crown, is the one that apparently made the mistake. Costs are awarded against Patterson in the Court of Queen's Bench and then when he went to appeal the decision — and I guess that was the penalty for appealing — costs are awarded . . . against Patterson. And the words which were used so faithfully and identically in the Dow judgment, "No stigma attaches to his name," in the Marion judgment, "No stigma attaches to his name," in the Patterson judgment you can look right through it and you will not find a similar statement, nor will you find similar statements, Mr. Speaker, about what the returning officers did.

Mr. Speaker, I was involved in the court action respecting one of those cases. I heard a lot of things being said about the returning officer. I know that the returning officer operates in an atmosphere where all the results are brought in in one night, that he is getting it from every single person and he is tallying the votes and he must make on-the-spot decisions, and it is a wonder that they do it as well as they do.

In some of these cases the courts were very critical of the returning officer. I saw, Mr. Speaker, or I was involved in one of the court cases, and after sitting there with highly professional staff and having all the time to reason it out and go out and reserve judgment and have people advising them, highly paid counsel advising one side and the other side, that the courts came back and, in my opinion, did a worse job than the returning officer, who did it all at that particular time. And in one case, Mr. Speaker, the court in the middle of a judgment, after having had counsel on both sides advising, having all the time to look and relook at and examine in the greatest detail not 7,000 ballots but a few disputed ballots, that they, in the course of a judgment, were going to make a mistake and find for the wrong candidate and had to be corrected in the middle of delivering a judgment. And they found fault with what the returning officers did.

I heard the former Member for Wolseley make the following astonishing statement with regard to a returning officer, that his election is not going to be upset, because if it is the returning officer who made the mistake, then surely the judges are not going to find for the party whose own returning officer made the mistake. That is the statement of a man who is supposed to be learned in the law, that the returning officer's mistake would be held against any candidate of any political party because it was our returning officer. That was his position, that suddenly a candidate would be affected by — (Interjection)—

Well, Mr. Speaker, this debate is an old one. I am participating in it because I believe that those people have been maligned. They are good people, I don't care what political party they belong to. They did a good job, that there will be mistakes made no matter which returning officers are appointed, and that when returning officers are appointed by the New Democratic Party, I don't care whether it is the Member for Morris, I don't care whether it is the judges over across the bench, I don't care whether it is the media, and they insult these people because they happen to be appointed by New Democrats, then I am going to get up and defend them. And I am going to say that that is the kind of classic snobbery that we get from the economic status quo, beautiful people, that makes people want to support somebody who is not going to engage in that type of junk. And that's what it was, Mr. Speaker. That's what it was, because these returning officers did a good job.

I suggest to you that in any future election, as it has been in the past, and I can go through chapter and verse in every single election, the election when the Member for Kildonan was elected before I was in this House, it was a Mr. Reid, Tony Reid, who was elected and the judges threw him out because there were two X's beside his name, which had been counted by many judges in many other cases, and I can quote chapter and verse. And what the instructions to the voter were, the instructions to the voter were as follows, and I am going to paraphrase because I can't get it exactly: Place an X in the square beside the candidate's and in the space after his name. And some people read that and put two X's in it because there was an "and" there which was not an additive "and," it was a descriptive "and." But some people put in two ballots and the judges through it out and the returning officer left it in. I say the returning officer made a more sensible decision than the judges, and as has been held in many many cases.

Mr. Speaker, in another case where they criticized the returning officer, the returning officer — and I am not saying that the judges in this case criticized the returning officer except that they did so generally on many occasions from the bench — what happened was that the returning officer refused to accept four ballots which were mailed in — this was a new mail-in system and they weren't exactly as the legislation required. And we went to court and we argued it out, and we argued, Mr. Speaker, that in a recount you do not decide whether a ballot should have been received or not, you count what has been counted. The question as to whether a ballot should have been received or not is one for a controvert, not for a recount. In other words I am not talking about a ballot that has been opened. These are ballots which were enveloped, they were sealed, and the returning officer said that they were not properly made out therefore he didn't take them. That a recount counts only what was counted and that if it was to be upiat made this unusual decision. They said a recount is to count only

what is already there. What has not been counted cannot be recounted. So they didn't count those ballots at the county court stage, but at the Court of Appeals stage, Mr. MacKay sent on the Manitoba Court of Appeals decision to the county court of British Columbia which was a decision which said that in a recount, you do not only recount, but you count what has not previously been in the ballot box, and they did count them the second time, nevertheless it didn't change the results of the election.

But one should not complain about the returning officer because he did what a county court in British Columbia found made sense, and which could be argued on behalf of many people. And there are many things that are done wrong. And if my honourable friend wishes me to read the book of what Liberal and Conservative-appointed returning officers did prior to 1973, I will, if, Mr. Speaker, not be able to convince him, convince a reasonably-minded person willing to listen that that kind of thing happens everywhere. It happens everywhere in the country. It is one of the problems with an electoral system, where the machinery . . . where you depend upon the average public for the machinery, but I have found, Mr. Speaker, that despite the non-sophistication of the average public, that their common-sense decisions are good or better than the judges. Good or better than people who have been trained and paid and given all the opportunity they want to to make a decision. They will make mistakes. Certainly they will make mistakes. But it is not fair to them to say that in 1973 this group of people, who on our behalf, on all our behalfs, conducted the election, were such that should be insulted and disparaged rather than thanked and congratulated and our respect shown to them, regardless of the mistakes that they have made.

It is that aspect, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friend's remarks which annoyed me, because I know the people and I know them whether they are Liberals or Conservatives, and I know that they can make mistakes whether they are Liberals or Conservatives, and we can make mistakes. But basically they did the kind of job that had to be done. They did it well. They made mistakes, but we should not be ones who are insulting them because things occurred which can occur and have occurred from time immemorial, from the time that democratic elections have been held in this fashion, that they should not be insulted.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the election expenses because my honourable friend raised it. I have indicated that I consider the legislation to be a problem. I consider the efforts to be well-intentioned. I know it is being done across the country with various degrees of success and this government introduced it, and I believe it was supported by all political parties, that it was not voted against. But nevertheless there still exist differences of opinion as to the efficacy. My problem is not merely the fact that there are so many ways that a party can find of spending money as to make the efficacy of that which is spent between writs on particular items as not being very effective. I would certainly agree with the Member for Morris that that is a problem. At the same time I have to yield to those who feel that this is at least an expression of intention and does have some effect.

I am much more worried about the legislation, because to make it effective, you have to do terrible things. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the 80 cents or the 65 cents is not the most serious problem, because what will happen is that people will see that that doesn't work and then they will try to do other things. Once it is determined that a party can spend 65 cents, but the Group for Good Government can come in and spend whatever they want, and the Chamber of Commerce could come in and spend whatever they want, and the Manitoba Federation of Labour could come in and buy a full-page ad in the newspapers and spend whatever they want — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that they are fine organizations, and I say that — (Interjection) —

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** They can spend whatever they want. They have no candidates in the election. What scares the hell out of me is that all three political parties, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party, the organizations made representations to The Law Reform Commission saying that nobody else should be permitted to spend money.

See where we are going: A political party can't spend money. Now an organization can't pursue a position in favour of its party because that leaves the barn door open and permits other expenditures. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, this is where we are getting to. It would then prevent me, I suppose, from having a party in support of a candidate and spending money which would not be spent by a political party. And after all that is attempted to be done, and I say that it would be a form of thought control and speech control which is far more dangerous than the having of money to win elections, it is the greatest fallacy of political parties that money wins elections. In 1969 we spent virtually nothing and we did very well. In 1973 we spent a lot more money and we did not do as well as we did in 1969 in comparison to what had been — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asked me the question, "Why have the restriction?"

I have yielded to him the problem with it. I have indicated the limits that we have gone to, and that there are people who feel this way, but I say that there are problems and the worst problems are not associated with these expenditures. — the worst problems are trying to make to make them effective.

Because if you're trying to make them effective, Mr. Speaker . . . Let us assume that they could be effective, that the only people who could spend money during a political campaign were the political parties. We have to determine who is the political party and where do they register and where do they have to prove *bona-fide*, etc. in which case I am sure that a lot of parties would have to go to somebody which . . . —(Interjection)— You know if I ever go to somebody to lay the blessing on them, that if you did that and were able to exclude all the individual expenditures and all group expenditures, who is going to stop the Winnipeg Free Press, the Winnipeg Tribune, every day, publishing a full newspaper which has the particular view which I may disagree with, and which in effect allows for \$10,000 worth of publicity on its front page every day, Mr. Speaker, and which then I am prohibited from buying advertising to try and come back. That's the worst feature of it. The worst feature, Mr. Speaker, of what the Honourable Member for Morris —(Interjection)— what you would have to do is to say that during an election, the newspaper can't publish and that the only publications that will be permitted are those that are blessed by somebody. —(Interjections)— And to me, it will be just as — and I make no equivocation — just as horrendous if it was the New Democrats who blessed it or the Conservatives who blessed it. I don't want a blessing from anybody. And that's the kind of thing that this type of election expense legislation — I'll conclude my remarks in a moment, Mr. Speaker — that this type of election legislation expenses can go to if it is not limited and as relatively ineffective as the Member for Morris indicates. His decision, his remedy, would be to eliminate it altogether.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to register opposition to that. I am saying that for better or for worse, the political parties in this province, all of them, have elected for some type of limitations. I am not a great fan of it and I would not want to extend it and I want to indicate to honourable members that the legislation in its present form, although it permits all kinds of expenditures which are not controlled by the Act, is far better legislation than if you tried try to follow it through and the kind of controls that would be necessary to make it "effective." It would be effective, all right, effective in destroying what we know and what we regard and respect as the best features of our democratic system.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** By leave because the member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Morris.

**MR. JORGENSON:** If the House Leader could assure the House that he will make sure that all of the Returning Officers who will be fulfilling those positions during the next election, will be appointed somewhat in advanced at the calling of the election so that they will at least have an opportunity to do the job that they're expected to do.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, we, like every previous government, will try to do our best in this connection. I can remember in 1968, there were some very late appointments of Returning Officers and there were some problems. I believe that most of the returning officers are now appointed and that they are now getting now —(Interjection)— Get ready! . . . that they are now in the process of receiving instructions and —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen any instructions, I haven't seen the instructions. I regard the Chief Electoral Officer of the province as somebody that I don't talk to about elections. I talk to him about other things.

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

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I was going to arise to debate the question of election reform. After listening to the Minister of Mines, I think that we are really debating who is on the social register. He confused me a great deal, Mr. Speaker, with all his preoccupation with the beautiful people. I don't know whether his obsession was because he wasn't chosen as one of the beautiful people in the poll done by the Winnipeg Eye Magazine magazine last week. In fact there's maybe even more out of joint because a city councillor has made the grade and no member of this House was able to gain those exalted ranks, or whether in fact he just labours under a great deal of delusion as to the those who are active and involved in other parties. I think the Minister tends to suffer if anybody in this House does, from a high degree of class myopia because he seems to feel that the students and the workers and the postmen and the bakers are on his side and somehow in the Liberal and Conservative Party, they are a group of cocktail, swinging sort of five o'clock swingers from the Winnipeg Inn, and that the only time that all the returning officers ever appointed by Liberals or Conservatives, were drawn from the Hollow Mug or from the Town and Country Lounge. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, frankly, a little silly.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, it is a point of privilege and it is a little silly. I said that no matter which party was in power, the returning officers are appointed from amongst the ordinary, average citizens, of students, housewives, etc. I said that each party appoints these people and that when we appoint them, they should not be insulted. That's what I said. And we never insult them when you appoint

them.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister frankly if that was exactly what he said, then we will have a chance to check Hansard. The impression that he left was somehow that what the whole cause — and I don't know what brought this on — was because somehow it was the beautiful people who were resenting the fact that now the New Democrats were running the ballot boxes. And I frankly think, Mr. Speaker, that's nonsense, sheer, unadulterated, silly nonsense coming from the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I think, Mr. Speaker, we don't know who said it. I don't know where he is getting his funds from. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** You see, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that it is really putting out a very serious charge which the Minister is usually responsible for of using *ad hominem* arguments to deal with what should be dealt with on their substance. And the fact that to throw in the red herring or to throw in the red beautiful people and whatever particular subterfuge he was trying to introduce, I think has nothing to do with this bill.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this bill is an embarrassment. It is an embarrassment to government, it's an embarrassment to all members of this House, that so very little has been done to bring The Election Act of this province up to date to reform its inconsistencies to deal with the problems that have previously been identified. It has nothing to do with social class, it has nothing to do with beautiful people. It's simply a matter that for four years, after having all parties identified serious inequities and problems in the operation of elections, this government has come up with the kind of paltry, putrid little document that is presented before us. Talk about great minds producing sort of little mole hills. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything wrong with this government, it is not that there's a problem of discussion between the beautiful people and the workers of the New Democratic Party. It's just that the government has obviously and clearly wants us to believe or think or to react or to understand. And they have no excuses, Mr. Speaker.

Four years ago in this House, a resolution was passed outlining a series of problems dealing with election reform. It was accepted by the Attorney-General on the basis that it be referred to the Law Reform Commission because in the 1973 election, a number of problems had been identified. Four years later what we've come up with — if you look at that Act — addresses none of the problems that were contained in that resolution or in that debate, four years. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, the reason why that resolution was passed was because at that time and at the same time, even now, there's a great deal of public skepticism about the conduct of elections, whether it's responsible for Manitoba or not. Maybe we are reaping the whirlwind of the corrupt practices that we saw in the Watergate affairs in the United States or whatever. The fact of the matter is that there is a general public mood of concern about the way elections are conducted. And this government has done nothing whatsoever in any way to correct it. —(Interjection)— That is not my opinion; it is an opinion that can be gathered by anyone that you want to talk to. And that's the problem, this government no longer talks to people to find out what they think. They simply consult within their own internal Chambers. They've become so wound in into their own sort of internecines or kind of communication that they no longer recognize that there is a world out there where people have concerns.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that going back to the resolution that was introduced in 1974, when we introduced some of the concerns that were introduced at that time, and see what corrections have been offered in this bill. One of the major problems that we identified last time was that in the 1973 election there was double the number of spoiled ballots that there was in 1969. Close to 1,000 more ballots were spoiled in that one election. Now, that has nothing to do with who was the returning officers. It has to do in large part with the changing conditions that we are going through. I can think of my own particular constituency where there is a much higher degree of mobility amongst people. People change their residence much faster than they did ten or fifteen years ago. They move around an awful lot more. They change their location. They find, therefore, that they have far less sort of permanency in those areas and therefore far less ability to get information. So that when we argue we argue for things like having a permanent advance poll somewhere, in certain locations in the city —(Interjection)— No . . . I've already been interrupted enough, I think, and I only have a few moments left. I'll be prepared to answer questions when I am finished speaking.

We argued at that time for some system of a permanent advance poll so that people would be able to vote, because many people in this day and age travel a lot. It's a way of life in 1977. When having the advance poll held, as it was in my constituency, a week before the election, meant that many people were disenfranchised simply because other requirements forced them elsewhere and they didn't have a chance to vote.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not a big renovation but there is nothing in this bill to deal with that problem. We identified the problem in 1974. We made representations to the Law Reform Commission on those grounds. There is nothing in this bill that says anything about that problem.

The same thing is true, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the problem of the returning system itself. We suggested at that time that there be a degree of permanency — a permanent voter's list to be looked at. That would be one way to continually renew a voter's list rather than following enumeration.

Let me explain to you, Mr. Speaker, what happens in my own constituency, again, which is a good example as a downtown riding. Most people work from nine to five. When do the enumerators go out? From nine to five. Many of them will simply not go out in the evenings; the good ones will go back the odd time. I've had cases where enumerators have gone back, as they are required to, one, two or three times during the daytime. And yet I would suggest that 70 or 80 percent of my riding is not home during the daytime. They are usually working or at school or somewhere else. Now, we catch all of them but there's an awful lot of people missed from the voters' list simply by the way that we enumerate. We pointed out that problem. We said that there are solutions to it. Where are the solutions in this bill, Mr. Speaker? They are not to be found. Now, that's not something to do with the "beautiful people" or anything else. The Minister of Mines and Resources misses the point that there are problems in the election system and that they should be corrected. We are all simply saying that the world does change and the election system should change along with it and those changes should accommodate the fact that if there is one person, one single voter in the Province of Manitoba that is disenfranchised for reasons of the inadequacy of The Election Act, then, Mr. Speaker, we in this House and the government are responsible for that and bears a very heavy load. Because no one should be disenfranchised for reason of an inadequacy in the machinery. There should be no disenfranchisements. Yet, Mr. Speaker, problems that were identified four years ago are going to be, because conditions have not been changes; the laws have not been changed and yet the same problems haven't gone away.

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't make sense. I don't know what this government was thinking about when they brought this bill in. I don't know if they put their mind into neutral; if they had forgotten that a resolution outlining these things in a debate had been gone through in 1974; that representations have been made to the Law Reform Commission. The reason is, of course, that I don't think that they really bothered to concern themselves much anymore with the procedures of a democratic system. What the heck, you're in power, it seemed to work before, why bother making any big changes? Do the minimal; do what you have to; get along with what's easy, but don't bother to apply yourself. And so as a result, this government, with this bill, unless we can get some changes in Committee — and we'll be moving changes — is going to be responsible for the disenfranchisement, I would suggest, of thousands of Manitobans simply because they have not been prepared to bring The Election Act up to modern-day standards.

Now, that is the problem with this bill. —(Interjection)— No, what we heard today was a defence that had nothing to do with The Election Act, it was an attack upon the judiciary, the same old story the Minister of Mines and Resources has been rolling out for the last how many years, that the problem with Manitoba is its judges, that if we could only, I guess, get to the point where either the New Democratic Party would appoint the judges — and God knows that day will never come, I hope — because look at the mess they've made of that; or that we set up tribunals where they can have their own appointees.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that you get very far by these *ad hominem* arguments. I think that that is really —(Interjection)— Well, I'm not using, I'm simply repeating what the Minister of Mines and Resources had to say. I didn't put the words in his mouth. He is fully responsible for what he says himself. I am simply saying that it's about time this government got serious about its job and started looking at problems as they exist rather than relying upon old prejudices to rationalize its own inactivity. —(Interjection)— That's right, it's always someone else that's at fault.

But there is a clear-cut case where reform was required, where changes should have been made. The chance was there; you had four years to do it and nothing has been done to bring it up to standard. There is no excuse for that.

Let's talk for a minute, Mr. Speaker, about the question of election financing. The point that has been raised by the Member for Morris about election expense ceilings, I think, is only half the argument. The other half of the argument we presented in our resolution in 1974 had to do with the funding of elections because one of the real concerns that I receive from my electors is the concern about who pays for elections. Who is putting the money into elections, because obviously there is a connection between those who pay and those who call the tune? And one of the recommendations, proposals that we made back in 1974 was that we take a look at some form of public funding of elections, that we allow for tax write-offs. It could have been introduced without a great deal of trouble so that people could support the party of their choice similar to the kind of system that is now in place in the Federal system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard members opposite say, "We can't adopt that system," and yet the hypocrisy of this government, the hypocrisy of the New Democratic Party where they are prepared to use the Federal Election Expenses Act to raise money for their own provincial activities. I know for a fact, Mr. Speaker, that last year or the year before, the Minister of Public Works and the Premier attended swishy little lunches for the beautiful people, the engineers and the architects invited for \$100 dinners. They invited the beautiful people for \$100 dinners sponsored by the New Democratic Party with a write-off under the Federal Election Expenses Act. Now, we didn't say that there weren't

any Federal New Democrats at those dinners; there was the Premier and the Minister of Public Works, they were entertaining the beautiful people with their speeches at that time and using the Federal Election Expenses Act to write the thing off for all those beautiful people who were contributing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I would suggest, you know, that there seems to be a certain inconsistency, to say the least, in that particular posture, that if the Election Expenses Act is good for raising money for the provincial party, then why can't we have our own? Why can't we legitimize that kind of fund raising? Why shouldn't we have our own system to do it? Why should we borrow upon the Federal's?

Now, I'm not saying that they are the only ones that are doing it because the other parties, including our own, are also employing the same tactic but we're not being self-righteous about it like friends opposite. We don't go around sort of saying, "Well, we rely upon the people." I know the people they are relying upon; they are relying upon those people who think that they should be going to a dinner because the Minister of Public Works and the Minister responsible for MHRC are inviting them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that . . . well, I see the Member for St. Matthews shaking his head. I'd ask him if you like; I could show him in fact probably the invitation list, because it came to me by some route, as to who went to those old dinners in the Mall Hotel and other places. They were there. So let's not be self-righteous about it. Let's admit that there should be a proper system by which people donate to political parties of their choice and get the same kind of concession that we do for submitting to the Winnipeg Ballet or the United Way. I think that if a democratic system is important enough it should be supported. And by the way, the Election Expenses Act, Mr. Speaker, the Federal one, is having the effect that it was supposed to have because what they are finding out is that the donations are coming in far more frequently from those ordinary people, those \$100 givers, and that the corporations are giving far less now than they gave before. It's having a desired effect.

I want to know, Mr. Speaker, why we are not doing that in the Province of Manitoba? They had four years to bring it into effect. They had the chance to do it and they fumbled it. They fumbled it for lack of attention and for lack of concern. —(Interjection)— Why? What's the possible excuse? You know, what can they say that . —(Interjection)— Oh, we had other priorities. Yes. Now that's a good question, Mr. Speaker. I would say the first priority of any group of elected people is to ensure for the proper, effective, democratic functioning of the election system. I don't think there is any more important priority because that goes to the roots of our very system, and if the Member for Ste. Rose thinks that there are other priorities more important than making sure that people aren't disenfranchised, that there are problems in the funding of elections, then, Mr. Speaker, he is sadly off base.

**A MEMBER:** We know that.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Because I think the fact of the matter is that we again must go back to basic principles, and that is that from our party, first and foremost, we think that the most important question is how the democratic system functions. How adequate is it? How good is it? That's the first task. Then you can start worrying about the others once you're sure it's in shape. But I don't think you put it down on the list, you don't put it No. 17 or No. 98, which this government obviously has done.

So, Mr. Speaker, we would suggest that there is still room for a far more serious number of both specific changes in The Election Act dealing with the question of the introduction of advanced polls, mail imbalance, enumeration, the operation of the Returning Officer, the training of such, the kind of system that is worked out to ensure against controvert elections, all those things that could have been reported upon by the Law Reform Commission much sooner if they had been given the priority and we could have been enacting legislation on.

And secondly, and just as importantly we feel, that there is a requirement to provide for a different system of funding of elections to eliminate the big high rollers who can dominate the elections through the power of the purse.

The Minister of Mines and Resources is wrong. The elections are affected by money, unfortunately. —(Interjection)— It may not be the only reason why people get elected but it has an awful lot to do with it. We feel, for example, that the ability of those of economic power to affect the political system, that the concentration of that power is something that should be checked and balanced. I think that there should be alternatives provided and that we should give the kind of opportunity for the ordinary citizen to support a political party and not rely upon the big downtown insurance companies or professional Portage and Main law offices, whoever are footing the bills in this day and age.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is the way the system is still going to persist in Manitoba because we don't have a proper Election Expenses Act in place, that we're still going to be relying upon the class warfare that the Minister was so concerned about. It has nothing to do with the returning officers. The class that we are more concerned about is the disadvantages in terms of who has economic power and who can pay the piper to call the tune. That's a much more important concern when it comes to elections, and there's nothing in this Act to rewrite or redress that imbalance and

therefore, that the system is not going to function as well as it should.

I'd also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that something else should be done, and it may not be in the way of changes to The Election Act, but I would suggest that one of the other problems that I discovered, talking to people about what happened in the election, is that a lot of them just don't know what their rights and obligations are; that in order to determine exactly who can vote — let me give you a case in point. We still have an anachronism, I believe, in our Election Act. We still allow "British subjects" to be eligible to vote. Now, Mr. Speaker, who is a British subject any longer?

**A MEMBER:** Idi Amin.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** That's right. Is Idi Amin a British subject still? He's a Member of the Commonwealth. I presume that those who are still under that orbit of the Mother Queen or whatever we now call it, are considered in the colloquialism of being British subjects. Well, when someone says to me, and I have a large number of recent immigrants in my riding, — someone comes from Guiana, are they a British subject? Someone from Trinidad a British subject? Do you have to be from Scotland, England, Wales to be a British subject? Well there's some confusion about that, Mr. Speaker. I think it's about time we cleared up some of those anachronisms because when people read The Election Act or someone tells them they say, "Well, I consider myself a British subject because I come from one of the British Colonies," — they're still colonies if they still have them, or recent protectorates or whatever they ought to be. The British still have a few of those hanging around the world.

But there are a number of problems in relation to exactly what are the rights of people in terms of mail imbalance. We suggested in our resolution that it would be very useful that every elector receive proper information about the election, that they receive in the mail a basic setup of who is eligible to vote, what are the residency requirements, what are the times and dates of polls, advance polls, and mail-in ballots, so the people would know, that we could eliminate a great deal of the present confusion that always exists around election time simply by giving sufficient information. But again that doesn't seem to be of much interest or of much concern.

Again the problem is that the election machinery — — the Minister argued against some form of permanent election machinery — well we think that there should be some form of more permanent, not necessarily full-time, but more permanent machinery that would be able to undertake the appointment of election officers, returning officers much further in advance. There's no reason why they couldn't have been appointed two or three years ago, as the Federal Government does. It appoints officers years in advance and subjects them to — every summer they go for training and retraining — every summer to make sure that they fully know The Election Act. At the same time it also means that people who want to be enumerators . . . I see no reason why it is disparaging to New Democrats why we shouldn't suggest that if people would like to be enumerators, if they would like to serve their community by being an enumerator, why they couldn't apply for the job; and that people who are on retirement, senior citizens, who would like to make a little bit of extra money, have a little extra time, that would be available for that kind of service, why they couldn't make application, why they couldn't be election officers. That takes nothing away from ordinary people operating, they'd be the same ordinary people but there wouldn't be a mad rush the day the election is called to find out who is a loyal supporter to put them on as enumerators.

So again, Mr. Speaker, it comes down to the fact, I don't think we've thought the problem through very effectively. We haven't looked at the kinds of ways that we could improve the system to bring it up to a contemporary modern-day standard and to eliminate any problems that might be employed. And there's nothing to say that the people operating the machinery are at fault, but we are saying that The Election Act, as it is presently constructed, has required an awful lot more examination than has been given it.

So, Mr. Speaker, our position on this bill is that it is embarrassing for all but perhaps more than being embarrassing it is going to be a serious impediment to several thousand Manitobans being able to secure their full election rights simply because the machinery doesn't work and keep up with conditions. That is the problem with this Act, that it does need correction, and it will also . . . because it has nothing to do with the question of public financing of elections it will not deal in any adequate way with the ability to redirect the balances and correct a lot of the inequities when it comes to how do you fund elections and who pays the bill.

So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is our intention when we get an opportunity and have the time, to try at least to move amendments to change some of the proportions of the bill to at least make some improvements through them.

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

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member indicated he would accept a question at the end of his remarks. The question has to do with the statement he made that more than 1,000 ballots were spoiled in the last election. Is he aware that a spoiled ballot may be exchanged for a valid one by a voter?

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

**Wednesday, June 8, 1977**

---

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware of that but I am also aware that when the ballot boxes were opened that was the end result and that many people simply, for reasons of not knowing, really were not aware of how they should be using their ballots

**MR. WALDING:** Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member aware that a spoiled ballot does not go into a ballot box?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.