



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 92B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 21 JUNE, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 21 June, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: Order please. Would the Acting Government House Leader please indicate the next item of business?

The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bills 4 and 5, and I believe the Clerk has a list of the other ones that would be called subsequent to that?

THIRD READING

BILL NO. 4 - THE MANITOBA OIL AND GAS CORPORATION ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the third reading of Bill No. 4, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that with respect to this bill, of course, we have made the points that we wished to make concerning the general thrust of the bill, but there was one item, which I had raised both in second reading and again during committee, having to do with the provision for payment of extra remuneration to a Minister who might serve on the board of this corporation. I objected to that at the time that I saw it in the bill. We raised the issue in committee in the hopes that the Minister would delete it at that time.

He pointed out instead that it was a provision which existed in some other legislation dealing with Crown corporations, and preferred to review the matter over time and decide whether or not to remove it. I don't think that is an especially satisfactory way to proceed, Mr. Speaker.

If the government has no intention to make use of that provision, then of course I think that the government should simply delete the section from the bill. But it's not my intention to try and move an amendment and have it deleted at this stage, but I would have preferred to have seen that provision taken from the bill. I certainly would hope that we would not see a Minister introducing or appointing a member of the Executive Council to that board and drawing extra remuneration by dint of being appointed to that board. It also, of course, makes provision for another member of their caucus to be appointed. I have no particular difficulty with that concept, but it's one more means by which backbenchers can be given some additional remuneration as well.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, we naturally don't think this bill is the right thrust to go and we are opposed to it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, just to close debate on this bill, I would like to put on the record that I certainly will review this matter . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Just so that the honourable member is not under any misapprehension, there is no closing of debate by the Honourable Minister at third reading.

HON. W. PARASIUK: It would be my intention, as I have stated, to review this clause which is a clause that appears in The Manitoba Telephone System Act, The Manitoba Hydro Act. I certainly intend to review it over the summer, determine whether in fact it shouldn't be taken out of all of the bills or at least modified so that if a member of the Executive Council was appointed to any of these boards, which hasn't happened in Manitoba, but that option still exists, that if that was the case the member of the Executive Council will certainly draw no extra remuneration apart from that remuneration that he or she draws as a member of Executive Council and that certainly is a matter of policy, but we could clarify that with the legislation while leaving open the option, which still is a matter of policy as to whether or not a member of the Executive Council should or should not sit on the board.

There have been instances where members of Executive Council, indeed, have actually sat on the board of a Crown corporation. One of these was Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. So that option may exist, but we'll certainly look at this over the course of the summer and possibly bring in an amendment through The Statute Law Amendment Act next year.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The question before the House is the third reading on the proposed motion of Bill No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? On division? On division.

The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest that perhaps if you proceeded to call Bill 48 and later we could go back and deal with Bill No. 5, if that's satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are amenable to that suggestion, so if we could proceed with 48, then we could get back to - was it 48 or was it 55 that would be called at this particular time? — (Interjection) — Okay, we can go with 48. I gather that Mr. Driedger was holding 55 or the Member for Emerson was holding 55. If someone's here to speak on 48, well, then we'll proceed with 48.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

BILL NO. 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 48, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, obviously the position of the Progressive Conservative Party with respect to Bill 48 is that we are absolutely opposed to its passage. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which the Attorney-General indicated would, if it had been in effect in the 1981 election year, have cost the taxpayers of Manitoba \$1.4 million. It is likely that in the next election whenever that is called, it will cost the taxpayers at least \$200,000 or \$300,000 more than it would have in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this bill. It is another burden on the taxpayers of Manitoba who are already overburdened under this government. This is a government that has brought in record deficits in the Province of Manitoba; it has destroyed the credit rating of the Province of Manitoba, under this government, there is record unemployment and record bankruptcies. We find today, Mr. Speaker, that the Consumer Price Index increase in the City of Winnipeg is the largest of all Canadian cities. This is the legacy that this NDP Government is leaving to the taxpayers and the residents of Manitoba.

This is the government, Mr. Speaker, that has burdened the taxpayer with the payroll tax, with an increase in the sales tax, with increases in gasoline tax, large increases in all sorts of fees and user fees. They are now saying to the taxpayer of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, over and above all of these burdens that we have placed upon you, at the next election we're going to compel you to pay off the NDP deficit for running the next election. That's what they are saying to the taxpayers of Manitoba. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, we oppose that, and we are going to oppose it as strenuously as we can. We will not participate, Mr. Speaker, in this bill. Indeed the government, Mr. Speaker, likely will pass the bill, because there's nothing that causes a socialist, Mr. Speaker, to become firm in support of something when it benefits them financially. We've seen that with the appointment of their friends, the Deputy Ministers' positions, and to positions in the Civil Service; so, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, they are going to be just as strenuous in seeing that this bill is passed.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General went to new lengths when he introduced this bill to attempt to justify this bill. He said that limited public financing - and he calls 50 percent of election expenses limited public financing; I would call it major public financing - is an extension of an already existing system for providing financial support to political parties and candidates from the general public.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. What is in effect now is a voluntary system, whereby individuals who wish to support the NDP, the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, or any other party, can voluntarily make a donation to that party and receive a tax credit. That, Mr. Speaker, is a voluntary system. This is a compulsory system where the taxpayers of Manitoba, whether they like it or not, are going to have to pay the NDP deficit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the bill, I think, will have a further deleterious effect in that the system that we introduced in 1980, which provided for voluntary tax credits for contributions, is one which required political parties to reach out to individuals in this province and develop much wider basis of support than they already had. The information that is filed by the Chief Election Officer

indicates, I think, that it has been successful because there are thousands and thousands of individuals who are providing financial support to all political parties in this province. That, Mr. Speaker, I think is advantageous and in the public interest because of the widening of the base of support of political parties.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has other disadvantages to it. In the current Election Finances Act, there is a restriction in Section 43 with respect to an individual, or group of individuals, against using newspapers, TV or billboards without the endorsement of the candidate or the political party. Under this act, in Section 48, the principle embodied therein, Mr. Speaker, is that, "No person or organization shall print, publish or distribute during an election period

(a) any advertisement

(i) in a newspaper, magazine or other periodical publication, or

(ii) on a billboard, bus or other property normally used for purposes of commercial advertising; or

(b) any poster, leaflet, letter, card or other promotional material; or

(c) any sign or banner; . . . " without the authorization, Mr. Speaker, of the candidate or his chief financial officer.

Mr. Speaker, we imposed what I feel is a reasonable restriction on media advertising expenses in our Election Finances Act, because that is the one area where it is obvious if excessive monies are spent by a candidate or a political party in the media, that can have undue influence on the results of an election. So we felt it was reasonable that there be a restriction in that area as there is in the Province of Ontario. That didn't stop individuals, Mr. Speaker, from publishing or printing or distributing a poster, a leaflet, a letter, a card or other promotional material or any sign or banner.

This, Mr. Speaker, I submit, is in violation of a person's freedom of speech. This means that a neighbour of the Member for Springfield in his constituency who for some unknown reason thinks that the Member for Springfield is a good candidate, can't, Mr. Speaker, send out, for example, a little endorsement card to other people in the neighbourhood saying that the Member for Springfield is a good person and is deserving of support in the election. Mr. Speaker, this section has the effect of not allowing a person or organization or group of people expressing their point of view during the election period without the endorsement of the candidate or his financial officer.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that — (Interjection) — it said that. The Member for Springfield said, that's what our bill said. It said that with respect to advertising in the media and on TV and on billboards. It said nothing about what an individual or group of individuals could do on their own by way of a poster, a leaflet, a letter, a card or other promotional material or any sign or banner. Mr. Speaker, that is an affront to the citizens of Manitoba who will wish to express their opinion and their views during the next election campaign. What is worse, Mr. Speaker, is that the way the government defines candidacy period, candidacy period could begin quite some time prior to the actual election period, and this act makes the Chief Financial Officer responsible for anything that goes on during that period of time; so not only during the election period but for some time prior to the election period.

People in this province are not going to be allowed to express their opinions on the election by any of these means, and they should be entitled to, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Springfield is shaking his head, Mr. Speaker, but I think what we have involved here is a very fundamental right of citizens of this province and of this country, Mr. Speaker, to express their views and to exercise freedom of speech.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General is a great advocate of the Charter of Rights. He came into this House right after the election and said, we will follow the Charter of Rights; never will we opt out of the Charter of Rights, Mr. Speaker. That's what he said. He said it time and time again. And he introduces a bill, Mr. Speaker, that prohibits people from exercising freedom of speech.

A MEMBER: No, it doesn't.

MR. G. MERCIER: It does so. — (Interjection) —

Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Springfield says sending a letter or card, or publishing a poster or a leaflet is going to involve that much money, he's sadly mistaken, Mr. Speaker. Sending a letter, a card, Mr. Speaker, it's a wonder, and maybe if I look closely enough we'll find it, that people won't even be able to write letters to the editor during the election period because that might be presumed to be prohibited under this government's authoritarian act.

Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to know how this bill got through the caucus of the NDP party. I recall, and the Member for Springfield should recall too, the summer of 1980 when the existing legislation was passed, when we spent a long evening one hot July night dealing with that legislation, and strong views were expressed, Mr. Speaker, particularly by the current Minister of Highways and Transportation. I didn't think I'd be speaking this early in the evening; otherwise, I was going to look them up in Hansard, but I will and I will use them later on or others on this side of the House will use them later on. But I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister of Finance who expressed the views that he did back in July of 1980, the Minister of Highways expressed those views in July of 1980, could support the bill that is before the House today.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Vic never tells the truth, though.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: What views, Mr. Speaker?

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister of Highways and Transportation, I'm referring to. I apologize to the Minister of Finance. I think I did say the Minister of Finance. I meant the Minister of Highways and Transportation, who the Member for Springfield referred to as John Gamble?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. MERCIER: So we have a bill, Mr. Speaker, which is going to impose another financial burden on the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay the NDP deficit; we have a bill which unnecessarily violates a person's freedom of speech during the election campaign and prior to the election campaign, Mr. Speaker; and we have a bill I suggest, Mr. Speaker, which interestingly

enough I submit favours incumbents over new candidates. It is interesting that this kind of legislation was brought in by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the candidacy period for which a candidate's election expenses shall be limited in accordance with this act begins prior to the actual election period under the terms of this bill and - can I suggest? - begin quite some time prior to the election period. All during that candidacy period, the candidate's election expenses will be governed by this act and limited by this act.

In the meanwhile, incumbents supposedly, Mr. Speaker, continuing to perform their role in the Legislature and as a result informing the residents of their constituency, will be spending money which is essentially re-election money, but will not be covered by this act because they will not become candidates under the act until much closer to the election period because they will take advantage of that. Mr. Speaker, incumbents will take advantage of that.

So any person contesting a constituency against an incumbent will be unfairly dealt with under this act, because his election expenses will be limited over a much larger period of time than incumbents who will . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Read the bill.

MR. G. MERCIER: I've read the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. ANSTETT: You better try again.

MR. G. MERCIER: You know, the Member for Springfield thinks he is the expert on this. I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that all members of that caucus read this bill carefully and understand it carefully, and that they just didn't rely on whatever the Member for Springfield told them that it contained.

Mr. Speaker, this bill and a bill that parallels it, an amendment to The Elections Committee, also has the effect of doing away with the Electoral Commission. Substituted in its place, Mr. Speaker, will be an advisory committee composed of one representative appointed by each registered political party.

Mr. Speaker, how do you become registered? You can become registered if you hold four or more seats, if you have endorsed five or more candidates in the general election or if you file a petition of not fewer than 2,500 persons, Mr. Speaker. Won't that be a great advisory committee, Mr. Speaker? We will not only have a member representing the Progressive Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party, but we'll have a member representing the Marxist-Leninists; we'll have a member representing the Communists; we'll have a member representing the Rhinoceros Party, and any either fringe party that wants to run.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is particularly appropriate.

MR. G. LECUYER: That's how much faith you have in the democratic process.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Member for Radisson says, that's how much faith I have in the democratic process.

He should read the bill. I wish he would and not listen to the Member for Springfield, Mr. Speaker, because this bill says, on the advisory committee, the Chief Electoral Officer is one representative appointed by each registered political party. You become a registered political party with a petition of 2,500 names which the Communist Party did the last election. The Marxist-Leninists did. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Radisson just simply fails to understand the point, Mr. Speaker. Each one of those groups becomes an advisor to the Chief Electoral Officer. Mr. Speaker, I support the right of anybody who wants to running for political office and submitting their views to the electorate, but let's be reasonable. Until you can at least elect somebody, Mr. Speaker, why should you have the right to be appointed an advisor to the Chief Electoral Officer on the administration of this act?

MR. A. ANSTETT: Have a look at the Charter of Rights

MR. G. MERCIER: You should look at the Charter of Rights. You should look at the freedom of speech sections and you should look at this act then. You should get an independent legal opinion on how this complies with a person's freedom of speech, Mr. Speaker, because what they are doing is restricting a person's freedom of speech under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are principles contained in this bill which are quite interesting. This bill, if it gets to committee, will take some time to get through committee because of some of the concerns that we have over the detail of this legislation, Mr. Speaker. This bill, for example, requires all contributions made at a meeting to have the names and addresses of every contributor, no matter what the amount contributed, to be taken by the candidate or by the Chief Financial Officer.

Mr. Speaker, on our bill we had a reasonable exemption; I believe it was \$25, and the members should consider whether or not something like that would be appropriate.

There is, Mr. Speaker, also a section that allows organizations to make contributions, and organizations is defined in quite a different way than it was under our legislation and includes non-incorporated groups. I think members opposite, if they haven't considered the implications of that, should give that some thought.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that is simply one that we oppose strenuously because of the impact it will have on the taxpayer, because it will require taxpayers to finance all political parties in Manitoba when there is a reasonable program in place now where people who want to voluntarily contribute to the support of a political party can do so, Mr. Speaker. It is a bill that we think is unnecessary from our perspective.

We're prepared on this side to work with the people of this province to gain their support both electorally and financially, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to support a bill simply because the NDP are of the view that the public should be required to pay off their deficit, Mr. Speaker. We can't support a bill which unnecessarily restricts freedom of speech of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker.

There are many more, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — It doesn't matter what our deficit. We had a deficit; we still have a deficit; we're paying off our deficit, and we will pay it off. We will not require the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay off our deficit as you want to require the taxpayers of Manitoba to pay off your deficit.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will be vigorously opposed by this side, and we are not in any way, shape, or form ever going to support this kind of legislation in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to speak, but after listening to that, to a part of the Tory big lie. I will give you three instances of the big lie that the Tories are using.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would suggest that the honourable member's terminology is not appropriate in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Perhaps the Honourable Minister of Finance would wish to reconsider his words and use more parliamentary terminology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, I did not call the honourable member a liar, although I was tempted to. Mr. Speaker, he started off his speech by talking about the cost of living in Winnipeg being the highest in the country. What he didn't say was that indeed the cost of living in Winnipeg is one-tenth of a percentage point above the national average; that's not what he wants to talk about. That is the kind of statistics the Tories use in attempting to present their case.

It reminds me of the type of statistical misuse, legerdemain, used by the Member for Turtle Mountain recently when he talked about government spending as being the highest in the country. When it came down to what he was talking about, he was talking about the year-over-year increase, but that's not what they talk about out in the country. They don't say out in the country that Manitoba's spending is about average for the provinces in the country. No, no, they say, the biggest spending in the country; drunken sailors; all that sort of nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain on a point of order.

MR. B. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe we're dealing with The Election Finances Act, and perhaps the rule of relevancy should be invoked.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance is entitled to the same preamble to his speech as other members are.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now on The Elections Act - another area of the big lie - they talk about a restriction of freedom of speech. What

was the legislation that they brought in? What did they say? They said, you can't spend more money than this; if you do this, then you are in violation of the law.

You could certainly argue that somehow that is a restriction on freedom of speech but those people are trying to tell the taxpayers of Manitoba that there's a free lunch. Those people are trying to tell the taxpayers of Manitoba that it's much better for them if some transportation company gives money to the Attorney-General than if the public comes along and provides funding for elections at least on a partial basis. They try to tell people that it is better that Inco pay \$30,000 for the reelection of a Progressive Conservative Government than it is to have the taxpayers in general accept the responsibility for the cost of democracy in the province. It is a cost that should be borne by our taxpayers.

The big lie again, the big lie, Marxist-Leninist, communist, all that sort of stuff; that's what they're talking about. They know full well, Mr. Speaker, that there is no possibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Virden state his point of privilege?

MR. H. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, again I would suggest that you consider very carefully the words that the member is using. I believe they are unparliamentary and they are attributing certain inflections that certainly are not familiar on this side of the House at all. When he talks about . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: . . . Marxist-Leninist, he may know what he's talking about, but we on this side don't know anything about it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Since the honourable member did not conclude his remarks to the substantive motion, he clearly did not have a point of privilege.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, it is true that they don't know what they're talking about. That's why I'm here trying to explain. They are saying, and the former Attorney-General says, oh, the Communists are registered. Yes, they're registered in accordance with a procedure that his government set up. His government set that procedure up, but I've never heard Tories complaining about that flaw, which is identical federally, excepting for a 15 percent limit as opposed to 10 percent, where you can also register the Rhinoceros Party, you can register the Marxist Party, etc. Never heard a complaint from federal Tories while that was in place, and it is in place today.

They know, full well, that if this act had been in place in the last election, there would have been no funding for the Marxists. They know that full well. There might have been one or two Liberal candidates who got it,

but even the Liberal Party in general would have been excluded under the terms of this legislation, because they didn't get the minimum threshold of voter support. — (Interjection) — The Member for Virden says, "What do we have against the Liberals?" We have nothing against them, but they set up federal legislation pursuant to which they would reduce funding to a political party that doesn't get 15 percent of the vote. So certainly we're not reciprocating in kind. We're saying that we're prepared to do it at a threshold level of 10 percent and at 10 percent, surely people can say that there is some support among the electorate for the candidate, for the particular party, and that there should be some support on behalf of society in general. I believe that makes sense.

The members opposite attempt to make it sound with all of their red smoke, their red paint, they make it sound as though this is something new. They themselves, their party has been taking advantage of this very act federally. Their brothers and sisters federally, in Manitoba, have been reaping the fruits of similar legislation for a number of elections. When they were in power, they never made any move to eliminate it. Indeed, there are Conservative provinces as well who have similar election funding and yet they have the gall to stand up here and say somehow that when we do it, that it's wrong.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is, who is going to do the funding, and what happens when you become beholden to Inco? Do you give them a dam? Mr. Speaker, there was a company that got \$30,000 or paid \$30,000 to the Progressive Conservative Party and they have, as the Member for Turtle Mountain knows, had some interesting discussions with Inco before that election campaign dealing with the Burntwood River. One begins to wonder about conflict of interest and one begins to say, maybe there is no free lunch — (Interjection) — Well, Mr. Speaker, we happen to have an Order-in-Council that we could provide. That's something that we could be considering. Those are concerns that taxpayers have.

We have concerns not only about how things are, but as to how they appear to be. We've heard now, just now, and I was expecting that. They were going to start hollering about the trade unions and their support for the New Democratic Party.

A MEMBER: We never said a word.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Well, there was somebody over there talking about checkoff, and yes, we get some money from the trade union movement. Across Canada in the same year, we got \$143,767 from the Canadian Labour Congress, the OPEIU, the United Auto Workers . . .

MR. B. RANSOM: What about all the undeclared contributions?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: . . . CPU, Plumbers, Canadian Paperworkers, Steelworkers, IBAW, Boilermakers, etc. You know, you average that out over the millions of workers who are members of those trade unions and it comes out to certainly much less than \$1 apiece. But when you take a look at Hiram Walker Resources

giving \$16,600 to the Conservatives; Gulf Canada, \$29,000 to the Conservatives; Canadian Pacific - how do they vote with respect to Canadian Pacific and its taxes in this House? What do they do whenever we start talking about having Winnipeg come into the 20th Century in terms of taxation with the CPR as compared to every other city in this country? What do the Tories do, and what did the CPR pay them? Twenty-five thousand dollars. There is a free lunch for Tories. Is there a free lunch for taxpayers?

Those people have received funding from one corporation after another, many tens of thousands of dollars which officials in my department tell me they are entitled to deduct from their taxable income, which shareholders in those corporations are not asked about, shareholders are not asked about that.

One company that isn't on my list here that recently paid a sum to the Tories was Dome. Dome is a corporation that . . .

MR. H. GRAHAM: It's a two-way street, Vic.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Of course, it's a two-way street, and I am prepared to read off the contributors to our party. We have no problem with that. We are saying that you people are standing up and using the big-lie technique, the technique that if you say often enough that we are going to fund the Marxist-Leninists in the next election campaign there will be poor people out there who believe it.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. V. SCHROEDER: There you are. Now they're saying, they didn't say it. I heard your leader say that this was a scheme to fund . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. All of the members will have their opportunity to speak to this bill if they wish to. Until that happens, the Honourable Minister of Finance has the floor and I'm having difficulty in hearing him.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Your leader, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Conservative Party, attempted through this House to tell the people of Manitoba that we were attempting to fund the Marxist-Leninists, that we were attempting to fund left-wing kooks and that sort of thing. That's what he was saying.

A MEMBER: Over and over again.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: That is the technique of the big lie. You say it often enough and people might even believe it. People opposite know full well that under existing circumstances in this province, there is no likelihood of that happening in the next election and probably for many many elections to come, but if it should happen that that group should get more than 10 percent of the vote and be fully qualified in all other areas, who are we to say in a democracy that the state will determine who is good and who is bad. That is

what the Tories would like to have happen, but they know, they know themselves that when the Liberals can't even get the money, that it's pretty unlikely that another group that far down in the totem pole would get it.

So, when they talk about limiting freedom of speech, it must surely sound hollow when you start reading legislation that they passed with respect to election campaigns. There is just absolutely nothing in that. When they talk about the cost of the donations by the taxpayers, they ignore totally the cost to the taxpayers of the donations of their corporate friends. They think that this doesn't cost us anything. They seem to think that when their corporate friends provide these funds that it's free, that the taxes foregone are just as surely money that we don't get as if there was a loan that hadn't been repaid.

Well, you know, we can set up laws that eliminate from taxation any item. We could say, for instance, we could reverse the law on free lunches because, you know, the Tories like to talk about free lunches; we could say that all the business lunches that are done over three cocktails should be taxable next year and all lunch bucket lunches by workers should be not taxable, okay. We would still have the same amount of tax collected approximately, but it would be from different people. Would that be more fair? Some of us might say yes. They seem to think that when you say to a person you can deduct this, you can deduct that; and you say to another person, you can't deduct it, but there is nothing wrong with that. You can't talk about a deduction for some people as being a tax exemption, a tax cost to the taxpayer, and it is a tax cost.

The legislation they put into effect is as surely a tax-cut cost to us as the legislation that we are putting in. It is a cost; we don't deny that it is a cost. We believe that it is being done — (Interjection) — Of course, we're not doing away with it; neither, incidentally, is the Tory party federally indicating that it wants to do away with a similar tax credit system that they have in place federally, because you have both systems federally.

The Member for St. Norbert seems to forget that there are two systems in place federally. There's not just the one system. There's the tax credit, which incidentally only provides assistance to those who have taxable income, and that's something that none of those people opposite seem to want to refer to. You know, we do have senior citizens, we do have people on low incomes who don't qualify for any rebate when they pay \$100 to the political party of their choice and, quite frankly, predominantly those people pay to us as opposed to the Tories. That is true. That is true, because they know that we are a party that will do whatever we can to look after those who have less. That is why we are here. Those people can pay \$100 to the New Democratic Party and get nothing back on taxes, but when some guy in a three-piece suit pays \$100, he gets \$75 back, and that is the system they say they don't want any changes to that; that suits them just fine.

Mr. Speaker, it does not suit us just fine. We think that this is a system that will make the political system in the province more fair and equitable. I do not believe that the taxpayers of Manitoba believe that payment for elections is a free lunch, that if they don't pay, that

they don't pay somewhere else; that if somebody else pays, that somebody else doesn't get a benefit back. I think that they're prepared, on a significant basis, to come directly to the assistance of the political process in funding election campaigns which everyone recognizes costs significant amounts of money these days.

MR. H. GRAHAM: When are you going to start talking about honesty?

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, let's talk about honesty. When the Tories start telling us CPI figures as they are, then we will be getting honesty from there. When the Tories start telling us about the true amount in terms of government spending over there, then we will be getting some honesty. When the Tories start telling us the truth about who will be affected by this bill, then we will start talking about honesty. Let us hear some.

I plead with the opposition to get away from the big lie, to recognize the statements that they have made for what they are, that they are cruel hoaxes; they are deceitful to the people of Manitoba when they suggest that somehow this is a tool for funding some crank third parties out there in the left-wing kook world, as the Leader of the Opposition says. Let them stand up and at least honestly tell people what effect this will have in terms of this province as opposed to Ontario, Nova Scotia, Tory provinces that have similar laws, the federal law that is similar. Let them start telling people about what the real effect will be rather than the nonsense and the big lie they have been spouting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, we have heard tonight another typical speech with a lot of bluster and flimflam by the Minister of Finance, and what we really heard was not a speech dealing with the election finance; we heard a typical NDP class warfare speech. Mr. Speaker, what we heard is something that we have known in this House as the type of politics the New Democrats play whenever they are put in a corner, and what they do is they then turn to class warfare. It's the corporate person against the lunch, the typical NDP gruel we get then, Mr. Speaker. It's the lunch bucket against the corporate blue pinstriped-suit person, and that has been the strength of their system and they resort to it every time they are put in a corner, because they like to drive that wedge. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that has been the only success of this New Democratic Government, because they can very nicely get that little bit of envy and greed and some of these latent things that are boiling in many people by using that class warfare thing.

We heard the Minister today indicate to us the terrible corporate donations that this particular party received. Mr. Speaker, they are there for the public record, and I'm not one bit annoyed or concerned that they are there. We put that in. People have to go ahead and indicate who they're supporting and where the money is going; there's no problem with that. I believe, if the Minister will check the records, the New Democrats under that system, under the Manitoba Fund, the tax

credit system, collected more money last time than we did. Mr. Speaker, where in the whole system in politics does the party and do the individuals finally become responsible for collecting some of their own money and for making sure that they are bona fide candidates in the field?

If the government is going to start funding elections, I say to you that I don't think we're going to see as good a calibre of candidate very often come out of the situation as we should. Because the commitment by the individual, if that individual raises funds or has people go out and raise funds for him or her, is much stronger and it's much more real. I think the system then doesn't bring in certain things which in many instances aren't of a real concrete nature.

But let's talk a little more about what the Minister of Finance was saying. He really believes in the premise - and it was articulated today very well - that all the money that you make belongs to the government unless they in their wisdom decide to let you keep some and that's the premise he worked on . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Who said that? That's the big-lie technique again.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . because he says, Mr. Speaker, that the corporate person or the average guy on the street who wishes to donate to my campaign is, under the Manitoba Fund, really taking it away from all the taxpayers, because he's not paying it. That's what he said, he's really taking it away from all taxpayers. So what he's basically saying is that money doesn't belong to him unless the government says that you can keep it. Because that's the premise, . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: No, he's not saying that.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . that's where you're coming from.

I want to say to members opposite that at a time of record unemployment in this province, at a time of a record deficit, you are asking this Legislature to pass another bill which is going to cost the taxpayers of Manitoba over a million dollars next election, and you're not doing away with the other act, you are still allowing the Manitoba Fund in place. In other words, we will now have two avenues of funding: No. 1 - we will still be able to collect under the Manitoba Fund . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: Just like Ottawa.

MR. B. RANSOM: . . . and on the other hand, we are also going to receive funds from the province.

Well, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's wrong. There is a system in place where an individual who wants to run and who has the support of the community can go out and raise funds, and that system is in place and was working very well. I don't believe the Member for Inkster should have his hands in the pockets of the taxpayers of Manitoba, and I don't believe that I should have my hands in the taxpayers' pockets of Manitoba to fund my election campaign in such a matter. That automatically, Mr. Speaker, without . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. H. GRAHAM: It's the Czarist system.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . having to even ask for the money. Without having to go around and raise it, the government is going to send me a cheque at the end of the election, that's ridiculous. There has to be a commitment on behalf of the people that support me and myself to make sure that those funds are sought after, and I can't see the government spending another million dollars at a time of record unemployment and record deficit to prop up somebody's election campaign.

You know, there are a lot of things in this act that we can't deal with today and I guess will be dealt with on clause by clause when we go into committee. But you know there are certain things in the act and one, for instance, where if you go to a meeting and you pass the collection plate around for your particular party, if somebody donates more than \$10 and you cannot identify the person, you then have to send the money in to the government. Mr. Speaker, now get this, you've got to send the money in if you can't identify him and that money then goes to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That's ridiculous.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Where should it go?

MR. R. BANMAN: So, Mr. Speaker, if somebody is sitting down and throwing a \$10 bill in a collection plate that goes by at a political fund-raising thing, if you have 200-300 people out and you're raising some money, and the average guy on the street is at this meeting and he throws in \$10-\$20, if I can't identify that money, I'm going to now have to have somebody in the organization who is going to have to determine which bill belongs to who and then we're going to have to send in excess of \$10 or more and the government will then use it in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. That's how ridiculous the limit is with regard to the suggestions that the Member for St. Norbert made. It's crazy.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Would you rather it was \$5.00?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that there is any free lunch, and I'll tell you at a time when politicians are being questioned about the amounts of money that they receive, about the different remuneration that we all receive for different things we do - the people are already questioning the kinds of monies we're looking at and the kinds of benefits we get - bring a bill forward which is going to cost the taxpayers even more money, I just cannot support that kind of a bill.

The thing that also has to be pointed out - and the Minister of Finance, you know, in a very sort of imputing way of course got back to what I said before, the socialist way of driving the wedge in-between the different so-called social strata in this particular province, but he very nicely only singled out the corporate donations to the Conservative Party. He insinuated that Inco maybe had some favourite spot in the heart of one or two of the members here and that there were a few other companies that would receive favours because they had donated to the party. I want to say to members opposite that particular knife cuts both ways. When the members from CUPE or

somebody come and talk to this particular government and they have provided all the different types of support staff, the different donations that are made not just maybe as money donations, but in kind, I wonder how many of those people were under the \$250 mark which didn't have to be reported previously, Mr. Speaker. I want to say to members opposite that maybe that is why some of the labour legislation that we're going to be looking at is receiving favourable attention. If you want to use that, the knife cuts both ways.

I want to tell members opposite that I was fortunate in my riding to have a lot of people donate funds to my particular campaign. I was happy for it, because it showed a commitment on their part. It was a good feeling for the candidate, because they showed some feeling that I would represent them properly. It had nothing to do with the government sending me a cheque. It was a commitment by the local people to send somebody there that would represent their concerns and their feelings. It wasn't a government that sent in that amount of money.

I want to put one further point down. When a company or an individual donates to a particular party or to a particular individual, I want to tell you with the system that was in place where people had to declare, you know, it very often made it more difficult to deal with those people on a fair and equitable manner than otherwise, because the indications were always there that the type of politics that we see being played by the New Democrats on this particular issue would be there. In other words, they would impute motives to us.

So I say to the Minister of Finance, he's got the biggest deficit going for him that anybody ever has. He is going to face another problem this coming year. My goodness, we're seeing 52,000 unemployed. The revenues won't climb that much. His expenses are going to grow, and he is asking now the Treasury to put up another million dollars in the next couple of years to deal with this matter. Well, I don't believe the people of Manitoba really want that, and what he demonstrated today in reverting to the old class warfare speech is that they are going to hurt on this one.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when we get out into hustings and we start listing off all these things that they're talking about, and we find out that really they are bringing in bills which are costing taxpayers, which are costing the average man on the street money, the average man and woman will realize that on the one hand they speak as though they are for the average person, but on the other hand, given the reins of government, they do a better job of putting their hands in taxpayers' pockets to further what they believe is their own end than any Conservative or Liberal Government could ever do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for River East.

MR. P. EYLER: Would the Member for La Verendrye entertain a question?

One point I'd like to clarify; it's been hinted at throughout and I'm not sure what the member was saying. I heard him say that he was proud that a large number of people in his constituency had donated to

his campaign, and I heard him say that this bill is wrong. I heard him say that he felt that he should not have his hand in the public pocket. I'm wondering then, does that mean that the Member for La Verendrye will not be accepting any money from the public for his election campaign next time?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will say one thing, because the members opposite and many other people who are dealing with public funds, when you are passing bills in the Legislature here, are creating situations where everyone has to be put on the same footing. I want to say to members opposite, and we will be discussing this at greater length to see exactly what the party position will be with regard to this, but I want to say to the members opposite - if the bill is passed and should there be a situation where all the members opposite are taking advantage of it, I want to say to members opposite, I will use every method and every dollar available to get rid of these people who are putting their hands in the pockets of Manitoba. I want to say to you, the principles are there. But I want to tell you, when you are going ahead and fighting the type of thing that we are seeing happening here right now with the members opposite, I will vote against this bill. I predict to the members opposite, should the government change, this is one of the top priorities to get rid of this to save the taxpayers of Manitoba this kind of money.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?
The Honourable for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Tuxedo, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Government House Leader require 55 called next?

HON. W. PARASIUK: No, I was wondering, Mr. Speaker. I see that the Member for Virden has come in. I believe he wanted to speak on Bill No. 5, which is The Surface Rights Act. Maybe we could call Bill No. 5 now.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THIRD READING - AMENDED BILLS

BILL NO. 5 - THE SURFACE RIGHTS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed third reading of Bill No. 5, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: I adjourned this on behalf of my colleague from Virden.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. H. GRAHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's quite often the case when we come to third reading on bills, that members on the opposition side are quite prone to let them go to a vote and have them pass without any further comment. However, this

is a bill that is of such importance to the people in Virden constituency and Arthur constituency and, to some extent, probably in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that I feel compelled, Mr. Speaker, to just say a few words about Bill No. 5 and the implication that it will have in Manitoba.

This is one of the bills that rarely occurs in the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, which has the full concurrence of both members of the House. It is a pilot bill that is ploughing new ground and trying to accommodate a problem that has been increasingly difficult over the last several years. I commend the government for bringing it in; just as I commend the previous government for initiating the studies that led to this bill. I would sincerely hope that every member of this Assembly will support this bill on third reading because I think it is very important to the southwest region of Manitoba.

However, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I want to tell the Minister that this bill will do a tremendous service to western Manitoba only if he provides the right type of people to put the bill in operation. The people that he appoints to the Surface Rights Board, the administrative people that he hires to do the everyday communication with the people that involved in this type of industry are very very important.

I just wanted to take a few minutes of the House's time tonight to tell the Minister that he has my full support in putting this bill into operation and he has my complete co-operation. If there's anything I can do to assist him in making this bill work in the field, I will do everything I can to make this type of legislation work because I think it is worthwhile for the people of Manitoba and for the Province of Manitoba.

I commend the Minister for bringing this bill in and I will support it on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just respond briefly to the comments by the Member for Virden, and also to put some of my comments forward with respect to this bill in general as well.

We are breaking new ground with this bill. I think it is a bill that is one that reflects all sides of the House. I've said that in the past. Some of the momentum for the bill originated back prior to just, I think, about 1976 there was some matters raised, and in 1977, then in 1978 and there was a Nugent Commission Report which I think provided a lot of the basis for the bill. We drew on the experience of Alberta and Saskatchewan, taking into account the fact that the level of activity in Manitoba is nowhere near the level of activity in Saskatchewan and Alberta. We certainly intend to treat this bill in an evolutionary way. We're doing the best we can, I think, all of us as legislators in this respect. We want to see how it operates in practice over the course of the next year.

If revisions or improvements to the bill, or regulations are required, I certainly would welcome those to bring them forward next year. I certainly look forward, and I would look forward to the Member for Virden, or other members involved, to see how it operates and to come

forward with suggestions for improvement if they're warranted next year.

It is important as to who is put on the board. I think it's important to pick people from the area who have experience in making judgments. There are a number of people in the area who've had experience in municipal affairs, who have a good background in making judgments, who know the agricultural and rural lifestyles, who also, because of the very nature of their living in that area, have had some experience with the oil industry as well, and have some understanding of what's involved there. Because what we want is greater co-existence between both industries because we think it's important for both industries to develop in the best way possible.

I would hope that in fairly short order we could be announcing a board when this receives royal assent. I would hope that the board itself would move towards hiring an executive secretary, a director, and we want to move quickly on that. Again I think there are people in the southwestern part of Manitoba who have a lot of experience. I don't want them to be necessarily rating the staff, but there are people who've had experience as secretary treasurers, or assistant secretary treasurers, who I hope would when they see the bulletin would apply. It would be good to have that local experience at the staff level - a person who would organize the meetings, co-ordinate them, keep the files, keep the records.

I've indicated that the board office itself will be located in Virden, so it will be in close proximity to the people there. People should be able to get there within one hour's drive if they have hearings, either to attend, if they are board members, or if they are people - interested parties. This will be in close proximity to them, because so far the oil phenomenon is very much a phenomenon to the southwest. We certainly would hope that this would be a phenomenon in other parts of the province. It would be a delight for us all if we could have oil in other parts of the province, but for now it's centered in the southwestern part of Manitoba.

I would expect that the board would tend to meet more in Virden, but that doesn't preclude their possibly meeting in Waskada or other places like that. But those are things that I hope the board would look at themselves, because I think what's important here will be, although we have a backlog, some grace to let that board get moving because they are a board that has to make the best judgments that they as a board can make.

They will get legal counsel; if that is required that will be provided. If they need other types of counsel or technical advice, that will be required. But in the end what we're looking for in that area are a bunch of Solomons, people who will make the best possible decisions. They don't have to have Ph.Ds to make those decisions. They have to have people who have experience and that's what we're looking for. I'm hoping that we'll all work together to, as I say, make the bill work and make the intent of the bill achieved.

I commend this for unanimous approval by the House.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you please call Bill No. 55 now?

BILL NO. 55 THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill 55, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the bill and have the bill stand in the name of the Member for Emerson.

Mr. Speaker, we just finished dealing with one bill which deals with monies that will flow from the provincial coffers to finance provincial election campaigns, and we are now dealing with another bill which has to do with the remuneration which members of the Legislature will receive with regards to certain services that the taxpayer will be asked to pay for.

The bill does provide an opportunity to make several observations of what I say of a personal nature, and I might not even have the total concurrence of my caucus with some of these remarks, but it's something that I believe I would like to speak to at this time and put on the record. It's something that I have, over the last 10 years in this particular place, become more concerned about as the years go on.

Coming this month, I am going to have spent 10 years in this particular institution, and I have to say to members opposite that when I did run back in 1973, the remuneration for members on an annual basis was something that was a lot less, I believe about maybe a quarter, about a third to a quarter of what it is today. That's 10 years ago. I also have to tell members opposite that at the time when I ran, I really didn't know what the pay for a member of the Legislative Assembly was. That was not the prime motivating force for me running. That leads me into the few comments that I want to make today.

One of the concerns that I have with regard to the field of public representation in this Legislature is that what I see happening now is that we are becoming full-time politicians. I believe that is not serving the people of Manitoba in the best possible way. What we have seen happen here in the last number of years is that we are spending more and more time, and this year, we're going to be here maybe till August. We are going to be spending time in this particular building dealing with legislation in many cases, which I believe is unnecessary. We are going to be dealing with subject matter which has been, for one reason or another, brought in by the government, I think very often, to sort of justify the existence of many members here. I don't think that is the type of legislation that serves the people of Manitoba well.

We are developing a system where the politics in Manitoba are becoming a full-time job. We are going to be developing a breed of politicians who are involved in dealing with things in this Legislature and not having the opportunity and the time to spend in their local constituencies. One of the strengths of the democratic system has been that average people, people from the labour force, people from small business, people that are involved in professions, whether it be teaching, medical, or lawyers or whatever, have had an opportunity to be in the Legislature and yet pursue their particular field or vocation.

That has been the strength of this, because once a person has served a number of years in this place, it doesn't matter what intentions you have, the best intentions that you have, in very many instances the sphere of friends that you have changes because it all starts gravitating around politics. The outlook on a lot of things changes because you really do lose - I hate to use this overworked phrase - the sort of grass-roots thinking that you brought into the Legislature. What we are seeing now is a breed of politicians being developed in Manitoba who, after having been here for so-and-so long, really do lose some of that grass roots.

I am one of the fortunate ones, Mr. Speaker, that can travel home every night. I am in the position that if there is something happening in my riding, I can be there because I book off. In opposition, of course, it's easier than if you're in government. But we have a lot of members that travel over great distances and cannot attend the different functions in their constituencies because it's just too far. They can't slip out for an hour to open a new small plant or attend a graduation or whatever. They just can't do it because time just won't allow it.

So I say to members opposite, I think it's wrong that we are developing a system in the Manitoba Legislature where we are moving to a full-time system. As someone — (Interjection) — I know that the Member for Inkster is unhappy with that. He believes that politics should be a full-time job. Well, I want to tell the members opposite that one of the problems we have in dealing with this particular bill is that with our remuneration the way it is now, there are many members in this Chamber that could not make more money than that in the private sector. They couldn't.

The difficulty we have is that somebody is elevated to a ministerial position, then loses that and might even lose the election. Suddenly, he or she comes from a \$50,000 a year job and is out on the street looking for a job; and we all know that if you belong to a particular party and your party has lost, it's much more difficult to find a job because you're tainted politically, no matter what political stripe you are.

Mr. Speaker, we have some people mumbling from their seats over there, but I say to them, to make the kind of money we make in the Legislature here today, to make that in the private sector is very difficult if you're not a professional person, very difficult. People are all the same. It's not difficult to spend a lot of money and develop a life style that is at \$40,000 or \$50,000 a year, but you reduce that to 18,000 or 20,000 after you've made certain commitments on house payments and things like that, it becomes very difficult.

So what you see happen, that instead of being guided by the principle, which I would hope that we are all here for, is to try and provide some input into helping out our fellow-man and trying to make Manitoba a better place to live in, suddenly the money scene comes into play and rather than running for the principles that all should be here for, you suddenly start running for the money because it's self-preservation. It's the house payment, the car payment and all these things that you know that if you lose the election, if you're not Minister anymore and you don't get that 55,000 a year plus a car and expense accounts — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster has hit the nail on the head.

I think one of the strengths of this business has been that people of this particular Legislature have maintained their outside ventures, because what happens is that you become totally reliant on the job. You become out of touch with what you were involved with before. The democratic system, I don't believe - as I said when I started off, Mr. Speaker - I know that many members will not agree with me, but the fact of the matter is that the closer you are to the people, the better you will serve, the better you will know what they want. The better you know, the better the democratic system will work. That is what I'm saying.

I say to the members opposite, I think it's going to be a sad, sorry day . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye has the floor. If other members wish to enter the debate, they may be able to do so at the proper time.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I know many members won't agree with me, but that is my own personal belief. This bill has given me the opportunity to express that, because I have observed this from my colleagues and from colleagues on the opposition who have in one form or another either retired from this game or been defeated. It's a terribly difficult transition. If they have nothing to fall back on and they have over the years lost all their friends, suddenly their whole lives are put into a very very tough situation. I've seen it happen and the members opposite know what we're talking about. So, I say to members opposite that my concern with regard to the type of remuneration that we're talking about is that we will make it too lucrative for people that they won't want to do the outside jobs that they had before to pick up a few dollars working for somebody or to do something on the outside instead of totally relying on this money here.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Springfield, I know doesn't agree with me because he wants this to be his full-time job, and I'm not arguing with that. That's his prerogative, but I think it's a sad and sorry day when we're going to be sitting here for six, seven months of the year, or eight months of the year where it really will preclude anyone from having an outside job because you just won't be able to.

As I said from the outset, this is my own personal feeling and these are my observations that I've made over the last number of years, and I really believe that as we move further and further to insitutionalize - and that's what I have to call it - institutionalize the member's existence in this particular place, in this place that becomes almost an island unto itself. How often have we all gone back to our constituents and mentioned something about what has happened here and they say, that hey, that's not really the issue, the issue is this, and we think in here that because we get involved in a heavy debate that that is very important and is really going to be earth shattering.

But I say to the members of the Legislature and I say to anybody that's listening, that I don't believe we are best served by prolonging a Session and by trying to justify our existence by being in this place, because

we don't bring the ideas, we don't bring the feelings of our constituents back here if we are robots in this particular building.

Now, having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have to say in conclusion that there are a number of aspects of the bill that I would point out to members opposite and hope that they would have a look at them. One of the areas that I have never been too keen on is the area of providing an allowable expense limit up to a certain limit and then having to provide receipts for it. We've all been on committee meetings, we've all been somewhere, somebody eats a hamburger and somebody eats a steak and the person that submits the steak bill gets that paid for and the person that's being a little frugal gets the hamburger. He doesn't get paid for that large amount. What's going to happen - I predict this - is they put a \$2,000 limit on monies that you can receive if you put in receipts. I would suggest to you that everybody here is going to have a \$2,000 limit. That's what's going to happen.

I think the system that we had before where there is an allowance for the constituency, which I in my particular case used for printing of brochures and different things, allowed me that limit, and there wasn't any argument about whether or not when I went to Falcon Lake to visit my constituents whether I should have had a hamburger or a steak, because we've all been on committee meetings and we've seen members who have a much bigger appetite and when I say appetite I'm talking about eating steak instead of hamburger and then making sure that the taxpayer picks that up. I don't want to get into the situation where somebody says, hey, that's legitimate, that's not legitimate because when you put the \$2,000 limit on it, everybody knows here that's what's going to happen in 99 percent of the cases, everybody is going to be at that \$2,000 limit, and one way or another the receipts will be issued.

So, I say to members opposite, instead of having that kind of a situation, I would rather leave the situation the way it is right now and provide the members with a flat fee to do away with this business of providing receipts and all these things. I think the system has worked well till now, I think the majority of members on the constituency allowance, which was given out for that, was for precisely that. I know I've got a constituency office which I have a telephone in. I pay that out of my own constituency allowance. I have certain other services that are provided, which I pay for myself, and I don't think the public is served any better if I'm going to start having to keep track of all the bills and put them in because some people are going to have higher expenses than others and as I said before, I think the upper limit is the amount that everybody is going to get. Because I ask, which member here, who is allowed a travelling allowance, has not claimed 26 trips in the last five years that he was here?

HON. J. STORIE: Thirteen, Bob.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that anybody driving - within driving distance has claimed all 26. I claimed 26. I bet you the Member for Springfield claimed 26, because I make many more trips than that, and I don't mind saying that goes a

short way to cover my travelling expenses. However, I want to say to members opposite, do have a look at that. You get into this receiving business, it's really a charade and it's something that you can leave out. Keep the system the way it is and don't move on this particular aspect of the bill.

I also say to members opposite that I believe - and I come back to what I said before I spoke on the other bill - I believe that this is not a time to expand the services and the cost to the Manitoba taxpayer as far as the members of the Legislature are concerned. We all got a lot of flack for the fact that the Federal Members of Parliament voted themselves a raise. As we all know, many of our constituents thought it was that we in some shape or form benefited from that and I want to say to members opposite that at a time when we're seeing this kind of unemployment, when we're seeing people at Red River Co-Op, the workers, taking a 10 percent decrease and then not even being able to maintain their jobs, I don't think the timing is right for the expansion of something as the public paying of election expenses or all kinds of changes in institutionalizing members in this particular Legislature.

I believe, looking at people around me, that the pay for members is pretty good if, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. A. ANSTETT: What has this got to do with pay?

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . we could at least maintain the one thing that I spoke about earlier. If we don't have to move in the direction of going ahead and going and making this an absolute full-time job with a couple of months' recess. I think that's wrong. I don't think that is a direction in which the Legislature should be moving.

So, I say to members opposite that I wish you'd have a look at some of these areas to really simplify some of the things that are happening, and I sure hope for the sake of the people of Manitoba that the time never comes that we are sitting here nine, ten, eleven months of the year. It's wrong, it will not be in the best interests of the people of Manitoba, and will make a bunch of full-time politicians out of people, who have come from all walks of life, trying to represent those people here fairly, and will really take them out of the mainstream and not allow them to do the basic job which they were intended to do.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to be here too long, and you're going to spend too much time in this place, you're going to become a bureaucrat and heavens knows we've got enough of those in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Speaker, I have question for the Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Speaker, the member referred to this package in Bill 55 as making things more "lucrative" - was the word he used - for members. He also then compared this to wage cuts for Red River Co-op and the wage increase for MP's in Ottawa.

I'm wondering if he can tell me where in Bill 55 there's any increase in the gross pay or take-home pay for members. In fact, I wonder if he could concede that

actually the pay cheques that members receive for performing their duties here and in their constituencies will actually be reduced by \$1,500 a year.

MR. R. BANMAN: Well if we want to get technical, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about it.

When you're going to be handing in receipts for expenses, you will expense that, which means that you will not be income taxed on those \$2,000 that you receive because they would be considered as expenses, because you will be paid an expense account.

The \$1,500 that we receive right now is taxable, which means that if you're in a 40 percent tax bracket, because you're on the top end you're really only netting out of a \$1,500 allowance that we get right now, we're all paying income tax on it, so we're going to be paying, many of us will pay \$500, \$600 of that. I think the majority of members, Cabinet Ministers, will pay more. They'll pay almost half of it in income tax, so you're coming back down to \$650.00. When you are looking at receiving \$2,000, which is expendable, that I would say to average members over here, will mean the difference of \$1,200 a year.

So if you're looking at the whole group here, we're increasing the cost to the taxpayer by about \$70,000 there. We are also looking at paying for the printing; we're looking at more travel; we're looking at a number of increased things.

Now the member opposite hit on a point. We were talking about the cost to the taxpayer and how you juggle it is . . .

MR. G. FILMON: He doesn't understand that.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, when I indicated that one was . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. R. BANMAN: When I indicated that one was taxable and one wasn't, he agreed with me and I just point that out to him.

The other thing, of course, that he alludes to is that this does not basically effect your pay. The pay in Manitoba, as I understand from looking at my cheque, has not been adjusted and I would say to the members opposite on that point that I don't think that the type of adjustment that the legislation calls for should be put forward on MLA's pay. I think it's time that we showed some responsibility in that field as well, and that I hope that the government by not going ahead and doing the automatic increase, which would have, I think, happened sometime in April or May, is looking at a formula which is less than what we would normally receive because there are a lot of people in Manitoba that really believe that we are well-paid at the present time, and that the 52,000 unemployed would love to have half of what we are getting as members of the Legislature.

So I say to members opposite that while we don't want to pay poverty wages here, there comes a point in time when we all to have kick in and I reiterate again that I think this is a wrong time to do any expansion

in this field. I would urge members to look at it carefully and maybe make some changes in this bill before it it passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster has already spoken.

MR. D. SCOTT: Yes, would the member entertain another question? I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for La Verendrye campaigned in his last election that he was running for an office that was going to pay, I think at time, some \$29,000 a year, but that it wasn't worthwhile being a full-time job and that he wasn't going to commit himself as a full-time person to caring for his constituents. And how many of his colleagues also ran for this office, and recognizing that it wasn't going to be a full-time job, and told the people that he wasn't going to treat it as a full time job?

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, when I ran everybody knew that I had a small gasoline service station and car business and it was understood that I wouldn't give it up.

One of the strengths, I believe, of my involvement in this Legislature is that I still have a day-to-day experience and know what it means to employ people; I know what it means to pay the 1.5 percent payroll tax; I know what it is, Mr. Speaker, to come in and meet a payroll every month, and pay my people, and deal with my people, and I know what their feelings are and what their concerns are.

I say to the member that he's hit the nail on the head, he's hit it on the head. What happens is that you lose sight of what is really happening there if you just isolate yourself in this particular building. You really don't realize what's happening out there. I say to the members opposite that the day we come to the point where I think that he wants to go, I believe that we are heading in the wrong direction.

But as I said on the outset, I didn't expect some of the members opposite to appreciate that point of view. It happens to be my belief and I would say that to any constituent. My constituents know that that's the way they elected me and that's the way they got me.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other member wishes to speak to this bill, it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

The Honourable Acting House Leader.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 78.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member repeat the number?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Bill No. 78, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 78 - THE MANITOBA TELEPHONE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Bill No. 78, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin Russell.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address comments to Bill 78.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill 78 as introduced by the new Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System is a prime example of what can happen to a young fellow when he knows not what he's doing and a seasoned, experienced career civil servant slips the bill by him and gets a number of amendments into the act, supported and pushed and advocated by the rookie Minister. It indicates what kind of trouble one can get into when he inherits the Telephone System from a Minister who did nothing with it while he had it. Now we see this bill coming forward which undertakes a number of interesting things.

The first thing that happens with this bill is that it, in effect, legitimizes an activity of the Telephone System that's been going on for approximately five months formally - no, I'm sorry, longer than that - approximately 18 months formally. The reason we have this amendment which is before us in the first part of the bill is to legitimize some activities that the Manitoba Telephone System is undertaking in Saudi Arabia, activities which according to the Provincial Auditor were questionable under the existing provisions of The Manitoba Telephone System Act.

I wish to read to the new Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System an excerpt from the Report of the Provincial Auditor to the Legislative Assembly for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1982. This is the last page, Page 40. The preamble to this deals with an Order-in-Council dated January 6, 1982 whereby the former Minister responsible for the Telephone System, Mr. Speaker, established by Order-in-Council a new subsidiary corporation to undertake a joint venture with a Saudi-Arabian company owned by a sheikh in Saudi Arabia. Now the last paragraph says:

"In view of the wording of the act" - the act in this case being The Manitoba Telephone System Act - "which has been quoted in a preceding paragraph as part of the Order-in-Council, I have serious concerns as to whether the System is not extending its scope of operations beyond what the Legislature intended. I believe it would be prudent before the scope of operations is extended so significantly beyond the customary operations to obtain legislative authority which clearly authorizes such an extension. Misunderstandings are likely to continue if the Manitoba Telephone System does not carry out these kinds of operations in a more effectively approved and explained manner."

This amendment to this bill justifies an activity for the Manitoba Telephone System started by the Minister of Community Services, continued by the present Minister of Government Services. Each of them have had responsibility for the Telephone System. They were warned by the Auditor that it was beyond the scope that was allowed in the act, and now they are bringing in legislation which will allow them, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to carry on operations beyond the boundaries of the province, something the Provincial Auditor questioned whether the system could do in 1982 in his year-ending Report.

So here we have the classic example of a bright - well not a bright - but a young, new Minister now having to come in with amendments to the act to justify activities undertaken by the professionals in MTS management after the fact. We are wondering what further amendments are going to come up over the next two or three years which are going to be required to cover the tracks of some of the ambitious projects in MTS after the fact, similar to what this amendment is doing today, Mr. Speaker. Because what we are seeing is retroactive authority to undertake operations in Saudi Arabia that the Telephone Company has been participating in for some 18 months. That's the first thing that this bill covers.

The other one is rather a major change to the operations of the Telephone System. It is contained in the clauses, the provisions of this bill which deals with ownership of certain equipment used in the telecommunications system, not, Mr. Speaker, the Telephone System, but the telecommunications system.

The Minister obviously - well I'm not sure who wrote his introductory remarks for him, but on Page 4 of his introductory remarks, he says, "Members of the House will recall that successive governments have been sensitive to this matter, the matter being the ownership of components of the emerging electronic highway." The Minister goes on to say, "All of them," meaning all successive governments which would include our government when during our term, "have recognized that the full range of benefits of that highway can be assured only if the key network elements of it are owned and controlled by the provincial common carrier."

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the Minister that is an absolute falsehood. It is not a factual statement. We were concerned about the electronic highway and the advent of the use of the electronic highway by diverse and new services to be offered like teleshopping, Telidon service and a number of others, burglar and alarm systems, but we had no concern, Mr. Speaker, with the ownership of the terminal attachment, the decoders, the end delivery equipment. Yet the Minister had the audacity to say that was our concern.

Our concern only was with the Manitoba Telephone System becoming a common carrier, providing an electronic highway, if you will. We cared not to have MTS involved either in the delivery of those end services or the ownership of the equipment to do so. What the Minister has said in his introductory remarks is simply untrue. It is not based on fact. It is not based on any position that was taken by the previous administration.

It does recognize the drive and the desire of the New Democratic Party to have the Manitoba Telephone System extend its monopoly powers into services which the private enterprise is now delivering effectively, but it does not reflect the direction of policy that was taken by the Progressive Conservative Government under Premier Lyon. So I would just like to point out that little diversion from the truth that the Minister of Government Services used in his opening remarks.

Now we had advance notice that this amendment allowing the Telephone System to own and control all " . . . apparatus, equipment, contrivances, devices, wires, cables and fibre optics used for transmitting, controlling, securing, encoding, decoding, emitting, modifying or receiving telecommunications through the

system" - we had advance notice that was coming and, once again, Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that it's telecommunications they are talking about in this amendment not telephone service. That means cable television, pay television, alarm services, teleshopping, terminal attachment of computers to the system, remote computers, intelligent and sending computers.

Now we had advance notice of that when this government passed, first of all Order-in-Council 1339 cancelling a previous one that we had put in place, and replacing our Order-in-Council 84178 with Order-in-Council 1470. Because in Order-in-Council 1470, they changed the criterion by which the Public Utilities Board must consider applications not strictly for gaining access to spectrum allocation on electronic highway in setting and adjudicating a rate there for that space on the electronic highway. They went the quantum step further in Order-in-Council 1470 and required several additional things; one of them being that the Telephone System must own the terminal attachment devices, something that was never included in any Order-in-Council that existed previous to Order-in-Council 1470; and secondly, they brought in the concept that the Public Utilities Board must now consider in any setting of rates for additional spectrum on the electronic highway, that a suitable and reasonable contribution from that granting of additional spectrum be made to the Telephone System; in other words, cross-subsidization of the black telephone service by these new communication services.

Now, the new Minister has been sold the traditional bill of goods given to them by the Manitoba Telephone System management that we must keep basic telephone services inexpensive in this province, and to do that we must, as Telephone System, get into everything possible, and if at all possible, we must get into them on a monopoly basis; which means that once we're in a monopoly position, there will be no competition. We will be able to charge the customer whatever the tariff and the traffic will bear and, in doing that, we will justify it because we'll keep the telephone service as inexpensive as possible. You know, I suppose to some that's a logical argument, except that what you end up doing is not necessarily providing economical black telephone service, basic telephone service.

You then are subject to running a less than efficient operation within the Telephone System because you know you've got a built-in gravy train of revenue from other sources that you can keep pouring in to the provision of basic telephone service. You neither accomplish the most efficient telephone service, and it's for certain that in offering the other range of services in telecommunications in order to cross-subsidize, you must therefore provide a very expensive service if you have a monopoly position on the alarm systems, the pay television and the cable television system.

So, on one hand, you have the users of additional telecommunication services being overcharged, if you will, to provide a less than efficient basic telephone service because of cross-subsidization. I know, to the new Minister, that was probably a persuasive argument and led him to buy the amendments put forward by the Manitoba Telephone System that we now see in Bil 78 today. Well, this is a reasonable approach, given that the new Minister doesn't understand the system, but I only want to point out to him that, under this bill,

the Telephone System will own the entire telecommunication system. As a matter of fact, the bill says, they shall own and control the entire telecommunication system.

I want to read to the Minister, because I'm sure he hasn't seen this, but I want to read to the Minister excerpts from a notice dated the 22nd of April, 1983, it's Public Notice CRTC 1983-82. The subject is: "The Ownership of Equipment for the Delivery of Pay Television Services by Licenced Cable Television Undertakings." On Page 2 of the order, second paragraph, it says: "In the case of an addressable security system, a computer facility controls this system and ultimately controls the operation of the subscriber's decoder." Subscriber's decoder is the one that is on your television set and unscrambles the pay television signal so you can watch it if you've paid your bill and are in fact a paying customer.

Now the next paragraph says: "The commission considers that all elements of the security system play a vital role in the effective delivery of pay television services and are integral components of the broadcasting undertaking which delivers them. The best method of ensuring that control over the broadcasting undertaking remains with the licensee is to have its ownership of the entire security system in its hands." In the licensee's hands, not Manitoba Telephone System's hands, but the licensee's hands.

The next paragraph says: "Cable television licensees are universally required by condition of licence to own their local head end. This local head end ownership will, at a minimum, include all signal processing equipment. For pay television services, it will also include all encoders or other scrambling devices and, in the case of an addressable system, the computer facility because the address which it generates electronically forms part of the scrambled signals. Thus the commission considers that licensees must own the encoder and the computer facility to satisfy the condition of the licence requiring ownership of the local head end."

In the final paragraph, Mr. Speaker, it says: "The commission further considers that the operation of decoders for the delivery of pay television services to subscribers must remain under the unequivocal control of the licensee." Not Manitoba Telephone System, as the Minister is proposing in this bill, where they shall own and control all securing, encoding, decoding, emitting, modifying and receiving telecommunications devices.

I simply ask the Minister, who is going to pay the legal bills when you get into the fight with the Federal Government, the legal battle over this bill, when it is so much against the CRTC order?

Now, the Honourable Member for Springfield says, not Don Orchard. I submit it will be Don Orchard, because if the Manitoba Telephone System pays the legal fees, it will reflect on the telephone bill, the telephone bill that I pay each and every month. If the Government of Manitoba pays it, the taxpayers will pay for it, and I am a taxpayer in the Province of Manitoba. Manitobans are going to pay the entire bill of this head-on battle that this incompetent Minister is now bringing to the head with this legislation which goes against every principle of cable television and pay television delivery in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The time being 10 o'clock, when this bill is next before the House, the honourable member will have 23 minutes remaining. The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).