

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA**  
**Monday, 21 July, 1980**

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Present Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS  
AND TABLING OF REPORTS**

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I want to table copies of the brochure on the White Paper Reforms.

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

**ORAL QUESTIONS**

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General but he's not here yet, so my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Further to our discussion of this morning during question period, can the Minister give a commitment that there will be at least a 24-hour notice, insofar as Bill 83 reaching committee of the Legislature, in order to deal with that bill in committee Clause by Clause?

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't give that commitment. The bill is now in committee for Clause by Clause consideration and members will be notified at the earliest moment that I can when the bill is going to go to committee.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, then to further explore that, can the Minister indicate a minimum notice that he may prepared to provide to the House, as well as to the public, as to when that bill indeed will reach committee?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** That's difficult, since the disposition of the business of this Chamber is somewhat uncertain. A great deal will depend on how quickly my honourable friends can conclude the legislation that is placed before them in second reading.

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

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services. Is the Minister of Government Services aware as to

whether or not the Telephone System is contemplating advancing moneys to further firms in order to enable them to pay their wages and to fulfill contracts with the Telephone System?

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

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any further advances that MTS may be contemplating to make.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was some information made public to the effect that a certain firm is unable to pay its wages and that it is now working for the Telephone System, is the Minister concerned as to whether or not the Telephone System will be considering making such loans as they have done in the past?

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm satisfied that will not be the case. The specific issue or question, subject matter the honourable member relates to, was a situation, that off-service or contract to be entered into by that firm, however, it was never concluded and no services were provided by that firm to MTS, so there is no contractual obligation by MTS to the firm in question.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, now that the Attorney-General is in his place, a question to the Attorney-General pertaining to Bills 95 and 96, The Elections Act and The Elections Finances Act respectively. In view of the fact that there is necessity for all party-type of consensus and certainly consultation involving legislation of this nature, in the general interest, the importance of these bills to the public at large, is the Minister prepared to consider referring both Bills 95 and 96 to an intersessional committee so that they can be reviewed, improved upon, so that there is a better consensus arrived at insofar as all parties of this Chamber are concerned and the general public at large?

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

**HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, there has not yet been any consideration given to referring these matters to an intersessional committee. I can certainly indicate to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that we would certainly be prepared to consider any reasonable suggestions to amendments to the Act that might be put forward by them.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further pertaining to Bill 96, since there are a number of very substantial differences which obviously exist, insofar as the government and ourselves are concerned, pertaining to that Bill, and I believe — (Interjection) — speak for herself, the Liberal Party — it would seem to be most difficult in order to develop amendments in committee, would the Minister not, insofar as that particular Bill is concerned, in view of the wide areas of difference, not be prepared to agree at least to

consider at this stage referring that Bill to an intersessional committee?

**MR. MERCIER:** As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, there has not yet been any consideration given to referring that matter to an intersessional committee.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in case there was misunderstanding, I had not asked the Minister whether there had been consideration up to this point in referring that Bill, No. 96, to an intersessional committee. A question to the Minister in case the Minister did not get a proper understanding of the question, whether he would now give some consideration to referring that Bill to an intersessional committee?

**MR. MERCIER:** Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** My question is directed to the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of reports of canvassing of American politicians and bureaucrats, which indicate that the Americans believe that the Garrison Diversion will be proceeded with, despite a conclusion to the contrary by the C.D. Howe Research Institutes Report, which the Minister passed some comment on on Sunday, is the Minister in a position to give us the clear position of the Manitoba Government with respect to what is found out regarding possible passage of the Garrison Diversion and implementation of that diversion within 10 or 15 years.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, that's almost an impossible question to answer which the honourable member has placed. I am not even sure if he has placed a question or if he simply made a statement, and I'm not sure to whom he refers when he talks about Americans that have been polled as to their position on the Garrison. I am not familiar with the information that he refers to. If it refers to people who are strong supporters of the project, then I am sure that the information would come out on the positive side for the project. Were he to gather information from those that are opposed to it, then I am sure it would come out on that side, Mr. Speaker.

I think the position of our government is quite clear on this matter, and I have stated on a number of occasions what that position is, what safeguards that the government believes that we have, and if the honourable members opposite, the Honourable Member for Transcona chooses not to recognize the safeguards that we have, the assurances that we have from the government of the United States; if other outside experts on the project choose not to believe those assurances, Mr. Speaker, then there is nothing I can do about that. I remain satisfied that in the long run, Manitoba's and Canada's interests will be protected by the mechanisms that are in place.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Supplementary to the Minister, in view of quotes directly attributed to a Senator Milton Young, the most senior Republican congressman, to the effect that he expects Ronald Reagan to be elected president, and if Ronald Reagan is elected president, that will make the way much easier for the Garrison Diversion to be proceeded with. In view of those quotations, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether in fact the Premier of this province, when he attended the Republican convention in the United States last week as the leader of the Conservative Party, actually did raise the issue of Manitoba's position against the Garrison Diversion with the Republican Party to impress upon them that we do not want the Garrison Diversion to proceed with.

Did the First Minister actually take the opportunity that he had to make that position very clear to people like Ronald Reagan, who apparently, Mr. Young believes will push through the Garrison Diversion if elected?

**MR. RANSOM:** One of the difficulties that we face as a government in attempting to deal effectively with this issue is the persistent grandstanding that we get from members such as the Member for Transcona. This project has no down sides for those who come out against it in the political grandstands, Mr. Speaker. There are down sides for those who are responsible within the government to protect the interests of Manitoba and Canada. We will attempt to do that in a responsible fashion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Transcona with a final supplementary.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last week it was the Premier of Manitoba who was grandstanding about the fact that he would be raising this issue with the Republican Party when he was there on a sympathetic visit, and in view of the fact that two or three days after his return, the most senior Republican congressman in the United States is quoted as saying that if Ronald Reagan is elected president, and he has just been nominated at the convention that the Minister was at . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. The question is repetitive. The statements are repetitive.

Would the Honourable Member for Transcona care to rephrase his question?

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes. In view of those facts, I would ask the Minister if he in fact has found out from the First Minister whether the whole issue of Garrison Diversion was raised by the First Minister when he was attending the Republican Conference, and if so, did he receive any answers from them that would contradict the statements made by Mr. Young to the effect that Ronald Reagan is in favour of the Garrison Diversion project.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I realize the Honourable Member for Transcona has a rather selective method of choosing those American politicians whom he wishes to believe. I certainly can agree with him when he apparently concludes that Governor Reagan will, in fact, be the next President

of the United States. But in this case, he chooses to believe Senator Young, who is a long-term proponent of the Garrison Project, who is retiring this year, he chooses to believe Senator Young and his assurance and his predictions that the Garrison Project will go ahead. He chooses to believe that over the assurances that we have presently have from President Carter and the executive level of government in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I don't understand that kind of selectivity on the part of the Member for Transcona. We follow the accepted procedures of communication between nations and we have treaties between nations, between Canada and the United States, we have assurances that those treaties will be adhered to, we have the assurances, the favourable recommendation to the International Joint Commission. We at one point, I thought, had a resolution passed unanimously in this House, proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, that was going to support the position taken by this government. Mr. Speaker, we don't seem to be getting that any more.

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

**HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This morning the Member for Lac du Bonnet posed a question about purchasing of concrete for repairs of PTH 44 and 59 and I'd like to inform the Member for Lac du Bonnet that that purchase was carried out in accordance with longstanding practices of the district.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister says in accordance with longstanding practice. I wonder if he would explain what that is?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, that intersection is part of District No. 12. District No. 12 each summer has to undertake a certain amount of concrete repairs and in doing so, at the beginning of each construction season, they will offer to because District 12 is centralized in and about the city of Winnipeg, they will offer the contract to supply certain amounts, and I must forewarn the Member for Lac du Bonnet that the quantities are never definitive in the offer to purchase because concrete repairs are of such nature that you may estimate that you need five cubic metres and in fact you need seven. So the contract is placed for the supply of concrete to various locations within District 12. That tender is let amongst the Winnipeg ready-mix suppliers and one supplier who offers the least cost tender is awarded that work and is called upon to perform that work and deliver that concrete to the locations at which repairs are undertaken by the district. That is the situation for the intersection that he mentions. Part of District 12, the concrete was supplied by the ready-mix contractor in Winnipeg who was awarded the contract through the lowest bid for work in District 12.

**MR. USKIW:** Just a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, did the Minister say that the project was submitted for a bid to a number of contractors within the district?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, what I said was that this concrete repair work — I don't want the impression to be left with the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Lac du Bonnet is questioning about a major road project, this is not the case. This repair job involved the supplying of some 19-1/2 cubic meters of ready-mix concrete and was part of a number of repairs that were undertaken to concrete roadways and curbs within District 12. This was one of the projects for which the total supply contract was let earlier this year by tender and was awarded to one of the contract supply firms in the city of Winnipeg. This was part of the point-to-point indefinite repair program that we undertake.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the project in question is within three to five miles of two other plants, I ask the Minister what relevance it is that the project happens to be in District No. 12. Logically, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, does it make sense to truck concrete from Winnipeg away out to No. 44 Highway when there are two plants almost adjacent to that highway who are not asked to submit proposals?

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Lac du Bonnet is choosing one location. Now, Mr. Speaker, would he expect that on the south junction of the Perimeter Highway and PTH 75 that we would call upon that same Selkirk contractor to supply the concrete there. Of course he is not, Mr. Speaker. What he is saying, is that because in one location, which is one location of probably 25 or 30 locations in District 12 that require small amounts of concrete for repair work, that we take each and every one to a separate tender and contract. That, Mr. Speaker, is not possible. It is something that hasn't been done. These small concrete repair jobs are undertaken by department staff with the supply of ready-mix concrete from the most readily available source, which 99 percent of the time, Mr. Speaker, is within District 12 within the city of Winnipeg.

He has drawn to our attention one location in which there happened to be a ready-mix plant, which would have been closer than the Winnipeg supplier. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is 19-1/2 yards of concrete, 19-1/2 cubic metres, pardon me, of concrete. To tender that one separately for the 19-1/2 cubic meters might have saved us a dollar a cubic metre on transportation; the cost of going through the tendering of that 19-1/2 cubic metres probably would have been 100.00. I suggest the economics is in the practice which has been carried on by the department for many years in providing a lump contract for supply of repair ready-mix concrete to various locations within District 12 and put that contract out on a one-tender basis, where one supplier will supply concrete to all the repair locations. That is what was done, Mr. Speaker. It is the most efficient method by which we can undertake the supply of concrete to these repair sites.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to ask the Minister whether there was more than one bid submitted for these projects that he enumerates throughout District 12.

**MR. ORCHARD:** It is my understanding that Winnipeg suppliers of ready-mix concrete bid in number on the contract, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet with a fifth question.

**MR. USKIW:** That wasn't the question that I posed. I wanted to know if there was more than one bid submitted and whether the lowest bid was accepted.

**MR. ORCHARD:** Mr. Speaker, I think when I initially answered the question, I indicated to him that concrete to be supplied for various repairs joints was tendered and the lowest tender was accepted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

**MR. EINARSON:** I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture, and the question relates to the movement of grain to Churchill. In view of the fact that Dr. Horner was able to reach a successful agreement, an interchange between the CP and CN railroad relating to the movement of grain to Churchill, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture has anything to report in the way of movement of grain to Churchill, if there is anything going now or if there intends to be a grain movement in the future?

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

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, we have continually requested the full utilization of Churchill and I understand that the Canadian Wheat Board and the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator have moved to move more supplies into Churchill so that the loading of the quotes can take place on a scheduled basis this month.

**MR. EINARSON:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister and ask him, in his consultations with the Canadian Wheat Board, what kinds of grain are they anticipating being sent to Churchill for sale to other parts of the world?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, over the past year, the Port of Churchill has been pretty well used extensively to ship barley. At this particular time, I think they are probably going to be shipping both wheat and barley, but I can check further for the member for his information.

**MR. EINARSON:** A second supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could get assurance from the Canadian Wheat Board that there will be sufficient grains in the elevator at Churchill when the first boat arrives for loading.

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

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

**MRS. JUNE WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the Honourable Attorney-General. Would the Honourable Attorney-General advise the House whether he has received any complaints from circulation of letters from the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Organization, similar to those that were circulated among the elderly of Toronto, soliciting money in the amounts of 67 or 670.00?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen any complaints come into my office.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** In view of the fact that Toronto reports revealed considerable concern among some of the elderly people, and in view of the fact that the letter is reported to chastize people for putting their money in banks instead of giving to their organization, would the Minister be willing to make a statement warning the people of Manitoba against such a solicitation?

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see one of the letters first. Perhaps the Member for Fort Rouge can provide me a copy.

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

**MR. VIC SCHROEDER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I would hope that as Minister in charge of consumers in this province he has had an opportunity to look at the White Paper which was just tabled a few minutes ago. Possibly in pursuit of honesty and truth in advertising for the Conservative Party, can he point out to the House where that document states in clear unequivocal language that the SAFER program benefits to tenants will be reduced specifically by the amount payable otherwise in property tax credits to them?

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have not had the same opportunity that my honourable friend has had of looking at the White Paper. I will take his submission into consideration.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had probably less opportunity than the Minister. We just got this paper a few minutes ago. But I will pass the question on then to the Attorney-General. Can he advise us, in pursuit of honesty in advertising for the PCs, where this document states in clear unequivocal language that that amount which people would otherwise receive in property tax credits will be taken away from tenants who are entitled to the SAFER program benefits?

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to review that document for the member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

**MR. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, again to the Attorney-General. I will just refer him to Page 3 of that document, the second paragraph, underneath the heading, "An Improved SAFER Program Helps Keep Rents Reasonable Compared to Income." The last statement shows the maximum SAFER payment will be 120 monthly or 1,440 annually. Where in that paragraph or anywhere else does it state clearly that that very tenant will lose 500 or 600 of that amount at the end of the year, even assuming they qualify for the full amount?

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

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, I would address the Acting Minister of Finance in connection with the same document which has been distributed to us entitled the White Paper Reforms. In view of the fact that it contains straightforward Conservative election propaganda, and in view of the fact that I do not see any reference to this document not being printed at public expense, may I ask whether or not this document is printed at public expense or under the Conservative Party's responsibility?

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Johns, of course, regards any effort of this government to disseminate information to the people as being propaganda, and I would be happy to take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I am quite certain I know the answer, but I will leave that to the Minister of Finance.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for . . . Order please, order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a supplementary, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources whether he would look at a paragraph opposite that of the picture of the Leader of the Conservative Party which reads, "Since the 1977 — Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted by people who seem to deny my suggestion that he is the Leader of the Conservative Party and it is not really for them to put into my mouth the words that I speak.

Mr. Speaker, the paragraph which reads, "Since the 1977 election your Manitoba government has increased support for basic services, health care and education . . . Mr. Speaker, let the record show that I was interrupted by the applause given by the members of the Conservative Party to the words I am quoting of their leader. I complete the sentence.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface):** On a point of order, the Attorney-General wasn't applauding at all; I want that in.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member had no point of order. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, may I conclude the reading; "has increased support for basic services, health care and education to meet the needs of everyone in the province." And, Mr. Speaker, to take into consideration the statement made by the Premier of the province to the effect that a section in the proposed Elections Act which provides for false statements during an election would have to be dealt with, deleted from the Act, whether he would not consider when he investigates the question I first asked him, whether this paragraph I read would not during an election be a falsehood as described by the Attorney-General under The Elections Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that paragraph would be considered a falsehood, before, during, or after an election. It's a matter of fact which the honourable members opposite do not wish to acknowledge; which their colleagues in the federal government or on the federal side were able to challenge successfully in the election of May of 1979. No doubt they will continue to try and say that this government has not increased basic support for health and education. They will be unsuccessful in doing it, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a final supplementary.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I'd like the Honourable Minister to consider his statement just given about increase of basic support and compare that with a statement which he approves which says that basic services, health care and education have been increased to meet the needs of everyone in the province.

**MR. RANSOM:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very confident of the accuracy of that statement. It's quite evident though that the government is going to have to undertake additional efforts to make that information known, not only to the members opposite, but to the general public.

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

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Attorney-General can advise whether the publication that we received today, which is entitled, White Paper Reforms, is the kind of publication that no person would be able to incur expenses for if published during an election campaign under the Act that we are considering today, namely Bill No. 96, which deals with publications that can be made during an election campaign. If this were made during an election campaign, would it be an expense that would be included in election expenses?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The question is out of order. The honourable member is seeking a legal opinion which is entirely contrary to the question period. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader concerning this pamphlet and ask him whether this was proofread, because we have a letter from the Premier to the people of Manitoba that is full of bad grammar, full of redundancies and poor punctuation. I don't want to illustrate them, I would just like to know whether that letter and this pamphlet were proofread?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader — The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question then to the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Finance, and ask him when we are going to receive information. We have made a number of requests in the House for the cost of this advertising campaign, which undoubtedly costs several hundred thousand dollars for a series of ads and pamphlets at taxpayers' expense, I think we have a right to know the total cost, and I ask him when we will receive that information.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member should file an Order for Return.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there is an Order for Return on that that has been accepted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House will be concluding its total business soon, in my judgement, I would ask whether we will receive that information this week.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return was accepted and will be dealt with in due course, the same as all Orders for Return. I can't indicate to the member whether it will be back within a week.

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

**MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, who is concerned with the White Paper and the tax changes. There is reference in the introductory remarks of the Premier requesting citizens to phone in for applications and we will make sure the proper applications are sent to you as soon as they become available. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance when will those applications become available.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, there are several thousand that will be sent out this week that have already been received, and the applications will go out with them. Some of the programs, as the member will be aware, start January 1, some start in September. The MSP Program for those over 65 will be automatic, and their first cheque. I believe it is their October 1 cheque, which covers September

will be automatically adjusted so there will be no necessity for those to qualify or to make any applications. For pensioners under 65, applications will be necessary. I don't think they are being mailed out at the present time. If in the ones that have been received there has been a request for the 55-65 age group, they will be advised that it will be mailed out immediately it is available.

In any event the program for them will start in September regardless of whether they may have had the application prior to, say, August 15th or whatever it may be. There is no problem in that regard.

The Day Care Program, which starts also this fall, is similar. There have been requests come in, they have been documented, that information is being sent out immediately; the program is on course and is going on schedule at the present time.

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a supplementary. Could the Minister of Finance give us some approximate idea how many of these pamphlets have been printed, and could he indicate what is the nature of the distribution? Members of the Legislature have them, but are substantial quantities being made available to each MLA for distribution in their riding for example, or what has the government decided to do with regard to the method of distribution of this pamphlet?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I trust the member would like to acquire a number of these for distribution to his constituents, in which case we will certainly take it under consideration. I can't tell him how many are available in total. I can tell the member that there is sufficient information there for a person to find out what category they may be in, and then upon specific contact they can obtain information on their specific case. It is impossible to deal with every single case at one time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe at the present time, as I say, there are several thousand, I think some 20,000 inquiries that now have to be dealt with immediately with the mail-out of this brochure. I presume that there will be several more twenties of thousands that will be dealt with immediately upon the specific inquiry coming into this office.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister referred to a mail-out of this brochure. Is he suggesting that there will be one of these in the mail to every household or every person?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, no, that hasn't been the proposal to date, but perhaps the member has a good idea, perhaps we should send it out to every . . .

**MR. USKIW:** Well, I simply want to follow that up with an obvious question, Mr. Speaker, and that is whether under the new Elections Act there will be provision for a ballot to go out with such a brochure?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. George.

**MR. BILLIE URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Finance. Can the Minister of Finance indicate where the application forms will be made available if anyone wishes to pick them up, or does anyone who wants an application form have to phone in — is that the only way the forms will be made available?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the general procedure would be to phone either the long distance number that is available here or to write in. In the case of the school tax rebate for property owners, the information is also made available through the municipal offices, and there will, of course, be information that is available through all the relevant government services to people. For instance, those falling under the MSP Program will have information available to them because they will already have been in contact with the government staff person over the course of the years of them having received it.

For those in the age group 55-65 there will be some difficulty — well not quite as readily available information — they will be required to make application.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member with a final question.

**MR. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I just asked one question, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Minister of Finance whether or not the control of not letting application forms go out to provincial offices is a means to gauging the public acceptance or not, and whether or not another brochure of this nature will have to be published to make sure that the public well knows that the Tories are electioneering?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I have to advise the Member for St. George that the advertisement program that was carried out through the newspapers has been extremely successful so far. We have a satisfactory number of applications, and we know that we are getting through to the people that are in need.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will you all Bills No. 107, 95, 96, and 86 in that order.

### ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

### BILL NO. 107 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD ACT AND THE MANITOBA TELEPHONE ACT

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 107 — the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MRS. WESTBURY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again I'm not going to spend very long with this bill. I have had it read, and there's not a great deal wrong with this bill, Mr. Speaker, I suggest, but there are a few questions that need to be answered and a few things that need to be straightened out I think, before it goes to third reading. I can't hear myself.

Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Public Utilities Board will be controlling the equipment to be used and the Manitoba Telephone system will be the owner of the lines, but not for their own programming, and I'd like to have these understandings confirmed by the Minister when he closes debate because some of these things aren't altogether clear. I would just like to have them clarified, please, for the record.

The Public Utilities Board approval is required before cable operators, for instance, can rent the lines, Mr. Speaker, with eventually Public Utilities Board controlling all signals that go out on the lines for non-programming services. My advisors say they do not agree with this particular aspect. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister can explain the thinking behind this, if it is in fact as we read it. My advisors believe this matter should be tendered or handled on a first-come first-served basis, if the application meets minimum standards. On the other hand, the application in itself to the Public Utilities Board causes some difficulty, as the legal costs to prepare a good submission are hard to meet and make it probably prohibitive for some private businesses to apply.

The coaxial cable is owned by Manitoba Telephone System but the cable TV owners own the amplifiers and the drops to the outlet from the main line. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm told that the Manitoba Telephone System has the option to buy the cable drops and amplifiers but have not picked up that option. What is the situation there? Is it the intention that the telephone system should own all the equipment and others should rent or lease it? The suggestion that I would make is that the telephone system should be a passive carrier and provide service to those using the line.

Mr. Speaker, I presume that the difficulty referred to in the Free Press, which says that the amendment bill will change the powers requiring Public Utilities Board to approve all television sets in the province, I presume that is an error that will be corrected before it returns to this Chamber from the committee, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.  
The Honourable Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I won't take any great amount of time in closing debate on Bill 107. I wish to thank the honourable members, the Member for Inkster, the Member for St. Vital, the Member for Brandon East and the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, for their contribution. And surprisingly, Mr. Speaker, although very welcome, their support for this bill; it doesn't always happen to a member of

government when he seems to have, with some reservations, support for a measure that he introduces, particularly, when the matter is of substance and of considerable significance. I'm not so sure, Mr. Speaker, that all of us, and that includes myself, are totally aware of the significance of what's happening in the telecommunications industry and what's liable to happen in the future. Members have received, at some time, a mailing or a brochure from the Manitoba Telephone System entitled "Exploring the Wired World;" I would refer all the members to that, they certainly are available from MTS.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 107 is not complex in its basic structure, it reasserts and reaffirms the common-carrier goal for Manitoba Telephone System, and that is a role that Manitoba Telephone System has for many years, indeed since 1908, enjoyed and has been understood to carry out that role. However, what's happened in the last decade, or perhaps a few years beyond that, with computer technology and communications' technology merging, the two have become blurred and people are, wiser people, sociologists, are calling it, that we are now entering into the age of information, where massive, massive amounts of information and services will be available or can be available to all of us, with the combination of those two technologies. The massive memory capacity of modern-day computers, along with the exotic forms of telecommunication, Mr. Speaker, they are bursting about us so fast that it's difficult to keep track of them.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that it's against House rules to bring exhibits into the chamber, but, you know, it's hard to visualize that this hair-like thread that I have . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I would suggest that if the honourable member has an exhibit, that he not bring it into this House; he may take it to committee, and I would suggest that anything he does with an exhibit, he do in committee rather than this chamber. The Honourable Minister.

**MR. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, I'll leave it be, but what I was attempting to say was, that that little hairlike fibre, made of glass, now has the capacity of carrying thousandfold the voice, picture, data transmission, which today is more conventionally carried on either copper wire, or indeed the coaxial cable that we have.

The kind of situations that are facing a telecommunications' carrier system are complex because of these changes. It's quite possible and quite probable that in the future the same cable will carry, voice, picture, video and data along the same electronic highway, and what we have done, Mr. Speaker, in Bill 107 is ensure that Manitoba Telephone System will continue to be that common carrier, and derive and continue to be in a position to offer to Manitobans in the widest possible way, the full range of this service, that Manitobans have become dependent upon and I'm referring to the basic telephone service, as well as extending to as many Manitobans as possible, the future services that are just on the horizon.

Mr. Speaker, what honourable members aren't particularly, you know, perhaps, aware of is that the possibilities of allowing a greater degree of

interconnections, the bill specifically refers to the consideration for allowing terminal attachments — is one of concern, and I'm sure all members, if they discuss or have contact with MTS officials, that these concerns will be expressed to them. We believe however, Mr. Speaker, that by making available to MTS, it's a share of the revenues of the new services that are already there and that will be expanded upon in the next decade so that any loss of revenue that may accrue to MTS as a result of allowing a greater freedom in terminal attachments, greater freedom of purchasing equipment, not necessarily owned by the system, will be offset by the measure that makes it very clear that MTS will be able to charge its tariff for the carrying of any and all services on the electronic highway.

Mr. Speaker, the bill in itself is not of any great length. I would have liked to have had, of course, the opportunity to have discussed, the bill as I'm sure any Minister would have liked to, with some of the people most directly concerned, in this instance, namely, some of the present cable operators, MTS itself, under our rules that's not specifically possible until the bill is public and distributed, so that there will be some amendments made at committee stage to this bill. The situation that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge referred to, I can assure her that is being addressed.

There is also a concern that I mentioned at the time I introduced the bill for second reading, that there are provisions in here for the Public Utilities Board to be responsible for some of the matters that currently are not within the jurisdiction of the province. Upon further advice, even though I indicated at the time of second reading that we were not presumptive at all in doing that, we at the time we drafted the bill felt it would be advisable to put it in there in the event that constitutional changes would come about within the next year that would indeed bring some of this delegation of powers to the provinces, that it would be in fact in place.

Mr. Speaker, my advice is that it has caused some nervousness in Ottawa and other places and I will be withdrawing that section of the bill. Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to break any of your rigidly adhered to House rules, so I can't refer to the specific section, but I just simply indicate, if the members remember, that there was a reference to giving PUB authority on programming matters, which at the moment is clearly within the federal jurisdictions. So those kind of . . . some changes will be proposed by the Ministry at the time the bill comes to the committee stage.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the biggest concern here is the strengthening that we will require of the Public Utilities Board itself. The Public Utilities Board will become a very important body in the development of telecommunications in the province of Manitoba. That is something that I'm happy to say is reasonably well accepted by the industry. They would prefer to deal with a public body, in a public forum. I would have to reject the suggestion that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge made, that the accessibility to the highway could only be made to those who get to the door first, or who have some prior advantage in accessing that system. The idea is to make this system that we publicly own as accessible as possible to all those who wish to provide services on it.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I have to indicate to the Honourable Member for Brandon, we sometimes accept a word of advice or an impression that is totally erroneous. In Canada the cable — he made some reference to the fact that in Canada we were a decade or so behind in cable development to that which has occurred in our American cities to the south of us. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is it is just the opposite. Minneapolis, for instance, has no cablevision. Boston has no cablevision. Their cities are just getting it now. There was a different situation, they had such a multiplicity of channel selections with three major networks offered, there was not the requirement. But the fact remains, now to provide these additional services, alarm systems, they are now developing cable plant which we have had for the last 15 years in Winnipeg.

In that sense — it's a small point, Mr. Speaker, but in this instance, the city of Brandon has cable television service while the city of Minneapolis or Boston or Cleveland does not. And the kind of race that is going on in those cities now is that it will enable Canadian communities to advance, I would suggest, particularly with this kind of legislation, much faster in the development of the ancillary services that are possible under the coaxial, fibre optic, and cable system generally. I am referring to such services — (Interjection) — yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite right. In the United States the cable development has been the exact reverse to what it has been in Canada. In the United States the rural communities have cable, but not the large cities. In Canada the large cities have had cable for a number of years and rural communities are just now getting it.

Mr. Speaker, the other particularly important feature that we want to build into the bill, and we think we have in the bill, and certainly it should be very clear of government's intent, and that is to allow and to encourage maximum competition in the delivery of services available on this public electronic highway. There is a tendency to regard these services as monopolistic private franchises and certainly that is the case to some extent with the present cable operators having conveniently divided the city in two and offering — in effect having a monopoly on the current cable services in their respective shares of the city.

But it is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that with the Public Utilities Board being the fair and objective adjudicator and being the adjudicator that also will ensure that MTS's revenues will be protected, and being the adjudicator and the arbitrator that will see to the differences that arise from time to time as to rights, as to rates, that the log jam that has been created in the past several years, where we have had a number of entrepreneurs prepared to offer some of the services but haven't been able to get past the red tape, if you like, or put them into operation, will very shortly, upon passage of this bill, begin to flow.

Mr. Speaker, let me to indicate to the honourable members that the government is not in any hurry in the implementation of the various parts of this Act. It is obvious to the honourable members that a number of things have to be done prior to the implementation of this act. The strengthening of the Public Utilities Board, of course, is the obvious one. The kind of personnel, the kind of people, the people

that have a particular experience or expertise in the field of technology will have to be sought out to assist the Public Utilities Board in beginning to grapple with some of the problems that will be referred to it very very immediately upon passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the honourable members' continued co-operation and support at the committee stage of this bill. I would have to indicate to the honourable members that I am more than pleased in the general response, the responsible way that the private sector has responded to this bill. Certainly they have their concerns.

There was a question being raised about the continuation of the 1967 agreement. Let it be clearly understood that under the — while not specifically provided for in the bill, because it is not necessary — but the intention is to let Manitoba Telephone System exercise the option of taking over the ownership of the amplifiers and drops of the two present cable companies. Mr. Speaker, let me not pass over lightly that that is a considerable move by the public sector into the private sector. We are assured, and I have been able to assure the current operators, that is, the Greater Winnipeg Cablevision Company and the Videon people, that while this technically places them in violation of their federal licence, in discussions that I have had with the federal Minister and his officials that their licences can be amended to accommodate this move that the province is taking.

There is certainly a feeling on the part of the present cable operators who invested substantial amounts of money in developing the cable industry in the Winnipeg area that they are losing some portion of control over what they feel was theirs.

Mr. Speaker, they appreciate the fact that option was there, was built into the contract in 1967, and the fact that that is being exercised now is being accepted, if not with any great enthusiasm, but certainly with an acknowledgment that it is the prerogative of MTS to do so. However, they have asked for, and I believe not just they, but we have insisted that in the interests of making sure that the system, the electronic highway that we speak of, is accessible to as many companies that wish to provide services to Manitobans in the future, to make sure that the financial arrangements arrived at, contractual price paid for spectrum space, is equitable and fair to all companies, and open to public scrutiny. That is the reason for that substantial shift of responsibility out of Manitoba Telephone System's hands and into the sphere of the Public Utilities Board.

Mr. Speaker, it our hope that this bill and the subsequent actions that will have to be taken at Manitoba Telephone System, at the Public Utilities Board, and by the private sector in Manitoba, will usher in what some people refer to as the Age of Information into Manitoba, and that it will be done in an orderly way.

Mr. Speaker, I close by reading one short paragraph of so much information that is available on this subject matter, and this particular person, a Mr. James Martin, who is deemed to be one of the world's foremost systems and computer authors indicates that: "There is a danger that politics, lobbying, monopolistic sloth, regulatory ignorance, or

vested interests will rob us of part of the riches that the technology could bring. It behooves our politicians and regulators to understand fully the many facets of possible future developments in telecommunications."

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can prevent some of the problems that the author suggests are possible, as it always has been the case when new technology impacts on our society, that we approach it in an intelligent and orderly way, in a way that will benefit the maximum number of people in this province.

Thank you.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL NO. 95 — THE ELECTIONS ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 95 — the Honourable Member for Logan.

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

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

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to deal with this Bill 95 under three different headings. Before I get to them, let me say I see a certain similarity involved here in the main with a bill brought in by one of the Attorney-General's colleagues, the Minister of Education, and that had to do with The Public Schools Act.

Both of these Acts date back a great number of years, several decades in fact, and both of them have been amended from time to time and changes made to cope with changing situations. The present revisions to both of them have been to make the Act easier to read, to delete some rather archaic provisions and generally to tidy up an old Act. From that perspective, Mr. Speaker, we don't have any objection to making the bill neater and tidier, and to make it work easier.

My colleague, who spoke on the bill a little earlier, pointed out a few minor problems with the bill, and suggested that at committee stage these matters could be addressed and hopefully put right. When the bill should get to such a stage, we also would be interested in assisting to correct or to improve some of the small sections. It would not be our feeling to hold up the bill unduly because of those rather minor things.

The three main things that I had to deal with had first to do with a matter that has been raised before in this Chamber, as a matter of fact I believe it was raised on the day that the bill was introduced by a colleague, and that had to do with what has been called the "Truth Squad", but we will accept the word of the Honourable First Minister that this provision is to be deleted from the Act; accepting that assurance there would seem to be no further point in belabouring that particular aspect of the bill.

There was one part of the bill that concerned me particularly, Mr. Speaker. It concerned me partly because of the rather cavalier manner that it had

been dealt with and passed over. The Minister said in introducing his remarks, "Wherever possible, Mr. Speaker, Bill 95 attempts to make it easier for voters to participate in the electoral process." Mr. Speaker, I agree with that, I think that is a good principle to bear in mind, but what Bill 95 also does is to make it impossible for some of the people who are presently voting to vote at all.

Mr. Speaker, what I am referring to here is a particular category of people who can presently vote. In order to perhaps explain it a little easier, I would like to go back to The Manitoba Act, 1870. We have heard other references to that particular Act. For the benefit of those members who might be interested, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read out the qualifications of voters as of some 110 years ago. Qualification of voters, section 17, of the act said, "Every male person shall be allowed to vote." Apparently women of no age were allowed to vote at that particular time. Not only that, males had to be 21 in order to vote in 1870, something that we've changed. They had also to be a subject of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization and had to be a bona fide householder within the electoral division, Mr. Speaker. So it would seem that in those days that tenants were not allowed to cast a ballot at a provincial election. Not only that, there was one further stipulation for the first election, and that was that the voter had to be resident for 12 months prior to the passing of the act.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a number of progressive strides since those days. The 12-month residency requirement is in the present act, but I notice that Bill No. 95 seeks to improve that or change it to a mere six months. Whether that's an improvement or not I'm not sure. Whether it requires only six months to become familiar with the political situation in Manitoba, or whether it takes it 12 months, I suppose that would vary with individuals, and the six months or 12 months has a certain arbitrariness involved in that matter.

Mr. Speaker, in the 110 years since The Manitoba Act, the act has been changed to allow tenants to vote in provincial elections, which is an improvement. Also, the age of 21 years was reduced to 18, as I recall, approximately 10 years ago, which again increases the franchise, and giving the vote to women was an early change in our election law, early that is, in comparison with other provinces. What we have seen over those years has been a steady increase or improvement in the size of the electorate and a general liberalization of the right to vote. There have been other changes that have been made, Mr. Speaker, which I support also. That has to do with the provision for blind voters; for a mail-in ballot; systems to incapacitated voters; the provision that people who are in a mental institution or a provincial correctional institution not against their own will, have been allowed to vote, and I support those provisions as well.

In viewing on the one hand a gradual expansion of the right to vote, as well as an easing of the ability to vote, we find in this particular bill that the Attorney-General intends to take away from a certain group of Manitobans the right to vote which has been enshrined in the legislation now for 110 years. The Minister is probably aware that under the category of persons entitled to vote under the present act, is the

phrase, Canadian citizens and British subjects. The Minister is changing that to delete the words, "and other British subjects." But he really doesn't give a reason, Mr. Speaker, nor does he advise the House how many people that he is concerned with in this matter. I asked his colleague, the Minister of Education, who was attempting to bring in a similar provision, and he didn't know either.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it runs into the thousands rather than a smaller number, but it would be interesting to find out what that number is. One particular change that I note between those two Ministers, is that the Minister of Education takes the bull by the horns, takes away that right to vote immediately on Royal Assent of the particular bill; the Attorney-General for some reason or another, I don't know whether it's his personality or his method of doing things, but he doesn't intend to do it immediately, only in three years' time; again he really doesn't give us a reason for this.

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister had come forward and given us a very valid reason to take away the right to vote from a group of people, I would like to consider that on its merits, and if other other British subjects as a group pose some particular danger to the democratic system in this province, I would like to consider that before I supported it. If other British subjects were so concentrated in particular constituencies and voted in a particular manner or supported some particular or peculiar political philosophy that was a danger to the province, I would have liked to have considered it on that basis. If other British subjects as a group were somehow subversive, or out to upset or do damage to this province, well that might be a reasonable cause to take away their capacity to do that damage, but I see no reasons of that type given at all.

It would appear in reading this bill, that it's purely a matter of administrative convenience, Mr. Speaker. A similar reference or reply was given by the Minister of Education when he proposed the same thing. The only reason that he could give was, well, it brings it in line with another act. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to pursue that matter of administrative convenience, there are a whole lot of other groups that you could take away the voting rights from and have a very very neat and tidy and orderly and easily run election campaign. Let me say again to the Minister, if he has a particular very strong overriding reason why he should take away the right to vote from several thousand people, I would ask him to tell it. If he does not, then I would ask him to review this particular requirement, because surely the right to vote is perhaps the most basic of all of the rights that we enjoy or hope that we enjoy.

I would like to ask him too if he can tell us who is in this category of other British subjects. Certainly it would include some people that have been in this country for many many decades. There are a lot of ex-servicemen who found that after the war they were for some reason not classified as Canadian citizens, yet had adopted this country as their home and settled here and fought for this country in wartime, and that is the situation they found themselves in. There were significant numbers of war brides who came to this country as the wives of Canadians citizens, assuming that because their husbands were Canadian citizens and that they had

come here and settled, that they were counted as and classed, and in fact were Canadian citizens, and found out to their chagrin that for some reason that they were not counted as Canadian citizens. For what reason they are being now proposed to be deprived of their right to vote, I really don't know. But I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the largest group of all of "other British subjects" are those people who have come here from other Commonwealth countries and that is what we are considering here who have not been here long enough to become Canadian citizens. I suspect that this is perhaps the largest category that keeps turning over as new people come each year, as they put in the necessary three or five years, whatever it is, so they can become Canadian citizens.

Again I raise the question, what harm are they doing, what damage are they doing to this province in order to deprive them of that right to vote for those three years or five years until they become Canadian citizens? I don't accept the reason that has been given that it is purely an administrative convenience. We don't do things of great policy import for the benefit of civil servants and those people who might be administering a particular act.

I referred a little earlier to two different Ministers on that side, who are both taking away this right to vote from "other British subjects", but are doing so on a different basis. It is rather like a prisoner who is told, you have been found guilty and sentenced to hang in the morning, the day after tomorrow. The Minister of Education wants to bring in his measure immediately; the Attorney-General is cautious, or for some other reason, and wants to delay it for three years.

I am a little disappointed that the Honourable First Minister is not in the House this afternoon. I had intended to appeal to him, who made a statement on this matter of the "Truth Squad" immediately seen, when he spoke of civil liberties and the need for a close watch to be kept on that sort of thing. Knowing it is the First Minister who has a very keen sense of the value of the parliamentary system and the democratic system in this country, I had intended to make an appeal to him to step in on this particular clause and to see that the voter requirements are kept at the present requirement.

Mr. Speaker, I also expect to have a few remarks to make on Bill 96, which will be coming up soon. I see Bill 95 and Bill 96 as being companion bills in that part of what is in one bill is referred to and followed up in the other.

The Leader of the Opposition made the suggestion earlier this afternoon that Bill 96, particularly, be referred to an committee for discussion between sessions, and I would make the point that since part of one bill has an effect on part of another bill, it would seem logical that they both be treated in the same manner; that if it is the government's intention to deal with both of those bills at this session and he should be prepared for a considerable discussion on them at the committee stage — that they should be treated in the same manner in pushing them through to committee. If the government is prepared to accept the suggestion that they go to a committee for discussion between sessions, again I would like to suggest that the two bills go together and should not be dealt with on a separate basis.

I would further urge, Mr. Speaker, that these bills be sent to a committee, for another reason, and that is, I am somewhat alarmed at the length of this particular session. I have been one of those in the past who has been in favour of having two sessions a year, some arrangement whereby legislation can come into the House and be discussed perhaps past Second Reading or even First Reading, and then referred for inter-sessional discussion and consideration and brought back at the second session of the year. I noticed that we did that a year ago when we referred two education bills to an inter-sessional committee; I believe that was a worthwhile exercise. I note that the suggestion has been made this year that there are a whole bunch of professional bills, which are being considered to be referred to a committee, and it would seem reasonable that somewhat technical bills, such as these elections acts — and they are technical and will have long-range effects too — ought also to be referred to an inter-sessional committee. Maybe they can be laid over and brought back at our regular session of next spring; maybe the House will meet again later this year to consider some of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am hearing some heckling from the other side, and I would tell the members I am a little hard of hearing and I can't hear what the remark was.

Those were my concerns with this bill, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the matter of the "Truth Squad," which I understand is coming out of this bill, and so it should; and secondly, the matter of voting rights for those who are called "other British subjects;" and thirdly, the fact that Bill 96, at least, and preferably Bill 95 as well, ought to be referred by this House for a much closer and in-depth scrutiny by a committee between sessions.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to just add a few words to those that have already been uttered pertaining to Bill 95.

There is one particular aspect of this bill that does concern me. In The Federal Elections Act those that are admitted voluntarily to an institute for mental diseases are given the opportunity to vote in a federal election, if indeed they are permitted to leave that institution the day of the election to vote in their home constituencies.

Now, I would like clarification from the Minister. It appears to me from my reading of the sections in the bill, that indeed the same type of provision does not prevail insofar as the provincial situation is concerned. We find reference to those that are disqualified from voting to include persons who are patients in mental hospitals or institutions for mental retardates. Certainly I understand that insofar as those that have been committed, why they would not be permitted to vote, but insofar as those voluntarily committed to a hospital for mental diseases, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister to examine the practice at the federal level.

I can remember in the last federal election, that indeed there was quite a bit of discussion. I know in the hospital in my own constituency, amongst those that were voluntarily committed, the candidates held

meetings in the institution; there were speeches; there were question periods; so that those residents did not lose their franchise. I note that in the bill that there is provision, and support this, that those in jails that are detained and are awaiting a period for a date to be set for trial, are permitted to vote. I am wondering if the Minister could not consider altering the provisions of this bill to ensure that it is consistent with the federal legislation, possibly to provide for a travelling ballot box. I think that could be worked out; I think it would be feasible to do that.

I really, Mr. Speaker, do not want to take any more time pertaining to this bill. It is an extensive bill with widespread ramifications, and though I do not feel as strongly about this bill as I do 96, I do think that it ought to be referred, along with 96, to an inter-sessional committee. It seems to me that will give members a much better opportunity to see if a fair and reasonable consensus cannot be arrived at.

A bill such as this, and such as the companion piece of legislation, surely is legislation that is not of a partisan nature, but is legislation that must be seen to be fair and open and acceptable to all the political forces within a province to a reasonable degree. I would therefore trust, and I do think the Attorney-General would be in concurrence, that there should be the utmost effort to ensure that type of consensus, if in fact the legislation is to receive acceptance by the public at large, by the political parties that are involved in the democratic process, so that indeed our democratic process can be strengthened and can be made healthier in the years that lie ahead. I would say to the Attorney-General, that I think from his point of view, from our point of view, from the point of view of Manitobans in general, it would be better to have this bill and certainly Bill 96 reviewed inter-sessionally to ensure that we do have that type of legislation that would be arrived at with the widest and the fullest area of consensus.

We will be supporting the passage of Bill 95 from this House, Second Reading, until we reach committee; we will be listening to submissions that are made in committee pertaining to 95, and, of course, we will be reserving our position insofar as voting this bill out of committee at that stage. We may very well feel even more strongly that it should be referred to inter-sessional committee at that stage. At this point, in principle we would support its departure from this House, Second Reading, to committee, so that it can be dealt with at the committee stage.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Brandon East.

**MR. EVANS:** Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to take very much time. I simply want to reiterate what my Leader has just said, and also, in particular, the one point that was made by my colleague, the Member for St. Vital, with regard to discrimination against British subjects.

I really appeal to the Attorney-General to reconsider this matter and hopefully withdraw that particular provision. I believe there is no need for this type of discrimination. We have a long historical connection with the Crown, we recognize the Queen in Canada, we have the Union Jack in our flag, it is

right beside the Speaker; we have other historic connections with Great Britain, the mother country of Canada, and indeed we are operating under the British Parliamentary System. I really believe that there is no great advantage in discriminating against those particular British subjects, who for whatever reason are not now Canadian citizens. There may be some particular explanation, but I haven't heard it.

I would therefore ask the Minister to reconsider on this particular clause— this is really the only one that I want to discuss in this bill, although I support what my Leader said generally about referring the bill to an intersessional committee for more deliberation, but this one in particular I would urge the Minister to reconsider and hopefully change or withdraw from the bill.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Vital, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I should indicate the Member for Morris, who is acting as government House Leader, wanted me to indicate that would not be allowing debate on this bill to stand tonight.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** On a point of order. You gave the Honourable Attorney-General the courtesy of making the statement he just did. I gather he is not the House Leader on this today and I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, in response to his point of order, which I assume it was, that it seems pretty precipitous when you are into a debate of this kind and an Act of this kind to force closure in the way that seems to be indicated. I hope that the good sense of the honourable members of the government will see to it that there is ample opportunity to debate this bill.

## BILL NO. 96 THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The next bill on my list is Bill No. 96. Are you ready for the question? The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in seeing this bill go to a committee, Mr. Speaker. I am interested in this bill being buried as far underground as my honourable friends can dig it because, Mr. Speaker, as I see this bill, it is the road to political statism, Mr. Speaker. My friends in the Conservative Party talk about state control and indeed, Mr. Speaker, I make no secret of the fact that I believe that the public generally should have a much greater involvement in our economic affairs. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I have resisted in opposition between 1966 and 1969, resisted in government between 1969 and 1977, and will again resist the

involvement of the state in matters political, Mr. Speaker, and ideological, and this particular bill is a movement in that direction.

I will concede this one point to my friends in the government; I will concede that they are not the political party which can claim most responsibility for this type of legislation. I will also concede, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably the New Democratic Party that made more noise about election finances and election financing reform than any other party. But having done that, Mr. Speaker, I say that the Conservative Party has picked up this theme with a vengeance and have brought in a bill, Mr. Speaker, which points clearly the direction towards political involvement by the state in election financing and election campaigns and in freedom of speech mostly during an election can be carried, and it's not the end of the road, Mr. Speaker. These are the initial paving stones and the road leads, Mr. Speaker, to political statism and that political statism will be to ultimate detriment, in my view, of those parties that stand for the kind of things or at least say they stand for the kinds of things that I stood for when I entered politics.

Mr. Speaker, we have an interesting position today. It is coincidental that we receive a debate on Bill No. 96, or that we are engaged in a debate on Bill No. 96, and we are also — have put on the table, Mr. Speaker, a document called The White Paper Reforms, which in my view, Mr. Speaker, is a blatant use of public expenditures for the purpose of advertising the political objectives of the Conservative Party in the province of Manitoba. And one, Mr. Speaker, which incidentally and interestingly enough will not be subject to The Election Finances Act because it is not published during an election campaign. And even if it were published during an election campaign, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day would take the position that it is informational in nature.

Mr. Speaker, there is no secret about the fact that throughout the period of 1966-1969 when I made numerous speeches in this House, arguing against the government's use of public funds for the purpose of party and political positions in the Information Services Branch and in other branches. It is also, Mr. Speaker, no secret that while a Minister of the Crown, I never once permitted the Information Services Branch to prepare material on behalf of my department unless, Mr. Speaker, I requested the material, and the material that was presented was of an informational nature and demonstrably so, Mr. Speaker, as to when hunting licenses would be issued, as to when an environmental clean-up program in terms of picking up litter off the streets was being done. But it is confirmed, Mr. Speaker, and has been confirmed by the present Minister of Finance, that the only department that Information Services did not have a blanket authority to print political material and churn it out and send it to the weeklies and to the dailies and to the country newspapers, was the Department of Mines and Resources while under my particular portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, it is also the fact that when the initial Election Expenses Act came in, I indicated, and Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to do this without sounding somewhat as a person without any humility whatsoever, but I have been quoted nationally as

having been against the kind of "election reform" financing, that has been pursued by the New Democratic Party, both at the national and at the provincial level. And, Mr. Speaker, the things that I said are now coming home to roost and can be seen in this Act.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that according to this Act, you cannot say what your party name is, except that an election group can say that you are prohibited from using that name. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, make an anonymous contribution to a political party. It may be that someone wishes to make a contribution to a political party and does not wish to be known as a contributor to any political party or to that political party, something, Mr. Speaker, which I respect, but it is illegal under this Act. And how naive can one be, Mr. Speaker? Is that contribution going to made? Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of what happens at the party organizational level since I have been there; been there both before and during the time that we were in government.

I say, Mr. Speaker, this Act won't create more equitable election financing; it will create more liars out of people who have normally been honest and who were quite prepared to be honest, except that they have been now faced with a piece of legislation wherein they required to disclose political contributions which somebody wishes to make but cannot make if his name is attached to them and therefore, Mr. Speaker, that political contribution has to be laundered through a third person such as the Conservative Party Trust Fund of the province of Manitoba. And the honourable member says that I am doing away with the trust fund; that the trust fund has to say where they got it. How far will you go, Mr. Speaker? How far will you go if someone comes in with a political contribution to a political party and says that my name is John Smith, I wish to give 500 to the New Democratic Party. Will you be required to ask that person, where did you get the 500.00?

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Government Services says maybe, and I say, as we add pavement to this road, not maybe, but certainly, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, that is where we are going, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that direction is the road to political statism, something that we should stop the moment we see it being germinated in the fashion in which was germinated, I will admit during our government, Mr. Speaker, but the Minister is carrying it the further steps that I said it would go if we happen to move in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, why do we need this bill? We need this bill because some people for many years, refusing to admit their inadequacy, blamed all their problems on the fact that some parties were rich and they were poor. They didn't lose because they didn't have a good program; they didn't lose because they had no organization; they had to rationalize their loss and therefore they rationalized it by saying that the other party has got all the money to spend on advertising, television, and entertainment, and bribing voters and what have you, and we lost because we couldn't match them dollar for dollar. That was the rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, that I heard from losers; from continuous losers who could not accept blame for political defeat and therefore blamed it on the fact that they were poor.

Mr. Speaker, let us remember that given the same circumstances, that is power of money economic power, over an idea that would catch the imagination of the people, and which they could push forward, money has never really won. Mr. Douglas won in Saskatchewan with laws which never made it improper for people to have more money to advertise against him, and they did. Mr. Thatcher used far more money to advertise against Mr. Blakeney than Mr. Blakeney could use against him, and Mr. Blakeney won. The election that was won in the province of Manitoba in 1969 used almost no money whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. It was an election that was run on virtually no money and the election was won; and the labour government won in England under those rules, and governments who were prepared to fight with the strength of their ideas won universally, Mr. Speaker, without passing laws which were intended to deprive the people in power of their right to advertise themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the right of people to advertise themselves and the money they have to spend on themselves to try to prove how good they are will not make a silk purse out of a pig's ear, and the public is not going to vote for a pig's ear, no matter how much you advertise. Mr. Speaker, further than that, this pamphlet, I suggest to you, indicates the utter desperation and inadequacy and frustration, Mr. Speaker, and collapse of the Conservative administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard it before, I will give you the words. Somewhere in an office in the Conservative Party where you have hired political hacks, they are saying to you, your program is terrific, we like it, but the people are not getting it. They are not understanding it. It is not coming through, and you have to do something to get and convey your program to the people. And if you do that the people will not only see how good you are, but they will vote for you.

Mr. Speaker, the people will not say that at all. The people will say that if the Conservative Party of the province of Manitoba has to spend my money to send me this type of junk to tell me how good they are, they must be an awfully bad government. Mr. Speaker, I know whereof I speak. I have seen it happen before in places very intimate to me. And the fact is that it didn't help another government and the political hats did not get the kind of response that they wanted, because they don't know what they are talking about, and it spelled, Mr. Speaker, not the elevation of the government in the eyes of the public, but it spelled their downfall. And I look to this pamphlet, Mr. Speaker, as being more an indication of the self-conscious knowledge of their defeat by the Conservative Party, that they have decided to do, Mr. Speaker, the ultimate. They are going to take the taxpayers' money and they are going to spend that taxpayers' money to try to convince the taxpayers themselves how good they are.

Mr. Speaker, there are members on that side of the House who disagree with doing this. I know that there are, and they have lost their argument and we have delivered to us this document, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest to you, and I say it without real fear, Mr. Speaker, that I am making an exaggerated statement that this document — the document doesn't spell the defeat of the government, the

document indicates the defeat of the government; indicates their own view of themselves, that they are not sufficiently credible to be believed, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, they have to publish something with taxpayers' money to elevate that position. Mr. Speaker, when a government themselves know that they are no good, then you can rest assured that the public knows that they are no good.

So what do we have now, Mr. Speaker, along these lines? We have a system whereby political parties have to be registered. No, that is wrong; political parties may register. It is not yet clear to me what happens if a political party does not register, but if, Mr. Speaker, the Minister will tell me that none of this will apply to a political party that does not register, then I can tell you that whatever political party I happen to be with, if I am with one, I will convince them with all of the strength that I have at my command to not register, that there is no value to putting a political party under the control of the state, because once you put yourself in the hands of the state, the state will tell you when a person is a volunteer and giving services of his own free will, and when he has taken time off from perhaps his practice as a lawyer, therefore his legal rates per day has to be included as part of goods and services delivered voluntarily for which credit has been given, and if that is not here now, Mr. Speaker, it will be here. It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, we now have a law that will tell a person what he can call himself. You know, I have always known that there can be no law saying what other people can call you, but now there will be a law saying that if you use the word "independent" you cannot be registered as a political party, you cannot use the word "independent" to be registered as a political party.

**A MEMBER:** How about the Independent Party?

**MR. GREEN:** You cannot have an Independent Party. There will be a law against an Independent Party. The use of the word "independent" will not be registered. Now that's okay, you don't have to register. Mr. Speaker, I say that I would convince any party of which I was a member not to register, if you will assure me that none of these provisions will apply to non-registered parties. But that's not what the Act says. The Act says, Mr. Speaker, that every political party, whether registered or not, shall have a limit of expenses during an election campaign, shall be required to file documents, shall be required to have financial commissioners, etc., all of which is going to go through some commission composed of the establishment parties of the day. And that's interesting, Mr. Speaker, because at one time the New Democratic Party wasn't the establishment party of the day, and if they ever sunk below three members, would not be part of this commission. Then, from my knowledge of the New Democrats, you would hear them screaming, about not being recognized and not being part of this commission, because they are not one of the registered parties of the day.

Mr. Speaker, there is a section in this bill which tells you how much money you can spend on the newspapers, how much money you can spend on billboards, and how much money you can spend on the media. That is not new, that was what I call the

beginning of this road to serfdom and we are now carrying it further. They have learned something, Mr. Speaker. They have learned to spend all their money on their material prior to the election campaign. → (Interjection) → My friend says, right. So why are we making dishonest people out of honest people? Why don't you let them spend it when and where they want, get it from whichever source that they convince to give it to them, and let the public argue that question, which they were intelligent to decide before, that if you have a party that is fully financed by Inco and the Royal Bank and the Canadian Bank of Commerce, then you are entitled to think one of two things. You are entitled to think, if those smart and prosperous people are supporting these people, they must be good; or you are entitled to think, if those smart and prosperous and powerful people are supporting this party, then obviously the party is going to govern in their interests and not in my interests.

But what does this do with regard to publication, Mr. Speaker? Do you know that according to this Act, if I was not in politics → I ask the Attorney-General to correct me if I am wrong → if I was not in politics but I liked the New Democratic Party, and I had a million dollars, without the permission of the New Democrats → and if they gave me their permission, it would have to be included in my election expenses → there would be a law which prevented me from every week during the election campaign, saying, I think that the New Democrats are wonderful, I would urge people to vote for them. That right would be denied to me under this Election Act. That is an advertisement calling for the election of a political party, and it would have to be included in their expenses, and they could refuse to have that advertisement delivered.

How does this affect, Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce, the labour unions, or take a particular group? There was a group in Winnipeg, I think it was called the "GGG", the Group for Good Government. I happen to think that they were wrong, Mr. Speaker. They thought that they were for good government and they were going to select the good fellow between the Liberals and the Conservatives. That is a Hobson's choice, Mr. Speaker, but they were going to select a good fellow between those two, and they spent ads and they published material, and I think really that they did the New Democrats a lot of good. Mr. Speaker, I think that they did the New → (Interjection) → Well, it seems to me that in 1973 we won the election, that is when they participated.

Mr. Speaker, the Group for Good Government were a major factor in the 1973 election, the election in which the New Democratic Party got 43 percent of the vote. → (Interjection) → No, in 1968, they didn't exist; 1969, they didn't exist; they existed in 1973, they were called the Group for Good Government. They picked Mr. Jansen over Mr. Sherman. I remember that was a traumatic thing that they did and Mr. Sherman won. They picked Ken Arnason. → (Interjection) → No, they didn't pick me, they had a Hobson's choice, they picked between Liberals and Conservatives. Maybe this year they would pick me, I don't know. You never know what they would do, but that is beside the point, Mr. Speaker.

The fact is that in our society elections are not and should not be the property of political parties. This

legislation institutionalizes political parties. Look what they do, Mr. Speaker. They say that if a political party raises money during an election campaign, and they have a overage, that overage is turned over to the political party. If an independent raises money during an election campaign and has an overage, that money escheats to the Crown unless he runs again in the next election.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that contributions for a political position can continue, that they are needed not only for an election campaign, and that they can continue indefinitely. And, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to deal with that, because I am going to show the Minister how one can make sure perfectly honest, except a complete non-good reason. Let us assume that I, as an Independent candidate could spend 6,000 legally within the rules. Let's say I got 9,000, which is 33 percent in addition. I could only spend 6,000. If I have 9,000 at the end of the campaign, 3,000 has to go back to the government, and then if I run again in the next election I can apply to get that 3,000 back. That is right here in the Act. I mean you guys aren't looking what independents have to do. It is right here in the Act.

Mr. Speaker, if I got the 9,000, I would send back 33 percent and say, hold it, until two months from now, and then I am going to go on a educational campaign to try to push my position, whether elected or not elected, and is there something wrong with what I have just said? Is it devious? Is it crooked? I think, Mr. Speaker, it is common sense. Why should people give money to me, give me more, and have that money go to the state? They didn't intend that at all, but there it is, "all funds or property paid or delivered to the commission under Section 50", which is an overage, over an independent candidate, "shall be converted into money and the proceeds paid to the Minister of Finance and treated as revenues of the government." A new form of taxation, a new form of taxation. But if he is nominated a candidate in a later election, like, you know, twenty years later, he can apply for the overage that he got in the previous election and get it back.

Mr. Speaker, there are within — and I am not dealing with every one of them — the Member for Lac du Bonnet dealt with one which I hadn't noticed; I knew that it was there somewhere. When I spoke on The Elections Act, I said that they are going to make the commission an election offence, not only an offence, this business of telling an untruth, but they are going to say that the candidate is disqualified from holding office, and they are then going to say that he is not entitled to run again for five years. So that if I happen to make a statement which the Minister disagrees with, or the commission disagrees with, maybe the commission will be united against me, they can prosecute me if a statement is made which they happen to disagree with, and the judge agrees that it is a false statement, and I say that the judge is wrong, but nevertheless he will be the judge — "where a person is convicted of an offence under this Act or of an election offence under The Elections Act," — 21 .. "the commission shall not, within 5 years of the date of the conviction, register the person as a candidate in respect of an election." That you cannot be registered as a

candidate, this is not as a political party. If you are not registered as a candidate, you are not permitted to run. — (Interjection) — My friend says, Mr. Speaker, that you do not have to be registered as a candidate? All right, let's say you were a political party, let's say you were a New Democratic and you are convicted of an election offence, they will not register that person as a candidate in respect of an election for the next five years. That is what it says 21.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there it is, it is clearly as I have read it, and I don't know to this point. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Minister to tell me. If he says that is for tax purposes only, then you have one candidate who has been convicted of an election offence, and I am almost sure the Minister is not right, but if he says that it is for tax purposes only, then that particular candidate cannot receive money on the same basis as other candidates, because he is convicted of an election offence. I ask the Minister to look at it.

This deals not only with registration of a political party, but registration of a candidate for an election. "Upon the application for registration by a candidate, in the prescribed form, the commission shall register the candidate for an election in an electoral division if the writ of election for the election has been issued; and the nomination of the candidate for the election has been filed with the returning officer of the division." If they don't register the candidate for an election in an electoral division, can he run in the election? I don't believe so, Mr. Speaker. This is for registration for the election, paragraph 17.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Minister that whatever he does, whenever he talks about election offences, if a person is to be disqualified by a breach of the law, according to a judge, at worst he should be permitted to present himself to the people to see whether the people agree with that, because otherwise you have a person not being able to register as a candidate for five years, and that, Mr. Speaker, is why I have asked the Minister, if you tell me that none of this Act will apply to candidates or political parties that are not registered, I am not that worried, because I will tell, for what good it does, the political party that I am associated with, don't register, and I will not register, because I think that the Act is ridiculous.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the other thing that the Act does is put the so-called lesser economic parties, and I am not sure even how much I would go along with that, puts them at a disadvantage. They are restricted to their expenses in an election campaign. Their expenses are restricted in accordance with an Act which they then have to justify to some public commission. The other parties need not be restricted. Do you think that the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce care one whit whether they get back 600 from an election contribution? They don't care whether they get back 600 from an election contribution; they are giving 15,000 to a political party. They don't care whether it's 15,000, and they are entitled to claim on income tax 1,000 dollars back.

So if the Conservative Party does not register, they will get all their contributions from the big money people in any event; the amount that they will lose by

virtue of no-tax rebates will be negligible, whereas the New Democratic Party will have to record every one of their contributions except those from which they are — excuse me — if they are a registered party they will have to record them all. And all of those contributions are of the nature that the people who make them will want tax rebates. So in the long run it will only affect the New Democrats moneywise, because it will make their finances the subject of openness. The Conservative Party, if it doesn't register will not lose a great deal from the enormous contributions that they will get from companies that are not concerned with the tax rebate. The tax rebate is a small portion of the contribution if it is a decent contribution, because it only goes up to a certain limit.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, that all of the important communication media will not be restricted from the election, from their advertising, and I don't want them to be restricted. I faced the fact, Mr. Speaker, that as a New Democrat, did face the fact, that the Winnipeg Free Press will campaign against the new Democratic Party, and every day on its editorial page — and for those of us who are subjective, even on the first pages, they will be able to print anti-New Democratic Party news regularly for eight weeks during the election campaign, and they have a right to. But you try to put out a little paper combating that, and you are overspending on your election campaign. You are overspending; you can't do that. Unless you own the Free Press; unless you are supported by the publisher, you can't print that kind of material, but they can. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, I tell the honourable member that the day could come, and I said this during the other bill, when the newspapers and the New Democratic Party and what it stood for were all talking the same language. And I hope that I would stand up on that day and say that the Conservative Party is not prohibited . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has 5 minutes.

**MR. GREEN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that I would stand up on that day — and the only way you can ever prove it is to see whether I have done this in the past — and say that I believe that the Conservative Party should not be restricted while this type of advertising is going on against them. I believe that, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that this type of legislation, if the Minister wants me to take him to some extent off the hook, I will say that we started it, but that he should not finish it. Excuse me, I take that back, he should finish it. He should take this bill, not send it to committee, but tear it up like this, and he should take the other bill and present a bill to this Legislature today, that the previous Elections Financing Act is hereby repealed; we are going to rely on the integrity of people and the power and the strength of a right cause to able to pursue its position.

We are not going to over-emphasize the role that finances play in an election campaign. We have been able to look to the past and see that power and money are a patsy for a strong just position which can rally people to it, and the people who will rely on power and money to try to maintain an equity will

lose, Mr. Speaker, in the long run. And I don't care which side that falls on.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask conscientiously that the Minister not travel this road; that the people who want to contribute to an election campaign and the spenders who want to spend money on an election campaign, will find means of doing it despite this bill, and that all we will do is to take people who normally feel that it's perfectly honest to make a contribution, and a party feels it is perfectly right to take a contribution and to spend as much as they can, and try whatever means that they can to get their view to the public, that that will be fair; that the things that will controvert an election are things that are referred to now in the act, and some of them should be looked at. But we should not, Mr. Speaker, involve the state in the political affairs and the political choices of the people. This will ultimately lead, Mr. Speaker, to election financing, that's the next step. Then it will lead, not that you may be a member of a political party, but you must be a member of a political party. Then it will say that if you are elected by a political party, you cannot leave that political party, you have to vote with that political party.

100 years ago, the words political party were not mentioned in the rules or the legislative act. They were formed naturally by people getting together saying that they want to pursue a particular position. They are a desirable feature of the electoral process but the independence, Mr. Speaker, of the member in the last degree is most desirable. And I say this not as a result of this year's involvement, I say it as a result of my entire involvement in politics, and I have never said anything different. If those members wish to get together and pursue a position, fine, but in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, we get up and vote here as members for a constituency, and that from time to time will mean that we agree with people of the same political persuasion, and from time to time it will mean that we don't agree.

We had an interesting feature of it last week, Mr. Speaker, and what harm did it do? The Member for St. James got up and voted against . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that it is not parliamentary to refer to how any member votes in this Chamber.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I think it's on the record. Are you saying that I have to say that my honourable friends voted for my resolution when they voted against it? I don't think I can reflect on a vote, but I can say that a member stood for a particular position. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, if you will refer me to Beauchesne it's not a big point, I will go on to something else. But, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you that this concentration on the institutions that have been built up in politics will be a departure from the normal democratic process and from the best features of the democratic process, will not be an advantage, and I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister to not proceed with this bill, and as a matter of fact I ask him to repeal the old one.

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

**MR. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to add a few words to this particular debate on a very intriguing subject, a subject which is close to all of us because all of us have had experience in the electoral process. In fact all of us have had to at one time or another face the problem of financing our elections within our constituencies, and indeed of financing the electoral success, hopefully, of our own party.

The position that the official opposition is taking is against the bill, and perhaps not because of some long-run intent of the bill, but rather because of all kinds of details in the bill, various proposals in the bill, penalties in the bill, various restrictions in the bill which we don't think are fair or equitable. But I want to say this, that I have seen in my 10, 11 years in political life, a situation whereby when a party is financed largely by small contributions, by individuals giving freely of themselves in terms of money, 10, 50, 75, 100, whatever it is, that so often I find, at least in our party where we depend largely on those smaller contributions, that we are going back to the same people time and time and time again. Somewhere along the line it's my view that a great percentage of the public of Manitoba, or indeed of other jurisdictions, do not pay what I consider to be their fair share of that element of the electoral process.

We try to make a democracy work, and ours is working to some extent. We could all point to inequities; we could all point to injustices; we could all point to failures of the system in one way or the other, and you could make a case against state funding of the electoral process and saying that this will lead to diminution of democracy; that it will lead to intrusion of the state into the democratic electoral process. But having said that, Mr. Speaker, having made that statement, I can think you could also make the opposite case, that unless there is some now, general recognition that the public at large must help to pay for what is becoming increasing costs in running elections, that you will not have the fulfilment of some sort of a democratic ideal within the electoral process. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is recognized in many provinces of Canada and it is recognized in many countries of the world which are good western democratic nations.

Within our own country we have seen various provinces move in this direction, Nova Scotia, Quebec, Saskatchewan and so on; direct public funding of the electoral process over and above the printing of ballots, over and above the printing of necessary legal posters and so on. I am suggesting that I don't want to see the state directly control in a way that has been perhaps described as sinister, totalitarian and so on. I too am in favour of motherhood; I'm against totalitarianism in the electoral process or whatever, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the reality of funding has been for many decades in western countries, Canada and the United States, where you have what I consider to be a large percentage of funding by large corporations; a heavy percentage of funding by large financial interests, and therefore the consequence being a dependency by the large parties on those sources of funding; unfortunate and unsatisfactory dependency on big corporations, and he who pays the piper, calls the tune.

I say, Mr. Speaker, I would much rather see state financing in general towards the electoral process than corporate financing, because that, I think, is probably the alternatives we are looking at. Yes, you can talk about small people giving; they do give, and they can give, and they will give, but I say there is an inequity in that procedure too, because what you find and I find from personal experience, the same few people giving, giving, giving their 10 or 50 or 100 or whatever, and others not even being aware that it does cost money to run an democratic election, where people have to be given information; they have to be given the various points of views. And how do you do it? You need money to buy the ruddy pamphlets, to get the ads in the paper, to take the television and radio ads, or whatever; to hire a hall and so on; or to have a banner or to put up a poster, whatever. It does take money. And that's the problem. How do you get adequate funding in such a way that the candidate and the parties, although favour to any one particular vested group, and I submit that it's far better that there be a system, above board, where it's laid down that the taxpayers generally will pay a percentage towards that process by whatever means.

We have seen, I think, some success at the federal level in this direction, and I would like to see us perhaps emulate that in the province of Manitoba. I suppose the Attorney-General can get up and say, well, this bill is aimed at going in that direction. The problem we find with the bill, Mr. Speaker, is that there are too many inadequacies in it; that there are too many restrictions, and there are so many prohibitions that it is chuck-full of inequities; chuck-full of unfair situations, in fact some situations I would say are actually silly. Some of the prohibitions are actually silly and certainly unfair restrictions, for example on receiving funding from individuals ordinarily resident outside of Manitoba, or from a corporation that does not carry on its business or undertaking a good part thereof within the province.

First of all it is difficult to enforce those — I just use two examples — it's very difficult to enforce those provisions; secondly, it's not fair. You can think of many examples where someone who lives outside of the province and wishes to contribute for whatever reason to a candidate, to a party within the province. They may have been lifetime residents, but are no longer, and they still have an interest in what's going on in Manitoba so they contribute. He may be some relative that wants to help his brother, his sister, his cousin or whatever, his uncle, his aunt, whatever, and it seems to me that you are unfairly restricting this type of contribution. It's just not necessary. I don't see what the point of it is.

Then there is the other side of it. There seems to be no limit on how much money a corporation can give. This is something that I object to, and I made reference to that a few minutes ago. There is one section, and I know that we are not to deal with sections, but reference has been in the bill, and perhaps in debate by others, that no constituency association of a party, or no person acting on or behalf of a constituency association shall accept contributions except by general collection at a meeting held by the constituency association or by fund-raising functions. For the life of me, I don't know what that restriction is for. That's ridiculous,

absolutely silly. That means, as I read it, in very cursory glances, that if someone should come up to the constituency association and wished to make a donation they can't do so, if they haven't attended that meeting, or if it hasn't been a part of some fund-raising operation. If just out of the blue they say, well I want to now give some money; I just inherited a lot of money and I feel I would like to give 100 or whatever to the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party or to whoever, apparently the constituency association cannot accept those funds because it wasn't during a fund-raising function or it wasn't at a general meeting.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, there are other aspects of the bill that really deserve a lot of attention, and I would suggest a lot of changes can be made and should be made, and this why we think the bill should be withdrawn, reconsidered, and maybe something far better come out of this. But I particularly deplore the very very harsh restrictions that are thrown in the bill, and there have been other members mentioning them. They mentioned section 21; there are other sections that are very very harsh where, I understand, that if a candidate has not filed a statement of return within 30 days after he receives written notice, that that person, and until a statement or return is filed, that person is ineligible to be registered as a candidate in any subsequent election, for ever and ever hereafter he cannot run in an election. And if you were elected, you are ineligible to sit or vote in the Assembly.

I think the Minister is becoming far too extreme in his reference to penalties in this legislation. I can appreciate there has to be some teeth in this type of legislation regarding filing, some fines, or what have you, but this, Mr. Speaker, is totally uncalled for; far too harsh; far too heavy; far too heavy-handed. When I couple that with the other comments that I have made about the prohibitions on various donations, reminds me of the Attorney-General's friendly newspaper, the Winnipeg Free Press, which reminded us of, tis the silly season don't you know, and I guess this is the Premier of Manitoba bounding the Attorney-General in a lot of rope and referring to it as — suggesting there is something silly at work, and I wonder whether that can apply to this particular bill as well, because there are just too many deficiencies in the bill.

I don't want to speak at any further length on the legislation. I don't want to be repetitive, because a lot of good points have been made, but I do want to go on record as saying that there is room for some state funding of the electoral process. I think in the long run that's better than the alternative. I think the bill itself — I think the Attorney-General and the government recognize there is some need for this, so while we object to many parts of the bill, I think in principle I believe that it's not fair, it's not adequate for a small group of people, where you are talking about small contributors, to always carry the burden of financing the process of electioneering. I object to, and I abhor, and I think it's to the detriment of the democratic system to have parties depending on large donations such as those that can be given by corporations — as I understand it from this bill, unlimited amounts can be given by corporations, and that surely is not desirable. It is not good for any

party to have to depend upon one or two or three sources from private corporations. Far better that it be made open, and that it be given by the public under certain conditions, open for everyone to see and to scrutinize. I think in that way, Mr. Speaker, I don't see the electoral process being worsened; if it's properly administered, the electoral process will be enhanced and we will have a better democratic system than we have today.

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

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I listened with great interest to some of my colleagues that have spoken on this and I don't want to repeat what they said. I just wanted to add one more particular point that has not been referred to. My concern with this was very similar to that of the Member for Inkster when he referred to freedom of expression during election periods. I don't think this has really come across to people, that the more we put into an act, into an election statute, it limits more and more who can do what at election time. It permits parties to make statements at election time. It permits candidates to make a political statement, but apparently it would seem to remove from all other people except newspapers and the media the right to their freedom of expression. As the Member of Inkster says, a large paper can come up with its point of view, but for an individual wishing to put a single sheet, no, that's not permissible.

In reading this bill, I get the impression that what the Attorney-General expects to happen or would like to happen, is that there would be a freezing in place of two political parties in this province, or possibly three. There seems to be an allowance in here that the Liberal Party could become a registered political party. The advantage of being a political party is that the party itself can spend 40 cents a voter and the candidate can spend 25 cents a voter.

I can tell the Attorney-General what's going to happen if this bill goes through, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the Manitoba New Democratic Party will apply to become a registered political party. And the St. Vital New Democratic Party will apply to become a registered political party, and the Kildonan New Democratic Party will apply to become a registered political party, and the Flin Flon New Democratic Party, and the Ste. Rose New Democratic Party and the Elmwood New Democratic Party and so on. But not only that, the Osborne New Democratic Party will apply to be a registered political party. And how will it do that? Because it has one member, one person sitting in this House who is a member of the Osborne New Democratic Party. And I will be a member of the Osborne New Democratic Party and the Rock Lake New Democratic Party and the Wolseley New Democratic Party, and all of those others. So what the Minister is going to finish up with, 57 small political parties of the left, plus one large one. And what will that enable us to do in St. Vital? It will enable us to spend 40 cents for every name that's on the voter's list, plus 25 cents for every name that's on the voter's list. So we will be spending in St. Vital, 65 cents per voter, and any individual or independent who happens to be running is limited

solely to 25 cents. And any Conservative or any Liberal who is running will also be limited to 25 cents.

Mr. Speaker, you know that won't happen, and in defence, the Conservative Party would do exactly the same thing. So the Osborne Conservative Party will apply to be a registered political party and the Rock Lake Conservative Party will apply to be a registered political party, and you will have another 57 political parties in this province. That takes us up to 114 political parties. And the Liberals of course will not want to be left out either, Mr. Speaker, because you will realize that the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge will also be a member of the Liberal political party in every constituency, so you will have another 57 political parties, ending up with something like 160 political parties in this province.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Attorney-General intends with this bill, but according to my reading of it, a political party is defined quite simply as an organization, association or affiliation of voters comprising a political organization whose prime purpose is the nomination and support of candidates at election.

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that it only takes a few people who will state that their intent is the nomination and support of candidates to be able to apply for registration for an unlimited number of political parties. It need not be restricted to 57. There can be a Winnipeg New Democratic Party, or a South Winnipeg New Democratic Party, an North Winnipeg New Democratic Party, and the various regions in the province which would make a mockery of what the Minister's intent is to restrict spending at election time.

So that is but a further reason why we are opposing the bill, and why it is our suggestion that it be referred to a committee to take another look at all of these matters. Whether it should be torn up and thrown away is still a matter for discussion. It may yet be that certain financial controls and movements toward equity between the different groups and different candidates can still be done, but I rather suspect that the more the bill is enlarged to take care of different circumstances, the more complex it becomes and indicates a need to put even more and more and more controls on it, until we come up with an institutionalized system of two parties in this province. I am sure it will come down to two that are completely run by the state, so, Mr. — (Interjection) — well, my colleague suggests that there will finally be only one party and that is a — (Interjection) — the Honourable Member for River Heights is a people. If he wants to join the people's party, well, we'd see what happens over that.

That's our suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that we send this to committee; if not, it would be our intention to vote against it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Rose.

**MR. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak very long on this bill, because many of my colleagues have spoken and have covered most of the points that I would address myself to. But what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that we have seen a steady ongoing erosion of civil liberties under this

government, and we will be bringing all these things forward at a later date to show where all these civil liberties are being taken away from the public.

I want to say that this bill is a classic example of the loss of civil liberties that is taking place in this province under this government. I would strongly urge, as some of my colleagues have done, that the Minister seriously consider withdrawing this bill and coming up with a new act, or failing that, that we would transfer it over to an inter-sessional committee to go out and hold hearings and discuss this situation fully, because certainly there are things in here that are very repugnant and horrendous.

As I look at this legislation, particularly that of the contributions and donations, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would be impossible for an association to have a financial committee go out to its members and call on the members and say, you know, our party is in financial difficulty and we are required to see if we can't raise contributions to bring our party in a more sound financial position. It seems to me that this legislation would prevent us from doing that, that the only way that we would be able to raise money is at a political meeting or a function, a social; even raffle tickets, if we put on a raffle to raise funds for our political party we would be restricted in this regard as well, Mr. Speaker.

No matter where we look in this bill, we find civil liberties being eroded, and it is unbelievable that well, it is amazing but not surprising we are not surprised what this government is doing, because we have seen it in the last three years. They are gradually creeping in with erosion of civil liberties.

I don't intend to speak that long, just to point out a few things. For instance, my colleague from Brandon East did mention political contributions from individuals from out-of-province. Well, my God, Mr. Speaker, where are we coming to? There are areas of regional disparity in this country; there are parties who are struggling to get going in other provinces that are very very weak, and need help from other parties, from other people with similar views, and under this legislation we would be restricted from accepting or contributing, I suppose — maybe not contributing, because I hope that other jurisdictions or other provinces would not be as awful as this legislation here and prevent me from trying to help, say, the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland if they required some financial assistance; or even if I had a friend up there, or some person that I know that I would like to assist. I would that would not come about.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, you know, I have friends and daughters all over the country; I don't have that many, but I have family spread out. They would not be able to come here on election day, Mr. Speaker, and just join in the excitement of an election day, tabulating the votes as they are coming in, or taking phone messages and so on. They would not be able to participate in that, because that would be a contribution in time, Mr. Speaker, and I think this is horrendous. But it is not surprising, because we have watched the erosion of civil liberties in this province, and as long as this government is there it is going to continue.

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

**MR. R. G. (Bob) WILSON:** I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to rise on this particular bill in support of the government, but also to indicate there is some areas of concern to myself under this area, by what they mean "contribution in kind", and the area pertaining to the disadvantage that a member has that is sitting here in Speed-up, while a senior civil servant has been nominated by an opposing party, has been able to use her position in the government, and together with the massive union funds, to be able to run a campaign and distribute literature, while I am held into the House here unable to counteract this type of big money campaign.

I am kind of worried, because I feel that I would want to be able to have a fair fight. It would seem to me in my experience in every election that I have been involved in, members opposite have sent a team from out-of-province experts into the area, and I was able to offset that by bringing friends of mine you see, I have a University of Life degree, I have been able to make a few friends, having been born and raised in Winnipeg and I was able to bring in people from Vancouver and Seattle, bring them in, because they believed in Bob Wilson and they knew that the particular opposition was bringing in these high-paid union organizers.

Another problem that I had under this Act as it was, was that I happen to be unfortunate in that the Union Centre is located in Wolseley. Now this massive structure doesn't allow me to put my signs up, doesn't allow me to take my material in there, I have to sneak in and put my material into the Liquor Lounge and the Bingo halls and I go into this particular Union Centre and I put my material in there, and yet I am not able to — the Member for Winnipeg Centre and the other members are able to put large signs on the roof of the Union Centre, and I submit that that is a contribution in kind. I am concerned with this area. I would like it more clarified in the Act, because like members opposite I can point to two or three garages that if I wasn't an honest man there would be a fire, because they contain all sorts of bygone election material.

In addition, because I am a bit of a thrifty chap, I have saved all my election material from past campaigns and I use the same signs over and over again. So in the means of saving money for both parties, I would like something in the act that would allow us to be able to print over the official agent and to be able to use our old signs, because each election that I have been involved in, the advertising agencies seem to have a monopoly on the printing of this material, and the costs of this are absolutely horrendous. I would like to be able to be given that choice of being able to go to Saskatchewan or Ontario and buy my material.

So this pro-Manitoba thing is good, but if you have an monopoly, there is some aspects of it are bad. I just wanted to say that it seems — right today I have another pamphlet printed by members opposite regarding the rent control aspect; the amendments have not come in, yet at least three pieces of material have crossed my desk. This woman is drawing down an excellent salary as either head or second in command of the Womens Bureau, has influence with the MGEA, and has massive influence in IOUs coming to her for having worked on campaigns for members opposite, so while I am

compelled to stay here, without the use of caucus facilities, and also to have to stand here in Speed-up and stay until two o'clock in the morning, civil servants, union people are printing propaganda and waging a campaign against me that I am unable to compete with.

I suggest that when dealing with The Election Act and all the umbrella that does with it, that there has to be some measure of fairness to clarify things, because I think a person that doesn't have much money and has fallen out of favour in the case of this member here with a lot of old-time contributors, and especially I don't think I will be seeing any contributions from any members of the Law Society for some time to come, and these are the types of donations that members who are Progressive Conservatives kind of rely on from time to time. So without being able to get any money from the lawyers in the province, who are very fond donors to our party, and I believe they even donate to the Liberal Party as well, I am rather concerned that I would like to get a lot of contributions in kind, because I could probably, through a social or through a general campaign, be able to mobilize, like Lloyd Axworthy did, probably the University of Winnipeg in the next campaign. I don't want to be able to have it said that I can't use people as contribution in kind.

So therefore with those few remarks, I would like to be able in Law Amendments when we are going over the bill clause by clause to put some clarification into the bill so that the — I'll call them for lack of a better word — ordinary voter out there can in some way, shape or form contribute to a member who does not have the access to the large union treasuries or the large legal firm treasuries, who have to rely on the little people. And for the record, I personally have never been in an election yet that I haven't spent at least, I believe the lowest amount that I lost was 1,300 of my own money, whereas other members who run in more affluent suburb areas here we get into the old problem of the old city of Winnipeg versus the suburban areas in my riding in Wolseley, I don't have any industry, I don't have any large law firms, so therefore I am at a disadvantage, I have to rely on the little people, the 20 from the corner grocery. So therefore I am quite prepared to run an election and lose.

Except one of the things — I would be less than honest if I say I am not jealous when I see some members having large socials after the election is over, to help spend some of the surplus, and I have heard that many politicians make a handsome return by running in elections, because they have a surplus.

So some type of government control, or some monitoring has to take place so that those that spend their own money to get elected in the cause of public service are able to share somehow in the large surpluses of other members from more affluent communities.

So therefore I concur with some of the thoughts of members opposite, but for different reasons. I believe the Member for Brandon East talked about, the day is coming when these expensive campaigns in part have to be funded somehow or other by the public.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Mr. Speaker, I thought we might straighten the record out about the Union Centre. I appreciated it very much the request that the Union Centre placed my signs during the election campaigns on the premises of the Union Centre, and I appreciated over the years the support of the union, but, Mr. Speaker, I am really sorry that I am not running against my friend, the Member for Wolseley, in the upcoming election because it's fun running against the Member for Wolseley. I just thought, when he took that swipe or that crack at me that I'd put on the record about the big red machine in Winnipeg Centre which has disappeared. The organization has gone its various ways, I think four different constituencies. But the member said he couldn't get support. The big red machine in Winnipeg Centre, Mr. Speaker, over the years raised between 2,000 and 3,000 a year, doing everything from holding socials, making aprons and selling 'Woodsworth Lives' buttons and everything else.

I'm going to be brief, but I just want to put on the record, when we talk about this truth in advertising during an election campaign. It was during the 1973 election, and I happened to be on a platform with my friend from Wolseley, and the GGG candidate was Mr. Arnason. During the campaign there was a piece of green paper — I'm sorry I haven't got it with me. It was circulated through the constituency and was signed by a girl that worked in my friend's office over there. It said: Bud Boyce doesn't live in Winnipeg Centre, doesn't work in Winnipeg Centre, blah, blah, blah. Mr. Arnason doesn't live in Winnipeg Centre, doesn't work in Winnipeg Centre, blah, blah, blah. Mr. Wilson lives at, works at . . . Neither one of them was in Winnipeg Centre; this is really really humorous.

But I was wondering about this. Was this a lie, or is truth?— (Interjection)— But the funniest part of it all, when he said how all the unions were working for him, one day my wife happened to be alone in the campaign headquarters and I came in, and she looked a little distraught. She said that there were a couple of young people in there, poking through the papers on the desk. Just then the phone rang, and I could hear on the other end of the phone, obviously the noises which we associate with campaign offices. It was obviously from somebody's office, and a voice said, my father is Italian and he hears that you're having a meeting of the Italian community. The only people who knew about it was myself, because I had just put a note on my desk to have my campaign manager get the Italian community together, and nobody knew about it except myself and this person on the phone. I said, I'm having trouble getting a hall big enough. If you leave your name, I'll call you back. Click.

So I thought I'd have some fun. I told my campaign people, if you find anything written in this office in brown ink, forget about it. So I made some signs, and I went to my chemical handbook and I got the biggest formula I could find,  $X$  is equal to the function of the square root over this, and a whole bunch of other stuff. I made this sign that says, Bud insists that all data process is a function of this, that and the other thing. Another sign said, all data must

be in for processing by 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon. We plastered brown ink with hieroglyphics all over the place. After the election, my friend from Wolseley gave an interview. The reason he was defeated was because I had all these computers working for me. Was I guilty of . . . ?

But seriously, the only reason I entered the debate was to express my appreciation for the support over the years that I've had from the union people and also from the people in the area, that they themselves raised the money. I agree entirely with what has been said on this side of the House, especially the Member for Inkster, that this bill shouldn't even . . . We shouldn't even bother with it going to the committee. Because in the final analysis, truth will out. The people will support those people who should be supported and, from time to time, they'll change.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## **BILL NO. 86 THE MILK PRICES REVIEW ACT**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Bill No. 86. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will now be able to give my speech and still have two minutes left in the event that I want to use it.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that the final pieces of legislation before the House on milk and rent are going to be the final two nails in the coffin of the Conservative Party, that those pieces of legislation will ultimately lead to their downfall. If we didn't have enough ammunition before, we sure have it now, namely that they are going to de-regulate or decontrol two sectors of the economy that the public does not want decontrolled. I intend to muster all the energy I can to make that known to people in my riding and throughout the city of Winnipeg, because I normally don't venture out beyond the perimeter to express that point of view.

But I think on this particular question, the case has already been made by my colleagues who represent rural ridings that not only is this legislation not in the best interests of consumers but it is not in the best interests of the producers, and that is really the strange dimension to this bill. Why did the government bring in this legislation? The only answer I can obtain, and the only one that I can sort of concoct in answer to that question is that there must be something under the table, there must be a promise, there must be a deal for the future, because there surely, surely cannot be, at face value, anything in this legislation that would help producers.

Mr. Speaker, the consumers of Manitoba are 100 percent against this bill; that's nearly everybody. The only people in favour are the retailers, but in particular the processors, the big dairies; they're in favour of this. The producers themselves don't appear to be very enthusiastic, and I am told that

they are in fact opposed to this legislation. So what possessed the Minister of Agriculture, other than inexperience or promises in the future for special consideration, to bring in this particular legislation?

My colleague hands me a clipping from the paper which says, "Milk Pricing Bill Upsets Producers", and how the president of the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board says the provincial government's proposed milk pricing legislation is unsatisfactory to dairy farmers. And this is Art Rampton. --(Interjection) Well, I don't know know Art Rampton. You don't like At Rampton? I'm told he was a Conservative candidate in Dauphin. I guess he didn't make it, I guess he ran second. Maybe he's quit the party. I guess he's going to throw his support to the New Democratic candidate. We took the seat federally; we're going to take it provincially, and I'm going up there, Mr. Speaker, in ten days to the Dauphin Festival to guarantee that we take that seat provincially. I might even dance the kolymeika if there are a few extra votes to be picked up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting questions here, and I want to give some examples of groups that are against this, but one of the interesting questions -- and I say this again to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. He is failing to represent the consumer interest in the province. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to give psychological explanations about this but I want to say that the Minister has failed to represent the consumer time and time and time again. He has failed on the two most important pieces towards the end of the session -- rents, and in terms of milk. He has failed before when it came to the environment, and so on. But I think that somebody who is interested in consumer affairs has to say to himself, where is the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the man who should be champion, who should be wrestling and fighting against the Minister of Agriculture. The least he should do is fight him to a standstill, but he appears to have simply laid down and allowed the Minister of Agriculture to walk into Cabinet and have his way. I have to say that I am disappointed.

I am further disappointed when I learn that this is not even in the best interests of the agricultural community. One would assume that there are issues in which there is the consumer against the producer, but in this issue it seems to be all against the consumer and all against the producer. Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatsoever that the price of milk will rise. If you talk to some people in the stores, in the small stores, they want more money for milk and if you give them an opportunity to raise the price, they'll do it. You go into the 7-Eleven Stores and these Mac Stores. The only thing that they offer that's reasonable is milk. The only thing that I ever buy in those stores on a regular basis is milk, because everything else, whatever you're going to buy, is sky-high in price. And I think that they will now raise the price a number of cents per quart. My own prediction is 5 cents a quart. The least that will happen is a couple of cents.

The Minister will tell us and the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Consumer Affairs will say, once in a while there will be a sale. You'll go into a supermarket; they'll have a special. You buy your 30 bucks worth of groceries, or your 50 or 75 bucks worth of groceries, and you'll buy two or four

or six quarts of milk and save a couple of cents per quart. But how many people are really going to go there for the purpose of buying milk on a regular basis, go through the lines, go through the hassle, go the distance, when there are smaller corner stores and so on where you can pick this up? So people will tend very quickly to pay the extra amount of money. Although there may be some that cut the price, there will be many more who raise the price and the net effect will be that this legislation will cause an increase in the price of milk in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the backing for this is endless. I received a letter, which I'm sure everyone else did, from the Health Action Centre, where I think they formed an ad hoc committee to oppose the increase in the price of milk. This letter written July 15 to the Minister by the Citizen's Health Action Committee says that they predict, they fear higher prices and windfall profits. I think that's a reasonable statement by the Ad Hoc Committee on milk prices.

Now this committee is supported by 37 organizations in addition to their umbrella organization. Mount Carmel Clinic is well known; Consumers' Association of Canada; National Farmers' Union; Family Services of Winnipeg; Winnipeg Labour Council; National Plan Organization Incorporated; Winnipeg Police Association; Dr. Percy Barsky; Winnipeg Society of Seniors; Manitoba Paramedical Association; School Council of the School of Social Work, University of Manitoba; Machray Day Care Centre; Univillage Student Daycare; United Steelworkers; Native Alcohol Council; Shaughnessy Park Community Schools Council; Manitoba Association of Social Workers; Learning Assistance Centre; Freight House Day Nursery Incorporated; Clinic; Marymound School; U of W Students Association Day Care; Kids Centre Co-op; Fred Douglas Lodge Senior Citizens Home; Winnipeg Native Pathfinders; William Whyte Community School; Canadian Association of Industrial Mechanical and Allied Workers; Argyle School; Nor'West Co-op; Munroe Day Nursery; Norquay School Principal; Independent Co-op; St. Vital Montessori School; Dufferin School; Community Education and Development Association; the Freight House Community Centre and last, the St. George's Nursery School. I don't know if that's in my honourable friend's area. (Interjection) Well, I'm not sure what my honourable friend is saying to me. --(Interjection)-- The society? --(Interjection)-- les soeurs -- my French is not as good as my colleague for St. Boniface. It's just seven years of high school and university French.

Mr. Speaker, with all of those organizations, dozens of organizations, representing hundred and thousands of Manitobans, how can the government talk about eliminating the controls on milk? How can the government throw the public to the wolves in the sense of higher prices from the processors and higher prices from the big dairies? Mr. Speaker, we all know that I guess milk costs more money outside of Winnipeg. The Winnipeg prices are not the prices in rural Manitoba or the prices in northern Manitoba; they are a lot more expensive. I want to quote Margaret Soper, who is the president of the Consumers Association of Canada. She said the Ontario experience has shown

milk prices are reasonably competitive in major centres, but in communities like Thunder Bay consumers have to pay much more for their milk. She also said it's essential for consumers to be represented on the commission.

My honourable friends are attune to the rural sector. They are, in fact, the rural party and I'm telling them that people are saying in Manitoba, they are saying that in Ontario it's the rural people who got hurt. It's the rural centres which have been paying the shot in this particular debate, Mr. Speaker. I want to also say that another spokesman for the dairy producers of Manitoba, Manitoba Milk Producers Co-op, a Mr. Armand Desharnais - I'm happy to have the pronunciation of the Member for Emerson who is trilingual apparently — and they say that they are not happy with Bill 86. Mr. Speaker, I only heard fragments or figments of the imagination of the Member for Emerson, but he gave such a rousing speech. Oh, the best speech he ever gave, in fact. I'm sorry I missed it, but it was so wonderful about how this was going to help the dairy farmers. Mr. Speaker, I'm telling him that the same people aren't happy, so I hope that he doesn't go and campaign on this. I hope he doesn't send them copies of his speech. In fact, well actually I hope he does, but for his benefit he's not going to do too well on this.

Desharnais says this bill which would deregulate the wholesale and retail price of milk, while fixing the price for producers, said it isn't going to please anyone, "It should be scrapped". Do you know Mr. Desharnais? Do you know him? You know him and do you also know Mr. Rampton? Well, you better be careful. Well, is he here now? He's upstairs right now. Well, that's good. He's going to oppose this legislation and Wendy Land, who is from this other action group, too, she says it will result in higher milk prices. — (Interjections)— I think we could consider any proposals like that. I think that would be good, a good mix. Labour people on farm boards and farmers on union and labour boards. I think it would be beneficial, there would be an exchange of ideas and appreciation, so that some day there would be even a greater blend of farmer-labour forces in the political spectrum.

In Minnesota, they have the Democratic Farmer Labour Party and it's very successful. They have been the government there for many years and I guess Hubert Humphrey, who was one of my idols in the early Sixties, he became less of an idol after he became Vice-President. But he helped put together that coalition — (Interjection) — no, he was my idol. I was one of those who was at the Democratic Convention in '64 and cheered him on. I was practically part of the Minnesota delegation. Cheered him on when he was accepted as a Vice-Presidential running mate. Now, I was certainly more successful, Mr. Speaker, than the First Minister who went down there and was unsuccessful in being drafted as the running mate. I went down there to support Humphrey and Humphrey became the Vice-Presidential running mate of Lyndon Johnson. I'm not saying that I had much to do with it, but it is an interesting coincidence, nevertheless.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the price of milk is going to fall heaviest, take greatest effect for ill, as opposed to for good, on the poorer people of the economy.

It's going to hit hard on the lower classes. It's going to hit hard on the people with large families.

**A MEMBER:** You're just worried about yourself.

**MR. DOERN:** No, I'm not worried about myself, because I drink milk and I can afford to pay a few cents more for a quart of milk, but somebody with four or five children will find it difficult to pay more for milk. If they're paying a nickel more a litre and their kids drink three or four litres a day, 1 — it will another dollar or two a week and so on and so on. I'm always worried — (Interjection) — well, I'm just saying about the increase, only the increase, but the price of milk will cost them a lot more per week. But I'm always worried when the price of milk goes up, Mr. Speaker, because I happen to believe that when it does a lot of people make poor substitutions; they will probably buy less milk. There are some people who will do it because they don't have the money and there are others maybe, who don't have the intelligence and will use less and maybe even will give their kids Coca-Cola or Pepsi-Cola to drink when the price — (Interjection) — No, it doesn't cost more, no, it doesn't. Well, I don't know where you buy your soft drinks but I always try — and I'm not a big professional consumer's buyer. I don't pretend to be that, but I try to buy soft drinks, when I buy them, on special. You can often buy them on special, I think, for about 35, or 45, or 49 cents for a large bottle. — (Interjection) — Oh, yes, you can, even today. Oh, yes, you can. You can still buy them for 50 cents or less a bottle on special. On special, because I have had some good experiences. Well, my friend gives me a good example. He says Kool Aid, and there's all sorts of stuff like that, that you can mix with water and give to your kids and so on. If you're poor, I'm not talking about us, we more or less manage, more or less manage and I'll make my speech on the indemnities bill, I will resist making my speech on that right now, but somebody who is living on a very small income will try to make ends meet and will sometimes make bad decisions and sometimes will be forced to buy less.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's shocking. If you think of this point, you really ponder this point, we have had milk control in Manitoba for 48 years, since 1932. Now that is an extraordinary length of time and all of a sudden the Minister of Agriculture, because he doesn't like milk control, he's been listening to certain people whispering in his ear, decides to take advantage of the drought and decides to take advantage of a lot of complaints about the board and decides to scuttle the board. Mr. Speaker, after 50 years, I don't call that socialism. I mean I don't know what you call it. I think it's necessary — I'm now talking philosophically — I believe it is necessary for the government or the state to intervene on behalf of certain groups in society. But I'm speaking from the consumer end, I'm only talking as a consumer champion; but my colleagues from Ste. Rose, St. George, Lac du Bonnet and elsewhere, they tell me that the regulation of milk has helped the producers, that you've had orderly marketing and you've had fair prices and so on and so on. That's what they tell me and I believe them, because I believe that they might take a position that I would have to argue with them on. I thought that we might

have a split in our party and I was very pleased to learn that they felt that the bill was detrimental to the farming interests of the community. Now, on that side, they are all in agreement. They are all in agreement, Mr. Speaker, and I find that hard to believe. Where are the people there who stand for the consumers? Show me somebody, show me one person who stands for the consumer? Well, Mr. Speaker, they believe that they stand for the consumer. They are standing up, grandstanding is what I am told, grandstanding for the consumer. But I tell you that there are 38 groups that say you're wrong, in addition to us; there are two spokesmen of producer groups that say you're wrong; there are three or four rural champions on this side who say that you are wrong. (Interjections)

Mr. Speaker, I'm telling you that within the city of Winnipeg in the next election I can go anywhere in Winnipeg and speak against rent decontrol and speak against milk decontrol and draw blood against the Conservative Party candidate in that area without even talking about the economy or all that - (Interjection) - no, because my colleagues are going to handle the rural area and they are going to go into the marginal seats and they are going to break off the marginal seats from the Gladstone, Swan River, Springfield, Emerson and all those other seats, Radisson. Well, Radisson is peculiar, there is a sort of a farmer representative there, so it's then a special category.

Mr. Speaker, in 1938, my colleague, the Member for Burrows did some excellent research on this issue. In 1938, the Milk Control Board of Manitoba released a report - I'm going to just throw this in, I'm going to not quite tell this accurately, I'm going to tell it partly accurately - what I say is perfectly accurate. In 1953, I worked at the Milk Control Board for six weeks. You didn't know that, did you? I worked at the Milk Control Board for six weeks. I didn't learn much there. I stamped cheques; I was working for the Auditor-General for six weeks. I was sent there to stamp cheques and look at the cheques that the farmers got. So I just want you to know that I have a long association, I made my mark at that particular thing. - (Interjection) - No, Mr. Speaker, it's not be that should be ashamed of myself, it's the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 they released a paragraph in their report saying, listen to this, the regulated price has given plant management freedom to concentrate on improvement in quality products, economy in plant operation and efficiency in servicing consumer needs, and has manifestly brought employee and employer more intimately together on matters of mutual interest and benefit. Now here's the line, here's the line, jungle methods of price competition are no longer the intelligence quotient of management and successful salesmanship. They brought order out of chaos, Mr. Speaker. This sounds like the future, when the lion and the lamb will lie down together, when we'll beat our swords into plowshares. Harmonious relations - (Interjection) - Swords into plowshares, you don't know that quote? I might have said something else. - (Interjection) - No, I never said that, I did not say what is alleged to have been said, Mr. Speaker. - (Interjection) - Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move along, that's dangerous ground.

The jungle, they want to go back to the jungle. And that's why I say this Minister has to be thought of as Jungle Jim. Mr. Speaker, what a thing to be called. And so does his colleague, another Jungle Jim beside him from Gladstone. - (Interjection) - Someone says Jumbo Jim but I say Two Jungle Jims, Mr. Speaker. I could be more unkind, I could say, instead of Big Jungle Jim and Little Jungle Jim, we have Tarzan and Cheeta, but whatever - (Interjection) - I'm not saying that. Whatever, I say that that is a backward step, a backward step to the jungle. They believe in that, they like that idea, laissez-faire, free enterprise, get rid of these controls and so on, back to the good old days, the good old days of 1932. Can you imagine a government saying that they want to go back to 1932? Can you imagine our Premier, who actually said this, Mr. Speaker, that he liked a lot of the things that Ronald Reagan said and that he found himself in complete harmony with the thinking of Ronald Reagan, I think that is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, I say that that is the wrong direction and I don't want the Minister to get up here and make one of those Grade 9 speeches that he makes every day in question period, all that phoney baloney stuff about socialism and every day I have to listen to about nine statements by him attacking socialism, and I have to listen about every two or three days to the Member for Rock Lake telling him what he's going to ask him, the Minister of Agriculture getting up answering this question. I mean, you know, we really have had enough of this. We really have had enough, and I could scream, Mr. Speaker, I could scream when I hear the Minister of Agriculture get up. - (Interjection) - I don't mind the Minister of Agriculture giving us that kind of, you know, 4-H style of oratory, well he was probably the valedictorian. I'm sure in Grade 9 he gave the address to the whole school. There must have been six students, he was chosen as valedictorian and he gave that graduation stuff, and they said, Jim that's great, great stuff Jim, you should go into politics, and he did. But I want to tell him that his area is not representative of Manitoba. It's not a typical riding; it's not a typical riding. It's a typical riding in the southwest, which is typical of a hard, bedrock, Conservative area.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that they are throwing away 50 years of experience and 50 years of protection, first and foremost to the consumer and, secondly, to the producers of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, they want to go back to laissez-faire; they want to go back to free enterprise; they want to go back to the jungle; they want to go back to the jungle where the lion is king and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the next election we're going to clear the jungle and we're going to cage the lion, and the only place that you're going to find the King of the Beasts is on exhibition in the Assiniboine Zoo. Thank you.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the few moments that are available to me to begin my remarks to this particular bill and I'd like to address my remarks in specific to the effect that this bill will

have on northern Manitoba because I believe it is an area that the government has neglected, not only overall in their reign, but also specifically in regard to a number of pieces of legislation that are coming before us this year, and this happens to be one of them.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is allowed to proceed in the way in which it is written now, it will have an impact on northern Manitoba that will be far more insufferable than the impact on the rest of the province. And that is because of the fact that transportation costs play so great a role in the economy of the north, and transportation costs plays so great a role in increases in the cost of living of up north that whenever you take away protection such as this, you are in fact opening the door for increased costs that you would not find in other areas. You would not find it in the rural areas; you would not find it in the southern areas.

The price of milk will undoubtedly increase, as it will throughout the province, and I believe the Member for Elmwood is absolutely correct when he makes his predictions. He may be not entirely honest to the price, the amount per litre, the cents, but he in fact is correct when he says that the price is going to increase. And it's not going to increase one time, it's going to continue to increase and to continue to increase and to continue to increase, at the will of the store, at the will of the retailer and in the north when the retailer has to pay the cost, the extra cost for transportation, they are in fact going to start to increase their price more and more and more, and what we will have is a differential that spreads. There's a small differential now, even with the board in place, and I would speak against that.

If you can sell a case of beer up north for the same price you can sell a case of beer in the city, or if you can sell a bottle of liquor in the north for the same price that you can sell a bottle of liquor in the city, then surely you should be able to sell milk, which is an essential, for the same price as you sell in the city. (Interjection) The member says bring back the northern living allowance, well I can tell him of a number of unions right now that are out trying very hard to negotiate such in their contracts because they are feeling the pinch. The north has been trod upon, the north has been abused. -- (Interjection)-- What's the price of Coke? You know, the fact is that there's too much Coke drank in the north instead of milk. There's too much alcohol drank instead of milk and that's a fact that we can't deny, and that's partly because of the conditions but it's also partly because of the subsidies, in fact, and those subsidies work against good nutrition in some sense. I speak out against that with no fear of reprisal or no fear of contradiction. But . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 5:30, the House is adjourned and stands adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.