



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 145 - 2:00 p.m., WEDNESDAY, 10 AUGUST, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

WEDNESDAY, 10 AUGUST, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

MR. ASSISTANT CLERK, G. Mackintosh: It is my duty to inform the House that Mr. Speaker is unavoidably absent. I would ask the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair in accordance with the statutes.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. P. Eyer: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

Jobs Fund investments

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

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy First Minister. We are given to understand by a News Service Bulletin that has reached our desk today, commenting upon what the First Minister is saying to his colleagues, the Premiers, in Toronto, that "Manitoba's Jobs Fund . . ." in the words of the Premier, ". . . designed to create meaningful jobs immediately, and create investments that produce long-term benefits for the province's economy . . . a down payment on our future." He goes on to say in this bulletin, Mr. Speaker, that "There has been a significant rebound in employment growth in Manitoba. Three-quarters of the jobs lost during the recession period have been restored." And then he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, "Manitoba's Jobs Fund," he said, "could provide a model for joint action and he urges . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. S. LYON: I'm happy to hear the accolades from across the way to the words of their now distant "leader". He urges, ". . . that a joint economic summit Conference be convened to take immediate steps on a national basis."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have two questions to the Acting First Minister: No. 1, can she tell us how many jobs and what category have been directly created as a result of the so-called Jobs Fund investments? That's No. 1; and No. 2, can she - we've all heard of the carriage that turned into a pumpkin at midnight, but we have never before, except in the Jobs Fund, heard of the Manitoba pumpkin being translated into a glittering carriage once it reached Toronto - can she give us any other facts that would substantiate this kind of senseless, misinforming rhetoric that the Premier is turning out now that he's safely beyond the reach of this Legislature?

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

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot give fine detail on the total Jobs Fund, but it had three components. There were capital investments, there was skill development, and there was investment in some future capacity to create jobs. Probably the biggest area of job creation - I guess I should point out, first of all, that the total work force in the province has increased and, therefore, there is a rate of job creation going on, although the unemployment figures are still unacceptably high to both sides of the House.

The chief advances have been in the housing area and in the services and sort of educational field. There are smaller gains, but nonetheless significant gains, by programs, such as, the Salary Assistance for Science and Engineering graduates, because those are key people in improving the capacity of the manufacturing sector in the future to adapt to new technology and improve the competitiveness, though not always the employment-creating capacity, of our manufacturing sector. Because often, in becoming more competitive internationally, they may actually eliminate jobs, but they do play a role in reducing our dependence on imports and, therefore, do contribute to the economy. But the big gains in employment are not necessarily in that sector.

In total, Mr. Deputy Speaker, \$200 million in a variety of programs that are, as I say, infrastructure-oriented, skill development-oriented and some, such as an investment in the extension of the Food Products Tech Centre, that enables technology to get transferred through the food processing system to improve our food processing industries are examples of the types of things that are represented in the Jobs Fund.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my further question to the Deputy First Minister, does the Deputy or the Acting First Minister actually believe that either the conception, the capital formation, or the administration and the results of the Jobs Fund would or should leave this government to ask for a national economic conference to be called to review it? Would that not be a cause of grave embarrassment, not only to the people of Manitoba, but indeed to this incompetent government?

HON. H. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is our belief that a responsible handling of the economy, not only of the province but of the country, does require initiative by the Government of Canada; that were they to use their fiscal capacity to stimulate in a variety of ways the economy, such as we have done within our capacity in the Province of Manitoba, we would, as a nation, be able to perform better on the employment side to the extent that we will only slowly improve our relative competitive position internationally. We could still insure that, within the country of Canada, the burdens and the benefits of that struggle were spread somewhat more equitably, and a great deal could be done by the willingness to take such an initiative.

Indeed the Federal Government has a package of initiatives. I don't like to imply that they have not been taking any of the necessary initiatives, because we are, in fact, working in concert with them in quite a few areas. But it is our contention that, through a partnership approach and a more initiating stance, the Federal Government could create more hope and more sense of direction in the economic development in business, labour and government.

HON. S. LYON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there was only some \$18 million of new budgetary money provided for the Jobs Fund this year; in view of the fact that by the most recent accounts that we've had from the provincial Minister of Finance, all of the money has been either expended or allocated, in other words that the Jobs Fund is now effectively broke; in view of the fact that it has provided, according to the plan that she mentioned, some 75 jobs for 1982 engineering graduates, but has also provided jobs for mariachi band players, for grass cutters, brush cleaners, and variegated short term, make-work jobs, will the Deputy First Minister not immediately get in touch with the First Minister and have him withdraw this embarrassing statement before his colleagues in Toronto find out the real truth about the Jobs Fund?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I defy the Leader of the Opposition to take the list of job initiatives that are available, and were available during the Estimates procedure, and demonstrate that there are make-work jobs in any of those projects. I think if he looks carefully he will see that they fall under the categories of human resource development, of capital and infrastructure development, and of some initiatives and investments in the basic economy of the future of the province so that we are, as the years go by, in a better position to generate a good revenue base from which we'll be able to do all the other things we would so much like to do.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before continuing with question period, I would like to direct the attention of all members to the gallery, where we have a group of 50 members of provincial and territorial Legislatures and of the Parliament of Canada with their spouses.

On behalf of all members of the Legislature, I would like to welcome the members of the Canadian Parliamentary Conference.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

Jobs Fund numbers

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Premier. She has defied us to examine the list of jobs created by the Jobs Fund. I have been asking the government for the last several days to provide such a list, the breakdown of the projects, the number of people employed, and the amount of money allocated. Can the Minister table that information now?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would refer the members of the opposition to the debate on the Jobs Fund when it was here in Estimates, when we were all prepared with our material on each of the projects that were linked to our respective departments. We had full descriptions of the type of project, the expected result, and the potential employment promotion.

However, I will take in good faith the question asked as notice, and we will table, as soon as is reasonable, summaries and updates on the actual implementation of the Jobs Fund programs.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Has nothing happened in the Jobs Fund within the last three months?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the members opposite are demonstrating extremely short memory. They seem to forget that between the allocation of funds to a particular program area and the actual administration, hiring of people and carrying out of the work, it's an ongoing process. It's like a budgeted amount that is earmarked for certain areas for the coming year and, in fact, the programs are carried out, sometimes with ongoing personnel and sometimes with new or part-time personnel, during the course of that year. That is what we mean on this side when we say that the monies in the fund are allocated.

It is, however, also consistent with our saying that there are job openings and expenditures of those funds going on, on a day-to-day, week-to-week and month-to-month basis.

Bill 95 - Pension Benefit Act

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have supplied the Deputy Premier with a copy of a letter which I received today from the Co-operative Superannuation Society, dated August 8, 1983. The Society has a registered pension plan covering co-operatives and credit unions across Canada and particularly in Western Canada, and indicate that they have many Manitoba employees participating in the plan. Their plan has been in existence since the 1940's and has been approved over time so that it exceeds legislative requirements by substantial amounts.

On Page 2, Mr. Deputy Speaker - and this is my question to the Deputy Premier - Mr. L.D. Williams, the General Manager of the Co-operative Superannuation Society states, in referring to concerns with respect to uniformity of pension plans across Canada, he says, "I believe the government's actions will contribute to many organizations and employee groups simply terminating their pension plan in favour of other non-regulated forms of retirement income savings."

My question to the Deputy Premier, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this; in view of this concern, does the government not have any concerns about pushing through this legislation at this Session of the Legislature?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's a stretch, I think, of the imagination that I should be responding on the pensions bill which is yet to be debated. However, I think a general comment is in order. That is that we have been in favour of federal reform of the pension system, but until such time comes that there is a demonstrated will and intention on that level to reform the pension system we do not think that Manitobans that do come within our jurisdiction, our ability to assist in the pension area, should have to wait.

I think we would be overjoyed if we found that provincial pension legislation had become unnecessary because of major improvements in the Canada pension plan, but that eventuality, according to my estimate, is some time down the road. Therefore, I think it's quite in order for the government to proceed with the pension bill as proposed.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, Bill 95, The Act to amend The Pension Benefits Act, was not debated because this government forced a vote without allowing sufficient time for this complicated subject to be referred. It is only now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we are receiving criticisms of this bill.

My supplementary question to the Deputy Premier, Mr. Speaker, is, in view of the further statement by Mr. Williams of the Co-operative Superannuation Society on Page 2 of this letter that he has no qualms in stating that, "I fully expect a number of employers and employee groups will simply terminate their pension plans as a result of these amendments, and the door will now be opened in Manitoba for an exodus from pension plans and the subsequent loss in retirement income protection for numerous Manitobans."

Are these types of concerns not of sufficient importance to the Deputy Premier and the government to delay action on this bill until there's a full opportunity for it to be considered?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did just receive a copy of this letter once the question period was under way, and I have not had time to read it in detail. However, I submit that I, personally, have more confidence in the employers of the province to recognize that fair pension plans are, in fact, a form of deferred wages and that it is in their interests, as well as in the employee's interest, to have a sound and secure package of employee wages and benefits. I have confidence that the majority of them, who have been consulted quite extensively on pension reforms that we're interested in, will accept the legislation we are putting forward in that spirit.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. In view of the concluding paragraph in this letter in which Mr. William states, "I have communicated with the Minister of Labour my pleasure and displeasure and concerns, both prior to the introduction of the act and since the introduction of the act. Unfortunately, the government seems bent on moving forward on this matter in a way which I feel will create a major disservice to Manitobans and Canadians in their request for

retirement income security". Can the Deputy Premier at least assure us that the Minister of Labour will be present at the Industrial Relations Committee meeting tomorrow when considering this bill and we are in receipt of public comments?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is a time and a place for opinions that vary or support the government proposal to be heard. We intend to listen, to weigh the opinion and the rationale, and then come to our judgment.

It is our belief that we must strive for a balance between the concerns of people who see themselves having to pay or see pension plans as a cost - a cost of doing their particular business - and the legitimate claim of workers to have some kind of future security and adequate preparation for retirement income. It's that spirit of balance and even-handedness that has informed us in our development of pension legislation. I have every confidence that we will continue to apply those criteria when listening to input in the hearings.

Speakers at constitutional hearings

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General, and ask him whether he has a current update on the number of persons wishing to appear to speak on the constitutional resolution.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: The last figure I saw was 52 individuals and organizations, but it may have increased since then.

Just, Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I'm on my feet, there may have been a misunderstanding with respect to the hearing of the pension legislation that I'd like to clarify. It is not intended, and that was made clear, that it be heard at committee tomorrow. The Minister won't be here. It will not be introduced until the Minister is here, and it may be some time next week.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that the current update indicates that there are now 161 delegations wishing to appear, including 104 municipal representatives; and given that the previous record for hearings was 1970 when 116 delegations appeared at the Legislature and that took some 75 hours or more of committee hearings; and given that these hearings could take well over 100 hours, which might be some three to four weeks of hearings on bilingualism, will the government consider holding these hearings after the Session?

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have never been able to accept the premises of the Member for Elmwood with respect to his mathematics. We've had some strange mathematical formulae come out from him from time to time. There are so many variables - one has to do with the length of briefs, the length of submissions - that to think that the matter may be determined as to whether or not the hearings are to

be sessional or intersessional simply on the basis of a calculation, in any event, is too simplistic. There are other considerations to be taken into account and which we are considering, and which I expect to be discussing with the opposition in the very near future.

MR. R. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, given that there are now 161 submissions and the final figure may reach 200 or more from everywhere in Manitoba, and that the government should serve the people, is the Attorney-General considering a greater number of locations for public hearings than the four indicated? Would he now, for example, also consider centres like Roblin and Russell and Dauphin and Pilot Mound, etc.?

HON. R. PENNER: We are considering all possibilities, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Co-operative Development and would ask him; in light of this government proceeding with The Pension Act - really ramming it down the throats of people in Manitoba at a time when we are seeing a lot of public objection to this particular bill - will he, as Minister of Co-operative Development who is responsible for the Credit Union system in Manitoba, ask his fellow colleagues in the government to undertake a lengthier survey of what the public opinion is really with regard to this bill, so that we won't see the type of things happen as has been forecast by the Co-operative people in Manitoba?

Bill 95 - Pension Benefits Act

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. First of all, I disagree that we are ramming this down the throats of the Legislature. I have not yet seen that correspondence. It will be given due consideration, and the Co-operative group has the opportunity to make their views known at the committee stage.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the individual from the movement has corresponded with the Minister of Labour and has put forward that organization's concern with this bill, will the government not now undertake to withdraw this bill, make sure that there is proper private sector input to this, or is this an attempt by the government to move into that life insurance and pension field which they have a tendency of wanting to get into? Is this the backdoor approach, and will the Minister not stand up for the co-op system in this province to ensure that monies aren't driven out of the province; rather that the system is strengthened here and that that system can grow?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: I think this government has shown itself to be very supportive of the co-operative movement. I can assure you that I have comments from

people within the co-operative sector expressing their appreciation of the support that we have shown compared to the previous administration. I could indicate that we have had, and I've said before, more co-ops formed in the last year than have been formed in any of the previous five years.

That letter has not been brought to my attention. It will be considered when I receive a copy of the letter. The co-operative group has the opportunity to make its views known at the committee stage, and they will be considered.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Co-operative Development who is now lauding his government's approach to the co-op field, will the Minister confirm that there are fewer people working in the retail co-op and the fishing co-op system in this province this year than there were three years ago? In other words, what he calls the expansion in the co-op system has resulted in the closure of such things as Red River Co-op and the loss of some 200 jobs in that one co-op alone. So, can he confirm that there are fewer people working in the co-op system in Manitoba today than there were three years ago? If he calls that expansion, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba, I know, are sharp enough to not agree with those type of figures.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The Member for La Verendrye has again displayed his myopic view of the co-op system. In fact, it may well be that there are fewer people involved in the retail co-op or Red River Co-op system. That's fairly obvious, and I will certainly obtain the figures to indicate that there are probably, by far, more people involved in the co-op sector today than there were five years ago. But we have to take into consideration all the various co-ops, whether it be fishing co-ops or day care co-ops, utility co-ops, the various mix of co-ops that exist. So I don't take that as any indication of lack of support by this government.

I should also indicate that, thanks to the previous administration, their concern about the co-operative development was so deep that many co-operatives barely know that our department exists, and that knowledge is so lacking that Red River Co-op never came to our government until a week before they decided to close down their stores.

Return of Minister of Community Services

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Acting Minister of Community Services and Corrections. I don't begrudge the Minister of Community Services and Corrections a richly deserved vacation, Sir, particularly in view of the bombs that have been falling around him lately, but in view of the new controversies boiling in his department at the present time, Sir, and in view of the Acting Minister's assurance this morning that the Minister would be returning to the Chamber shortly to answer for his department, can the Acting Minister give us a progress report on the Minister's progress down the Trans-Canada Highway east from Brandon? Can the Acting Minister advise the House whether the Minister has reached MacGregor yet,

whether he is coming by plane, train or hitchhiking, and when he will arrive to answer for his department?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Economic Development.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

I hope that all members of the House will assist the Minister of Economic Development in giving her answer by affording her a cordial and considerate hearing.

The Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the gentleman in question is on holiday, and it is an unwarranted inference to suggest that he is on his way in from Brandon. He will be back, as far as we know, at the beginning of next week.

Public safety at Headingley

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that's quite acceptable. I said, I don't begrudge the Minister a vacation. The Acting Minister gave us the impression this morning that the Minister was on his way.

Let me then put a question. Let us say then, Mr. Speaker, that we are not at the moment awaiting the breathless arrival of the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, who I expected to burst through one of the Chamber doors at any moment on the basis of what the Acting Minister said this morning. Let me put this question to the Acting Minister.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very disturbing findings of the MGEA into conditions at Headingley Jail, including a warning by guards, Sir, that public safety is at risk, can the Acting Minister assure the House that steps are being taken by the department today to act on those warnings and to head off any potential danger to security personnel at Headingley and to the public?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I said this morning, I have not had time to read in detail the MGEA Report, so any comments I make are not based on a detailed knowledge of what is in that report.

I have been assured by the department that the handling of the situation the other night was responsibly done. Extra staffing was retained after the 11:00 p.m. disturbance. Police were called in to encircle the institution on the outside in case there should be any further escape attempts. None were, in fact, attempted. By talking with the prisoners, the disturbance was quieted. By 2:00 p.m., it was felt that conditions had returned to a reasonably stable condition, and the extra staff were permitted to go home. A senior person did go out to Headingley to be on hand should any further emergency arise.

We have, as well, received a detailed accounting of damage to the premises, and the precise total is under \$10,000.00. Allowing for the fact there may be a little inaccuracy or whatever, it doesn't seem likely that the total will go higher than \$11,000.00.

We are, however, concerned about conditions there and will be monitoring the situation and ready to act should there be any emerging situation.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, will there be an interim report available? Has an interim report been prepared by the task force investigating Headingley Jail? The Minister has advised the House that report will be available in September. It is my understanding that there have been interim responses delivered to the government with respect to that overall question. Can the Minister advise whether there is an interim report ready on Headingley Jail from that task force at the present time?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'll have to take that as notice. I did indicate this morning that the expected date of filing the general report is September. As yet, I have had no confirmation as to whether that report will be ready, or whether there will be an interim report, but I think I did take that as notice this morning.

Labour liaison officer

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have had a news release that Mr. Fullerton will be the liaison officer between the government and business, and the Minister confirms that it's \$85,000 a year, and the First Minister confirms expenses and the Minister confirms a car, I would like to ask the Minister of Economic Development if he will have an office and a secretary. If so, where will they be located?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the gentleman will have an office in Lakeview Square where the rest of the departmental offices are, and he will have access to support services in that department.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance indicated that the agreement had not been signed. When we asked for the agreement to be tabled, he said, they would be happy to table the agreement when it was signed. Can the Minister inform the House whether the agreement has been signed yet?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the agreement has now been signed, and I will see that it is tabled tomorrow.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I didn't hear the Minister. Did she say, it has not been signed?

HON. M. SMITH: The agreement has been signed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that manufacturing is down, investment is down; in view of the fact that manufacturing shipments are down; in view of the fact that certain areas of the construction industry are in desperate shape; and in view of the fact that the Minister is supposed to be the top liaison officer with the business community in the Province of Manitoba, has the Minister hired an \$85,000 a year

person with a car, with expenses, with office, with secretary to do the job that she hasn't been able to do?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in case the members opposite haven't noticed, many of my hours are filled by being tied to the House. However, I accept a prime responsibility of making contact with the business community and visiting plants and coming to understand more acutely the difficulties and the opportunities that the business community are facing. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is a task that is much more efficiently done if there is someone busily involved in organizing and setting up those meetings and I look forward very much to working in concert with Mr. Fullerton in a more efficient form, if you like, of being in regular consultation with an ever-widening circle of business people in Manitoba.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, who is recognized?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Inkster.

Safeway store closing

MR. D. SCOTT: Well, how many supplementaries is he allowed? Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs. Mr. Speaker, I just got some very sad news today and that is in reference to another community Safeway store closing, this one in the community of Weston and right adjacent to Brooklands. We have two senior citizens blocks kitty-corner to the store and it's just another example, I think, of Safeway's indifference to the smaller communities and the collection of communities in the City of Winnipeg.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Well, the members of the opposition obviously are not very concerned about the people in that area having a major store to be able to shop and get their groceries at.

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Consumer Affairs, is he aware of this in the first instance, and is he involved or is he doing any kind of an investigation into the situation of the retail food marketing business in Manitoba, because it seems to be coming more and more concentrated into a few very large super stores?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I thank the Member for Inkster for making me aware of the closing of the Safeway store. I should indicate to this House that we have been concerned for some time about the apparent concentration of the retail food industry into what appears to be two large retailers. This matter is under consideration by my department. We will be conferring with the Federal Minister of Consumer Affairs and it will be under

consideration by other departments, as well. I thank the member for that information.

Paint damage claims to MPIC

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs responsible for the Manitoba Insurance Corporation. Would the Minister inform the House how many claims the corporation have received for paint damage to automobiles as a result of the recent aerial spraying with Malathion?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there have been six claims that have been received. Three have been confirmed and the other three are still under review.

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes, a supplementary to the Minister. I wonder if the Minister could submit whatever data might be available to him, the scientific data on the dangers of malathion spray to certain paint surfaces, if he could give us that technical data that he may have?

HON. J. BUCKLASCHUK: The MPIC is presently obtaining an analysis of the paint that was damaged. My understanding is that in certainly one situation that the paint that was damaged - and that's the one that was referred to on the Peter Warren program - was a repainted vehicle. The paint was not the original type, it was a softer paint. That is being analysed to definitely confirm there was malathion damage.

Facilities at Lake of the Prairies, Shellmouth Dam

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources regarding the barbecues, picnic tables and the outdoor toilets at Lake of the Prairies, Shellmouth Dam. I wonder, could the Minister advise the House and the campers of that area, are the picnic tables and the barbecues and the toilets back in place, finally?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice. I expect that in the matter of a couple weeks, I should be able to get out of the House and go up there and have a look.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Honourable Minister for that class answer I've been getting for about a month now as to where those picnic

tables went? Can I ask him, Mr. Speaker, now that he's indicated he's going to travel in the area, while he's there will he check with the farmers around the periphery of the Duck Mountain Provincial Park and the Riding Mountain National Park regarding the water problems they're having with beavers, their crops and hay losses in the area? Would he be kind enough to - and at the same time take his federal counterpart with him and see if they can compensate those farmers in the area for the loss that they've sustained through no fault of their own?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Order. Order please.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting physical attributes of the beaver is that its teeth never stop growing and it's similar to the questions from the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell - they never stop growing.

I have responded to those concerns in the House on innumerable occasions and I know that the honourable member has some concerns about pit privies. Some of my colleagues, a few friends of his, and he, are disturbed because, I gather, a pit privy that was highly used by the honourable member, perhaps, and a few friends, has been moved. That's my understanding.

Mr. Speaker, we respond to the totality of need for those kind of facilities in that area and we don't look at the particular needs of just a few individuals.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The time for oral questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY COMMITTEE CHANGES

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MRS. D. DODICK: I have committee changes, Mr. Speaker.

On Industrial Relations: the Member for Ste. Rose will substitute for the Member for Seven Oaks; the Member for Logan for Kildonan; the Member for The Pas for Burrows; and the Member for Wolseley for Flin Flon.

On Statutory Regulations: the Member for Radisson for Burrows; the Member for Flin Flon for Wolseley, the Member for Riel for St. Johns.

On Law Amendments: the Member for Interlake for Kildonan; the Member for Lac du Bonnet for Brandon East; and the Member for Churchill for Osborne.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 48, on Page 9, standing in the name of the Member for Arthur, who has 16 minutes left, that we're all anxious to hear.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 48, with the amendment thereto, standing in the name of the Member for Arthur, who has 16 minutes remaining.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In my remarks this morning I pointed out to the Assembly and to the people of Manitoba the lack of support that the government have put forward in debate for this particular piece of legislation, and I will again go back over some of the points that I made so that the Ministers and members are aware of what our position is.

No. 1, Mr. Speaker, of course is the principle which is involved in this particular piece of legislation. We, Mr. Speaker, believe firmly that it is not the responsibility of the taxpayers to have funds unwillingly taken from them to pay for any political party, whether it be of their choice or whether it isn't; that it's just not right that the taxpayers be subjected to that kind of extraction of money or for those kinds of purposes. We will fight, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of principle for a long time. In fact, as I indicated in my comments this morning, as has been indicated by our Leader, that we will in fact repeal this legislation and make the funds repayable by those political parties, Mr. Speaker, and that will be retroactive. So there's no question about how committed we are to the principle of not taking money unwillingly from people who do not want to support any political party if they don't want to, from the wishes of those taxpayers. So the people of Manitoba can rest assured that this law will be changed.

Another important point that I think one has to look at, Mr. Speaker, and as I indicated this morning, that when we look at what is happening throughout the world, we're seeing a shift from the left to the right with the whole philosophical approach of people. A good indication was that of the government in the UK, Margaret Thatcher's recent victory where, in fact, she has really shown the world what they believe in is the way in which to resolve the economic problems and the way in which the world has to go. I have pointed out that Ronald Reagan, Mr. Speaker, has a very successful program, and that the people are abandoning the left-wing philosophical approaches.

So really what is at stake here, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the New Democratic Party's concern that they will slide into oblivion, and without this kind of taxpayer funding of their party, then in fact they won't be able to go out and voluntarily muster the funds that they will need to operate as a political party in this province. It's evidenced again by what is happening nationally when we see the New Democratic Party slip to an all time low within the popularity polls that have been taken. The message is there for the New Democratic Party in Manitoba that their days are very numbered. Their days are numbered in this province because of the kinds of legislation that they're trying to impose on the people of Manitoba.

Question Period today was another example of that kind of legislation. I as well have some questions for

the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the conflict of interest act which, in fact, will drive local people out of the responsible roles of acting as municipal councillors. I know he is getting letters day after day telling him that they don't want that legislation. I would suggest that he reconsider it and withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

One has to ask the question when a government introduces legislation - why change? What is the purpose in what they're doing? To this point, the only answers that I have received have been the weak arguments that came forward from the Minister of Health this morning, and he indicated that it would remove any particular concerns that they have for people influencing government by putting money in place. Well, his argument doesn't hold water because what they are saying is that 50 percent of the election costs will be paid through the taxpayers funds, and 50 percent will have to be sought through public donation to their party. So if they're going to accomplish what he's saying they're going to do, then they're only going half way and it won't do it.

He talks about being against lobbying, that if a person puts money into a political party they're subject to the lobby of those individuals that have put funds forward. Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that hasn't happened to any great degree that has been able to be proven by this government. They haven't pointed out any examples of any magnitude. In fact, they haven't pointed any examples out, Mr. Speaker, of those kinds of cases. They haven't been able to justify the need for the funding of the taxpayers of Manitoba through the taxation system of political parties, and I would suggest they make a change in this act, so that it doesn't force people to unwillingly put funds into a political party.

It doesn't matter whether it's NDP, or whether it's Progressive Conservative. I use the example of me going out to an NDP in my constituency - I'm sure there aren't many New Democratic supporters want to fund a Progressive Conservative Party through their tax money. I don't blame them if they don't feel that they want to, that they shouldn't be forced to do so. I don't believe that should be the case. And I don't believe that a Progressive Conservative, or an individual who doesn't want to participate and support any political party, that they should be forced to do it through their taxpayer. Why should anyone through their daily work activities be taxed? Goodness knows, they're already overtaxed. The weight of government spending has got most people on their knees as it is. Why would they add more to it to force people to contribute to a political party, not by choice, but by force? It's wrong that they do that.

I made reference to the fact that any government that passed this kind of legislation was on the verge, or could be considered to have a direct conflict of interest. They could put any kind of imposition of charges on the taxpayers that they want. Yes, if they've generated enough money, they could almost, Mr. Speaker, go to the point of passing any legislation in this regard. Why start in this direction in this province? I believe that there are enough people committed politically to support the political philosophy of their belief to fund it. The system through the tax incentives, and the tax write-offs that are in place now, are as fair for one person as the next, and it shouldn't have to be changed in the direction in which they want to go.

What does this all lead to, Mr. Deputy Speaker? What does this all lead to? Mr. Speaker, this leads to, if a person says, no way do I want to support a political party with my taxation money, and withholds their taxes, they will be subject to the penalties of the taxation laws. Yes, I'm sure the eventual law would put those people in jail. Is that what we want to subject the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba to? Do we want to make them criminals because of bad legislation that the New Democratic Party are forcing through this Legislature? That's what we're doing. That's what we're being asked to do. We're being asked to force the people of the Province of Manitoba, if they do not want to pay their taxes and fund the political party, then they will be subject to the laws and penalties that fall within the Income Tax Act of this country; fully disclose and to put them in jail or heavy fines. That is not right.

As Jack Benny would say, it's maybe not so much the money, but it's the principle of the thing. That's what we stand up for, for the constituents that send us to the Legislature. We stand up to protect the rights, freedoms, and privileges of those people that live within a democratic system. We will continue to debate with that objective in mind to protect those people.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, I am astonished at him; I'm astonished at him supporting such legislation. I cannot believe him. Why does he not stand up for the constituents of Ste. Rose? Why doesn't he stand up for the municipal people which he represents? But everything he has done as a Minister has been against the wishes of those people that he is supposed to be representing. The Municipal Act, which is imposing conflict of interest on them, they don't support it; the bilingualism, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they don't support it.

What do they support that he and his government are doing? What are they doing? Well, believe me there's a Main Street Manitoba Program that they support, but at the rate that it's proceeding, I think that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be long gone before the full impact of that program is in place. I really would wonder what the full impact will be, whether he'll get three Main Streets done for two since he introduced the program almost two years ago.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we stand and when we debate, it is our objective as an opposition to make our points and make them very clear. I think that we have been able to do that on most subjects that we have stood to debate on. This one is not unlike it. My colleagues who have spoken on this particular issue have been very clear on how they feel.

I would, in my concluding remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, go back to some of the comments that the Member for Lac du Bonnet made a few years ago when the Livestock Producers Association in this province were given legislation which gave them the opportunity to organize and fund their own organization; a free organization which was one which they could participate in through a direct checkoff of their livestock at the time of marketing, and at a particular time, if they were not desirous of participating in that organization, didn't participate by having funds in; they could apply and get their monies back. They could, in fact, not participate in meetings of any choice. That, I think, wasn't an unfair approach.

What he is now supporting, is saying - and is even better - is that now those same people who produce

livestock can, through their taxation, pay funds into the New Democratic Party, pay funds into the Progressive Conservative Party, and yet, unless they go and buy a membership in those parties and go to their annual meetings, they can't have any part of the decision making.

Now, if that isn't force feed, I don't know what is. I would dare say it'd be difficult - and if I'm wrong, the Minister of Highways can correct me - that if you're going to pay for your parties, Conservative, or from your New Democratic Party, if you're going to participate in an annual meeting, that the first thing you'll be subjected to is the payment of those taxes to pay 50 percent of the election funds, but to also buy a membership into that party to have a say in what goes on in that particular organization. So, you're getting to be hit twice by this kind of legislation. It's not fair.

I believe if you want to contribute with the financial support that you feel is within your limits, that you can do so without that kind of forced legislation. If you want to buy a membership and participate in a political party and be a part of that supporting organization and give them directions through the mechanism of annual meetings and meetings that are held by those organizations, and become a voting delegate at certain conventions, then that's available to you. But why force the people of Manitoba to pay for something that they have very little control over, in fact, no control over? It isn't right, and we will continue to try to convince the government that they're going in the wrong direction.

Reference has been made to other provinces and the other jurisdictions in this country where they do carry out this kind of legislation. Mr. Deputy Speaker, two wrongs don't make a right. For us to follow other jurisdictions in this particular area I don't believe is necessarily right for the people of Manitoba, and I wanted to clearly put that on the record and I do not support this legislation and will continue to debate it at every opportunity.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Housing.

HON. J. STORIE: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to make a few comments, some in response to my honourable friend from Arthur who made some rather derogatory remarks about my commitment to the farm community. I don't think that those remarks were (a) justified, or (b) accurate, by any means, by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur, and a number of his colleagues, continue to make the argument that it doesn't matter that other jurisdictions have Elections Finances Acts similar to the one that's being proposed in Manitoba. He says, "two wrongs don't make a right."

Mr. Speaker, it's rather strange that this legislation where many other jurisdictions and certainly their federal counterparts, the Federal Tories, have used and have accepted public funding for their election expenses and have not seemed to have any deep principled philosophical objection to that, and yet we have that kind of objection here.

I say it's strange that the Member for Arthur can stand up and say, "two wrongs don't make a right."

It seems that only this particular opposition is right, because we have The Farm Lands Ownership Act. The members opposite said, "Well we don't care if they have the same thing in Saskatchewan; we don't care if they have the same thing in Prince Edward Island; we don't care if they have it in Saskatchewan, two wrongs don't make a right."

Mr. Speaker, the irony is that what we have is Conservative Governments, Conservative regimes in other provinces, and Conservative regimes, the opposition in the Federal House, and I should say the Clark Government, who used this financing mechanism, who have had no opposition, no principled objections, and all of a sudden only this particular group are right, and we are wrong.

There is an irony here in that we have a New Democratic Party Government who is introducing what is in effect Tory legislation in other jurisdictions and all of a sudden it's all wrong. Mr. Speaker, I think their objections are patently absurd. I think they're inconsistent. I think that many of their objections border on the hypocritical.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. J. STORIE: I said many of their objections border on the hypocritical.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We don't care about other provinces, and we don't care what you think you do.

HON. J. STORIE: The Member for Sturgeon Creek says, "We don't care about other provinces, and we don't care about what you think." I know that's possible, because I know the Member for Sturgeon Creek doesn't think. So that resolves that small problem.

Mr. Speaker, I find it rather ironic that what we're talking about in this piece of legislation is a process that is fundamental, that is the grassroots, that is the crux of our democratic system. We're talking about elections. We're talking about how those elections are financed.

Mr. Speaker, recalling some of the remarks from the Member for Arthur with respect to the fact that there is no other area where it's so important to rely on voluntary funding. I find that a very difficult idea to put up against the notion that a democracy is something in which all people participate, all people have an equal voice, all people have an obligation and a responsibility. Because, clearly, the democratic process, a vital process, requires and expects that each citizen will do his part in that process. Mr. Speaker, despite what members opposite have said about this particular way of financing elections, The Elections Finances Act brought in in 1980 does fundamentally the same thing, only with some serious flaws, and I'll get to those flaws in a minute.

I want to get back to the suggestion from the Member for Arthur that I somehow had made some unflattering remarks about the farmers and the farm community when I suggested that his particular statement that we were supporting some kind of left-wing, lunatic fringe by way of this Elections Finances Act - I want to indicate to the member that what I said, in effect, was that the Manitoba farm community is very heavily subsidized

by Manitoba and Canadian taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, I wrote down a number of ways that the people of this province not only support farmers, who are free enterprisers and whose objective and purpose in life is to operate at a profit, to operate their farming operations in a profitable way; the public not only supports them directly, but indirectly in hundreds of ways.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Natural Resources spends literally millions of dollars providing drainage for agricultural lands from which individual farmers can make a profit, millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba and this country pay hundreds of millions of dollars to support the farmers in the transportation of their grain, hundreds of millions of dollars. We are talking about an infinitesimal amount when you compare the cost of election finances with the cost of — (Interjection) — infinitesimal.

However, Mr. Speaker, the amount of money we're talking about is outrageously small, compared to the subsidy that we are providing to Manitoba farmers so that they can make a profit. Certainly we all acknowledge the importance of the farm community. I have not said, despite what the Member for Arthur might have implied, that it's not important that we do that. It is not important that we protect that industry.

Mr. Speaker, the members will also recognize that there any number of tax benefits to be had, fuel tax subsidies. The Department of Agriculture provides countless - not countless, they're countable - a number of services to Manitoba farmers; services to increase production, services for soil testing, services of - you can imagine the kinds. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and this government have introduced a Beef Stabilization Program that has cost tens of millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, this government has made available millions and millions of dollars worth of loans and loan guarantees so that the farmers can survive. Mr. Speaker, this government has provided funds for disaster assistance, funds for farmers that have been flooded out, as the previous government did. Mr. Speaker, we have a Hog Stabilization Program which is operating to subsidize and to support farmers.

I say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, only to disabuse the Member for Arthur of the notion that Manitoba taxpayers are not supporting farmers. In fact, they are. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba taxpayers are not only supporting farmers. Mr. Speaker, Manitoba taxpayers support many small businesses by way of Enterprise Manitoba, by way of the Department of Economic Development, by way of incentive grants. Mr. Speaker, there are any number of interest groups who are supported by taxpayers' money, by money collected by way of taxes from individuals in this province, not by their free choice.

Mr. Speaker, no one in Ilford, no one in Brochet, specifically, gave this Provincial Government the authority to go ahead and introduce a Beef Stabilization Program. But, Mr. Speaker, we are spending taxpayers' dollars on any number of what we believe are publicly desirable programs, public support programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have cries of outrage, I believe phony cries of outrage, about a bill that proposes to support the democratic process, which asks individuals to support the democratic process as opposed to a system

- and, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General commented that it was a way of preventing politics and the political process from becoming the preserve of the wealthy. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger that the tax credit system that was implemented by members opposite falls into that category, whereby the people who benefit most from donating to political parties are those people who: (a) have the largest disposable income; and (b) are in the highest income tax bracket. I haven't heard any member on that side dispute that fact.

Mr. Speaker, there are some clear inequities in the present tax credit system. Mr. Speaker, senior citizens, students, single families, low-income families who have no taxable income get no benefit whatsoever from that particular system. Yet, Mr. Speaker, because there are tax credits, because there are tax expenditures given out by the Provincial Government and the Federal Government to those people with high disposable income, to those people and corporations, I should mention, who have disposable income, they, the people who cannot get any benefit from the tax credit system, pay. They pay. Public funds go indirectly to political parties so that they can carry on the functions which serve the purposes of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the principle here is that the democratic process is a fundamental process, and it should be funded in a way that requires all people who pay taxes according to their ability-to-pay to donate to that process. Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that we move away from a system where - well it isn't a direct correlation - it relates to your ability to enter the process and remain in the process, and I can understand why there are cries of objection.

We can understand, because the Conservative Party is funded, by and large, through large corporate donations whose donations are tax deductible, and the tax expenditures related to those credits come from the backs of the senior citizens and the other people in our society who cannot benefit from that particular election financing mechanism.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we're on the right track, and I understand that this pains them. However, I think, in principle, they must recognize that the democratic process is each of our responsibility, and that we should pay for its costs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in closing, I would just say that I think the contributions from members opposite have, by and large, been I think misinformed about the intent. I don't know whether we can attribute that misinformation, that lack of understanding, wilful desire to misrepresent what this bill is all about, or whether we can attribute it to ignorance.

In either case, Mr. Speaker, it's deplorable, and I would like to see someone of principle stand up and acknowledge that the democratic process needs to be funded by all individuals who have a stake in it, and that is all of us.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it extremely interesting today. At least we've got two

government front benchers to their feet finally to stand up and try and defend some of this terrible legislation that this House is trying to wrestle with and deal with in a rational manner, and hopefully get it in a perspective that we can finally prorogue the House. But, Mr. Speaker, unless some of this legislation is removed from these records, I dare say, we're going to be here until Christmas. This is another example.

A MEMBER: Of what year?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well I'm not sure what year, but I see we have now set a record in this House, and I see us being here weeks and weeks unless the government backs off some.

I do thank the Attorney-General for standing in his place this morning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and recognizing the problems that we see and the public sees with the conflict of interest legislation, and stood in his place this morning and pulled back from that position that they had stood with so long in this House. Think of the hours and hours of debate that could have been saved if the Attorney-General of the government had seen fit to pull back weeks ago on that subject matter. That is the problem we've got with this and other bills. My God, one only has to look at the blistering letter that the Minister of Education got today from the President of MAST to show how bad this government is managing the affairs of this province.

He says, George Marshall, July 26th, "If you choose to proceed to the House with this ill-conceived proposed legislation, I will be obliged and at liberty to convey to every community in this province, by any and every means, the tragic consequences of what appears to be an arbitrary, political move and a cave-in to the pressures of the Teachers' Union."

Mr. Speaker, when you get the people of this province riled up, not only on this, but all this legislation that we're trying to resolve through debate, you've got yourself a real handful of problems. We have problems coming out of our ears in this Order Paper that's on my desk. This bill that's before me is another classic example, and I don't know how we're going to settle it.

I've been here in this Legislature a long time like the honourable member sitting across here, the Minister of Transportation. I have never seen the House dug into such an impasse, and there's no resolution or no way that it's going to be solved that I can see, except that the government backs off. It's their legislation.

I just, in response to the remarks that the honourable member that just spoke on this bill that's before us, and . . .

A MEMBER: Fine speech.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yes, it was, but he forgot one thing. Democracy around the world, as we know it, will never survive if it has to be propped up by government dollars, never. That's state control. Fifty percent of the elections in this province now will be state - it's a 50 percent product from the government. So the government is involved in the elections of this province.

I only ask the honourable members to take a look around the world. The thin edge and the fabric of

democracy in this world is so thin. It's a veil that can be hardly seen. I tell my friends and members of this House, once you start monkeying with the democratic system which is so tender, and we're so dedicated to democracy in the western world that I believe in but, when the day arrives that we have to stand in and prop that system up with government dollars, show me where that isn't government intervention in the democratic process that's been so sacred to everybody in this country for so long.

While the honourable members argue opposite and raise these various points as other jurisdictions doing it and on and on, those arguments are not worth even considering, because when you sit back in your place, Mr. Speaker, and just take a look at what's happening to the democratic process as we know it around the world, and whether it's done by government intervention, by dollars, or we see what's going on in Chad today where the military forces are moving in, is again a thrust to destroy the democratic process.

Why can't we leave it in its tender state that it was when it arrived and built this country to what it is, the greatest country in the world. Why monkey with it? Why try and change it? It's worked well over all my political career and my ancestors and those before me, worked very, very well, the democratic process that we practice in this province. I don't know why the members opposite want to tinker with it, because I have never in all the years, and I ran through five elections, had one elector, one man, woman or child have ever come to me in any political meeting or walking down the street and asked me to prop up the election process in this province by the taxpayers' dollars; never had a soul ever even think of it, because it's ridiculous, actually ridiculous.

Why should my supporters be taking 50 cents out of the dollar in their pocket to go down and support my opponent? That's not a contest any more; it's not. It's the state intervening in the democratic process of this country, and it should never happen.

What's the next step that will come once you start this ball rolling that the state is going to fund the elections in this province? What's the next step that we're going to do? Are we going to take some more rights away from the people who have historically elected good governments all across this country, stable governments, honest governments. As I said earlier, we enjoy the most freedoms of any country in the world. We enjoy more luxuries than anybody in the world, and they want to change the system. Where did you get your mandate? I've never heard of the electors or the taxpayers or anybody in this province asking for this type of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Health rose in his place today, and he said, it's to stop politicians from buying votes. Now he's a good one to talk on that subject matter because, when I arrived here, he was a Liberal. Then he switched over to the New Democratic Party. First of all, he's suspect. He's been sitting here under two governments but, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to use that argument that you want to stop politicians from buying votes, now just let's take a look at this garbage that went out in the campaign of the last election. Is that what you want the people of this province to pay? Half truths, quarter truths, garbage propaganda? I'm sorry.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

The Minister of Transportation on a point of order.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. I believe the member was reflecting on a member of this House in a way that I don't believe is proper. Perhaps you would want to rule on that, Mr. Speaker. The member was alluding to the fact that the Minister of Health was indeed a bought person by the New Democratic Party. I don't believe that's within our rules.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the the Member for Roblin-Russell wish to respond to that point of order.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, I have no allegations or suspicions against the honourable member. I only said, who is he, a member that has belonged to two political parties that sat in House, lecturing to us over here about this legislation before us. When he went out with his caucus and preached all this garbage around this province, which is filled with half truths, quarter truths . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Could the Member for Roblin-Russell restrict his comments to the point of order.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, on the same point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the same point?

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, on the same point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I heard the Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell distinctively say, who is he, the Minister of Health, to talk about buying votes when he was a member of two parties. First of all, he was a Liberal and then he was a New Democrat. I distinctly heard the Minister of Health also say that the Conservatives have tried to buy him out, they had invited him to go in.

I mean to say that the honourable member had better not cast stones because for they who live in glass houses . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would the Member for Roblin-Russell care to clarify his comments?

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the lecture I got from the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, I withdraw any allegation that related to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and say that he was a member of the Liberal Party, he is a member of the New Democratic Party, and as the Minister over there of Municipal Affairs says, he at one time was offered money or whatever to join the Conservative Party. — (Interjection) — He was offered a Minister's position. This is all news to me.

Anyway, it's all in the same political process. As I said, he lectures us today about our integrity on this Bill 55, and yet let's that kind of literature be spread across this province. I ask the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, can you assure me and the people of this province that this bill that's before us will eliminate propaganda, quarter truths, half truths,

misleading the people - they're going to be bribed with their own money, you're going to pay half the cost - can you guarantee me that you'll set up a board to screen every piece of literature that's going out from the political machines of this province, because if you can't pull that out, you'd better pull the bill.

I can show you the difference between the two political parties. We told the people of the province in the last election, if you vote NDP, the NDP would scrap the mega projects. That was a fact; that's true. If you elect an NDP Government they'll scrap the mega projects. We also said that if you elect a New Democratic Party, there'll be no new jobs, there'll be no new opportunities, there'll be no growth for Manitoba. Fact, absolutely fact. There's been no new jobs, there's been no new opportunities, there's been no growth for Manitoba; that's a fact, that is a fact. We said taxes would go up if you elect a New Democratic Government. Is that a fact? Absolutely, taxes have gone up. We said hydro rates would soar again if they elect a New Democratic Party. And they did, that's a fact. We also said the opportunity to build a decade of prosperity would be lost; that's a fact. Yet, they come out with this kind of garbage.

Now, there's two political parties campaigning in the same election, Mr. Speaker. One is telling the truth and the other is misleading the public. Do you think that the public should pay 50 percent of that kind of politicking and propaganda that's been cranked out. That's not in this bill. The honourable members opposite are very scared of this piece of paper and they don't like to discuss it. Do you think the people of the province should pay 50 percent of that? If you do stand up and say so. There you are. So there is the honourable member who thinks that we should support that kind of propaganda which has misled the people; it's quarter truth, half truth, some of it is a stranger to the truth. It's unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, but that's the thinking of these social tinkers over there who think that we should move in this way.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, misinformation, propaganda, that certainly is a problem today. That's how that government got elected, and there's not a word about that in the bill in any way, shape or form.

I wonder if the Minister of Health will come back in his seat, and stand up and say that if we pass this Bill 55 that this kind of campaigning and this kind of political literature will stop in this province. He won't come back. That's another reason why I'm opposed to it.

I can ask the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose or the Minister of Transportation where is this mass of people across this province who asked for this legislation? Where are these great hordes of citizens? It's got to be half of them at least, because they're asking them to pay half the election expenses. Where are these people that have asked for this?

Mr. Speaker, they're not there; they don't have a mandate. It was never in one of their elections pledges that they were going to bring this bill in. They don't even have a consensus. Same on the bilingual package, they don't have a mandate, they don't have a consensus from the people that they were going to bring forth this kind of legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, what's the problem with our friends across the way, what's the problem with this government? Well, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that they're

very very unhappy. They're sick about where they're showing in the national polls today. They're down to - what? - 15 percent. At one time they were 24. In the last year - was it? - they were as high as 24 on the national ratings. So, they're down, they've got to change leaders, they've got to change their Premier. We're going to have to change the government. So, as a last straw when they're being forced out of office, they said at least we're going to take something with us, we're going to make the taxpayers pay for half the election expenses in this province.

Isn't that a terrible thing, as they grab that last straw, because they see their party falling into oblivion, nationally and provincially - they're the only New Democratic Party as a Provincial Government in this country, and they haven't got a hope of ever forming a Federal Government, because they don't have the right policies - they are somehow, through this bill, trying to influence us and the people of this province we're going to get the public to pay for our elections, at least we can hang on for another couple of years, or maybe another 10 years if we get the taxpayers to at least pay half our bills.

I don't know what's wrong with their system, the union checkoff system, that they've been so successful with up to now, what's wrong with that system? Is it going to be wiped out in this bill? Is that system going to be taken completely out of the system, where any political party in this province will not be allowed to take money from a union check-off. I don't hear very much about that subject matter.

Or what's wrong with the little old lady, the old age pensioner in my constituency, coming over to a political meeting and giving me \$20 for my campaign, which she's done five times? Now, I've got to get somebody to run around over to her house after, and get a receipt to her. Then she has to send that receipt into this central office, and they will know who's voting for who.

That's what they want with this social tinkering, social mending, snooper clauses. They are in all their legislation. If you look at it either underhandedly or over top, you'll see this snooper clause in everything, because socialists are an eager beaver bunch of people, Mr. Speaker. If they don't get you on one way, they like to get you in another.

They want to get the masses to get up in the morning, and bow to them when they rise out of bed. They all take their same blue or pink-coloured toothbrushes, put on their green overalls, work hard all day for the state. Then when they go to bed at night, they bow down to the state again because the state is supreme. Here the state is going to be more supreme, because it's going to muck around with the democratic process in this province, the first time ever. First time ever, democracy in Manitoba that stood the test of time for some 116 years is going to be meddled with and changed, unless they back off, by this government that we've got across the way.

Mr. Speaker, they don't have a reason for doing it. They don't have a mandate. They don't have a consensus and, like all this other legislation, I said, that's before us, we are going to oppose it. You come here and show us you have a mandate and you have a consensus from the majority of the people in this province. Then I'll stand up and support your legislation every time. That is one of my rights here.

The people of Roblin-Russell constituency would say, I would be a very poor MLA if I didn't stand up when the government of the day shows me they have a mandate, and shows me that they told the people of this province, during the last election campaign, they were going to do that if you elect them, or they went around and got a consensus of the majority of the people and lay the consensus on the table and say, there you are, McKenzie from Roblin, there is the consensus we got from the people to make these changes in our democratic system.

They don't have that, Mr. Speaker. They don't have the mandate. It's not in there, look, show me. I've gone through all the literature, it's not there. There is no consensus there, and that's the problem with all their other legislation.

Do you mean to tell me the Minister of Education has got a consensus from the school divisions in this province, when she gets this dastardly letter daily that she got and we got from Mr. Marshall. That is a blistering letter.

No mandate, no consensus, and they're talking about democracy. Mr. Speaker, you think we should trust this government with our democratic process. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Attorney-General is back in his place because when I opened by remarks today, I said, democracy in this province and around the world as we know it will never survive if we proceed with state intervention, state control of the free democratic process like we're doing here in this bill. It won't, it can't survive.

What's been wrong with it up to now? What has been wrong with the democratic process in our province?

A MEMBER: Served us well.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Sir, the people of this province enjoy some of the greatest governments that the country has ever seen, good democracy.

A MEMBER: Including this one.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Absolutely. They've got their problems. They are learning the hard way that you can't make all these changes without a mandate and without a consensus and against the wishes of the majority. It's that simple.

This is another bill that I know the people in Roblin constituency do not support, and don't want me to stand here in my place, Mr. Speaker, and support in its present form. It has got to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, let's go through some of the clauses in this legislation, and just see how ridiculous it really is. It's unbelievable that a bunch of dreamers would get in a back room and come up and think they can make this system work. That's what scares me.

This advisory committee, let's just talk about this advisory committee that they are proposing, one representative appointed by each registered political party. Where goes democracy then? Where goes the rights of the elected people in this province, which historically has been run by elected people? They elect the people they want. Now you're going to have some people on this advisory committee that were never elected. All they have to do is get 2,500 people on a

petition and say, they're a political party, and they're on the advisory board.

MR. H. ENNS: And then start changing the rules. Your advisory rules will be changing.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Right. Poor old Manitobans. People in the province don't know this is going on in here today. The press do report some.

I just asked the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, how is that going to work. Supposing three new political parties get 2,500 signatures each, and so the advisory committee is set up, so we arrive at - we'll have Liberals likely. We'll have the New Democratic Party. We'll have the Conservatives, and we'll have three others. So there are three known political parties in this province and three unknown, and they're all sitting there at this advisory committee, guiding the destiny and the future of this province; guiding the democratic process that has been so tender to this people and this province, and they're going to change it.

They are going to move the state into the system, and the state is going to now pay half the shot and the state is going to - as I said, if we let them go and carry on with this kind of legislation, we will all have to use pink toothbrushes. We will have to bow down to the state in the morning and bow at night, and I ain't supporting that kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, even though we're hillbillies out in our country, some of us. We still see some problems with this kind of legislation.

Let's talk about these contributions made at a political meeting, and all the members have been around here. The Minister of Transportation, we've been through a lot of political battles, and you know what it is to go to those political meetings. They've got nuts and washers and wild oats in their pocket, all kinds of change. Now we've got to get some guy to run along behind those farmers and write down what they give. What an insult to a man's political rights in this province.

Whether he gives a buck, whether he gives five bucks or whether he gives 10 bucks or 50 bucks, the government and the state of this province doesn't have the right to go and say, you've got to give a receipt to me because you contributed to that political party. Poor old democracy, Mr. Speaker, will be wiped out if we allow that to continue, because the government of the day can right away - they've got the receipts from all these people - start riding herd on them because you gave so much to a certain political party.

Where does the secrecy of the ballot start, and where does it end in this bill? Where does the whole democratic process start, and where does it end under this kind of legislation? It's a can of worms, this bill. It's frightening; it's scary. It really is scary, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs sits there and chuckles. Yes, he does.

Well we heard him talk about the conflict of interest and earlier, when the Attorney-General wasn't here, I congratulated and thanked him this morning for his comments on certain matters that the House has had disagreement about because that's the only way we're going to settle these disputes. These debates will go on, as I say, until Christmas. I'm not going to back down on this issue, never, never, because the people

of Roblin Constituency, I'd be an insult to the people out there if I allowed this kind of legislation to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing. Here are the old girls that bring the cakes and the sandwiches to my political meetings. Now we're going to have to have somebody run behind her and get the receipt whether the cake was more than 10 bucks or less than 10 bucks, and you can hardly bake a cake today for 10 bucks or 20 bucks.

The nosey socialists, Mr. Speaker, are going to determine to find out who bakes cakes at political meetings in this party because there it is. "Where the persons in attendance at a meeting held by or on behalf of a candidate, constituency association or registered political party make contributions to the candidate, constituency association or registered political party, the name and address of each contributor, and the value of each contribution, shall be recorded."

It's none of our business if that lady belonged to the New Democratic Party. It's none of my business whether she belonged to the Liberal Party. It's none of my business if she belonged to the Rhinoceros Party. She's a free citizen; she has the freedom of the franchise; she has the freedom to support whatever political party she likes without us coming here and running with a sheet behind her and saying, "You were at that political meeting old dear and you baked a cake, and now we want to know your name because we want to tie you into that whatever political party you belong to." That's an insult to the voters of our province, it's an insult to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, democracy around the world, as I said earlier, as we know it, will never survive if we proceed with state intervention as we are in this election. State control of the free election process in this province is so sacred, so tender and has worked, worked beyond reproach since Day 1, and these guys and these ladies in the New Democratic Party want to tinker with it, want to change it, want to throw it out. They don't have a mandate, they don't have a consensus. It's just NDP socialist tinkering and I'm not going to stand for it. I'll tell the Attorney-General, tell the Minister of Municipal Affairs, we'll be here until Christmas unless you back off some of this bad bad legislation.

Mr. Speaker, here is another one. These definitions of a donation in kind, and that's a hooker. We're going to have to have lawyers now, running around these political meetings to analyze who is who and what's what. I suspect that maybe was another reason why the Attorney-General put all these hooked clauses in here because, who at a political rally can make a decision on a donation in kind, whether in fact it is a donation in kind? Who can make that decision?

We people in Roblin Constituency are not known to be able to make those kind of decisions or to put a price on it. Who's going to put a price on it, because once they eat the cake, it's all gone? You can't price it then. That's the kind of legislation they're trying to bring into this province, Mr. Speaker, to tear out the heart of our old democracy that's worked so well in this province for so long.

Let's read some more of the things. "the market value of goods or services at the time of donation."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The debate on second reading is restricted to the

principles of the bill. Specific reference to the clauses would be left to committee stage or third reading.

The Honourable Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I well understand that ruling. I've been through it time and time again. Just for the record, I read it back to show you how bad this legislation is, and if you're going to take issue with me about raising that, I'll have to sit down and take my place. All I did was read it and start paraphrasing and now I'm going to speak on it. If there's anything wrong with that, you make the ruling and I will sit down, Mr. Speaker.

I'm talking about the bill, or the amendment that is a six-month hoist resolution presented by the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, Mr. Speaker, but who is going to go out there to this political meeting in Lac du Bonnet or Beausejour where my long-time friend, the Minister of Transportation, is espousing on the platform at great length and these donations in kind are coming in? Who's going to stand at the door and analyze whether they need a lawyer or they need an appraiser? And, likely, because there are government dollars, you'd have to have somebody from all political parties there to decide, is that, in fact, a donation in kind that's coming in the door at that political meeting?

That's how bad this legislation is, Mr. Speaker. That's how bad it is. You could go on through it. There are all kinds of problems in there that the people in Roblin Constituency find with this legislation. There are some good points in the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

When I see a government, anytime, that doesn't have the mandate from the people and doesn't have the consensus like this government has been, week after week, ramming this legislation through here, that they don't have the mandate from the people. They never told them they were going to do these things. They don't have the consensus and they still proceed. You're going to head into a road block over here and it's going to be a big high one and rough tough one, because we ain't going to allow it. We're not going to allow it. I will, if you bring me the mandate. I will, if you bring me the consensus of the majority of the people that this is good for the people, then I'll back off. But I don't see that kind of thing happening, Mr. Speaker, on this and other bills.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for Flin Flon just speaking about the fact that there's some great big wealthy people in this province that have got to be influencing elections. Now, who are they? Who in Roblin Constituency, or in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Transportation, comes with these big \$5,000 and \$10,000 donations and influences us and gets us elected?

I can tell the honourable members opposite, I think the most I ever spent on an election campaign was \$4,000 and I remember one time it was 600 bucks. It was all the money I had. I remember one time it was \$900, every cent I had, that's all I could raise and that's all the people had. I still got elected. It was tough times.

The people don't need 50 percent of my election expenses to elect me into this House. If they do, the New Democratic Party need it, then maybe we should pass it only for the New Democratic Party, because I know they're in trouble. They're a way down in the

polls; they owe a lot of money; they owe about \$600,000.00. They owe a lot of money. I've never seen their financial report, but I have heard that they owe a lot of money.

So they now admit that they can't go out and fight an election under the rules that we've had in this province for what, some 116 years or more. They can't raise the money to pay their bills, so we're going to go and take it out of the taxpayers' pockets. That's what they're telling us. That's what they're saying.

We can't play under the rules that this province has enjoyed for 116 years in elections, because you guys always get the advantage. You get the big donations. That's not true. I don't get any big donations. The Minister of Municipal Affairs doesn't get any big donations. The same with my colleague and friend, the Minister of Transportation, we don't get any big donations.

So where is all this influence? Where is all this big money that's coming in the back door? The Minister of the Treasury over here, how many people had you knocking on your ministerial doors with these big donations and deals they made you in the last election campaign, saying either put that in legislation through or else. They don't have it. It's never been a problem in this province. Have you ever heard of a conflict of interest by MLA in this House, maybe the Member for Pembina one time over the rent on that - he had to pay back \$35.00. I had to pay back close to \$1,000 one time because — (Interjection) — Yes, on the grocery store thing, but that legislation was changed. Certainly, maybe it was conflict of interest, because I had a grocery store, they came there and the welfare officers said take the goods from McKenzie's store and take it out to the family. So, I've paid it back. — (Interjection) — Well, that's been changed. There was nothing wrong with the conflict of interest and The Legislative Assembly Act that we have in this province, Mr. Speaker.

I just wonder how many political parties that we're going to create in this province from now on. I've no quarrel about political parties coming out of the wishes of the people, getting into the arena, but this is going to make it pretty easy for some of them, because if they get 2,500 names on a petition, it's pretty tough, and who is this crowd that's going to check all these petitions to see if those are real people?

MR. D. SCOTT: You guys had that set up. That was in your legislation.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Yes, sure. If they get 2,500, or there's other ways they can do it, then the state is going to pay half their election expenses. Do we need that in this province? Do we need that? Is Manitoba in such a terrible state today that we need to interrupt that system that's been a treasure and a godsend to the people of this province? Do we need these changes as proposed in this legislation that's before us, Mr. Speaker? I say no. I tell you the people of Roblin-Russell constituency say no, because they've never ever asked me, no man, woman and child has ever asked me to bring in this, or even think about this kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, where they, the taxpayers of this province, are going to be locked into a new form of democracy, a form of democracy where the

state is going to put in half the money for elections. That's not the democracy that I was born and raised with. It's not the democracy the Minister of Municipal Affairs was raised with and brought up with, nor the Minister of Highways and Transportation. They weren't brought up in this country, nor do they live under that kind of a democratic process.

Our system is a treasure, it's a gem, don't monkey with it. Let's leave it, and God bless Manitoba, if you'll leave it alone, we'll have a great province for a long long time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not unlike Bill 77, The Public Schools Act, the amendments to The Public Schools Act. They're both terrible. It's not unlike many other pieces of legislation that have come before us in this Session, Sir, a number of which I've referred to in comment and debate in this Chamber in the last few days. This bill's not unlike the amendments to The Cattle Producers Association Act, both bills are terrible. It's not unlike The Farm Lands Ownership Act, they're both terrible. It's not unlike The Legislative Assembly and Executive Council Conflict of Interest Act, Mr. Speaker.

The one difference between this bill, perhaps, and some of those that I've mentioned is that rather like Bill 77, and this is where the similarity between those two measures is more strongly apparent, rather like Bill 77 there is one good feature to it. I had indicated in speaking to Bill 77 a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, that I felt that there were two good provisions in Bill 77, the rest of it was largely unacceptable, and unless the Minister and the government were prepared to make some amendments, it would not win favour from this side of the House. I did acknowledge there were a couple of good provisions in it.

I can say that with respect to Bill 48, the hoist motion on which we're addressing at the moment, there is at least one good provision in it. There may be more than one, but there's one recognizable one that deserves identification in debate, and I intend to identify it, Sir, and I intend to lend my personal endorsement to it, and that is the provision in the bill which proposes a virtual total prohibition on government advertising during the course of an election campaign. I note that when the Government House Leader, the Attorney-General introduced the legislation, he made the point that that provision represented an important new reform in this field, and that only the Province of Saskatchewan, I think, of all provinces in Canada has similar legislation.

I think that provision is a good one, the provision that prohibits government advertising during an election campaign, because, in fact, Sir, there is a tendency, and I think there have been some examples on the record in the past where government initiatives and communications related to government initiatives came fairly close to transgressing the line between information and advertising, and issues that should have been objective in presentation - in view of the importance of the period, the importance of the time, the election that was in the offing - became issues that were distorted by political considerations and partisan considerations to the resulting disadvantage, I think,

of the electorate in total. That's a kind of a difficulty that is devoutly to be avoided, if it's possible to avoid it. Therefore, I say that this provision in this legislation commends itself, I think, to us, and is one that strikes me as being a good one.

Beyond that feature, though, Sir, I find very little in Bill 48 to commend it to any of us in this Chamber. I find very little in it that the average Manitoban of responsibility, good will and objectivity would find acceptable, particularly at this point in time in our struggle to win through against the ravages of a very serious economic recession.

So, Sir, I give it credit for that one good feature, and I say that otherwise Bill 48 reminds me of the title and the message of a recent Woody Allen movie that was entitled "Take the Money and Run." That's what Bill 48 amounts to, Sir, from the perspective of the government that has introduced it, the Government of the Day, the New Democratic Party that concocted it in its backrooms; take the money and run.

Bill 48, in fact, Sir, is a companion bill to Bill 55, An Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act in my view. Many of us have had some strong things to say about Bill 55, myself included. I think I described Bill 55 when I was speaking on it, Sir, as the constituency office bill, and the political answer to the community clinic. It is a piece of legislation that provides for NDP style storefront politics and is ideal for that party, not necessarily conducive to the kinds of political practices and activities that other political parties and supporters of other political parties endorse and favour. This Bill 48 is a companion bill to that, Sir. Both of them are designed to extract from the taxpayer, from the citizen, as much money as can possibly be extracted, short of highway robbery, to provide for NDP style politicking. I say NDP style politicking, Sir, because it is an NDP Government that has introduced these measures and a Progressive Conservative in this province has not introduced, has not promoted such measures. Therefore, it is not unfair to describe it as legislation that is designed to introduce, implement and favour NDP-style politics. Both bills are of that nature, of that philosophical bent and thrust, Mr. Speaker.

The redeeming feature of the system that we have in place at the present time for election financing permitting limited direct public financing is the tax credit system, Sir. The redeeming feature of that system, introduced by our government, the tax credit system, in comparison to the system being proposed in this legislation is that with the system that's in place for election financing in this province right now, you have to go out and raise the money to fight an election campaign.

Candidates, parties, supporters, finance chairmen, official agents, all those personnel involved in the front-line democratic process of getting people elected have to take the initiative to go out and work together and make the effort to raise money which lends credibility to that candidacy and lends credibility to that campaign. That is the strong and unarguable and indisputable feature that so redeems the tax credit system, Sir, in comparison to the system being proposed here. The system proposed here, to a very substantial extent, absolves the individual political candidate and his or her people of the responsibility of having to go out and do that.

Certainly there is still a requirement to raise money to fight an election campaign. I'm not saying that that responsibility, that requirement is removed in total. I say that to a very substantial degree the election candidate and his or her team is absolved of that burden, of that responsibility, of that very necessary democratic challenge. I think, Sir, that represents a distinct loss to the parliamentary system, to the process of democracy, to the process of getting elected, as we know it, and practice it in this province and in this country.

Now, members opposite are going to say, but in other jurisdictions in Canada the very kind of election financing, as is proposed in Bill 48, is already in place and that federally it is in place. I know that, Sir, and I'm going to come to that point in a moment or two, I know that. We're addressing this from the perspective of the Province of Manitoba and the Progressive Conservative Party in Manitoba and the current Progressive Conservative Opposition in this Legislature, and there can be no mistaking, Sir, surely there can be no mistaking our position on the subject, regardless of whether this kind of system is in place federally and whether it's in place in other provincial jurisdictions in this country or not. We've acknowledged that to be the case, and we have said we don't agree with that. We have said that our party, our opposition, our approach here in our province is distinctly different from that which is described and implied in Bill 48 and may be in place in some other Canadian jurisdictions.

We believe, and certainly I, personally and individually, believe, Sir, that there is a very important ingredient in the political process and in the electoral process that is delicate and should not be buffeted and should not be compromised, and that delicate component is the commitment and the tangible commitment that exists on the part of a candidate's supporters and on the part of a party's supporters to make every reasonable effort to get that candidate and that party elected. That is a very vital and crucial component in our system and I think it is a delicate component. It is a commitment of sincerity, a commitment of depth and, as I say, a commitment of tangibility. If you take that away and you say to those people, be they the candidate or be they the candidate's supporters, that it's really not necessary to make the total commitment and the total effort that heretofore has been required to win an election campaign, because we can turn around and pick up most of our expenses, offset most of our expenses just through tapping the taxpayer; then, I think, Sir, you do two things. No. 1, you rob the taxpayer, but equally importantly, you rob the province, you rob society, you rob the democratic electoral system, as we know it of a very fundamental component and a very fundamental institution. You rob it of its truth, you rob it of a great deal of its integrity. I don't think that the process can be trampled and manipulated and compromised that way. Certainly, it can't be manipulated and compromised very long or very often and expect to survive with any degree of worth, any degree of honour and any degree of integrity.

I believe that the existing system, as we know it in this province, which requires that tangible commitment and effort to be made, is a fundamental safeguard of democratic freedom and the proven responsible, accountable electoral process that we practice here.

I see the kind of legislation proposed in Bill 48 and, indeed, accompanied in Bill 55 and acknowledgedly, Sir, in place in other jurisdictions in this country as highly undesirable for us here in Manitoba. I would think that I'm not wrong in suggesting that some other commentator, some other critics and observers in some other jurisdictions are looking at that precise system of financing, which they have recently put in place, and asking questions about it and reconsidering the advisability and the desirability of it. In other words, let us acknowledge that to some degree the implementation, the introduction of this kind of election finance in other jurisdictions in this country represents an experiment, a trial up to this point in time. I think the jury is still out on it in those other jurisdictions.

It may well be that the jury comes in in the next few years with a resounding and ringing verdict in favour. If that happens, I am perfectly willing to acknowledge it and perfectly willing to rethink the question and the issue, but it hasn't happened up to this point in time. Like so many other measures in society that are introduced in statute form as a result of particular initiatives that perhaps have been taken hastily in various legislative arenas across the country, it is something that requires experience, requires the test of time, requires the opportunity for people to understand and identify its ramifications and its effects before final decisions and final verdicts are rendered. I submit, in all sincerity, that the final verdict on that type of election financing remains to come in yet.

Before rushing into it ourselves, I believe it only reasonable, Sir, and only prudent to re-examine the concept, rethink it and reweigh it, and if possible permit a longer period of experience to take place in those jurisdictions that are trying it. That really is what lies at the root of the amendment to the motion that has been proposed, and which we are now debating; the amendment put forward by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park, proposing that Bill 48 be not now read a second time but be read this day six months hence.

That six-month hoist, in effect, Sir, is a deferment that, as all members know, says, pigeonhole the bill. Let us not rush into it. Let us not deal with it at this Session. Let us give the process time to work its way through our minds, to work its way through our study, to work its way through our individual and collective process of evaluation. Leave that kind of questionable initiative, perhaps precipitous initiative, to another Session. If there is a will and a consensus to proceed with it at another Session, all well and good. But prudence dictates that we would be acting hastily and perhaps very unwisely were we to proceed hastily with it at this Session. That's what the six-month hoist or six-month deferral says.

It does not say that the idea is not and never will be worthy of any consideration. It does not say that it is such an unacceptable or such a reprehensible suggested legislative initiative that it's not even worthy of consideration or comment. All it says is that now is not the time. Let us think on the process and on the proposal and on the concept longer, at greater length and at greater depth, and let's look at it again at some later Session.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at that motion put forward by my colleague from Kirkfield Park, one I

think appreciates or, hopefully, one should appreciate the wisdom contained in it, for it is not the time, in my view and in my colleague's view, to proceed with this kind of proposal. It is not the time to proceed, because we are not satisfied that it is in the interests of the integrity of the democratic, electoral process as we know it. It is not the time, because of a very practical and a very realistic economic fact of life.

It is an economic fact of life, Sir, that has been referred to in virtually every debate in this House this Session, and is on the lips and on the minds of every Manitoban. That is the difficulty that Manitobans are having at the present time in coping with the economic recession, in coping with unemployment, in coping with the downturn in economic activity, in coping with the special economic problems that we've been having in this province; in short, Sir, in coping with the cost of living at a very trying time in economic terms. In those circumstances and in that environment, it becomes doubly unwise for any government and any Legislature to try to turn around and featherbed its nest in any way by plucking more dollars, more funding and financial support from the hard-pressed electorate, from the hard-pressed citizen; the man and woman on the street who is working and carrying the burden on his and her back of maintaining this province's services at the present time.

So for those two reasons, this hoist motion is eminently justifiable and responsible. For those two reasons, it is simple and, I think, obvious, Mr. Speaker, and I think evident to argue, to claim that now is not the time to proceed with proposed legislation of this kind.

When one looks at the principle contained in the bill, one concludes, Mr. Speaker, that a very key question about the proposed legislation has to do with the control that might be provided by the legislation or might be missing in the legislation with respect to the kinds of campaigning and the kinds of election expenditures that can be financed this way. Is there any meaningful control provided in the proposed legislation over that kind of campaigning expenditure, that kind of electioneering cost? Or are we opening the doors here for *carte blanche* public funding, public financing of all kinds of election campaigning activities, of all kinds of electoral expenditures? Where is the meaningful control which dictates the fair, responsible and reasonable parameters within which election campaign expenditures can be offset by the public funding that is to be made available? Or is the public purse to be pillaged and compromised through an indefinite and imprecise piece of legislation that provides no such parameters of control?

If you look at the provisions in the bill, Sir - and I know that I cannot do that in detail at this stage of the debate; I can only refer to the principle involved - you are forced to come to that very crucial question. Are there specific parameters which would keep that kind of funding, that kind of financial commitment on the part of the public under control? Or can political parties and candidates, in effect, run wild in terms of the kinds of campaigning activities that they can get into and for which they can turn to the public for recompense and financial support?

I think that this is a question, Mr. Speaker, that should logically and responsibly trouble everybody in this

House. I am not sure that there is proper protection provided in the legislation for the taxpayer. I believe that there is a possible opportunity here for irresponsible parties to ride on the backs of the taxpayers to pay off their deficits, and that, Sir, is a travesty of democracy and a travesty of the process as we know it, and certainly a travesty of public accountability.

There should not be a doorway, an escape route provided and sanctioned by legislation, by legislators in this Chamber, for irresponsible parties or candidates to hit up the taxpayer, to clamber onto the back of the taxpayer to pay off deficits. And I think that kind of opportunistic opening may be there, Sir. I think that the necessary protection for the taxpayer against that kind of exploitation may not be there in the legislation, as it is currently worded. At least, those concerns and worries spring to my mind as I review the various components and sections of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, colleagues of mine speaking in this debate have raised the question as to the reason for this legislation. Earlier today my colleague, the Honourable Member for Arthur, I think identified a reason that stands very clearly and very disturbingly in the minds of many Manitobans. Members opposite, members of the government have not dispelled the suspicion in the minds of many Manitobans, Sir, that the reason for this legislation is to save an unpopular political party from the difficulty of raising money to support itself in the next election campaign.

The suggestion that many Manitobans have made, and it was articulated by my colleague from Arthur and it's certainly shared by many of us, Sir, is that in short, the fundamental reason for this legislation is that it provides a means of assuring members opposite, despite their increasing unpopularity, of some considerable and some significant source of funds for themselves and for their party and for their next election campaign, whether they stand in the favour of the public or not.

Sir, if that accusation is unfair, let the government say so. Let the government demonstrate it. Let the government satisfy us and other critics in the province of its unfairness. We have not been convinced or persuaded otherwise. The government spokesmen in this debate have not met that criticism, that suspicion head-on, and I tell them that suspicion exists out there.

I tell them that a great many Manitobans are saying that the New Democratic Party has fumbled its opportunity at administration; that this government has fumbled its opportunity at government, and is in deep trouble with the electorate; that this current government will not be re-elected and will have difficulty finding support, both in terms of energy and in terms of finances for its next campaign. If that is not the case, Sir, let us hear from government members that demonstrate that such is not the case, but that is the suspicion that exists in the minds of many persons.

As a consequence, they look at a piece of proposed legislation like this, and they see ulterior motives behind it. They see it precisely the way my colleague from Arthur described it, as a means of helping them finance their next election campaign, when those funds that they normally would have raised through the normal processes of fund raising will be shut off to them.

Over and above that consideration, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this legislation, in my view, represents

another intrusion and a very serious intrusion into the privacy of the individual. Many of my colleagues have made reference to the reasons for my putting such an argument and putting such an accusation on the record. Many of my colleagues have made reference to the picayune difficulties and the picayune requirements with respect to fund raising and fund raising events that are contained in this legislation. Sir, I think that any reasonable person with any reasonable interest in freedom for Manitobans, freedom for our citizens would have to concede that, in many of its provisions, the legislation represents a very extreme and a very abhorrent interference and intrusion into private lives and into private decision-making at the level of political party activity.

Why should Manitobans be subjected to those kinds of picayune questions and interferences in what they want to do and what they want to offer in the way of small tokens of financial support at fund raising events for their candidates and for the parties of their choice? It just bureaucratizes the process and the system to a point that, as I said earlier in my remarks, threatens the integrity of the democratic, electoral process, as we have developed it and defended it here in this country and in this province.

Like so much of the legislation that's before us at this time and that has provoked strenuous and legitimately strenuous debate in this Chamber in this Session, Mr. Speaker, this bill represents another invasion of individual freedom, another shackle on the individual man and woman in Manitoba, another assault on the principle of freedom of choice.

Now I know that members opposite, and I made reference to this earlier, are going to say, and they have said and they will say again, well this type of election financing is already in effect legislatively in other jurisdictions in this country, and it's already in effect at the national level.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to argue in debates of this kind that we on this side, in this party do not particularly care that some other jurisdiction, whether it be a jurisdiction that has a Progressive Conservative administration or not, should undertake some course of action that we think is a mistake. We do not particularly care that, because they have done it, it therefore becomes arguably a symbol of something that all Progressive Conservatives should do.

We say that in this party, in this province, we want the best for Manitobans, and we want to put forward that best and try to defend that best as the opposition in this province. We don't believe that this kind of election financing for the reasons I specified earlier is desirable, or certainly is a good idea at the present time.

Whether other jurisdictions - and whether they be Progressive Conservative or not - whether other jurisdictions have it in place does not affect our argument. Those other jurisdictions can be wrong, those other jurisdictions may well be wrong when the verdict comes in on the impact and the effect of that kind of legislation, and whether or not such a verdict comes in, we do not subscribe to that approach of election financing at the present time, so that we say that at this point in time in our thinking we regard those measures in that particular area by those particular jurisdictions as being wrong. We do not subscribe to them and we do not want to copy them here.

Members on the government side expect us to follow robotlike what other Progressive Conservative Governments have done in other areas simply because we're Progressive Conservatives. Well, we don't operate that way, Mr. Speaker, and the Progressive Conservative Party has never operated that way. We think for ourselves, we have as many reasonable and legitimate disputes and arguments with other Progressive Conservative colleagues in other parts of Canada as we do with anyone because our arguments are based on what we think is right for our society here in Manitoba. It may be applicable and right somewhere else, but if it isn't applicable and right here, we are opposed to it. That's the position we take on this question.

The government's position on it to me is highly confusing; it represents the same old inconsistency to which I've referred before in legislative positions taken by the current administration particularly in this Session, Mr. Speaker. The current government straddles two or three different horses all at the same time in legislative matters, and I made reference to that earlier this week in speaking on the hoist motion on Bill 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act.

They profess in the government benches opposite to be interested in the welfare of the nation, to be interested in the concept of a whole and a united Canada and in the preservation of some of those great legislative institutions that we have built in Canada like Medicare. As a consequence, profess to be strongly opposed to any individual initiatives that separate or individual provinces may take where health-care funding is concerned, but, Sir, they then take the position on legislation, such as, The Farm Lands Ownership Act that Manitoba is an empire unto itself and its doors and walls are closed to other Canadians unless members of the NDP Government of Manitoba say it's okay for those other Canadians to come in.

So, on the one hand, we have them preaching Canadianism; and on the other hand, we have them preaching isolationism. They bring that same kind of inconsistency to this argument when they say to us that other jurisdictions in the country have got this type of election financing. Therefore, the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Party should not be so terribly opposed to it. Well, we say to them then why do you take the position with respect to ownership of land and property that you take on measures that you have introduced in this House, such as, Bill 3, The Farm Lands Ownership Act? We say that other jurisdictions do not take that isolationist approach and you are taking it on that legislation, so you cannot pursue these arguments with us because you offer and pursue no consistency.

We have made it abundantly clear, Sir, that we do not think that this government or any government should have the right to turn around and tap the taxpayers of this province excessively for election campaign financing. There are reasonably good, reasonably fair and adequate provisions for election financing provided in the existing legislation. If there are some refinements and improvements necessary in that area, let us look at refinements and improvements, but let us not look at a burdensome and onerous measure of this kind which makes the taxpayer against his or her will the beast of burden to carry the costs

of election expenses for election parties in which he or she may have no interest whatsoever. In fact, Sir, he or she may not wish to participate in election campaigns and, although we may deplore that attitude, that, in a democracy and in a free democracy, is every individual's right.

There have often been debates, Sir, about the whole process and the responsibility of democratic participation by the voters and by the people, but very few of us have ever come to the view or the consensus that voters and individual citizens in democracy should be forced to participate in that democratic process if they don't wish to do so. What do you gain by forcing people to participate in it if they know nothing about it, if they don't understand it? If they bring an apathy and even a self-styled self-imposed ignorance to it, you gain nothing.

There has been discussion and debate from time-to-time on such practices as the penalty tax for not voting. Such has been attempted in other jurisdictions in the world, Australia and other places, and sometimes academics on this subject have argued that that's a good idea that if people don't get out and vote in our elections, they should be penalized, they should be taxed. That has been an abstract academic argument to which very few of us have ever subscribed, Mr. Speaker.

Subjects like this have been widely debated and discussed, but why, Sir, have most of us declined to endorse that kind of measure? Why? Because it strikes at the very heart of what democracy is all about and individual freedom is all about. We don't believe in forcing people to do those things against their will. As long as they're not hurting society, as long as they're not breaking the basic rules and laws and criminal code stipulations of their society, why should they be forced to do things against their will? Why should they be forced to participate in a process about which they may be totally ignorant and to which their ignorance may cause some damage and harm rather than some positive and constructive and beneficial result?

We have rejected that kind of mandatory imposed participation, Sir; that is, up until Bill 48 was introduced. Now we have the government introducing a measure that is proposing precisely that kind of mandatory compulsory participation and that is just one short step, Sir, I think, from producing a very mechanistic electoral system in our country and in our province that will damage the democratic freedoms and the electoral process that we have at the present time and that we cherish so profoundly.

I don't want to see this system turned into a mechanical, mechanistic, robotlike process. I prefer the freedoms, the climate and the atmosphere of individual choice, the decision to participate the way we preserved it and reinforced it up to this point in time. For that reason, Sir, I join my colleagues in appealing to the government and appealing to the House to vote for the hoist motion on this bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Member for Fort Garry would permit a question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired.

Does the member have leave? (Leave)

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member said that his main concern with this legislation was that the jury was still out, that there has not been enough time in this country to examine the feasibility of this legislation; and he was talking at some length about the fact that the facts weren't all in, that the jury was still out.

Considering that the federal legislation has been in place since 1974, almost 10 years and through three election campaigns, and that five other provinces have similar types of legislation, public financing in some form or another not tax credits, but rebates to political parties varying from around 1975, the early '70s in Quebec, etc., how much time would he consider necessary for us in Manitoba to be bringing in this legislation, to have the evidence as to whether this is a beneficial way to finance elections and democracy in this province?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I suppose any answer I gave would be subjective and judgmental. If I were to say 15 - 20 years on a question of this kind, that would just be my opinion and it would be subjective and judgmental.

The Honourable Member for Wolseley, I'm sure, thinks that a time span of that kind is not at all necessary, but I think there has been a limited experience for Manitobans - and particularly for Manitobans with respect to federal election funding on this issue - I personally don't feel it's been long enough. That is my opinion that I've offered in debate, but as I say, it's an individual opinion. The Honourable Member for Wolseley may think one or two years is enough experience.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have one other question. Considering the basic principle that the honourable member is concerned about is the fact that this would be forcing people against their will to contribute to the political process, I'm wondering whether he knows if in the last federal election, the 1980 federal election, whether the Progressive Conservative Party or candidates accepted the rebate from the Federal Government, or whether they refused that on principle and turned it back in.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I know, Mr. Speaker, the member doesn't have to wonder, I know that the Progressive Conservative candidates with whom I was familiar accepted the rebates, just as I know that New Democrats who have stood in this House and argued against any increase in the indemnity for MLAs have turned around and taken it every time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, if the member would entertain another question, there's a lot of speculation

as to - and I know speculative questions are somewhat out of order normally - but since there's a lot of speculation as to the Member for Fort Garry running in the next election, if he chose to do so, would he claim under the federal act for election sharing of 60 percent, which is allowed under the federal act on the cost of his expenses?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for Inkster has not had leave to ask that question.

Does the Member for Fort Garry grant leave, and the House? (Agreed)

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I've no hesitation in assuring the Honourable Member for Inkster that I operate under the laws of the land. I will operate under whatever the prevailing conditions and requirements of that election are, should I contest that election.

In the meantime, I do not believe that this is a desirable step to take and a desirable burden to put on the backs of Manitoba taxpayers at the present time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to think that I was facing a backbench filibuster from allowing me to add my comments to Bill 48.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to speaking to this bill. I have not spoken to the bill or to the motion before us, that is, the six-month hoist. I've indicated earlier and in conjunction with comments on another bill that there are, in my judgment, some reasons - you may call them superficial if you will, but nonetheless they are valid reasons - why this bill should not be proceeded with at this time.

Of course the one that comes to mind almost immediately is the simple fact that the fiscal situation of the province is in difficulty. The fiscal situation that many of our citizens are facing, economic times that they're facing are hard enough and the perception of a bill of this nature, particularly when included with the changes that were made, or approved just this morning, I believe, on The Legislative Assembly Act, when taken together all add up to added benefits to what - in the minds of many many people of the province - certainly the vast majority conceive us to be an already privileged group of people, earning above the average industrial wage or salary rates of the province.

We can rationalize all we want within the confines of this Chamber about how hard we work for that indemnity and how deserving we are of recognition in terms of the time we give up, in terms of the interruption to otherwise, perhaps careers that might well be more fruitful in terms of financial reward, but it doesn't really matter in terms of changing the perception of the general public, Mr. Speaker.

I even offer this rationale to the members opposite, that if the province wasn't facing a \$600 million deficit, if indeed we were operating with surplus funds, it might be easier to pass or more acceptable to pass this kind of legislation although as I say, I offer that only in

passing. I have fundamental objections to the bill, to the similar legislation that my colleague, the Member for Wolseley reminded us of, has existed on the statutes in Canada since 1974 and indeed in those other jurisdictions, wherever they may be, in this country or other democracies, that have similar legislation in place.

Mr. Speaker, different members, in proposing and in supporting this bill, have indicated the need for this kind of a bill, that surely parliamentary democracy should not be left to the reserve of the rich and they tend to still be entrenched in the last century or even two centuries ago when indeed that was the case. But, Mr. Speaker, look around this Chamber. Look around this Chamber and look at the individual members who are representing the people of Manitoba as their elected representatives. We have farmers, we have former broadcasters, we have teachers, we have former civil servants, I don't know whether we have any housewives - it's become the kind of a word that males get nervous about mentioning because of fear of being called chauvinist - but surely, Mr. Speaker, the proof before us, in terms of the makeup of this House, demonstrates quite the reverse from what some persons have argued about the need for this kind of a bill; that only the wealthy and only the very rich get into politics and, Mr. Speaker, if anything that has happened over the past 100, 200 years of evolution in the parliamentary system, it has been precisely the reverse.

Mr. Speaker, that's not simply true for our Legislative Assembly. I suspect it's very much the case in every assembly that you go to in the country of Canada and also is very much the case with respect to our Canadian Federal Parliament in Ottawa.

So, Mr. Speaker, that kind of basic reason for putting forward this bill simply isn't demonstrated in practice. In fact, it sounds all right, it sounds even logical, it sounds democratic, Mr. Speaker, that the state should take away the impediments of financial worries of those people who, for one reason or other, aspire to, or indeed are asked to, or are encouraged to seek public office. Well, Mr. Speaker, the makeup of the Legislative Assembly here in Manitoba for the past number of years, has shown that Manitobans, men and women from all walks of life, have found it quite possible to be the elected representatives of the people in this Chamber without having to rely on, without having to dip on the taxpayers of this province, to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that I have two rather more fundamental reasons for opposing this legislation. One of them has to do with the concern that is worrying lots of people who study and who analyze and keep a watch on the democratic process, whether it is in a republic as it is in our neighbouring country, the United States or here in Canada, and I happen to know that there is an ongoing debate and a fairly intense one about this subject matter in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't say that that same debate is going on here but it should, and from time-to-time when legislation of this kind surfaces it is brought to light and is talked about. My concern is the kind of onward movement of putting your elected people into a position where they become simply part of the overall administrative system of government; part of the growing bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, the understanding of course that is there as to why this is happening is because of the complex

nature of the government, the fact that our Sessions are longer and longer - and we're breaking all records with this Session right here - and that whether it's Congressmen in Washington or Parliamentarians in Ottawa or Legislators here in Manitoba we are making it more and more of a full-time job. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are members opposite, the Member for Springfield and others, who have argued the importance of making it a full-time job because it is the most important job in the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to challenge the Honourable Member for Springfield because of the dilemma that it presents to the original thoughts and building blocks that were put together when the whole democratic process of government was originally formed. You see, Mr. Speaker, it was deemed advisable to have lay people come together from time-to-time, through their capabilities, to represent the various segments, the various parts that make up a society of any jurisdiction.

A MEMBER: Citizen legislators.

MR. H. ENNS: Citizen legislators, a nice phrase. Mr. Speaker, it was always envisaged that democracy of this kind would require a strong, responsible Civil Service, a bureaucracy. People that gave their lifetime, that became career bureaucrats to carrying out the programs, indeed devising them, turning the express will of the people as expressed through the citizen legislators, into actual programs that work and for that reason we hired the best people we could, or should be doing.

If we were talking about highways projects, or drainage projects, or agricultural projects we would be looking for people expert in those fields. If we're talking about social services we'd be looking at people expert in those fields, to carry out the instructions, if you will, as represented by bills and by statutes that were passed from time-to-time by the lay representatives of the people in the form of the Legislature, of a Congress or of a Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, over the years as we've become more and more part of the bureaucratic system ourselves, in terms of the time we have to spend at it, in terms of even the housekeeping matters that we arrange for ourselves. We have the government pick up our mileage costs; we have the government pick up our telephone bills; we have the government pick up our office charges and the whole process begins to lose a basic element that the Fathers of Democracy felt very important to put in place; that these citizen legislators should bring to the Assembly the day-in, day-out experiences of those people that they represent.

It was important to have farmers, that actually farmed the land, be around the decision-making process that helps create farm legislation. It's important to have people in small business, even professionals, the dentists, the lawyers to be back home in their communities practising their profession and to have some understanding of what the whole process is all about. Mr. Speaker, right about now what is happening in Manitoba, right now, is seriously affecting the level of funding that every Ministry of this department is going to be able to expect when they next come together to prepare their Estimates; because right about

now, Mr. Speaker, a crop that looked good, above average crop, has in the 10 days that we have sat in this sweltering House, deteriorated badly.

A crop - if I can just use figures which aren't correct but in terms of descriptive purposes only - what could have meant a billion dollar income in agriculture is today downgraded to \$600 million or perhaps \$500 million. Barley fields that should have been producing 60 and 70 bushels are coming in at 35 and 40. Half a crop is being produced. Barley that should be weighing at 48 pounds to a bushel is weighing at 28, 30 and 32 pounds to a bushel; that's happening right now. Now, the only reason why I know that, Mr. Speaker, is because I drive out daily through my country; because I have colleagues right now on combines that are combining that barley and they're finding it light.

Mr. Speaker, the same should hold true for people that represent professional groups, doctors, lawyers. The same should hold true that we should have people, not talking in terms of the need for improving workingmen's conditions in the steel mills or in the factories of our province, but we should have people - and, Mr. Speaker, we had - the Member for Concordia, Mr. Fox, a long time packing house worker. It's important that those people bring their actual work experience to bear, not in a professional way, not in the language that the Civil Service then only understands but, Mr. Speaker, in a meaningful way, so that your government stays in tune with the people.

Mr. Speaker, many many serious concerns are being expressed - particularly I refer to a study that's ongoing in the United States right now - about the fact that it has become such a full-time job on the Hill in Washington and the fact that congressmen have voted for themselves all kinds of understandable benefits. An average congressman has a staff of anywhere from 12 to 15 people. A senator has staff of up to 30 to 40 people; senior senators up to 58. Well, that's just personal senate staff that are there to advise him on trucking issues, on automobile issues, on pollution issues. When does that senator, when does that lawmaker, get a chance to personally walk about the fields of the jurisdiction that he represents? When does he actually, other than at election time stand at the gate and shake hands for a vote, actually understand what working people in this country or in America really have to be concerned about in terms of workplace health and safety regulations?

We do all these things, Mr. Speaker, and we do it all because we can get the information in increasing fashion - second, third, and fourth-hand. I say that not as a criticism to anyone, I'm simply saying that is a growing problem of democracy; that is a growing problem when people then all of a sudden feel estranged from that government because we become so embroiled in our affairs here now for days on end, much moreso the case in Ottawa, much moreso the case in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite might wonder why I attached that kind of an argument to Bill 48. Mr. Speaker, I see as one of the kind of philosophic reasons for Bill 48 as being a move that further moves the citizen legislator, the lay politician into the bureaucracy, into the very system of the administration itself. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it cannot be helped.

But I voice the concern that ought to concern democratic legislators in this province and indeed

across the country, because all too often it's - and I don't ascribe any willfulness on the part of any political party or any individual members to this fact - it's a simple pressure of the workload. It's a simple burying ourselves in the reams and reams of paper and the reams and reams of bills that we quite frankly have to proceed with and we have to process.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are a representative government and I don't want to, at all times, rely on what my people are experiencing or feeling from second, third, or fourth-hand reports. I think it's important to the system that the elected officials retain as much as possible of the real world and what's happening back home.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that by removing from us even the very concern of having to raise our own monies for election campaigns, which at least puts us in touch with our people at that time, on having some understanding, that hey, in good times money is a little easier to get, in bad times, it's not so easy to get, and you get some appreciation of what's happening economically in your constituency and your province. But you don't simply automatically add that by passing a bill and then we can remove that one less contact with our people, that one less touch of a basic reality because it's going to be automatic. It will just be offered to us in the form of a rebate cheque as is now happening in the federal system.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to you that is one of my fundamental problems with Bill 48. The other one is one that hasn't been dealt with a great deal except in a cursory way and then often dismissed as fast as it has been raised. That has been the provision that allows for the public funding of any or all groupings within our society, that decide to come together to form a political party.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the provision of having to meet 10 percent is a substantial and significant safeguard in preventing what have been referred to as "the lunatic fringe," undesirable parties, from having access to the public funding for the furthering of their views. But, Sir, history teaches us that that is not necessarily a safeguard to fall back on. It certainly was no safeguard for the young Weimar Republic to fall back on when a party emerged in the '20s that called itself the National Socialist Workers Party of Germany and began in a democratic way to seek support among the population of that country. Mr. Speaker, they got their 10 percent democratically, and they got to become government of that country. Then they promptly burnt down the very Houses of Parliament from which they should have been governing, the Reichstag, and then engulfed the world in a decade of terror that has seldom been seen before.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the premise of the bill that says that any party or any grouping of people that puts together 10 percent of the electorate should deserve and should get public funding to further its cause. I reject that. I object to that, and I don't buy that because there are some causes that are not compatible with basic parliamentary democracy, and I don't mind espousing them.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, a Marxist-Leninist grouping is compatible with the kind of parliamentary democracy that we talk about; that we experience and have experienced for the last 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think a Communist Party is compatible with parliamentary democracy - nowhere,

Mr. Speaker - and they influence and they rule two-thirds of the world. But nowhere where a Communist Party is an authority does parliamentary democracy survive. Are there members opposite that generally disagree with that statement? Are there members opposite that disagree with that statement?

Well then, Mr. Speaker, why are we putting a provision in this kind of a bill that as far-fetched as that may seem, but nonetheless is entirely possible. Mr. Speaker, I warn you, it is not all that far-fetched as it may seem. We have no idea of the difficult, trying circumstances that our nation, our province may face in the years ahead. God willing, we will be able to resolve some of the very serious economic problems that trouble this country and this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us not be so smug or so self-satisfied, that given the right set of circumstances, given another 2 million or 3 million unemployed in this country; given further stagnation in the economy of this country; given those kinds of circumstances, Mr. Speaker, which no economist will guarantee could not happen - not just to this country but indeed through other western democracies in the world - that the people would reach out in desperation for any solution that looked to them, at the time, as being the right one, or as being something better than what they now have.

Mr. Speaker, it's not beyond the realm of possibility that a kind of fundamental challenge to our democratic process, the kind which we have been shielded from throughout our 116 years in the country of Canada, could be brought before us in a way that we have no idea how the general public would react.

So, Mr. Speaker, I object to the inclusion of the bill that says - and I object to it being mentioned even lightly in this Chamber that says - yes, if the Nazi Party gets 10 percent of the vote fine, the public will fund that. Well, Mr. Speaker, is anybody in this Chamber really serious about that? Or if there be a revival of the Klu Klux Klan that they should be getting any cent of public funding? Or if the Communist Party of Canada should get 10 percent of the vote, that they should get any of the public funding, Mr. Speaker?

I suggest to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there are political groupings that are not compatible with parliamentary democracy as we, and I'm sure the vast majority of Manitobans and as I believe all members opposite, would like to see improved and continue to flourish in this province, would like to see that system changed. But as remote the opportunities are for that change occurring as a result of the passage of this bill, I simply object in principle to even acknowledging the fact that a political grouping, who by its own constitution if you like or more importantly by its own practice in other jurisdictions, has shown it to be entirely opposed, to what we consider democracy, should by passage of this bill gain access to public funds merely by the virtue of getting sufficient number of votes, in this case 10 percent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to see a Communist Party of Manitoba or of Canada get any public money if they get 40 percent of the vote, or 49 percent of the vote. Well, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be repealed. But, Mr. Speaker, I think its this kind of legislation that gets passed without really be concerned about the kind of possibilities that could arise.

The legislation does not recognize the very nature of our parliamentary system and, Mr. Speaker, I think

it ought to. I think that any monies provided by the public, that is being proposed to us by a democratic party in a democratic setting, ought to in its first clause, in its preamble, ought to at least state that in the interests of maintaining, enhancing, improving the democratic process in our jurisdiction, it is deemed advisable to provide for certain fundings to those organizations dedicated through the maintenance, the improvement, and enhancement of that democratic process.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment that would exclude a number of groupings that operate in this province, operate now. One cannot talk about democracy and talk about monolithic governments, as the Marxists talk about and practice. One cannot talk about democratic process and at the same time, out the other side of the mouth, demonstrate that only one point of view, only one political party has suffered, as is the case in most countries that are under Communist jurisdiction. It's simply not compatible to talk in those terms. I believe that we ought to be able to at least acknowledge that in the kind of legislation that's before us.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I've unburdened myself of those two main concerns that I have in the legislation, principally, that it tends to further move - to use the phrase and it's a good phrase that the Member for Fort Garry offered me - and that's 'citizen legislator' further and further into the administration, into the bureaucracy to the point where, in due course, we will hardly be distinguishable.

We'll be here working full-time, our mileages, and gas, and automobiles no doubt will be supplied by government. We will have more and more staff and assistance, and our people from time-to-time, you know they won't see us back in Minnedosa, or in Emerson. They'll be talking to our assistants as they do, as the American Congressmen now do. — (Interjection) — Oh, we'll get back at election time because our caucus will be loaded with their tax money so that we can meet them at the factory gates, and at the fairs, and at the rural functions, the curling rinks, to garner their votes for the next election.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will be poor legislators, we will not necessarily know what's really going on back home. There will be a greater and greater tendency for us to pass more and more laws and the kind that don't meet with the approval of the people back home; and the kind that don't take into consideration what the real world is back home; the kind of stupid bureaucratic things that get citizens all tied up in red tape that finally makes them so frustrated that they either turn right off on government or worse, Mr. Speaker, start harbouring thoughts of anarchy or revolution and then turn to some saviour, some salvation, some future Fuehrer that will promise them the world because, Mr. Speaker, in this same legislation, it's going to make it easier for would-be leaders of different parties to make those promises. We're going to help them pay with the printing of that material. We've looked after that this morning, the passing of the changes to The Legislative Assembly Act.

Sir, we, on this side, have experienced the power of the pen, the power of the printed word in the 1981 election, not for sure that we all too frequently are wont to refer to. Mr. Speaker, those are the kind of difficulties I see that can arise from the passage of this bill.

So on those fundamental reasons, I have no problem with opposing the bill, but I remind honourable members opposite that the notice you have been put on by my current leader, should not be taken lightly. It happens to be a feeling that is felt within the caucus of the Progressive Conservative Party and there should not be a tendency on the part of the honourable members opposite to think that well, the current leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, of course will not be there after December 8th or 9th or 10th, that there will be another leader in place.

So really, that notice served by my leader that this bill will not only be repealed should we come to office, but in fact, will be repealed retroactively; that notice should not be taken lightly, Mr. Speaker, because it has been expressed by other people who have every intention of being back two-and-a-half years from now as government and, Mr. Speaker, it is a caucus position of the Progressive Conservative Party that we intend to carry out, no matter who our leader will be.

Mr. Speaker, just in closing, let me come back and at least once again try to be helpful to honourable members opposite as they are floundering in a sea of disaster during the course of this Session. But, Mr. Speaker, I can even understand, although politically it's hard to understand when they carry out in a vindictive way certain pieces of legislation that they feel committed to, despite the fact that it goes against the grain of 80 or 90 percent of the people that are going to be affected - I refer to The Cattle Producers Act - they chose to respond to 3 percent of the cattle producers and antagonize 97 percent. I can't understand it politically, but I happen to know the background of the situation. So as I say, I can understand the human reasons for the Minister of Transportation for wanting to do that.

I can understand a little better the Minister of Education for deliberately antagonizing every school division, all the school trustees and many parents in the Province of Manitoba, because she at least has some weight of numbers on her side of the argument. She is making a pact with the teachers' union and, Mr. Speaker, I'm very much aware of the powerful nature of that union, both in numbers, political terms and their influence, I can understand that, Mr. Speaker. But I cannot understand the government collectively now thumbing their nose at the entire population with Bill 48.

Mr. Speaker, it will be an election issue because it will be coming in coincidental, as we've been put on notice by the Minister of Finance, that most government agencies, branches of government are going to be held to 0 and 5 percent increases in the coming year and that's at a time that we are adding this kind of package of goodies to those few who serve in this House. That's the time that we were going to add a 50 percent increase to the fortunes of the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, although we won't take it, Mr. Speaker, we won't take it.

A MEMBER: You'll have to pay it back.

MR. H. ENNS: And the New Democrats will have to pay it back. If you think that's not going to be an election issue, Mr. Speaker, then think again. It might not have been an election issue if we were running a comfortable

\$50 or \$60 million surplus in this province; if the fiscal condition of the province wasn't on everybody's mind and on everybody's lips; if we didn't have the Minister of Finance warning us about: you ain't seen anything yet, restraint is just around the corner, that 0 and 5 percent.

At the same time we've put together a package of goodies here to sweeten our pie, Mr. Speaker, and that will be an election issue, Mr. Speaker, and one of the many many coffin nails that this government has manufactured all by themselves, Mr. Speaker, to bring about their demise at the next election call.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues say they're not listening, but in this particular case in this bill, we have given this bill a hoist, an amendment, and we have fought it, as we've said, with every way that we can in this Legislature. — (Interjection) — But as my colleague has just so rightly said, and we have discussed this among ourselves, this bill is going to be fought during the next election.

On my campaign literature in the next election, I will have on it that my campaign literature will be paid for only by monies that are collected by voluntarily sending the money in only. It will be prominent on my election material and also it will be prominent on my election material, that any funds I would receive from the government will be in trust and will be available to be paid back at any time. So you see, that's what's going to be on my literature and that's what's going to be on the literature of the members of my party, if they so choose, but our leader has said that this is retroactive, that it will not cost the people any money if we were elected again at the next election and we will say so. So this bill is going to be fought during the next election.

Do you know what we are going to be doing, Mr. Speaker? We are going to make it an election issue. But you see the Government of Manitoba that's sitting here at the present time, when they were elected in 1981, never made it an election issue. They didn't tell the people of Manitoba that when we become elected we're going to pick your pockets for election expenses; but at the next election it will be an election issue because the Progressive Conservative Party will make it known that if we are elected, that money will not be paid, it will go into trust to anybody and it will go back to the government. So it's an election issue.

You know you have that right now, our guarantee, that we will be fighting the next election with one of the issues being, the funds that the Progressive Conservative Party use will only come from volunteer subscriptions and any monies paid to us under this legislation, such as, 50 percent of our election expenses if we get a certain percentage of the vote, will be cancelled retroactive, right off the bat. So, Mr. Speaker, that's where this bill will be fought. That's the way the government wants it, that's the way they'll get it.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, if I'm prepared to put that on my election literature, how many of the members

opposite are prepared to put on theirs, that if I get a certain percentage of the vote, 50 percent of my election expenses will be paid by the people of Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Why don't you put it on? He says it's such a big deal, my friend that's finished in Dauphin, he thinks it's such a big deal, put it on and bury yourself. — (Interjection) — Yes, big wheel he says, Mr. Speaker, big wheel?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that a person, or a member, that puts his name up to run for election, and says to the people - that the funding of my election will be from people who volunteer to give me money, not from people who are forced to give it to me - now if that's a big wheel, I'm only sorry for the thinking of the Member for Dauphin. Of course the Member for Dauphin puts himself in the hands of unreliable incompetent people and they will take him down as fast as they brought him up, by misleading the people.

But, Mr. Speaker, isn't it ironic that we would give the opportunity to the Communist Party to have some election funding, as my colleague said. He put it very ably, and I don't intend to elaborate too much on it because he did well, but I'm just wondering how much any other party, or how much funding any other party would receive if they were running in a Communist country. I'd be very interested to know how much they would receive. I'd be very interested to know if they could run to begin with. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the situation that this government places before us. There is absolutely no justification for allowing that kind of funding to a party that does not believe in the democratic system that we live in. If they want to run in this country, and they can, they can get their money by soliciting their funds from people who want to give it to them, just the same as I will.

Then we have the argument about the Conservatives having the big corporations. Mr. Speaker, I happen to know some of the bag men for the NDP Party. Well, one of them was on my Housing Board when I was Minister of Housing, he never left the board, a very fine member of the Housing Board. I happen to know several of the bag men for the NDP and they contact every corporation that they can. So let's not be hypocritical about it, in this House, about big corporations. They contact every corporation they can and they take all the money they can get from those corporations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the situation which makes it all equal, then you'd wonder why they complain. Well the complaint is that the NDP party, once they get in power, do everything they can to harm investment and not work with the corporations. It may have been a pretence to work with the corporations and as Mr. Martin says, we got a lot of publicity out of the Portage Summit meeting, but that's really all they got because it was poorly handled, and the meetings that followed up, he said, weren't good; so there was really nothing that great except that we do have an \$85,000 salaried person with a car, with expenses, with offices. Really about a \$500-a-day man working days. We have all that but, Mr. Speaker, with all of the complaints about the monies that come from the corporations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what classification we will put these funds in. Building a better Manitoba by the Canadian labour people. They put out a brochure that says - that during the election in Manitoba that

we had George Nakitsas, I think - it's kind of blurred here - the National representative with the Political Education Department of the Canadian Labour Congress. He was a member of the free election campaign for the Manitoba Federation of Labour during the election campaign co-ordinated to southern Manitoba. Michael Lewis, CLC Political Education organizer, worked with Marina Melnikoff to co-ordinate the campaign for Northern Manitoba. "Manitoba free election canvass," it says here. The local union contacts and the potential canvass organizers had to be pulled together. Training sessions were set up, a leaflet was designed. I wonder who paid for that and what will we charge that to? The leaflet was designed with the help of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and the CLC Relations Department in Ottawa.

Then we have the phone canvass in Manitoba that was set up as a phone bank by the unions. A phone bank of 20 phones and over 100 phone canvassers, said Eugene Kostyra, the new Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, co-chairman of the election planning campaign. "As a candidate I was fully aware of the impact that the MFL and CLC campaign, the phone, and the on-the-job canvassing. I was involved in previous campaigns and I can say without fear of co-ordination, that the effort of Manitoba has been the best so far," paid for by the unions and I wonder what we're going to charge that to? I wonder what they're going to charge that to.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't said that the unions can't support the party that they want to support. Check Hansard. I haven't said that right now. But we get the hypocritical talk from the other side that only big business supports the party, the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party, when, as I told you, I know bag men from the NDP party who collect all the money then can from business and make many calls on business. — (Interjection) — Oh nonsense. As a matter of fact there's one person who's involved in collecting for the NDP party that makes a habit of contacting the hotels regularly. Ah, why not? Well, let's not be hypocritical about it, if why not. Let's not sit here as the Minister of Municipal Affairs does and continually says from his seat - what about the money you get from the big corporations? He just loves to sit here and make that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I take a look at this Gilbeys Canada, a whole list, Genstar Corporation, a whole list of business of donations to the NDP party. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentlemen opposite seem to forget that donations over \$500 are listed, so they should read that list before they get hypocritical about the fact that the Conservative Party is supported by big business, or business, when they collect an awful bunch of money from business and then turn around and are critical of a party that does; critical of us for doing it when they do the same thing themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I read from this article again, the Canadian Labour, January, 1982: "When the training of canvass organizers and canvassers began finally in the Spring of '81, 18,000 workers were canvassed." They discussed the issues all set up by a group of people who support the NDP party. Isn't it ironic that these people who support the Labour Union with their funds, it comes off their pay cheque, and part of that fund goes to support the NDP party, the NDP party is

going to dip into their pockets for a second time. You know, when their checkoff to help goes to their union, when part of that goes to support the NDP party, at least the member of the union does have some say, and can have some say, as to where his money goes and he could complain. I don't know what the circumstances and the rules and regulations are as to where the funding that the union collects from employees goes, but there's plenty goes obviously, as we see here in this, to support the NDP party. Then the NDP party, when they get in office, turns around and picks their pockets a second time for election expenses - absolutely no choice. Absolutely no choice.

As I said when I was speaking yesterday, that is called NDP democracy - not governing, but ruling - no choice, it's just inconceivable to me. The Federal Government does it and it's inconceivable to me, why it should be done; why there are bank accounts sitting around this country that has been paid to people that have got so much of the vote, that probably are in constituencies where they probably never will have a hope of being elected, have surplus money to go out and do as they like to get votes, building up funds. Do we really think that is a good situation? The provinces have done it, but this is the worst. The percentages here are the worst of any provinces and, Mr. Speaker, the people don't have the right to say, I don't want to support that party.

The Minister of Housing was speaking on this earlier and he compared government assistance to beef producers, or businesses, or whatever the government decides to support, as using the people's money without having any say on how it would be used; but to say to the people that you have no say as to whether you want to support a political party financially, is downright disgusting. Sir, it's probably one of the worst things that I have ever heard of in my life.

A young boy or girl turns 18 years old, gets into the working force, voting for the first time, now paying some taxes, is now being told that part of their money is going to support a political party; and not only that, going to support a particular candidate. They might have said, I don't know any of them. I don't want to give any of them any money. I wasn't taught that in school. The Minister of Education didn't tell me in school that when I turned 18 and could vote and had a job, that I would be forced to support somebody that I don't want to support, as far as political parties are concerned. So, Mr. Speaker, it's actually disgusting, and 90 percent of the people in this province are opposed to it.

As I've said several times, the Member for St. James paid the price for Unicity three years after it came in and, Sir, I've had people in his constituency tell me, he's going to pay the price on about five issues now. He will not get a third chance in that constituency, the Member for St. James. — (Interjection) —

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The hour is 5:30. The Honourable Member for Riel.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

MRS. D. DODICK: I have a committee change, Mr. Speaker. In Industrial Relations, the Member for St. James will substitute for the Member for Osborne.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hour is 5:30, this House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 8:00 p.m. tonight.