



**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. 147 - 2:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 11 AUGUST, 1983.**

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

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 11 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 and would ask the Deputy Speaker to take the Chair, in accordance with the statutes.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Deputy Speaker.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Eyer:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . .

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Third Report of the Committee of Industrial Relations.

**MR. ASSISTANT CLERK:** Your committee met on July 25, 26 and August 11, 1983, and heard representations with respect to Bill No. 2, The Law Enforcement Review Act; Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi, as follows:

Mr. Walter Kucharczyk, Private Citizen,  
Mr. Thornborough, Board of Police Commissioners of Brandon,  
Mr. J. Janzen, City of Brandon Police Association,  
Councillor Jim Ernst, City of Winnipeg,  
Mr. Ken Johnston, Chief of The Winnipeg Police Department,  
Mr. Doug Buhr, City of Winnipeg,  
Mr. McGregor, Solicitor appearing on behalf of The Winnipeg Police Association and the Manitoba Police Association,  
Mr. George Marshall, Private Citizen,  
Ms. Judy Elliott, Law Union of Manitoba,  
Mr. Harry Peters, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties,  
Mr. Paul Johnston, Winnipeg Police Senior Officers' Association,  
Mr. Don Douglass, Private Citizen; and Winnipeg Police Commission.

Your committee has considered:

Bill No. 2 - The Law Enforcement Review Act;  
Loi sur les enquêtes relatives à l'application de la loi,

Bill No. 49 - An Act to amend The Provincial Police Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for The Pas.

**MR. H. HARAPIAK:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

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

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

**MR. ASSISTANT CLERK:** Your committee met on July 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, and August 11, 1983, and heard representations with respect to Bill No. 60 - An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2) as follows:

Mr. Sidney Green, Q.C.- Manitoba Progressive Party,

Ms. Irene Stevenson - Private Citizen,  
Messrs. Ajit Manku & Dr. N.S. Rihal - Singh Sabha, Winnipeg Inc.,

Mr. Bryan Robertson - Independent Motorcycle Rider,

Mr. Thomas Cohen - President and Chief Executive Officer of the Amalgamated Transit Union,

Ms. Joan Friesen - Consumers' Association of Canada, Manitoba Branch,

Mr. Paul V. Walsh, Q.C.- ABATE (All Bikers Aiming Towards Education) of Manitoba Inc.,

Mr. Don Ficher - ABATE (All Bikers Aiming Towards Education) of Manitoba Inc.,

Mr. John Prest - ABATE (All Bikers Aiming Towards Education) of Manitoba Inc.,

Ms. Debbie Ellis - ABATE (All Bikers Aiming Towards Education) of Manitoba Inc.,

Mr. A.J. Moreau - Private Citizen,

Dr. Denys Herbert - Manitoba Safety Council.  
Dr. Herbert also presented a brief for Dr. Donald Penner.

Dr. L.C. Bartlett - Manitoba Medical Association,  
Mr. Edward Lipsett - Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties,

Mr. John Lane - Executive Director of the Canadian Paraplegic Association,

Mr. John Martens - Private Citizen,

Mr. R.N. Sharpe - Private Citizen,

Dr. Richard Stanwick - Maternal and Child Health Coalition,

Mr. Elliott Levine - Private Citizen,

Mr. Phil Zubrycki - Private Citizen,

Mr. George Chapman - Private Citizen,

Mr. John Schmitt - Private Citizen,

Mr. Harold Dalkie - University of Manitoba Road Safety Research Unit,

Mr. Peter Male - University of Manitoba.

Written Submissions:

Manitoba Motor League,

Transcona Jaycettes,

The Manitoba Chiropractors' Association,

City of Winnipeg,

Canadian Union of Public Employees (Manitoba Division),

Gary J. Hudson (Shoal Lake, Man.),  
Dr. W.B. Ewart, Private Citizen.

During consideration of the bill, the following motion was passed, on division, in committee:

"THAT the committee having heard the members of the public and exhausted those present who are prepared to speak, adjourn and return at our next sitting to consider the Bill and amendments on a clause by clause basis."

Your committee has considered Bill No. 60, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act (2) and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

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

**MR. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Rupertsland, that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I would like to table the Executive Summary Report of the North of Portage Administrative Task Force.

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'd like to make a ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that further testing for radioactivity in well water has been conducted in the Lac du Bonnet area. The findings indicate that approximately one-half of 55 wells tested contain levels of radioactivity above acceptable concentrations.

These levels are based on the "Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality (1978)."

I would like to emphasize that the radiation is considered to be naturally occurring and is not unusual in rock formations of the kind found in the area. However, further testing will be conducted to determine the specific natural source of this radiation.

All affected well owners are being notified of the high levels of radiation by letter. In addition, a public meeting will be held in Lac du Bonnet tomorrow night.

My department has indicated that the well owners that the risk from continuing to drink this water for a further period of time is not great. But to be on the safe side, we have recommended that they cease using the well water for drinking at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that my department and the Manitoba Environment Department will be working with residents and officials of the Rural Municipality of Lac du Bonnet to assist them in locating alternate sources of drinking water.

In addition, the Environment Department will be expanding its monitoring program to test wells in

Manitoba for radioactivity. The two departments will also be investigating possible ways of treating the well water.

I am also recommending that an expert advisory committee be established to evaluate the health risk and to determine ways of dealing with the situation. Government and non-government representatives will be recommended for this committee.

Mr. Speaker, both my department and the Environment Department are monitoring this situation closely.

Sir, I'd like to table the three sets of the different letters, depending on, of course, the finding of each well, that is now being delivered to these people in the area. Thank you.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We thank the Minister of Health for that announcement. It's obviously a concern to members on this side, as well as I'm sure to residents in the area, that so many of the wells tested have radioactivity levels above acceptable concentrations.

As well, the fact that the concentrations of the radioactivity levels are in the general area or reasonable proximity to the Atomic Energy of Canada Limited installation at Pinawa would, of course, lead to the furtherance of the concern and the hope that the government, through both the Minister of Health's Department and the Environment Department, will indeed step up their efforts to test the area and to search for the source. We take the Minister's assurance at the present time that it's a naturally occurring situation but, as I say, the proximity to the Pinawa installation would have us insist that the departments take every effort to ensure that is verified.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

### ORAL QUESTIONS

#### Selkirk water supply

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of the Environment. Has the Minister been informed of the intention of the City of Selkirk to launch legal action against the Province of Manitoba and the City of Winnipeg with respect to the pollution of its water supply in the Red River?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister of the Environment.

**HON. J. COWAN:** No, I do not have details of any such law suit being launched. I have had correspondence with representatives of the City of Selkirk as recent as within the last couple of weeks, and that was not indicated to me at that time.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, has the Minister responded to a letter from the Town of Selkirk dated, I believe, June 30th this year, in which they requested urgently a meeting with the Minister to discuss their concerns about this matter?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Yes, I have indicated to the City of Selkirk, and if they are not in receipt of the letter by now, they will be in receipt of the letter shortly, that we are continuing to work with the City of Winnipeg and with representatives of the City of Selkirk as well as representatives of the Provincial Departments of Health, Urban Affairs and Environment to complete the work of the task group which was set about several months ago, and was anticipated to have prepared a report a number of months ago and have had some delays in trying to reach a consensus. But I'm informed that the report in its final form is nearing completion, and as soon as the report is completed, we will be having a further meeting with Selkirk and with the City of Winnipeg to proceed on the basis of the information which has been gathered through an intensive and an extensive review of the situation, and the options that are available to us over the next number of months.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Is the Minister considering as one of the options, tapping into the City of Winnipeg's aqueduct and allowing the Town of Selkirk to have a clean fresh water supply, as part of the alternatives to what they presently face?

**HON. J. COWAN:** I think there are two questions that have to be addressed, one is the City of Selkirk water supply and the other is a general water quality of the river system.

What we are attempting to determine is, if both of those goals can be attained, and that is the preservation and the enhancement actually of the river quality, and also an enhancement of the water supply to the City of Selkirk - those are options which have been discussed - I believe there are probably in the order of four or five different options of varying costs and of varying natures that will be discussed at the next meeting. As I indicated earlier, a task group of officials have been meeting over a number of months. They are nearing completion of that report. It should be in its final form very shortly and that will provide for the basis of the next meeting of political representatives of the City of Selkirk, the City of Winnipeg and the Departments of Urban Affairs, Health and Environment as was held a number of months ago.

### Financial assistance re education

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

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister confirm that the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs, the former NDP member for The Pas, the former Minister of Northern Affairs under the Schreyer administration, is leaving the Department of Northern Affairs for educational purposes?

**HON. J. COWAN:** The Deputy Minister has been granted a leave of absence for a period of one year and the

Acting Deputy Minister will be the Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Morrisseau.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate to the House whether any financial assistance will be provided to the Deputy Minister while he's on educational furlough?

**HON. J. COWAN:** Certainly not to my knowledge.

### Manitoba fisheries

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Lakside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, with the return of warm weather, the fisheries are under extreme pressure in Manitoba. The Winnipegosis Fisheries has been closed. My question to the Minister of Natural Resources is, can he indicate to us what is happening on the other two major summer fishing operations on Cedar Lake and Lake Winnipeg itself?

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

**HON. A. MACKLING:** I'll take the particulars of the question as notice. It is understood that because of the high temperatures, the waters have increased in temperature and there has been deterioration of the quality of fish being harvested. I believe that applies to Cedar Lake as well as Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis, but I'll get exact details of the entire fishery for the honourable member and members of the House.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Mr. Speaker, while the Minister takes that as notice, I would hope that the government would be undertaking some program of help to the fishermen. They have seasonal work at best and when an act of God heats up their lakes to the point where the fish cannot be commercially sold, I would think that perhaps even the \$200 million Jobs Fund might come to rescue of the fishermen in this case and be of some assistance.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, of course the Jobs Fund is an area that has been looked to for various responses to the many areas where we would like to be able to secure further employment for people. I know that there are broad allocations of all of the monies available under the Jobs Fund. I don't know whether it's possible to redirect any of the previously committed allocations. Certainly there are a diversity of programs we are looking at, but I can't assure the honourable members or the members of the House that there is any program that can be readily turned to, to meet all contingencies such as the one described by the reaction of nature on the fishery.

**A MEMBER:** It's a little tough on the fishermen, eh?

**HON. A. MACKLING:** It is.

### North of Portage - development

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs with respect to the North of Portage Administrative Task Force Report which we've just received. Could the Minister indicate whether the government is committed to approval of the plan, as it has been recommended by the task force?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Minister of Urban Affairs.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As the member is aware, the report has been just received today and submitted by the North of Portage Administrative Task Force to the three levels of government. It is our intention to review and to study the recommendations made by the Administrative Task Force, to review them in Executive Council and to make decisions in due course, in consultation with the other two levels of government; that being the Federal Government and the City of Winnipeg.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the summary report indicates that of approximately \$60 million to be committed by three levels of government, some \$37 million would be designated for the Portage Place Mall for the relocation of Portage Avenue and for the development of underground parking, which is the most expensive type of parking to construct. Would the Urban Affairs Minister not consider that this \$37 million could be more efficiently and better spent on the development of north of Portage Avenue, rather than being all allocated towards this one particular area of development, which could be much more efficiently and economically dealt with by simply building an enclosed weather-protected mall above the sidewalk on the south side of Portage Avenue?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe that the Provincial Government and, indeed, the other two levels of government, are willing to take into account any concerns that are expressed with respect to the task force recommendations, and indeed, any further proposals or ideas based on those recommendations that come forward.

However, in saying that, I would suggest the proposals that are made in the task force, in my view, on one hand are bold innovative proposals, I think were also based on sound principles. The proposal for the Portage Place is based on the historic retail anchors of the City of Winnipeg, the downtown area of the Hudson's Bay and Eaton's and that side of Portage, which once played a major part, a major role in the city with respect to retail trade. It's also based on the sound principle that there is need for expansion of housing in the downtown area, thereby the proposal in the report for some 1,100 units of various types of housing in the north Portage and north Ellice area.

Thirdly, it's based on the principle that there is a residential community that is existing in the north Ellice area of seniors, low income and new ethnic groups that needs to be enhanced and further developed. There are certainly recommendations in the report in that regard.

Fourthly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the report is based on sound financial premises that will indicate that this kind

of development will, on one hand bring about revitalization and regeneration of the downtown area, and at the same time provide much needed long-term job creation possibilities. I think it's being done in a way, or it's being suggested it be done in a way, Mr. Speaker, that is different from previous developments in the downtown area, whereby they were isolated developments that tend to move activity from one part of the downtown area to another. Rather this is a development that uses the existing strength of the downtown to create a unifying force that I think is much needed and will, I believe, work in the downtown area of Winnipeg.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, on Page 13 of the Executive Summary of the Report, it stated that the development corporation of governments are recommended to encourage a quick start on the following related proposal: development of the Union Centre concept. Will the government be contributing to, or financing a new Union Centre north of Portage Avenue?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** The proposal for the development of the Union Centre concept, as I have been informed, is one that would see the possible development of a comprehensive union centre, senior citizen housing and related centre in the north Portage area was one that was proposed to the task force and one that obviously is being endorsed by the task force. The question as to whether or not there would be any public sector direct funding of that proposal, there is none. If the member would read further in the report, there is none being suggested with respect to that specific proposal where there may be some level of perceived public assistance, as there would be in other parts of the development, as with respect to the land that would be assembled for the overall proposal.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, could the Minister advise if there are any firm commitments by the private sector to proceed with any projects, other than government financed projects? Are there any commitments by the private sector to proceed with any projects in this area?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are no firm specific proposals from the private sector to commence the private sector proposals under this plan. Indeed, it would be premature to indicate that because — (Interjection) — it seems that some members opposite are concerned and not in favour of any private sector development downtown, Mr. Speaker. But I can indicate that there were numerous presentations to the North Portage Task Force indicating that the private sector is very interested in developing housing in the north Portage area.

There were proposals for other private sector activities and it's the feeling of the task force that this be developed in a co-ordinated way, and if the implementation vehicle that is being suggested, that being the development corporation, is formed and agreed to by the three levels of government, then they will be calling for specific proposals from the private sector for the various activities.

But I can certainly indicate from what is contained in the task force in their extensive discussions, consultation with the private sector, there is indeed a lot of interest in a renewed downtown area from the private sector, but I think it would be premature to select specific proposals and specific private sector interests. I think it would be best done by way of proposal calls for the specific developments.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, in view of the fact that the task force report calls for a development corporation of citizens to implement the development proposals; in view of the fact that the North of Portage Administrative Task Force is composed entirely of members of the Civil Service of the three levels of government, in order that a realistic plan can be developed for north of Portage Avenue, would the Minister consider recommending to his colleagues, the Federal Minister and the Mayor, the appointment of a development corporation composed of citizens, of men and women who work in the downtown area, and who know realistically what is required to develop the area north of Portage Avenue, in order that that group of citizens might come up with a realistic, practical plan that will work, north of Portage Avenue?

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the member that he read further in the report of the Administrative Task Force and the technical and more detailed report that I supplied to him this afternoon. He will find that one of the recommendations with respect to the development corporation is that it be comprised of citizen representatives on that, and that it specifically not include any civil servants from either level of government; a further recommendation - one that I think is obvious by the line of questioning - that it not include any politicians on the development corporation.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I read the summary report to the Minister. The problem is that the development corporation is directed to implement the proposals of the task force recommended by the civil servants. I'm asking him to change the order - to have a group of citizens, of men and women who work in the downtown, who know what is practical and realistic to develop the area north of Portage Avenue, to have that corporation composed of those people, and not politicians and not civil servants, appointed to come up with a realistic practical plan for north of Portage Avenue.

**HON. E. KOSTYRA:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm really somewhat surprised by that line of questioning and the suggestions. I take it from that, that the member is suggesting the proposed plan isn't a realistic plan. I would suggest to him that a lot of discussion and a lot of work has gone into it by the Administrative Task Force utilizing private sector consultants, consulting extensively with the development industry, the retail industry, the citizens that live in the north Portage Area and coming up with their recommendations.

The recommendations are going to be reviewed in detail by the Federal Government, by the Provincial Government, and at the present moment are being

reviewed by the total City Council of the City of Winnipeg. I would suggest that between those three levels of government, there are people that can review and can agree on a realistic approach to correcting the current situation in downtown Winnipeg. Hopefully, as a result of the task force deliberations and the discussions that will go on between the elected officials at each level of government, we will come to the final realization and the final decisions on a realistic plan for the downtown area of the City of Winnipeg.

## Bilingualism in Manitoba

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

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I should adjourn debate on those answers.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Honourable Attorney-General. I wonder if he could advise the House if his department has instructed the towns and municipalities in Manitoba to have their parking tickets printed in both French and English.

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** No, my department has not instructed any town or municipality to do that. I think what my department has done is pointed out the options that are available. Towns or municipalities can, of course, make use of two different kinds of procedures with respect to the enforcement of their municipal parking by-laws. Those half a dozen, or 10 towns that do, and if they use the summary conviction proceedings that are presently provided for, then as I understand it under those proceedings, the tickets would be in two languages, I think as they are in Winnipeg. But if they decide to use what is the alternative procedure, then they need not.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Yes, if they use the summary conviction procedure then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would towns where there is not sufficient numbers of those using the French language, would those towns still be required to print the parking tickets in both languages?

**HON. R. PENNER:** I would like to take that as notice. I've been reviewing the material on that. I'm satisfied that there's no legal obligation and there's no obligation imposed by my department on any town or municipality. They have an option of going one route or another.

But as the law is presently, as I believe it, with respect to going the summary conviction route, because the ticket is now not just a ticket as it was before, it is also a summons. It's because that under this new procedure the ticket becomes a summons. If they use that then it is a court form and may have to be in both languages.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I wonder if the Attorney-General could inform the House if the Town of Dauphin is one of those designated areas for bilingual services.

**HON. R. PENNER:** There are no areas designated for bilingual services. That's a misnomer and a

misunderstanding. The French Language Services Secretariat, in looking at areas where there are arguably substantial numbers of French-speaking people, as areas where the government might be obligated if it has a significant number, a section in the amended Constitution be required to deliver services has indicated those areas. But there is, as things now are, no designated areas in the sense of an obligation that is imposed by the government on any municipality, nor would there be under the proposed amendment.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** If the Attorney-General would be good enough to provide members on this side with copies of the letter of instruction that went from Mr. Cardwell, who is Registrar of J.P. and Magistrate Services, of last July. I don't know how many municipalities or towns it went to, but certainly the Town of Dauphin got one. I wonder if you'd provide members on this side with a copy of that letter.

**HON. R. PENNER:** It's the letter of Mr. Cardwell of July of last year that was sent by him, without authorization and reflecting his opinion on what the requirements might be, subsequent to the change in the law dealing with The Summary Convictions Act that I am now looking at. I'll be glad to both table that and further answers to the question asked by the Member for Minnedosa, so I'm taking it as notice in that sense.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Just a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I would take it from the Minister's answer then that this is not the thin edge of the wedge that we've referred to so often on the bilingual issue.

**HON. R. PENNER:** It is neither the thin edge of the wedge, nor the domino, nor the slippery slope, nor the morass, nor the swamp.

### Abortion clinic - Dr. Morgentaler

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

**MR. H. CARROLL:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I have read in the newspaper and heard on the radio where Dr. Morgentaler's request to waive a preliminary hearing has been denied. I understand in the Province of Quebec, Dr. Morgentaler was allowed to go directly to trial, rather than go through a preliminary hearing. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most important purposes of a preliminary hearing is for the protection of the accused. In the present instance, Dr. Morgentaler is prepared to waive that protection.

My question to the Attorney-General is, why is his department spending scads of taxpayers' money and causing a lot of money to be spent by Dr. Morgentaler to go through a process that is not necessary?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Again I must say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I only became aware of the position taken by the Senior Crown Attorney through the press this morning. I have asked the Deputy Minister for a report as to what was the reasoning.

I should say that preliminaries, in fact, are both for the Crown and for an accused. Quite often, where there

is an agreement, a preliminary will be waived, but there has to be an agreement. An accused cannot unilaterally waive a preliminary.

The reason why, in some instances the Crown might want a preliminary, is that the preliminary is used by the Crown in the same way as it is used by the defence, to see in fact, whether or not witnesses who are expected to give certain evidence, do give that evidence. It may be that indeed there is no case. It may be that where the Crown is proceeding on one kind of charge, it is more advisable to proceed on another related charge.

All of that emerges from the preliminary process, so it is not necessarily a wasteful procedure. The Crown has certain rights which must be protected, as well of those of the accused, but nevertheless I would like to find out the particular reasons in this case.

### Brandon Mental Health Centre

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

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Health. I would ask him, Sir, whether redevelopment of the Brandon Mental Health Centre continues to be frozen?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, there is very little new activity in this field. Until we get the report of the different committees, I think the 11 committees are working, bringing reports in the field of mental health. That's expected fairly soon.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, has work on the Brandon Mental Health Centre been, in fact, frozen for the past 12 to 18 months?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It depends what work my honourable friend is referring to. I don't know of anything that has been frozen. The new construction, yes, this has been kept in abeyance, as I say, until we have the bed count and the study of this report. That is true, as announced during my Estimates.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1982 - not 1983, but 1982 - the Minister announced in this House that during the fiscal year, 1982-83 - that's last fiscal year - \$2.4 million would be spent on the first phase of redevelopment of the Brandon Mental Health Centre, including \$1.4 million for a new laundry. Can the Minister confirm that in fact, Sir, none of this was done?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** In general, yes, I could confirm that none has been done - now I say, in general. It might be that some minor work was done. That is exactly correct.

At the time that I made this announcement, this was something that I had received approval for from the Cabinet. It was the department's decision and my decision to await until I received the reports and the bed study before proceeding. So that is the difference.

It is true that this work hasn't been done as yet, but it was approved by the Cabinet. I had no way of knowing



at the time; the decision had not been made. My honourable friend is right.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Mr. Speaker, can the Minister advise the House whether the difficulty and the indecision with respect to this project developed out of a difference of opinion between himself and the Honourable Minister of Community Services, the Member for Brandon East, as to where the new composite laundry should be sited? The Minister of Health wished to have that new laundry sited at the Brandon Mental Health Centre, whereas the Minister of Community Services wished to have it sited at the Brandon General Hospital.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, there is no interference or even recommendations from any other members of Cabinet. This is a decision that will be made in the Department of Health.

There has been some added information that I was seeking. A recommendation from the Manitoba Health Service Commission staff was that it would be at the Mental Health, because they think the facilities could be built at the General Hospital. Since then - I visited the area quite a while ago, we've been here a long time - I have been informed that there has been some more information that, yes, it probably could be built at the General Hospital, so there's certainly an open mind in there. It would be cheaper to do it, if possible, at the General Hospital, because then you wouldn't have to keep something that would be obsolete in a short time, if there's any change in there. But there is no interference from any other department or any other Ministers at all.

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the position that he has taken and continues to take, notwithstanding legitimate questions raised by the Brandon and District Labour Council and purported contradictory opinion coming from the Minister of Community Services, that the position the Minister of Health has taken and continues to take, is that that laundry shall be and will be sited at the Brandon Mental Health Centre?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, that is not the fact. I'd like to say again if I was not understood correctly, a recommendation coming from the staff at the Manitoba Health Services Commission was that the construction should be at the Mental Hospital. Since then, I was given different information after visiting the site and getting the staff from the Commission also to go back there; I was told that apparently they didn't receive all the information or there was a misunderstanding and that goes back to a couple of years ago. We certainly have an open mind on that. I'm not continuing to say that it will be built at the mental health hospital. I have very much of an open mind on that.

### Aboriginal rights

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

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General in his capacity as House

Leader. When the First Minister introduced the constitutional amendment dealing with aboriginal rights in this House in June sometime, he stated that that resolution would be referred to a Standing Committee of the Legislature to have public input. To date, a referral motion for that amendment has not appeared on the Order Paper and it's my understanding that there are some people would be interested in making representation. Can the Attorney-General advise whether or not that is still the government's intention?

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I'll be meeting with some of the groups who have expressed an interest in making representations tomorrow and depending on whether that is still their wish, then I'll have a discussion with the opposition House Leader of how this might be accommodated.

### Budget planning guidelines

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have a question for the Acting First Minister. The First Minister of the province, in making a presentation on economic recovery at the Annual Premiers' Conference in Toronto, stated that Budget planning guidelines for the coming year will have a general limit of zero to 5 percent. The First Minister also said that he had adopted a similar approach in preparing our Budget this year. Can the Acting First Minister explain how the First Minister would square that statement with the fact that real expenditures in government this year are projected to be up approximately 19 percent over last year?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I recognize the right of any members of this House to ask questions as to a statement made via the First Minister, especially in the name of the province, but I think that members of this House would also recognize that it certainly wouldn't be proper for me to comment on a statement made by other members of the front bench. I would take this matter as notice and make the First Minister aware of the concern and the question that was asked yesterday and today on his return, and he'll comment on it.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Acting First Minister then could advise the House whether or not it's correct that the government followed those same guidelines in preparing their Budget this year.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Prepared for this coming year?

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, the indication in the First Minister's presentation at the Premiers' Conference in Toronto was that they're following zero to 5 percent guidelines this year and that the same approach was followed last year, that is, in putting together the Budget for 1983-84. Can the Acting First Minister advise if that was really the case?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** If you're talking about zero and 5 percent, it would depend in what area. There's

no doubt that in certain wages we've gone more than 5 percent, there's no doubt about that at all. I think that we're talking about an average. As a guideline, there have been certain factors at times that haven't made this possible. We've also said that we wanted to go along with the restriction, not necessarily the 6 and 5 as such; at times in the lower wages, we've allowed more and allowed less in the higher wages such as the Cabinet Ministers where there's been no increase at all, the Deputy Minister and the senior people that have been an increase of \$1,000 only. So I would think that this is a fair statement, in general, that the First Minister has made.

### Manitoba Beef Commission

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

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I took as notice several questions from the Honourable Member for Arthur dealing with the Manitoba Beef Commission and marketing of cattle.

Mr. Speaker, the total marketings of slaughter cattle, steers and heifers from March 1 to July 30, 1983 were 102,610 head. As you know, the Beef Commission began marketing cattle as of March 1st. That 102,000 figure includes Saskatchewan cattle that came into the Province of Manitoba.

The total Manitoba Beef Commission marketings for that period were 21,893 head for a percentage total of 21.3 percent; the total number of Saskatchewan cattle coming into Manitoba was 31,881 head. Therefore the Manitoba Beef Commission marketed approximately 31 percent of the slaughter cattle originating within the Province of Manitoba. There also have been some small sales to local abattoirs but it's not very significant.

Five major packing houses account for the bulk of slaughter cattle sales by the Beef Commission. Producers have to notify the Commission of their intentions to sell their animals; information on numbers, sex and time of delivery is taken by the Commission. The Commission then notifies the five plants of the total number of slaughter cattle available on that day and asks for bids on the lots. Bids of one factor are not revealed to others.

At the close of bids, the Commission selects the highest bid and notifies the packers of their successful bids. The farmer is notified of the delivery date and the buyer. When cattle are delivered and slaughtered, rail grade receipts and grade information on various lots are sent by the packer to the Commission for processing. Marketing fees and premiums are deducted from gross receipts, and deficiency payments, if due, are added to the producer's account. The Beef Commission then sends the producer a cheque for the net cattle receipts plus deficiency payment after the weekly pooled price has been determined for his lot of cattle.

Mr. Speaker, the MACC cash advances for cattle feeding by the Beef Commission clients to date: there are 115 producers who have selected to hold calves for feeding as part of last fall's calf crop and have received and loaned out \$1.8 million in advances covering approximately 5,500 head of cattle which would be held in feed - that would be last year's cattle.

### Budget planning guidelines

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

**HON. S. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting First Minister. Sir, in view of the fact that yesterday we had to bring to the attention of members of the government the rather outlandish statements that the first Minister was making in Toronto about the Jobs Fund, statements that bore no relationship to the facts at all; in view of the fact again, Sir, today we've had to point out in a speech that the First Minister made, apparently, to the First Ministers' Conference, where he said the government this year carried out, in preparing its budget, the zero and 5 percent increase in grants, whereas in fact, as my colleague has pointed out, the expenditures are up 19 percent over what they were last year, would the Acting First Minister not deem it advisable and politic and prudent to put in an urgent phone call to the First Minister of this province? Tell him that the statements that he is making in Toronto are being heard back here and being corrected, and will he stop exaggerating the dreadful condition of the province, trying to make it appear better than it is?

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

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Speaker, I don't think I will rush to any phone to ask the First Minister to come back. I think the statement that he has made is a factual one. There is no doubt that there is always divergence of opinion between the party in power and the opposition and that's the way it should be. It's obvious that the members of the opposition will scrutinize every line of every word in every speech delivered by my Leader, and there will be time for debate on that. It's certainly not during the question period.

I am satisfied that you could make figures say pretty well anything on either side. I am satisfied that you could take things out of context also, in trying to make a point. So I would say that we be cool and collected and calm. We will wait until the First Minister comes in and I'm sure that he'll be able to justify the statement that he's made.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call the second reading on Public Bill No. 79, standing in the name of the Member for Elmwood; followed by the adjourned debate on second reading of Public Bills 103, standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert. After that, Mr. Speaker, it is my proposal to move to report stage on the four bills appearing on Page 2, that is, Bills 19, 22, 25 and 82, and we'll see where we are at at that time.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bill No. 79, the Member for Elmwood.

## HANSARD CLARIFICATION

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Member for Kirkfield Park on a point of order.

**MRS. G. HAMMOND:** Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have a correction for Hansard. On Saturday, 6th of August, 1983, Page 5049, it reads, "The fact that the Member for Elmwood brought out, and other members who have spoken on this, is that French candidates have not received a penny." It should read "fringe." "Fringe candidates have not received a penny." There is quite a difference.

## SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILLS

### BILL 79 - THE ENGINEERING PROFESSION ACT

**MR. R. DOERN** presented Bill No. 79, The Engineering Profession Act; Loi sur les ingénieurs, for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I guess my familiarity with the engineering profession goes back to 1952-53 when there was a great interest of our society in Manitoba. A lot of people were entering the profession of engineering, and I was a student in Grade 12 at Isaac Newton High School. I considered for at least a five-minute period becoming an engineer. When I discovered that you had to be outstanding in mathematics and physics, I then decided that this was not the profession for me, since I was more interested and adept in history and English, not to mention the French language which I had studied for six years at that time and then took an additional year at university.

Mr. Speaker, in 1971 to 1977, I was the Minister of Public Works and that is where I first began to meet with and deal with engineers on a regular basis. It is because of that, I volunteered to pilot this bill on behalf of the profession, with the concurrence of the caucus and the government.

Mr. Speaker, the original idea of Bill 79 was that there would be a whole series of revisions to The Engineering Act, but it was then discovered, given myriad changes, that it would require an amendment to almost every section of the existing act. In addition, to have the bill introduced in the House in both the English and the French languages, it was decided that the easiest way to accomplish the task was to simply re-enact the bill; start at the beginning, bring in an entirely new act and then proceed to have the legislation translated.

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, as to the rationale for changes in The Engineering Profession Act - in addition to a large number of minor revisions of a housekeeping nature, amendments are being proposed to deal with the following substantive items.

First, in order to expand the disciplinary powers of the association to include licencees as well as members. The present act does not adequately provide for the disciplining of licencees as opposed to members, by

the council. Members of the association are professional engineers residing in the Province of Manitoba, who are registered as professional engineers with the association. Licencees are non-residents of Manitoba who obtain a temporary licence to do a specific job in the Province of Manitoba.

Second, in order to formally adopt and recognize a code of ethics of the association; third, to more fully set out the procedures and powers of the association in regard to disciplinary matters; and fourth, to permit the association to regulate, through by-laws, group practice by professional engineers.

Mr. Speaker, I know that material has been forwarded to the Honourable Member for Tuxedo who is, in fact, a professional engineer and I look forward to hearing his comments on the bill and recommend it to the House.

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

The Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In responding to the introduction by the Member for Elmwood of The Engineering Profession Act, I readily acknowledge that I am a registered professional engineer in the Province of Manitoba and, therefore, governed by this act. I trust that this doesn't place me in a position of conflict of interest . . .

**A MEMBER:** Have you ever built a bridge?

**MR. G. FILMON:** Well, as a matter of fact, I have supervised the construction of the Eight-and-a-half Street bridge, as I call it, in Brandon. It's a bridge that, oddly enough, enters upon Pacific Avenue, halfway between 8th and 9th Street in Brandon — (Interjection) —

**MR. L. SHERMAN:** He's built bridges of friendship and understanding.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Don't burn them behind him.

**MR. G. FILMON:** This one was built of concrete so it would be difficult to burn. In any case, yes, I have been involved, Mr. Speaker, in the practice of the profession of engineering for a number of years prior to entering into a career in business, so consequently, I have maintained my registration as a professional engineer and kept an active interest in the affairs of the association.

In so doing, I have read with interest the proposed amendments to The Engineering Profession Act and, as has been indicated by the Member for Elmwood, many of them are minor and housekeeping in nature, in updating an act that has existed in the province for something in excess of 60 years and many of the things that have crept in are to do with terminology and modern usage and so on, but some are substantive in nature.

I believe that the aspect of the act which seeks to give additional disciplinary powers of the association, with respect to licencees is important in the public interest, in that, I believe, that the public will want to

have the opportunity for the profession to discipline its licencees who, in the main, are practitioners from outside the province who obtain a temporary licence to deal with certain projects within the Province of Manitoba. Under those circumstances, I believe that we want as great a protection for the public in the practice of engineering as we do have for those who are resident in the province and practising here on a full-time basis.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the aspect of the formal adoption of the code of ethics, I think, is probably a wise move; in that, the code of ethics has existed since November 1, 1921, but has never been referred to in the act. But it is the code under which engineers, myself included, have practised and operated as members of the profession in the past, but it has never been formally included in the legislation; so I believe that this is something, again, that is in the public interest and is a good move for the association.

The disciplinary powers and procedures being set out more fully, I think again, will promote public confidence in the practice of the profession because it will allow members of the public to know and understand just exactly what is done in the governance of the practice on behalf of its members. If there are conditions under which complaints arise, members of the public should know how they are dealt with and know that they are dealt with objectively, fairly and, at all times, with the intent of protecting the public against any malpractice with respect to engineering.

Members may well be aware that members of the engineering profession in Canada wear a ring on their little finger, a ring generally made out of some material that was used in a construction material or in a material that was used in an engineering sense, and that is to remind members of a number of failures that occurred. In one case I believe a bridge failure; in other cases, failures that caused loss of life because of improper design and practice of the engineering profession. So in a ceremony which is known as the Kipling Ceremony, graduating engineers entering the profession are given this ring to always remind them that they have the public trust in mind, and to ensure that they never forget their obligation to ensure that the public is protected, by virtue of any designs which they put forward, to construct whatever facilities - infrastructure or whatever have you - for the public use.

I believe anything that will promote public confidence in the practice of professional engineering in the province is of value and interest to the public and, therefore, am pleased to see some of these changes.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of two lay representatives on the Council of the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba, I believe, is a step in the right direction; a step that conforms with the actions that are being taken by many professions. I think members well know that most professions today, including law, medicine, nursing and others now have lay representation on their governing councils. Engineering is now taking a step in the same direction to harmonize with what is an accepted practice today, because I'm sure that, as the council deals with things that are in the public interest, it is well to have an objective contribution from lay members, in helping them to arrive at their decisions.

The increasing of the various classification definitions of engineering, I think, is just simply a step again into

the modern era where we have any numbers of new sub-types of engineering that are being practised, such as, bio-medical and industrial engineering, as being added to the practice of professional engineering in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the other areas that have been changed and altered, as I say, are not of a substantive nature and I think, on behalf of members on our side of the House, we would wish to pass it along to committee so that any interested members of the public and others would be able to appear before committee, let their views be known and have any of the amendments proposed explained to them by the representatives of the profession there in attendance.

Without further comment, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are prepared to have this move along to committee.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

## **ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING PUBLIC BILLS**

### **BILL 103 - THE LAW SOCIETY ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bill No. 103, on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, standing in the name of the Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to allow this bill to go to committee, unless any other member wishes to speak.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

## **REPORT STAGE**

### **BILL 19 - THE SURVIVORSHIP ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Bill No. 19. Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 19 be concurred in?  
The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, if you will just bear with me for a moment I would like to propose an amendment to Bill 19.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs,

THAT Bill 19, The Survivorship Act be amended by striking out the word "July" where it appears in Section 5 thereof, and again in Section 8 thereof, and substituting therefor, in each case, the word "October."

I presume the members might want an explanation about that.

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** The explanation, I think, is obvious, Mr. Deputy Speaker, namely, that it is now August and the chances of this bill coming into force in July have diminished remarkably.

**QUESTION put on amendment, MOTION carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 19, The Survivorship Act, be concurred in, as amended?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL 22 - THE WILLS ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 22 be concurred in?  
The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** While I'm in a non-concurring mood, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, THAT Bill 22, The Wills Act, be amended by striking out the word "July" where it appears in Subsection 38(3), and again in Section 63; and substituting therefor, in each case, the word "October."

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 22, The Wills Act, be concurred in, as amended?

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried.**

### **BILL 25 - AN ACT TO REPEAL THE STATUTE OF FRAUDS**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 25 be concurred in?

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, THAT Bill 25, An Act to Repeal the Statute of Frauds be amended by striking out the word "July" where it appears in Section 2 thereof, and again in Section 3 thereof, and substituting therefor, in each case, the word "October;" and

THAT Bill 25 be amended by renumbering Section 3 thereof as Section 4; and by adding thereto, immediately after Section 2 therefor the following section:

Place in the continuing consolidation.

3. This act may be referred to as Chapter F158 of the continuing consolidation of the Statutes of Manitoba.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **BILL 82 - THE JURY ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Shall the Report of the Committee on Bill No. 82 be concurred in?  
The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, THAT Clause 3(n) of Bill 82 be struck out and Clauses 3(o) to (s) be relettered as clauses (n) to (r).

**MOTION presented.**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** I think this does call for some explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker. At committee stage a written brief - I can't remember whether there was an oral brief to the same effect but certainly there was a written brief - was submitted raising a question of why this particular exemption, that relating to the spouse of, and then there were a number of names of persons, sheriffs, police officer, judge, etc., etc. Why that particular exemption? Wasn't that being discriminatory? Why not, if one was to do that, why would you not exempt someone who had a business relationship, let's say, with one of those persons, or some other relationship which arguably was not at arms length; and weren't we here just replicating that old notion now discredited, at least formally, in so many of our statutes, of the old unity, as it was called in law, between the spouses which really, of course, masked not a unity but a dependency.

In looking at the reality of the situation and what had been legislated now in England, where our whole jury system comes, from where that particular exemption has been done away with as a result of the recommendation of the Law Reform Committee in England of 1974, in this country, in Saskatchewan - I think in one other province as well - looking at that background and the reality, as I say, of the situation where now it's quite clear that it is open and given the circumstances for counsel to challenge a juror for cause, and then it is up to the jurors already selected to decide whether or not in the particular circumstance there is such a relationship that indeed it does constitute not apprehended purely on the basis of status, but an actual bias, and looking at all of these considerations, concerns that had been expressed at committee stage - I make no bones about it - by the Minister of Economic Development that I decided to bring in this amendment at report stage which removes that exemption.

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

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Member for Tuxedo, that debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### **ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING**

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

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, would you please call the adjourned debate on Bill No. 48, The Elections Finances Act, as it appears on Page 9 of the Order Paper?

### **BILL 48 - THE ELECTIONS FINANCES ACT**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General and the amendment thereto, Bill 48, the debate is open.

Are you ready for the question?  
The Member for Tuxedo.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the amendment to Bill 48 which states that this bill ought not to be read a second time, but six months hence, Mr. Speaker, the problem that members on our side have with the proposed Elections Finances Act is one that we have documented very very well. It is not good legislation. It is an attempt on the part of this government to transfer what was a voluntary system of contributions to political parties in this province, a voluntary system that allowed them to go out and seek support from whomever they chose, allowed a participation by average Manitobans, not just big corporations as has been alluded to by members opposite, and allowed for this kind of voluntary association and participation in the entire democratic political process as we know it today in Manitoba.

That would be replaced, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with a system of compulsory financing to the extent of 50 percent of the costs of an election by the taxpayer. As I said in speaking to the bill itself earlier, Mr. Speaker, the problem that we have with that is that the largest percentage of the taxpayers in this province come from middle- and lower-income situations. The largest percentage of the taxes that are collected - that is something bordering on two-thirds - comes from those who are, I believe it's in the 30,000-and-under range. In fact, of that amount about half of it comes from those who are on the range of 15,000 and under. So consequently, we are not achieving the purpose that a number of members on the government side have said this bill would achieve and that is to transfer it to those who have the ability to pay. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case as was demonstrated in a number of speeches on our side, principally in information that was presented to the House by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, as this debate has carried on, there have been some interesting contributions, particularly from the Minister of Health, who railed away at members on our side just a day or two ago, and spoke about his commitment to such legislation, saying that this would prevent people with a large self-interest motive from benefiting as a result of donations to the party in power in government. He gave basically that as the cornerstone in the thesis that he was presenting our side. He said that as things stand right now, in effect, he who pays the piper calls the tune. He said that our present system, the voluntary system of donations, was ripe for abuse, that it allowed major corporations and people with, as I say, largely a self-interest motive to influence government decisions by the amount of money which they contributed to the party in power.

I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it's interesting that there is no intention on the part of the government to change that. In fact, only half of the election expenses will be paid through the public taxpaying method that is being proposed by this bill. The other half will still be maintained by the present system which says that parties will have to go out, individual candidates will have to go out and solicit financial support from corporate members of the community, individual members of the community, and so on. So, although

he says that this is going to be a great improvement, because we're now going to take it out of the taxpayer's pocket, we're still going to leave in place the existing system, and if it has the evils that he says it does - and I suggest to you that it does not, Mr. Speaker - but if it does have those evils, he's not going to correct them. He's going to leave them in place and allow people to continue to get their support from whomever chooses to contribute to the parties. He has not, and the Attorney-General and the government have not corrected that problem which he perceives to be there.

Mr. Speaker, further to that, the suggestion that he has made that what we have in place both now - I assume it will continue after this bill is in place because of the viewpoint he has taken; the viewpoint he has taken is that he alleges that there is a sort of morality or mentality by which people contribute to political parties for personal gain; that people contribute to election campaigns, to individuals who are running for election because they believe that they'll get something out of it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that, and I believe that just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, so one's viewpoint - (Interjection) - The Minister of Education has caught my eye, Mr. Speaker. - (Interjection) - Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs has suggested that if I had a mirror I couldn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I don't have any difficulty looking in the mirror every morning when I get up to shave, in fact, I'm concerned that maybe the reason that the Minister of Urban Affairs doesn't shave is because he has difficulty looking in the mirror every morning. Oh, he wants to hide the double chin, he suggests. I have no difficulty looking in the mirror in the mornings, Mr. Speaker, my conscience doesn't bother me at all and I take full responsibility and will be up front about everything that I'm charged with in the public interest as an elected representative here.

I hope all the members opposite can say the same thing. Some of them are having a good deal of difficulty this Session and, in fact, they're avoiding the public on many many issues because of their difficulty in looking in the mirror and looking the public in the eye these days.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the point I was making when I was sidetracked by members opposite. Just as beauty is in the eye of the beholder, I believe the morality by which people judge others is indicative of their own morals and their own sense of responsibility, in a moral sense, to their fellow man. I suggest that the Member for St. Boniface, the Minister of Health, in looking at that proposition that suggests that people only contribute to political parties because of a self-interest motive, because they think they're going to get something back for it, is indicative of where his mind is with respect to this issue; and I think it's interesting to note - and I'll come back in much more detail as I review the contributions that are made to political parties in this province, and I'll look, in particular, at some contributions that were made during the last election to the New Democratic Party, and perhaps it will be indicative of what the Minister of Health had in mind - but a company that's known as Kapasoo (phonetic) Holdings Ltd. gave \$1,000 to the New Democratic Party.

My information is, and I stand to be corrected, that the principal shareholder in Kapasoo (phonetic)

Holdings is the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, as well, it's interesting to note that the Minister of Health and his wife contributed, in addition to that, \$1,030 and \$1,000 respectively. So, if indeed, the Minister is suggesting that people contribute to political parties for a self-interest motive, it's interesting to note that he has those same motives and he has made those contributions in a variety of ways, over \$3,000.00. So one can't be sure what his rewards are but it's evident that he's fighting his own personal war on poverty through a contribution to the New Democratic Party.

However, Mr. Speaker, judging everyone by one's own moral standards isn't exactly a good thing to do and it's certainly no basis upon which to legislate anything in this House. If we could legislate the morality of everybody then we'd have to find him who is without sin to show us what the moral standards ought to be.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Cast the first stone.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Yes, that's right, but we're not talking about casting stones at the present time, to the Member for Wolseley. We're talking about morality and we're looking for someone who is without sin and without blemish to tell us what the moral standards ought to be; and I don't think I see any across the way who might fit that category, and I'll be honest and fair and say that I doubt there is any of us, in society, who could take that upon ourselves as the basis upon which we are going to set legislation.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I don't want to be judged by his moral standards because they may not be sufficient for my standards and that isn't the basis upon which this legislation ought to be put forward. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that an honourable person can't be bought at any price, and a dishonourable person can probably be bought for a lot less than even the \$1,000 that the Minister of Health has contributed to his party.

Dishonourable people can be influenced for a game of golf or a dinner but, Mr. Speaker, I hope we're not talking about, nor dealing with dishonourable people in this Legislature; that's not my view of the situation in any case. Certainly, as I say, I don't appreciate the Minister of Health, in his pious way, attempting to be holier than the others in this Chamber by suggesting that the New Democratic Party's contributions were somehow much cleaner and much less open to suspicion than were the contributions given to our party, or any other party in this province. They, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, were no more or no less legitimate than were the contributions that were tendered to any other party in this province.

I spoke in the last address to this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, about a review of the contributions that were made to the New Democratic Party in 1981, as we approached and went through the election campaign that year, and at that time I, just in general terms, said that it was interesting to note just who did contribute to the New Democratic Party, because the New Democratic Party prides itself in having a ground swell of ordinary, average people contributing in small measure to its campaigns and implies, somehow, that the other parties in this province are supported by big business, big corporations and wealthy people. But I

find it very very fascinating, as we go through a list of those who contributed to the New Democratic Party in 1981 for their election campaign - and incidentally I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, that they benefited very handsomely from the legislation that is in place, I think to the tune of more than \$1 million during that campaign - by a voluntary, I'll put voluntary in quotations, a "voluntary" system of contributions because, as we review the contributions that were made to that party, Mr. Speaker, very many interesting things come forward.

For instance, Andrés Wines; now why would they have contributed to the New Democratic Party in the last election?

**A MEMBER:** They make red wine.

**MR. G. FILMON:** That's a corporation that does business in this province, that has listings under the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, Apex Realty. I have no idea why they might make a contribution, but they did. Atomic Transport, Mr. Speaker, why would they make a contribution to the New Democratic Party?

You'll find as I go through - and I intend to read many many listings here - that there are significant groupings of people who did contribute, in a corporate sense, to the New Democratic Party. You'll find, Mr. Speaker, that so many of the liquor companies and breweries contributed to the New Democratic Party. You'll find that transport companies invariably contributed to the New Democratic Party.

Now, if there's some morality involved in this then why did the New Democratic Party not refuse those contributions. My information, because I phoned some of these people and asked why they had made these contributions to the New Democratic Party who, in many cases, Mr. Speaker, are being harmed drastically by the New Democratic Party in government; the payroll tax, the increase in sales tax.

I was curious, and you know what I found out? That there was a heavy amount of solicitation being done after the election; after the New Democrats were elected these corporations, who the party knew had to do business in this province with the province and needed either licencing for approval from the New Democratic Government, they were being solicited after the election when they were being told, well, we understand that you do a lot of business with the government, or you require licencing, or you require government approval or regulation or so on, and we would be interested in having a contribution from your organization to our party. We have to pay for heavy expenses that we incurred in the course of the election campaign.

Interesting approach, Mr. Speaker, so that's why I had the term voluntary in quotation marks when I referred to it earlier in my speech. Let's go through some of the individuals names, Mr. Speaker, one A.R. Adam contributed \$1,025 to the New Democratic Party. Certainly he won't have to wait to get to heaven for his just reward for that contribution I'm sure, he is getting his reward today as a Member of the Executive Council.

Mr. Speaker, I've already said that the years 1981, in response to the Minister of Municipal Affairs — (Interjection) — Oh, he said he gave \$3,000, Mr.

Speaker, well perhaps it shows up in other forms. There is one, Andrué Anstett who contributed \$935, oh, and another \$935 from Mrs. Anstett. Yes, those are contributions and obviously he's waiting for his just reward for that contribution.

There was a contribution from a person by the name of Errol Black who, I believe, is on the Board of Governors of Brandon University, some board I saw it in the course of reviewing a number of appointments. — (Interjection) — The Minister says not the Brandon University but there is another appointment somewhere, I just haven't got it in the back of memory. Maybe with the McKenzie Seeds Board, I'm not sure of that but it's one of the government appointments.

There is a contribution from a Walter Bohonis, now was it the Liquor Commission Board, or was it the Lotteries Board that he's been appointed to? The Liquor Board, that's right. There was a contribution from a Harvey Bostrom.

Now, what was the amount of the consulting contract that he got from this New Democratic Government for a study into the wild rice industry? How much was it, was it \$70,000; no, several thousand dollars. Well, certainly that's not a bad return on a \$300 investment, I would say.

Mr. Speaker, there was a contribution from a John Bucklaschuk, \$1,299.20.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, he is receiving his just reward right now as a Member of Executive Council. There is a contribution from a William Burgess in Brandon. Now, he's on one of the boards, I know that, I saw that appointment, I can't tell you what.

Now, there's a contribution from the Canadian Labour Congress, \$3,000; there's a contribution from the Canadian Paperworkers Union \$1,000; there's a contribution from the CBRT and GW Local 142, another union, \$1,000; the Canadian Labour Congress \$250; there is a contribution from a Henry Carroll \$530, didn't meet the test for Cabinet. There was a contribution from a Ben Carson, now, this gentleman is now on the Manitoba Securities Commission, that's the one that he's been appointed to.

There was a corporate contribution from the Canadian Steel Tank, there was a contribution from another union organizer, I believe, by the name of Albert Cerilli; a contribution from a Joanne Cerilli, an executive assistant or special assistant in this government.

So the rewards come rather quickly and, of course, now the members opposite say that that is happening and it shouldn't happen, that people shouldn't be allowed to contribute voluntarily because they have a strong self-interest motive if they make these contributions to a party. But, of course, they only infer that if the contributions are made to other parties there's a self-interest motive, but if it's to the New Democratic Party there isn't a self-interest motive. Now, that's an interesting approach but, of course, there's no self-interest in making a contribution yourself to the party if you're a member because what could you get for it. A Cabinet post, what is that worth to you? It's not worth very much really in the final analysis.

There was a contribution from a Saul and Sybil Cherniack.

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** \$725 apiece and all he gets back is a trip to Japan and a trip to Switzerland and Europe, Chairmanship of Manitoba Hydro, \$36,000 a year, that's all he got back for his contribution to the New Democratic Party, but this, according to members opposite, is not a good system because it promotes self-interest motives on people contributing to political parties in this province. Obviously, they have a reason to believe that because there's a great deal of evidence on the record. There's a contribution from a Bernard Christophe, again, another union organizer. Now, of course, you can imagine what would happen if there was a dispute that went to the Labour Board that involved the United Food and Commercial Workers Union. Of course, that union wouldn't be given the time of day if there was a dispute, not after the contribution that he made. I mean why should they even listen to him, why should they?

The CLC Committee on political education, \$500; a development company by the name of Co-ordinated Communities Corporation gave \$250; Champs Food System gave \$427.00. Now, that's not chicken feed. Then, there's an Allen Cohen who gave \$300, special assistant I think to the Minister of Cultural Affairs.

**A MEMBER:** Not anymore.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Not anymore. Okay, well, I guess one can assume that he didn't carry through with his tithing commitment and, therefore, he's out. Mr. Speaker, there's a contribution from a firm of architects, Cooper Rankin. Remember what I said about the preponderance of distillery companies, here's another one, Corby Distillers \$3,000; contribution from a Brian Corrin \$1,250; contribution from an Art Coulter, appointee to a number of things, but often called upon at a fairly reasonable fee to become the chairman of arbitration boards when the two sides can't get together, the Minister of Labour appoints a chairman of the arbitration board and, strangely enough, he happens to come up as chairman on occasion, well \$600; contribution from a Jay Cowan, \$2,497.50; contribution from a A.I. Cristall of Brandon, happens to be on the McKenzie Seeds Board now; contribution from a Crosier Kilgour and Partners, that's a consulting engineering firm; contribution from a Doug Davison, Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour now, interesting; contribution from a Linda Jolson, Assistant Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs; contribution from a Janet Debicka, known well, I believe, to the Attorney-General; contribution from a Michael Decter, Clerk of the Executive Council; contribution, Mr. Speaker, from a De Leuw Cather, consulting engineering firm; contribution from Distillers Corporation, Seagrams — (Interjection) — No, Distillers Corporation, that's Seagrams I believe - that's \$1,000, not bad; contribution from a Brian Dixon, the one that the Minister said was a joke that — (Interjection) —

**HON. A. MACKLING:** Will the member yield to a question?

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources on a point of order. Does the Minister have a point of order?



**HON. A. MACKLING:** No, I want to ask him a question, I don't know if he will agree to a question. First question is, is it your intention to read every name on the list and, if so, if there are any known Conservatives on the list, will you read their names, too, and how much they gave?

**MR. G. FILMON:** As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some of those that I have already mentioned are known Conservatives. The point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the whole cornerstone of the argument being put forth by some members opposite, principally the Minister of Health, is that contributions by two other parties were improper because there was an implied influence there on potential government policy, and on those political parties in their endeavours, and that they wanted to, in effect, effect political purposes and decisions by their contributions.

I'm just trying to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the sword cuts both ways, and that if members opposite believe that to be the case, then they believe it from their own personal experience, not because they have any way of believing that it affects our party in this way or other parties in this way. I'm saying that the New Democratic Party plays the system for all it's worth as it exists to their advantage and, therefore, they know whereof they speak when they speak of the morality of the present system of contributions to elections.

More so than that, Mr. Speaker, they don't choose to change it. They only choose to add to it by taking half of the expenses next time around out of the taxpayers' pockets, but leaving in place the system that exists so they can continue to affect the kind of contributions they're getting from their political friends and those who have a handout and an expectation of reward in future from this government.

So, I carry on, Mr. Speaker, with the list. We have contributions from Russell Doern . . .

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

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . \$1,837, on the Board of Manitoba Telephone System as well as being a Member of the Legislature. So his return on investment was, as the Member for La Verendrye says, only about six months coming, but it was there no less. We have contributions from Marty Dolin, yes, \$671; we have contributions from Mary Beth Dolin \$270.00.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** And she got a Cabinet post and Doern and Anstett didn't.

**MR. G. FILMON:** It seems the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that these are only 1981 contributions. The Minister of Labour wasn't appointed until 1982. It may well be that there have been some contributions around; the evidence is still out on that and we'll get our return.

That's one of the good benefits of this act, is that in terms of financing of political parties, it's up front and we get the information on it, and members opposite and the public know, because it's completely open and up front and people know what is being done and there's no attempt to hide. Of course, what is being done by the present system - or is proposed - is that it will be hidden, half the costs will come innocuously out of the

tax dollars of all those Manitobans - low income, middle income, upper income - altogether will pay for the current proposed system without even knowing. They won't know that when they write that cheque out for their income tax next year that a certain portion of it is going to pay the election expenses of the New Democratic Party and other parties in this province. That's what's wrong, Mr. Speaker. That's what we're talking about; that's what's wrong. Dominion Securities, a large corporation that presumably this government says it has nothing to do with large corporations and it doesn't attract investment - investment is probably an appropriate slip on my part - but it doesn't attract contributions from major corporations, but Dominion Securities, \$2,000; that's not chicken feed, I would say. Dramer Corporation (phonetic), \$500.00.

We have further along the way, Duraps Corporation, \$700; a major corporation, I would say. We have, Mr. Speaker, contributions from a Doug Duncan and a Ruth Duncan. Now that is the new chairman - since the New Democratic Government was elected - of the Water Services Board, of all things.

**A MEMBER:** I bet you he got a good return on investment.

**MR. G. FILMON:** We have a contribution from the Energy and Chemical Workers Union, \$750; we have a contribution from Leonard S. Evans and spouse, \$1,100; we have a contribution from one Phil Eyler, \$1,112.00. We have a contribution from FD. Consultants Ltd., whatever that is. There are a number of lawyers on the list who have contributed to this party and, for what purpose - who knows? - perhaps there's an opportunity to be appointed to something or to get a little bit of government work.

Here's one lawyer, Fagie Fainman, \$475.00. Remember I said earlier that transport companies appear over and over again on these contributions. Favorite Transport, \$375.00. Here we have another interesting one, from Thompson, Manitoba, Allan Fleury, contributed \$1,430.00. This is one of the newly appointed - about a year ago - permanent commissioners of the Workers Compensation Board at, what was the fee, \$38,000 or \$40,000 a year? There was a fairly substantial salary being paid for this position.

We have a contribution from Peter Fox. It's hard to read the writing but I believe it's \$1,481, maybe it's \$1,981.00. Four T Constructors, whatever that association is; G.B. Orr Associates, another architectural engineering firm; Genstar Corporation, a development firm; George Smith Trucking, trucking firm. I mention those; those appear over and over again. L.M.R. Architectural Group, another architectural group; Gilbey and Company, another liquor company, \$1,500, Mr. Speaker. Various other ones; Golden Oak Inn. Various candidates, the candidate who ran against me last time, a major contribution from that individual.

Grey Goose Bus Lines; Halter Trust; Steve Hayman, the union organizer or leader up in Flin Flon of the steel workers; Ernst Hansch Construction; Hanuschak and Associates, Consulting Engineers; Happy Valley Resort; Harry Harapiak, \$274.00. One understands why he's in the back row after that. We have his brother,

Leonard Harapiak, who was much more generous with the party, \$750; he was appointed to the Farm Lands Protection Board or something like that. Maureen Hemphill, \$686.00.

Here we go again, Hiram Walker and Sons, another liquor company contributing to the party. Clint Hornby, who's a business agent or organizer for one of the unions; I.D. Engineering.

Mr. Speaker, if we took the contributions of the unions and the union agents or business managers or organizers who contributed to this government, it's an astronomical sum. It exceeds any amount that's been given by any corporation to any of the other parties in this province, I can assure you of that, if you add them all together. I.D. Engineering and I.W.A., both, I think, probably engineering firms, \$400 and \$500 respectively; Ikoy Ltd., Ron Keenberg, \$3,550.00. Not bad, in return for the appointment to the chairmanship of the Manitoba Racing Commission and other assorted benefits.

Ilford-Riverton Airways, \$500; Imperial Developments, \$2,500; Imperial Roadways, \$1,500 - all of the trucking companies. Do you suppose that they're concerned that their licences might be in jeopardy or anything of that nature? I don't know. The International Union, UAW, United Auto Workers Union . . .

**A MEMBER:** Hey, Al, did you scare all the trucking firms when you were on that job? You scared all the trucking firms.

**HON. A. MACKLING:** What did they give?

**A MEMBER:** Tremendous contributions.

**MR. G. FILMON:** . . . Why would the United Auto Workers give \$5,000 to the New Democratic Party in Manitoba? It's interesting. Investors Group, \$1,000; J.D. Carpet Gallery, \$1,000.00. What was the name of the company that did the new carpeting in the Premier's office, that expensive - was it \$40 a square yard? I don't know.

Bill Janzen, \$286; he has received a good deal in consulting fees to work on the Crow report for the province and a few other things. Joe's and Company, \$250; Joseph Management - ah, yes, principal of that company, Joseph Management is Saul Cherniack, \$850.00. Len Kaminski, \$480 - Professor Len Kaminski, who did a study on the . . .

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order please. The honourable member's time has expired. He's just at the "J's" but it has expired.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I was just enjoying myself and I say to you, in conclusion, that this is bad legislation because of the very reasons that the government is going into the taxpayer's pocket.

Thank you very much.

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

The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't intending to get involved in this debate. However, having

listened to a number of speakers on the other side yesterday and again this morning, I believe that it's time that we have some honesty put back into the electoral process, and this bill is a step in that direction.

It may not go all the way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but it's a beginning, because regardless of whether you want to accept that or not, the fact is, that when you make a voluntary contribution particularly from a corporation - I've never been opposed to individuals making contributions but when you go to a corporation then it's suspect; it always has been, and I want to relate a little story. I used to deal with a particular bank when I was in the livestock industry and required a considerable amount of capital at certain times of the year when it was time to buy livestock and it was necessary to have access to capital and I had a very good relationship with this bank as far as capital was concerned. Then one day, Mr. Speaker, I found out that they had made a \$50,000 contribution to the Conservative Party, so I went in one day and while I was dealing with this bank getting working capital at certain times of the year and you do that so you may have some savings, you may have some investments here and there but you don't want to disturb anything, you leave things in place and you work with bank financing to operate your business.

I went in to this banker and I said I've been dealing here for quite a number of years and I like the way that I've been treated, but I have to ask you something. I noticed that you're making contributions to the Conservative Party in the amount of \$50,000 and that tells me two things: either you're not paying me enough interest on my savings or you're charging me too much for the interest that I have to pay you when I borrow money because that is an expense. It is an expense to your company and if I come to borrow money here or if I'm a shareholder in your company, there is \$50,000 that is gone out of the coffers of the bank that gives me less dividends. I object to that, I said, I have no objection for you, as a manager of this bank to provide a contribution to the Conservative Party, any amount that you want; that's a different ball game; I have no objection to that. But when my bank starts doing it, then I have a problem - (Interjection) - of course, they've always done it. The Member for Inkster says they've always done it. Of course, they've always done it.

Well, he says to me, is it to the wrong party? Is it because we didn't give it to your party? I said, no, we don't want it, my party doesn't want it. I said, if you, personally, want to make a contribution to the New Democratic Party I'll accept it, but not the bank. Well, he says, maybe you've got a point, but there's nothing that I could do about it. I'm a little bank manager back here and there's nothing much I can do about it.

Well, I said, you can write to your head office and tell them that you're losing an account over this issue and they had better review their policy. Of course, my account is probably not big enough for them to worry about because it does take a lot of small ones to make big accounts as well. If you have enough small ones you eventually have big accounts. I don't remember how much our rolling account was but I would say it would say it would be around the \$50,000 mark somewhere around there, investing in livestock and selling and buying and so on, and operating the farm as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, why would the Bank of Nova Scotia, for instance, pay \$30,000 to the Conservative Party and \$30,000 to the Liberal Party? What advantage is there to them to do that? Why would they do that? I suggest to you that the reason they do that is they don't care who gets elected because there actually is no difference as far as they are concerned, as far as their welfare is concerned if the Conservative Party is elected or the Liberal Party is elected. That's why they make cheques out for \$30,000 to the Conservative Party and \$30,000 to the Liberal Party and they don't care who gets elected as long as they can pull strings after they are elected.

The Bank of Montreal, 1981; The Bank of Nova Scotia \$30,000 to the Conservatives, \$30,000 to the Liberals. The Bank of Montreal, zero to the NDP, \$30,000 to the Conservative Party, \$30,000 to the Liberals. Who are they kidding here? Why are they doing that? If it's good practice to support a party of your choice, why don't they contribute to one party and not the other one? It's because they don't care who wins as long as it's a free-enterprise, capitalistic party that is going to look after the welfare of the big corporate sector. That is the reason. The Banque Nationale du Canada, well, the honourable member will . . .

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Will the Honourable Minister submit to a question for clarification? The question is, I was paying close attention to the Honourable Minister and he mentioned it was \$30,000 that the Bank of Nova Scotia had donated to the Liberals and \$30,000 to the Conservatives. Was that the same figure and the same amounts for the Bank of Montreal?

**HON. A. ADAM:** Yes, the Bank of Nova Scotia, \$30,000 to the Conservatives, \$30,000 to the Liberals, zero to the NDP; the Bank of Montreal, \$30,000 to the Conservative Party, \$30,000 to the Liberals, zero to the NDP; the Banque Nationale du Canada, \$10,000 to the Conservatives, \$10,000 to the Liberals, zero to the NDP; Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, \$27,500 to the Conservatives, \$27,425 to the Liberals - they shafted the Liberals by \$75 - zero to the NDP; The Royal Bank of Canada, the biggest of the big five, \$30,000 to the Conservative Party, \$30,400 to the Liberals, the Conservatives better get back to the Royal Bank and find out what happened. Toronto Dominion Bank, Mr. Speaker, \$30,000 to the Conservative Party, \$30,483 to the Liberals, zero to the NDP.

Mr. Speaker, you can go through the list. I heard the member a while ago enunciating contributions that had been made by members on this side of the House. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we're members of the New Democratic Party; we're elected as New Democrats and we're certainly going to make contributions to our party as I'm sure, I suppose others do on the other side although we don't see it in the provincial list here or in the lists that we have, except for a few. There may be some in here but I haven't gone — (Interjection) — I know that the Honourable Member for Tuxedo - I listened to the member mention contributions from members on this side of the House to the New Democratic Party, let me say this, I found one in here anyway, the member who was speaking just before me, Gary A. Filmon, 36 Jaymorr Drive, Winnipeg, Manitoba,

a contribution of \$1,093.75 to the Conservative Party. I'm not complaining about that. I've never complained under the present system if an individual makes a contribution to a party of his choice, but I certainly object when corporations start making contributions because there's no doubt in my mind and, Mr. Speaker, they have made - the Member for St. Norbert mentioned the names of a few companies that had made contributions to the New Democratic Party but, Mr. Speaker, we can't even hold a candle to what the contributions of corporations are to the Conservative Party. It's obvious if we look at the — (Interjection) — yes, yes, the corporate donations in total to the provincial party in Manitoba was \$413,000 or 55 percent of all the contributions and outside total, outside corporate donations outside of the Province of Manitoba, \$163,300, 22 percent of their total contributions; \$340,000 or 45 percent came from individuals and 55 percent from corporations.

So, Mr. Speaker, let them not come here putting things on the record because we can go on for hours and hours and hours, we all have it here. Acadia Nursing Home Ltd., just down the street here on Mayfair, a nursing home that was not providing that good a service, I understand, \$1,000, Mr. Speaker. Burns Foods, \$5,000; Cadillac-Fairview, \$1,000; Safeway \$3,750; All Power Corporation - now here's a beauty because they're right in bed with the Liberals - \$25,000 to the provincial party; \$25,000 from Power Corporation, who are connected with investors. Paul Desmarais who is Chief Executive Officer of a conglomerate, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — Oh, sure, Brian Mulroney works for one of their subsidiaries?

Dome Petroleum, a company that was in financial difficulty, couldn't pay their bills. Chief Executive Officer there was a fellow by the name of Gallagher; serious financial troubles; \$5,000 to the Manitoba Conservative Party in the last election. Distillers Corporation, \$6,000.00.

**A MEMBER:** No shortage there.

**HON. A. ADAM:** No shortage of money there; they're not in the same shape as Dome Petroleum. Domtar, Montreal, \$3,000.00. Who's Eastern Datsun at Steinbach? I got a sneaking idea that, I think, it's the Member for La Verendrye. I could be wrong, but maybe the Member for Rhineland can enlighten me. — (Interjection) — Well, things are pretty rough in the automotive business, \$387.50, that's maybe the profit on one Datsun.

T. Eaton Co., now there's a good company. Frederick Eaton, he's in Power Corporation too and he's also in Massey Harris, \$1,000.00. — (Interjection) — The Member for St. Norbert was trying to say how come there's some transport companies that are making contributions to the NDP Party, and I see here one favourite transport on Molson Street in Winnipeg, made a contribution to the Conservative Party, \$250.00. Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot about democracy in the last few days. Now, there's a couple here by the name of Gourlay, I'm not sure whether they are, there's A.R. Gourlay of Cordova Street, Winnipeg, he paid a contribution of \$1,100, maximum, I guess, to get your tax credit. Mr. H. Brian Gourlay of Tuxedo Blvd., he

made a contribution of \$1,000.00. Now they may be friends or relatives of the Member for Swan River, I'm not sure, I suppose he would maybe enlighten us, perhaps he could enlighten us on that.

Greyhound Lines of Canada, Harlequin Enterprises, Hiram Walker - the Member for Tuxedo says that we had received a contribution from Walker, \$7,500; Holiday Chev-Olds, I'll never buy a car there again, \$1,000, they've just lost a customer; Hudson Bay Company, they're having a very difficult time to make ends meet the last while because of the downturn in the economy, Mr. Speaker, \$7,500; Husky Oil Marketing Ltd. Calgary, \$5,000, these are big ones; Imperial Development Winnipeg \$5,249; oh here's the Investors Group, Investors Group Trust Co. Ltd. Winnipeg, \$1,550; Investors Group, \$2,300; Investors Securities Management, \$2,300; Investors Syndicate, \$1,550; Investors Syndicate Realty Ltd. \$2,300; Inter-Provincial Pipelines \$1,000.00.

How many of the shareholders got shafted on their dividends, Mr. Speaker; who pays? It's the ordinary citizen that's paying for all this. That's who pays, Mr. Speaker, people have been trudging to the polls for . . .

**A MEMBER:** Who's going to pay for this, Pete, that's Bill 48, who's going to pay for that.

**A MEMBER:** All of us.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . That is a good thing because we will be putting some honesty back into the electoral process. That is what the intent of this bill is, is to get away from the payola that has prevailed since we've had elections in this country. People have trudged to the polls and made their X faithfully every four years, if there was a federal election that was called, and they never achieved anything. They made their X and it didn't matter where they made their X because when you have the Bank of Nova Scotia paying \$30,000 to one party, and \$30,000 to the other, it doesn't matter where you make your X because they're the ones that are governing the country anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Well, even in recent times the booze used to flow like water at election time. I don't see that so much now but there might be still a little bit, I haven't noticed it, but when I was campaigning in 1971 for election in the Ste. Rose Constituency I noticed when I went into a few places and I would ask people if they would consider supporting me in the by-election, and I noticed a bit of nervousness; they said, yes, yes, yes we might consider doing that. Well, I said, I appreciate that and I hope you give me serious consideration when you go to cast your ballot, nice to have talked to you and I'll see you again sometime. As I'm leaving this one fellow said to me, well - I could see he was very uncomfortable - he says, I've always - well, he mentioned who it was and I'm not going to mention it here - I always got \$5 at election time, I always get \$5 when election time is. Oh, well, I said I can't do that because, first of all, I think that your franchise to vote is a very precious thing, it's worth a lot more than \$5, or a drink of rye, and I wouldn't dare ask you to buy it because I don't feel that I have sufficient money to do so. That is the most precious thing that you have available to you and, that is, to have the right to go out and vote.

But I notice that it was still a practice to go out and pay people \$5, whatever, to go out and vote and hope that they will vote for you. I don't know what guarantee you have that once the fellow is in the poll, he has your \$5 and he votes for someone else, nevertheless that was the practice. I know of elections where the people working in the elections would start out in Dauphin with a carload of booze and drop it off all the way back, a few bottles at every poll. That is the kind of electoral system that we've had in this country for years and years and years where that prevailed.

That is the kind of thing that we have to try and get away from. It has been mentioned here that elected people don't have that good a reputation. There's a cloud over elected people. We know of some of the things we've seen in other parts of the country about payola, contracts and so on and so forth, and that casts a cloud over the whole electoral process and all elected people all over Canada. We have to try and put some integrity back into the system. We have to portray to the people, to the electors, confidence in their elected people, and we have to get away from the kind of situation that we've seen over the years, where he who pays the piper calls the tune.

There's no getting away from that; if someone comes in and makes a hefty contribution, particularly if he's a corporation or a company - it's not as serious if he's an individual - a candidate or an elected person or an elected government may have difficulty in dealing with that person if he comes and says, well, you know, I would like to see this done, I would like to have this done, it is very difficult to refuse that gentleman. I'm sure that's what would happen. That is why I oppose the system that we have.

I think that this kind of a bill is a step forward. I think, Mr. Speaker . . .

**A MEMBER:** I don't think so. I fancy it's a step backward.

**HON. A. ADAM:** . . . I've noticed in our own party, if a member puts in a contribution to his party and if he's politically inclined and is interested in what's happening in his province or in his constituency, if he puts \$100 on the line for a contribution, he may try and follow that through. There'll be a tendency on his part, I've put up some hard-earned cash to elect this fellow, and I'm going to follow him through and see that he carries out my wishes. I think that the fact that if everyone is going to contribute out of the provincial funds, I think there will more people who will be interested in seeing what is happening and make themselves aware of what is happening in the province. I think there has been too much apathy in the past about our electoral process.

In some countries, Mr. Speaker, you are required to vote by law, you have to vote. You have to have a very legitimate reason not to vote, Mr. Speaker. I want to put that forward because there is some criticism on Bill 48. I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in some countries there's a poll tax. When it comes election time, you have to pay to vote, and you are by law required to come in and vote and you have to pay so much when you go into vote. That is how they cover the expenses of the election, whether it's \$5, or whether

it's \$1.00. I don't know what it is, but I do know that does exist in some countries. Mind you, some of these countries, particularly in Latin America, they have corrupt governments and a lot of people go in and spoil their ballots, but they have to go in there. They may have to pay their poll tax, and they may spoil their ballot. If they get caught, you know, God help them if they get caught spoiling a ballot.

Mr. Speaker, I heard honourable members yesterday, and particularly the Member for Roblin-Russell, who was saying don't tamper, don't tinker with our system, it's worked so well, democracy works so well. Sure, it works well, Mr. Speaker, but the moment that we started providing welfare assistance, we were starting to tinker with the system.

**A MEMBER:** And you know what happens to people that tinker.

**HON. A. ADAM:** Mr. Speaker, the minute that you started to provide the Family Allowance, that is trying to prop up the democratic system that has failed in some way; and Unemployment Insurance, you call it the dole system. The system will not provide for certain sectors of your society, so you have to prop it up. That is what is happening with all this tinkering. Mr. Speaker, if we didn't tinker with the system it would have long been gone, all these programs of assistance of different kinds, and you can see what happens right now.

I don't know where there's any free enterprise left in the country. It's all supported by public in one way or another. I heard the honourable member criticize the Member for Flin Flon about his comments on assistance for the agriculture sector. Well, of course, there is assistance because if there was not, they would disappear. There are all kinds of indirect services provided to farmers which is one of our largest economic sectors in the province, and we want to see that it survives. That is why under the present system, the free-market system, there is no other way to make them survive unless we come up with programs to assist them.

That also happens in the business sector. Mr. Speaker, we all know that there are all kinds of grants going out to all kinds of associations that provide voluntary services. These are all services that cannot be provided under the democratic process and the public has to come in, and any time the public gets involved, any time that there are public funds, gets involved to do something, whether it's education, whether it's health, that is socialism because public funding is social, that is the total social structure. When you build roads for people to drive on without a toll that is socialism at work; when you provide a telephone system that's been put in place collectively by the people, by the government, that's socialism. We have Manitoba Hydro, that is socialism, it's things that we are doing collectively, and anything that you do collectively is socialism, anything that's done individually is free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, now, I put those things on the record, because there has been too much misinformation being placed on the record by members opposite criticizing Bill 48; I think it's a good bill, I think it's a step in the right direction, it's already in place in a number of jurisdictions, four or five at least plus the Federal

Government have similar types of legislation, and I recommend it to the House, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

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

The Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm kind of at a loss, I know that we are discussing Bill No. 48, The Elections Finances Act and the amendment which reads "be now not read a second time but be read this day six months hence." I'll be speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, rather than going into a filibuster as did the previous member.

Actually, I have the Winnipeg Telephone Book, Mr. Speaker, and I thought well if people were just going to be reading off all of the list of names and the donations, for whatever reason, for whatever purposes, I think that I'm entitled to read off the Winnipeg Telephone Directory if I was going to filibuster. I have been accused of filibustering, Mr. Speaker, and I will only be speaking five or ten minutes, or maybe just a few minutes longer but I want to thank the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, the Honourable Minister, for his listing of some of the banks that have made donations. I wasn't aware of some of those banks and I've made note of them and the amounts so that I can write them and say thank you to them for the donations they've made to the Conservative Party, particularly, and even say thank you to them for the non-donations that they didn't make to the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, it's obvious that the Honourable Minister was filibustering. This is what my group, on this side of the House, have been accused of, is filibustering, Mr. Speaker, and if it continues I think that we, on this side, will have no other alternative but to consider closure. Mr. Speaker, I'm not threatening I'm just saying that this is something that will have to be considered on our part if this filibuster from the government side is going to continue.

I'm not about to pick holes and condemn the people who have made contributions. I made a note of one person here and I thought to what advantage is it for me to read off that this person has made a contribution to the New Democratic Party and is now working for the New Democratic Party. There's just no advantage. It could be a little embarrassing to them and, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to do it, because I don't think that's what we are here for, to try and embarrass some of these people. We all know that it's done, that people buy their jobs. There's a few people that have made contributions and, I imagine, when we are government and we will be government after the next election, that we will probably give consideration to those people that have been kind to us, the same as what has happened for the New Democratic Party being kind to those people that have made contributions to them. I want to stick to the subject, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to wander all over the board. I want to stick to the subject of The Elections Finances Act and, Mr. Speaker, in sticking to this subject I have a couple of little stories concerning my football background that I think are very very appropriate concerning The Elections Finances Act, and you will see how I'm able to work

that in my discussion on whether you owe anything to people who have made contributions to you.

I guess a few years back when I was on the Board of the Winnipeg Enterprises and I was refereeing football at the same time, there was an opportunity whether there would be a semi-final or a final game played at the Winnipeg Stadium and just before I was appointed to do the - no, it was the final game because the semi-finals were the ones that were under discussion - and the Commissioner of the Canadian Football League asked me at one time, he said, "Abe, would your decisions be affected if you had to make a decision in the football game whether the game would be played in Winnipeg or played somewhere else?" Mr. Speaker, there was a financial advantage to playing the game in Winnipeg, particularly for Winnipeg and for Manitobans, because there is a big financial benefit, and I told the Commissioner, I said, "I don't think it really matters, Mr. Commissioner, whether, in fact, the game is played in Winnipeg whether it would affect my judgment." I think that what I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that for a few dollars and even for a great amount of dollars, I don't think the amount is really of any interest whether a person's judgment will be swayed or turned to favour somebody as to whether a football game would be played there, as to whether a job would be given to somebody. The amount doesn't matter.

I listened to the Honourable Minister read off all of those amounts, \$30,000 from the Royal Bank to the Conservatives and \$30,400 to the Liberals. Really, is the amount that important? What if it was \$15,000.00? I know what he was trying to establish, that there was no monies to the New Democratic Party. There was no monies donated to the New Democratic Party because the Honourable Minister made a point of it, \$30,000 to the Conservatives, \$30,400 to the Liberals, and nothing to the New Democrats. That was the exact remarks, I marked it down so that I wouldn't forget, Mr. Speaker. Not only did I want to make reference to it, I wanted to write them and say thank you. But if \$1 or \$10 or \$20 from the Royal Bank came to the New Democratic Party, does that justify or does that dispell what the Honourable Minister was trying to get across to us? Really the amount is of no significance, but we go through the whole of that charade of reading off all of those people who have made donations. I don't think it's significant.

Mr. Speaker . . .

**HON. A. ADAM:** The point I was making was that they paid to both.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** They paid to both and they didn't pay to the New Democrats, but if they had paid \$5 or \$10 to the New Democrats, would that have justified the situation? I think your point isn't well founded at all. Anyway, I said I was going to relate a couple of football stories, because I really want to stick to the subject and not go all around the mulberry bush.

Concerning another one, Mr. Speaker, I was refereeing a game in Edmonton and there was a coach from the Calgary Stampeders who was very very unhappy with the manner in which some of my crew were working out on the field. He was following us after the game right into the dressing room, he was threatening one

of my sideline men, and he said, "I will have your job." This sideline man - I think I've related this story once before in this Legislature - is a very prominent lawyer in Edmonton. After we had thrown this coach out of our dressing room and we were discussing it, he says, "You know Abe, he's going to have my job. I wonder if he wants my job as a football official or as a lawyer. He can have both of them."

Mr. Speaker, we were not paid that highly as football officials, not enough so that it would have affected the manner in which we had made decisions out on the football field. We just were not paid that kind of money, but what I'm trying to get across - as I have in the previous story - is that the amount is insignificant. I don't see how we can keep saying that these corporate donations and the amount is going to be significant in making decisions as to whether we will be favouring that group or not. I say no, Mr. Speaker. At least, that's the way I feel. I think that there are some people who feel that these corporate donations are significant and the amounts of these corporate donations are significant, Mr. Speaker, but I for one don't feel that they are, and I know my judgment can't be swayed by the amount or even by the donation at all.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak too long; I give you that assurance. It's not my intention to try and filibuster. We are now talking about the taxpayer contributing to the expenses of candidates running in the election, 50 percent to be paid by the taxpayer. I just can't see the rhyme or reason of people who are already paying taxes to have to pay additional taxes to help candidates run in the next election. There's just no rhyme or reason. In the last election, Mr. Speaker, and particularly when they weren't prepared for it, it was just out of the clear blue sky, you will now pay 50 percent of election expenses of candidates running in the next election.

There was no warning and possibly if we can time it so that it will be after the next election and there will be some advice from the taxpayers to let us know whether, in fact, it's acceptable, well then maybe it might be acceptable; but right today it is not acceptable.

In the last Provincial Election, Mr. Speaker, I understand that there was over \$1 million spent by the New Democratic Party and over \$1 million spent by the Conservatives in election expenses. To bring it into terms, that would be that the taxpayer, if it was transposed into the next election, the taxpayer would have to contribute \$1 million to those two parties, not taking into account any other parties, but if it was on the same basis as the last election, over \$1 million would have to be contributed to by the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, that's an awful lot of money, even if you say it fast. It's nowhere near the \$750 million deficit of the Province of Manitoba, that three quarters of a billion dollar deficit, or around that figure, but if you say that fast, it doesn't sound too much either; but \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, could you imagine what could be done with that \$1 million. We wouldn't have to close the obstetric department in the Concordia or the Seven Oaks Hospitals. The money would be there; this is the money I'm told is being saved by closing the obstetric department in the Concordia and the Seven Oaks Hospitals.

I have already spoken in favour of keeping those two obstetric departments open because I have heard from

nurses and people who work there who felt that the government - I shouldn't say we - were making a mistake in closing those obstetric departments. Can you imagine the . . .

**HON. A. ADAM:** You just said we had a big deficit.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Yes, but if we've got a big deficit, why are we spending that extra \$1 million to support people running for elections when it's not really required. That's the only point I was trying to make.

Mr. Speaker, I'm told, and I've heard it before, you can't have your cake and eat it too. You can't keep promoting spending money on particular items and cutting back on other expenses. The only thing I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is I'm a member of the opposition and I can't have my cake and I can't eat it too, and I can condemn you for spending too much money and I can condemn you for not spending enough money; that's my privilege.

There are many sports organizations and fitness programs that could use this \$1 million. I have a group of young ladies that are going overseas to represent Manitoba and Canada in baton twirling and I spoke to the Minister of Fitness and Sports a little earlier about getting some help for these people and there is no financial assistance coming to help them, they have to pay their own way.

Mr. Speaker, I would rather give up my share and I hope some of the other members in this Legislature would give up their share of that \$1 million so that these young ladies can go and represent Manitoba and Canada over in Italy in this baton twirling competition.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many programs that the money could be better used for. It's not that it's not to be used, but could be better used for. I go out to my farm, out at Menisino, and I have to travel four-and-a-half or five miles over a gravel road in the dust. My wife has allergies and that dust bothers her. I'm not crying or complaining; we know what it is. We have to put up with these things but, Mr. Speaker, there's other gravel roads over the province that could be treated, so that some of that \$1 million could go towards the treating of gravel roads to relieve and to add some comfort to people who have to drive over those gravel roads, rather than putting that \$1 million into helping people run for the next election. There could be repair of other types of roads.

As I'm going out to my farm also, there's a bit of No. 1 Highway, just a short distance out and it's awful; it's very washboardy - if that's the correct terminology - just shakes the hell out of you. I know I get shaken all to pieces and I was wondering what happens when people are coming in on Trans-Canada Highway No. 1 who are visitors to the province and this is the first thing they get just before they enter Winnipeg; they get the hell shaken right out of them. Anyway, if some of that \$1 million could go towards that, Mr. Speaker, I'd be much more satisfied.

We've just gone through the process of listening to all of the - and I can't be called out of order on this, Mr. Speaker, because it has already been reported to the Legislature, I have tried to make reference to it before and it hadn't been reported so that I had to withdraw my remarks, but what would happen when

we're talking about the helmet legislation and seat belt legislation - and we're talking about safeguards for children. I listened to these people when they were talking about these restraints for children, about how somebody coming out of the hospital should be given one of these restraints just as a token of goodwill and saying, all right, we love you and we love your children, here is a restraint package, so that you can carry your child home from the hospital in a child restraint, rather than that death seat right next to the mother in the front seat that really is a great danger. If we would give every child being born a restraint seat or to the parents so that they could take their child home from the hospital, if that \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, could go towards some sort of a program similar to that, rather than giving it to us greedy politicians, who allegedly grab everything that's available. I don't want it, Mr. Speaker. Let's put it into some safeguards for those children.

I listened to the people speaking against seat belt and helmet legislation. The helmets - the motor bikers were saying let's not put in this type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, let's put in a program of safety training. Let's put some of this \$1 million into a safety training program. I know that there's other monies available, but I say let's use this money, let's not wait until something happens before we say, goodness gracious, why did we not put this money into a safety program, look at the lives we could have saved, instead of putting it into the program to help promote politicians.

Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking, and I think that I've spoken for about 5 or 10 minutes, or I've just got a few more minutes of what I would like to say before I sit down, because it's not my intention to filibuster again, because I don't want to be accused of that.

Mr. Speaker, nobody likes to pay taxes, particularly if they're not aware of the type of taxes that are going to be imposed upon them, to tax the taxpayer in Manitoba for a tax that they weren't aware of, they didn't know was going to happen to them. We complain like mad when we have to pay taxes which are for the promotion of our schools and our hospitals and things of that nature. We're not that happy about it, but we know that these are things that have to be done. Mr. Speaker, we do not know, and my people didn't know that they were going to have to pay some additional taxes to help me get elected, or to help the New Democrats get elected, or to help any other political party get elected. I think that they should have been fair warning.

I think that we've got to get our hands out of the taxpayers' pocket, particularly when we're doing it without his knowledge. I guess if we caught somebody in our pocket without our permission and without our knowledge that they were going to go into our pocket, Mr. Speaker, that's a pick pocket, that's against everything that I believe in. It's against the law. Legislation can't make it legal if it is illegal before the legislation. Or are we trying to legalize something that is illegal? It doesn't seem right to me, Mr. Speaker, to pay the expenses for election.

I think there's some sort of an accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, in being able to run an election and be independent in running your own election, in forming your own organization with your friends and your supporters, and the people who support you either by going out door to door . . .

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

I would like to inform the Member for Niakwa that since the late '70s, reference to illegal actions coming from a legislator is not parliamentary language.

**A MEMBER:** He didn't hear you.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** For the information of the Member for Niakwa and other members of the House, since the late '70s, the word "illegal" in reference to actions of the House has been ruled unparliamentary.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood and I thought in the early '80s we had changed that, but if that is so and since the late '70s that it's illegal, I won't make — (Interjection) — I'm prepared to withdraw it. It was a slip of the tongue. — (Interjection) — Actually, it really wasn't meant as an accusation, Mr. Speaker, and I'm happy to withdraw it. Actually, it was just a typographical error, Mr. Speaker, and please forgive me for the typographical error, they seem to abound within this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I was speaking on the accomplishment of having an organization that will go out and work for you, knock on the doors, deliver your literature, go out and raise funds for you. This is quite an accomplishment. I'm prepared to support that type of an endeavour rather than allowing the government to tax the people to put that money into my coffers so that I can run. I don't believe that it's a wise thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this action by the government, The Elections Finances Act, isn't going to eliminate the corporate donations, and this seems to be what the critical part of the members of the government have been stating, it's the corporate donations that they seem to be so anti, but it's not going to eliminate the corporate donations. That's not their intentions. Obviously, it can't eliminate the corporate donations, because they do receive corporate donations also, and it wouldn't be to their best advantage to have these corporate donations eliminated.

What is going to do? Is it going to correct the problem to eliminate or to even suggest the elimination of corporate donations, but that's not what they're doing. What are the consequences of passing this bill? What is the next step, Mr. Speaker? Are we going to expect that 50 percent of our election expenses are going to be paid? Are we going to expect somewhere in the future that the people of the Province of Manitoba through being taxed are going to have to pay 50 percent of my car expenses? Are we going to have to expect that the next thing that could follow is that maybe the people of the Province of Manitoba through taxation will have to 50 percent of my house expenses, 50 percent of my food expenses, 50 percent of my recreation expenses? Mr. Speaker, the consequences are so far reaching, I just can't accept the thinking of the government in making this proposal.

Another point; 50 percent of the people entering government services, that their training of becoming lawyers and accountants and secretaries, should the people of the Province of Manitoba pay 50 percent of their expenses in training for these jobs? The final outcome is just so far reaching, Mr. Speaker, I just can't

see how the government could make this proposal, and that is part of the reason for the hoist, where we are trying to either have them withdraw the bill, or put it to a point where it won't go through at this time, or at least such time as we've had a chance to really think about it.

We are having trouble getting monies for some other programs. I hope it doesn't sound like I'm just wandering all over the place, but these are all things that came to mind on what to do with that \$1 million that will be spent on election expenses if the bill goes through.

I am a very very strong supporter of the promotion of hydrogen power in the province, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Honourable Minister of Energy has endeavoured to get some funding from the Federal Government to help to promote hydrogen power and the expansion of hydrogen power in the Province of Manitoba. I know that this is the future of the Province of Manitoba. The future depends so highly on electrical energy power and on hydrogen power, hydrogen power being the power of the future. We can sell hydrogen power all over Manitoba; we can be involved with selling it to Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec - well, Quebec and Ontario have received funds from the Federal Government already.

If we are not going to receive our funds, let's take this \$1 million and throw it into the expansion and the study of hydrogen power so that the people of the Province of Manitoba can enjoy the benefits, not the benefits of electing politicians, but the benefits of having cheaper power in the future because of our investment today. Let's take that \$1 million and put it into something substantial, Mr. Speaker. Let's take part of that \$1 million that would be spent on election expenses, let's not spend it on election expenses and let's consider a vocational school in St. Boniface. Another thing that I have spoken on in the past, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of areas in St. Boniface that a vocational school could be built, particularly a vocational school that could take advantage of some of the people that are coming out of the French Immersion Program because I have been a strong supporter of the French Immersion Program, not this resolution that's going through where it's going to enshrine some of these rights into the Constitution. I don't support that, Mr. Speaker, but the support of the French Immersion Program and the different French culture and French programs I'm a very strong supporter, Mr. Speaker. What are we going to do with the people who are coming out of these immersion programs and no French Immersion vocational school to go to? Could we not consider spending some of this money that was designed for the politicians to be put into a vocational school that will be able to look after these people who will be graduating from French Immersion schools?

Let's talk about some of the other corporate donations, and I'm not condemning some of the donations that the New Democratic Party has received. I know that they received a lot of donations from different unions, that's the name of the game, that's okay and I know what the New Democratic Party has done. They've given special consideration to the unions, because in words as well as in actions - it's obvious I'm not implying they're making any remarks that are not so - these are obvious and the New Democratic Party would not deny it, but the unions have contributed



to the New Democratic Party. I've had some union people who have contributed to my own campaign but a union, as such, has never contributed to my campaign. But what really bothers me and if something could be done about it, where some of the monies that go towards election campaigns from unions, if they could be used for eliminating some of the things that I see happening in my area, particularly where union representatives are threatening people about crossing picket lines, particularly using some of the funds that they received from election campaigns, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to dwell on that because it's an important fact, but it's not something that should be discussed at this time. There's going to be lots of time to get into that. Are we going to be hitting these young people, setting up something? I guess it's not irreversible, Mr. Speaker, it can be reversed. I think that if this election expenses act is passed, I think that you would find that the Conservatives, who will be forming the next government, will be doing everything in their power to reverse it and to eliminate it, so that the taxpayers don't have to pay. Because we are not looking to putting an albatross around the necks of our children and the children of the future in Manitoba by saying that they will have to support a political party because of this bill that's going through.

I don't think it makes them happy to be involved in having to pay these expenses, Mr. Speaker, where 50 percent of the expenses go through. If the NDP are considering pushing it through and they can do so, Mr. Speaker, there's no doubt. They can do anything, they've got the numbers, they can do anything they want, but I would give them just fair warning not to proceed too quickly. It's just another step for the NDP on their way to a loss in the next election.

There was one part that bothered me. There was some insinuation about everybody, the corporates particularly who donate, about what they expect in return. Last election I had an elderly gentleman come into my campaign headquarters and he says, Abe, here's a cheque for \$10 and he says I want to help you in your election. I said, well, that's very good. I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, \$10 coming from this gentleman was very much appreciated because I knew that he didn't have that much. I said why are you donating \$10 to my campaign? He says, well, I think that politicians should be helped and he says I think that we as citizens, not through taxation - I just added that, that isn't quite what he said - but I think that what we citizens should do is contribute to election expenses of some of the people who are running. I said, well, why are you giving me the \$10.00? I was really looking to find out why he was supporting me. He said, Mr. Kovnats, I'm giving \$10 to the Liberal candidate, and I'm giving \$10 to the New Democratic Party candidate; I'm non-political, but I feel that it is incumbent on us to look after these things. I said, well, that's fine and I accepted that donation. It was better than all the corporate donations that ever went around.

Really, Mr. Speaker, there were no strings attached with that type of a donation and I can't see why we keep thinking that there are always strings attached. There are things that happen, and I mentioned it earlier and I don't want to go into it again, but I think, Mr. Speaker, it's my money and it's the money of my friends and my neighbours that are being used for a purpose

that they never thought would ever come into being. If they were only given a forewarning, I think that they could accept it. But, Mr. Speaker, I can never ever accept under any circumstances that any of my money and there are a couple of other people - I'm not going to mention names - but they would just be so reviled to think that their money or some of the money of the taxpayers that the province has would go to a Communist, a Ku Klux Klanner, a Nazi, a fascist, a separatist, groups promoting prejudice. It just reviles me to think that there is the possibility through this act that those type of people can receive my money. That is absolutely not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, completely unacceptable and I will do everything I can to see that there is no chance that these people will get one penny of my money.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just realized that you've given me the five-minute sign, and again I advise that it was not my intention to go to the full extent of my time. I just wanted to relate a few of the things that I had pressing in my mind that were bothering me and I'm happy to get it off my chest. I hope that it would be received by the honourable government members in the manner in which it was presented, and they will not support this bill either. I really don't believe that they feel that strongly in supporting the bill. They have spoken in favour of the bill, but I think that if it really comes down to it, and we had a chance to talk it over without having any embarrassment of withdrawing the bill, I think that there would be a lot of government members who wouldn't support the bill, the same as I'm not supporting the bill.

I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Member for River Heights.

**MR. W. STEEN:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to make a few contributions regarding Bill 48, The Elections Finances Act. I've been sitting in my place listening to the Minister of Municipal Affairs read off to us who the contributors to the Conservative Party Election Campaign were, and some of the contributions that they had made. I must say that they were a lot of very fine people that contributed to a great cause.

My colleague, the Member for Tuxedo read off the names of some of their staunch contributors to the NDP Party, many of them who have received appointments to boards and commissioners, some that even have become Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers. So, the great game of politics is being played with The Elections Finances Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have before me the annual report dated 1982 of the Elections Commissions. I note in here on Appendix A where it says the totals for aggregate contributions, and they mention the Manitoba New Democratic Party at over a million dollars. It mentions the Conservative Party at about three-quarters of a million. What the Member for Niakwa has just stated, Mr. Speaker, is that the taxpayers of Manitoba are going to be asked to contribute 50 percent of the election expenses, and based on the most recent election, where both major parties spent very close to \$1 million each, that means half a million dollars in

taxpayer monies to the two major parties in this province, as well as monies going to so-called fringe parties if they're fortunate enough to get 10 percent of the vote.

It was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition when he spoke back in July that in Manitoba the persons earning between \$1 and \$20,000 a year are 37 percent, and that it's the people from within this income area that are going to be funding a great portion of these election finances from taxpayer to candidate. He made the point, and he made it rather strongly, that many persons in the low-income area, senior citizens, etc., are not in a position to pay greater sums in taxes and they should be the last people that would be asked to pay for election expenses.

The Minister of Health, when he spoke on this bill yesterday, made reference to the fact that it's not right receiving monies from corporations and so on, that it's people trying to bribe politicians. Well, the Member for Tuxedo stated earlier this afternoon that any politician worth his own salt, if he takes a contribution from a particular person, should know whether he's being bribed or not, and that corporate contributions or individual contributions to political parties, in my opinion, there's nothing wrong with it. Whether the Bank of Nova Scotia gives the Liberal Party \$30,000 at an election time or the Conservative Party \$30,000 and doesn't wish to contribute to the NDP, that's their business as far as I'm concerned. If NDP members of the Legislature have to give back a portion of their indemnity from the Legislature to their party, again that is their business and if they want to monthly have the payroll checkoff system to fund their party, all the more power to them. That is their individual doing.

I am opposed to the fact when a political party comes into government and forms the government and comes along and says, oh, we have an election deficit of some \$300,000 or \$400,000, and the best way to get rid of this deficit is to change The Elections Finances Act so that the taxpayer will make a 50 percent contribution to these deficits. What we are asking the citizens of Manitoba - and as I said almost 40 percent of them are in what you call middle to lower income groups and many of them are senior citizens and persons that are in no position to be funding election expenses - what we're doing is we're asking these people from the lower-income groups to pick up a portion of the NDP Party's deficit, or the Conservative Party's deficit if the Conservative Party should have one after the next election.

I think that if political parties want to run up deficits, it should be up to them to go out and raise sufficient funds to wipe out their deficits, and it shouldn't be legislated onto the taxpayers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the part of this bill that members on the opposition are definitely against is that part of the bill. We thought that we had a good bill in 1980 that made it so that persons giving fairly sizable contributions had to be identified. We felt we cleaned up The Elections Finances Act by making persons running for public office be accountable, and that after the election that they file with the Chief Election Officer their statement of revenues, as well as their statement of expenses, which is listed here in this 1982 report that has been distributed to members in the Legislature in recent weeks, that indicates what was spent by candidates in all constituencies during the 1981 election.

I think that the bill of 1980 was a suitable bill. It certainly let the public know who the larger contributors were and what the expenses of the various candidates were. You can see in this 1982 annual report where candidates in urban Winnipeg in most cases spent far more money than candidates in rural Manitoba. It's there for the people to view, and I don't think that the taxpayers should in any way shape or form be contributing to election expenses.

The Member for Niakwa mentioned that it would be in the area, based on the 1981 election, of somewhere around \$1 million that would be contributed. He cited a number of examples of how that million dollars could be used in the Province of Manitoba.

I was telling the Minister of Natural Resources a couple of weeks ago that I've participated in the Police and Pal Golf Event back in July. In taking to people up at Hecla Island in the park there, they were saying that they would like to get that road within the park hard-surfaced one of these days. The people running the golf course said that the gravel paths to and from the golf course and from the lodge is in the form of gravel, and that every time that a person enters the club house, they drag in a bunch of gravel dust with them, and that what they would like to see done some day is have these paths asphalted so that it would be far easier for them to keep both the lodge and the golf pro shop cleaner so that they wouldn't have all this gravel dust within the facility. Well, a million dollars would go a long way I'm sure to asphalt both the highway to Hecla Island, as well as some of the paths and walkways that are there for the people of Manitoba to walk around that excellent park facility.

Members of the Legislature can think of numerous ways that \$1 million can be spent in just about every department of government, and I think that it's criminal to take taxpayers' money to finance election expenses. What we should do is continue to police election expenses the way that the 1980 act states; that large contributions should be indicated, who makes them and what their amounts are; that the expenses of candidates should be indicated and should be filed and kept on record with the Chief Electoral Officer; and that monies by candidates should be raised on their own and whether, like the Minister of Health thought it was lobbying and he made reference to, how in the United States, that lobbying is such a big industry down there. Well, I don't think there's anything wrong with lobbying. The Minister of Natural Resources has a man in Washington trying to put forward Manitoba's case regarding the Garrison. He would be referred to by many as a lobbyist. I see nothing wrong with that; that's salesmanship or trying to get our point across. If persons want to back candidates that are offering themselves for public office and want to help them financially, again, I see nothing wrong with that, and with the larger contributions being reported, we can certainly keep track of who is obtaining favourable decisions from government.

Mr. Speaker, I'm totally opposed to public financing of elections. The Leader of the Opposition has said that we will make it retroactive; we'll bring in retroactive legislation that will see to it that election expenses are not paid by the government. After the next election, if we're fortunate enough to be elected, and I'm sure at the rate the government is conducting themselves

in the first half of their term there doesn't appear to be much doubt. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not support this bill and I would hope that the hoist motion would be accepted by the government and that they would hold back this legislation, think it out again and have a hard look at it as to whether they want to have almost 40 percent of Manitobans in the lower income groups paying for a candidate's election expenses.

I don't think that these people can afford to pay the election expenses and can afford to pay higher taxes; therefore, this is one area where government shouldn't be spending money. With regulations that are in place, as of 1980, there was really no need for this bill and in particular the financing aspect of this bill. So, Mr. Speaker, when the question is called on this, I would certainly oppose the passing of this bill. As I have said, I totally endorse the concept of identifying large contributors to political parties, and I certainly endorse the practice of candidates having to file a statement of expenses and revenues after an election. This is a good way of keeping the election system on the straight and narrow.

I read in an American newspaper recently a question that was asked to a number of American citizens, what do you think Watergate did for the American political system? The answer that many persons gave was that the incident of Watergate in the United States has made people in general much more aware of what is going on politically, and people in both Canada and the United States I believe today are following the art of politics far more closely than they did 20-25 years ago. I think by having candidates, after elections, produce an expense sheet as well as a revenue sheet is an excellent move, but to have the taxpayer pay for election expenses, I'm totally opposed to, because in Manitoba we have on a per capita basis as many senior citizens as any other province has - likely more than any other province in Canada. We have almost 40 percent of our taxpayers, persons paying taxes, are under \$20,000 a year in earnings and aren't in a position to pay increased taxes to fund election expenses, whether they be for Conservatives or NDP or Liberals or people of any party.

As I've said, I'm totally opposed to this bill and, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would

reconsider their position and support the amendment that has been introduced and re-think this legislation over once again, and perhaps in their wisdom they might come up with the understanding that taxpayers can't afford to subsidize election campaigns.

With those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I'll go on record as saying that I'm opposed to the bill.

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

The Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** If the other members, the members opposite, are willing to let this go to the question, I'll be letting it go to question now; if not, then perhaps I could start. I have an eloquent speech to start off with here, or we could hold it and call it 5:30.

If someone else would like to speak, I would gladly give the floor to them.

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

The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is there some agreement to call it 5:30? Then I would take the adjournment on it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Is it agreed to call it 5:30?

The Member for Riel.

## COMMITTEE CHANGES

**MRS. D. DODICK:** Committee changes on Law Amendments, the Member for Gimli will substitute for the Member for Burrows; and the Member for Rupertsland will substitute for the Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The time being 5:30, this House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning (Friday), with the understanding that the Law Amendments Committee will meet tonight.